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Why the world needs the EU

Investing in the future

Germany will assume the EU Council presidency from July to December 2020 and intends to contribute to shaping foreign policy and invigorating international development efforts – with a special focus on Africa. Gerd Müller, the federal minister for economic cooperation and development, spells out his policy.

Ireland’s fragile peace

Decolonisation often led to arbitrary borders that caused lasting grievances. Britain, a former imperial power, is itself affected by such a border. Regional integration in the EU context allowed Irish peace to take root, however, and that approach might, in theory, work elsewhere. But whether peace in Ireland can survive Brexit is not obvious, warns Ciarán Ó Maoláin, an Irish journalist.

“Swimming against the tide”

The Bangladeshi scholar Saleemul Huq has observed international climate talks from the start. In his eyes, the multilateral system has failed, but in our interview he appreciated climate protests and the European Investment Bank’s decision to back off from fossil fuels.

Grasp opportunities

Trade can stimulate development. Since 2018, Mozambique has – in principle – been able to benefit from an Economic Partnership Agreement with the EU. The country must grasp the opportunities, demand Friedrich Kaufmann of the German Chamber Network and Winfried Borowczak, a consultant.

“Teetering continent”

The EU has a vital role to play in global affairs, according to Dirk Messner of the UN University. As he told D+C/E+Z in an interview, five issues matter in particular: multilateralism, trade, digitalisation, global environment and peace.

Defining relationship

Libyans have mixed feelings about the EU. They admire it, but they also feel let down. Grievance include a desperate security situation and refugee problems. Moutaz Ali, a journalist, and Walid Ali, a foreign-policy expert, assess matters.
More than the sum of its parts

The EU is an unusual alliance of nations that have pooled sovereignty. It has its own administration (the European Commission), a parliament and a supranational law court. Members must adopt its binding legislation in national law, and a joint central bank (the ECB) serves the euro zone. The EU is an alliance of democracies that appreciate human rights and gender equity. The two arguably most important leaders – Ursula von der Leyen, the president of the Commission, and ECB President Christine Lagarde – are women.

The EU has a huge bearing on life in Europe, but its impact is felt around the world. It is a superpower in trade affairs, an important proponent of climate protection and, in conjunction with its members, the dominant force in official development assistance. By contrast, it remains a military dwarf.

The EU is sometimes accused of being run by unelected bureaucrats. That is vastly overblown. Yes, technocrats matter much in EU governance, but that is because the issues at stake are very complex and Europe’s many different languages do not offer congruent legal and political terms. Nonetheless, the EU has clear democratic legitimacy. The European Parliament is elected, and so are the member states’ governments whose leaders constitute the European Council. These institutions decide who heads EU institutions.

Nonetheless, EU policymaking can look arbitrary, particularly in moments of crisis. Sometimes, problems arise for which neither solutions nor procedures have been pre-defined. In such cases, ad-hoc summits of the national top-leaders tend to reach ground-breaking new agreements late at night after extended talks. In such contexts, one can indeed speak of a democracy deficit, since the elected legislators are not involved and it is next to impossible to undo compromises reached by the Council. On the upside, important Council decisions require broad majorities.

The EU indeed has flaws. In the past five years, it neither handled the refugee nor the eurozone crisis well. The union is incomplete and keeps evolving. Its strong points deserve emphasis however. People move freely within it. The EU’s single market provides more and greater opportunities than smaller national markets ever could. The pooling of sovereignty has entrenched cooperation in a way that safeguards peace on a continent that used to be devastated by wars. The EU gives its member states more global influence than they could individually exert. Just how useful it is became evident in the fact that it did not unravel after the Brexit referendum as stubborn nationalists had hoped. It has actually become more cohesive, while in Britain itself the doubts about leaving this alliance have grown.

EU coherence actually serves the interests of humanity as a whole. As a species, we are facing huge global challenges, from environmental devastation to worsening inequality, from mass poverty to the risk of war. Narrow-minded nationalism will only compound the problems. We need supranational policymaking – and in spite of all its shortcomings, the EU is living proof of it being feasible. It does not diminish sovereign nation states, on the contrary, it enhances their scope for achieving goals – including global ones such as the UN’s Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).
Communicating in humanitarian crises

When disasters hit, emergency aid usually means the provision of food, water, shelter and medical care. But people also depend on reliable information – they need to know where they can be safe, whether their families are alive, and how they can receive help.

By Sheila Mysorekar

War, natural disasters, forced displacement, persecution – there are many reasons why people have to flee their homes, and often even their home country. Most displaced persons lose everything they have and suddenly depend on outside help. Getting food and shelter is essential, but people need more. They need timely, accurate and reliable information; otherwise, they are often unable to access the help that is offered. Moreover, they need to be given a voice to express their needs and desires. Unless they are empowered to contribute to solving the humanitarian problems, those problems are likely to fester.

However, humanitarian agencies have strategies for addressing these issues. “Communication and community engagement” (CCE) is increasingly being recognised as a necessary and integral part of any humanitarian intervention. Forced migration is often closely tied to humanitarian crises. Both scenarios require CCE. It is as important as delivering food, clothes and medication, not least because it facilitates access to such supplies. Feedback from people in need helps humanitarian agencies to operate more effectively.

The international network “Communicating with disaster affected communities” (CDAC) is a platform of more than 30 organisations involved in humanitarian aid, media development, social innovation, technology and telecommunication. It is “dedicated to saving lives and making aid more effective through communication, information exchange and community engagement”. CDAC promotes up-to-date CCE. Members include the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), the UN Children’s Fund (UNICEF) as well as BBC Media Action and DW Akademie.

CHOOSING THE RIGHT LANGUAGE

There are many aspects to communication. One is often overlooked: language. People who flee their country often end up in places where they don’t understand the local language. They can neither communicate with their new neighbours nor with aid agencies. These international organisations often assume that refugees will speak a local language, but that is not necessarily so.

Translators without Borders (TWB) is a non-profit organisation that offers language and translation support for aid agencies and other non-profit organisations internationally.

“Language gaps hinder critical humanitarian interventions,” says Mia Marzotto, one of its senior advisers. She insists that both refugees and aid agencies need two-way communication.

One example where TWB intervened successfully is the Rohingya crisis. When the ethnic and religious minority Rohingya was expelled from their homeland Myanmar in 2017, hundreds of thousands fled across the border to neighbouring Bangladesh. The Rohingya language is closely related to Bengali, but the assumption that the refugees would understand the dialect spoken in the Chittagong region, where they fled to, was wrong. It turned out that most of the Rohingya refugees did not even understand basic sentences in Chittagonian. This is where Translators without Borders stepped in. “Information in the wrong language is useless,” Marzotto points out.

Any information addressed to refugees must use the languages that prevail amongst them. "Handbook Germany" is an award-winning project that runs a multilingual website. It uses English, Arabic, Persian, German, Turkish, French and Pashtu, providing recently arrived refugees with
Rohingya refugees in Bangladesh: the languages are related, but not enough to understand each other.

They can access relevant information, for instance on social media platforms. Illiterate people cannot do so. Ebrahimkhil explains, however, that even if they get reliable information, they will flee because the only alternative would be to return into the war they desperately want to escape. More than 6 million Afghans were displaced, she says.

Once refugees reach another country, they urgently need information about their new home and where to get help. However, it can take years before well-functioning communication channels are established for them. That is even the case for the UN Refugee Agency UNHCR, admits Jerome Serengi, who works for the UNHCR in Lebanon. Serengi set up a network of communication between his agency and Syrian refugees in Lebanon. It is a big advantage that all relevant parties speak the same language – Arabic. However, there is a lot of movement between places, with newcomers constantly arriving, so “it is not easy to make sure that people receive all necessary information,” Serengi explains. On the upside, he is proud of the communication channel in Lebanon being decentralised and two-way. “We want to know what they need,” he says.

International organisations like UNHCR play a central role in the implementation of international agreements like the “Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration” (GCM). It was concluded multilaterally in 2016 and is the agreement covering all dimensions of international migration in a holistic and comprehensive manner. It is supposed to:

- support international cooperation on the governance of international migration,
- provide a comprehensive menu of options for states so they can select policies to address some of the most pressing issues, and
- give states the space and flexibility to implement policies according to their specific realities and capacities.

At the conference in Bonn, participants agreed that getting communications and community engagement right is a crucial component of managing migration. The topic deserves further attention, with a particular focus on involving migrants and refugees in assessing situations and finding solutions.

According to Marian Casey-Maslen, the executive director of the CDAC network, “we need to push the role of media development in the context of forced migration”. She says, the international community must benefit from the enhanced connectivity of the digital age.
CLIMATE ENGINEERING

Buying time

Decision-makers still lack comprehensive strategies for mitigating greenhouse-gas emissions. Meanwhile, scientists are investigating how the global climate can be manipulated to maintain an inhabitable planet. Climate engineering raises highly controversial moral concerns.

By Floreana Miesen

Some of the more optimistic climate scenarios presented by the International Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) are based on major reductions in greenhouse-gas emissions in the near future. In view of the current weak mitigation efforts, however, these scenarios are not very realistic. In November, more than 11,000 scientists from all over the world signed a declaration of a global climate emergency. Accordingly, large transformational change is urgently required.

One way to combat global warming could be deliberate large-scale manipulations of the earth’s climate system through technology. Climate engineering, also known as geoengineering, is the use of aerosols and artificial cloud production in order to reflect solar radiation back to space. Sulphur injection into the atmosphere simulates natural effects from volcanic eruptions which have historically reduced atmospheric temperatures.

Proponents of climate engineering argue that it is the lesser evil compared to the dramatic consequences from unstopped climate change. New technologies could serve as a plan B in case mitigation strategies fail. It remains unclear, however, how such a failure is defined and when the time to implement alternatives is reached.

In any case, we should invest in research now, says Andreas Stamm of the German Development Institute (GDI). In his view, climate engineering is a responsible approach, and time is an important issue. “We urgently need ground-breaking innovations, whether we ever use them or not. If we don’t go for these technologies now, it might be too late,” Stamm said at a panel discussion organised by GDI this autumn.

While some experts argue that it is our responsibility to future generations to develop adequate technologies now, others warn that it would be more responsible to refrain from potentially creating new risks in the future.

In the highly complex earth system, climate engineering could come with unpredictable side effects, says Ulrike Niemeier of the Max Planck Institute for Meteorology in Hamburg. The tropical convergence zone, today the region of rainforests, would likely become cooler and drier. This could severely harm regional ecosystems. Some regions may therefore suffer from climate engineering even if the global climate stabilises, Niemeier warns.

Moreover, models show that if climate engineering is suddenly switched off, temperatures will rise quickly within a very short time. Therefore, once climate engineering has been implemented, it should not be stopped. This creates a lock-in situation for future generations.

The global scope of climate engineering also raises political concerns. It may lead to injustice and a concentration of power in those countries that can afford to implement it. International agreements and common governance are urgently needed to avoid conflicts, Niemeier argues.

For Frederike Neuber, an environmental ethicist from Rostock, mitigation and climate engineering are not alternative approaches, but rather add-ons. Climate engineering could be misused as a substitute for mitigation and could promote a business-as-usual attitude toward exploitative consumption and production patterns. “Mitiga-

Climate engineering aims to simulate the natural cooling effect of sulphate from volcanic eruptions on the atmosphere. Cotopaxi volcano in Ecuador.

LINK

World scientists’ warning of a climate emergency:
Many social entrepreneurs have difficulty securing sufficient capital to finance their business ideas. Conversely, investors willing to invest in social enterprises often fail to find partners that meet their criteria and expectations. A report by the Siemens Stiftung flags up ways to help bring the two sides together.

By Linda Engel

From new rural transport options to better marketing for small farmers, to digital health advice services – social enterprises are active in all sorts of areas around the world. Social entrepreneurs have a dual aspiration: to drive forward societal change and at the same time run a profitable business. In the launch phase especially, however, they often find the task of raising enough capital a significant challenge.

“In general, I think we all agree that, hypothetically, there is enough money in the market to invest in social entrepreneurs. And there are hundreds of thousands of entrepreneurs who need money. There is a mismatch of two parties who are somehow not able to find each other and to work together.” This view was expressed in an interview with Siemens Stiftung by Franziska Reh of Uncap – Unconventional Capital, a start-up offering innovative finance for young entrepreneurs in sub-Saharan Africa.

The reasons for the disconnect are legion. According to Patricia Jumi, managing director of GrowthAfrica, founders of a new business have difficulty presenting themselves and their ideas. GrowthAfrica supports young entrepreneurs in Africa. Many foundations run programmes to help hone entrepreneurs’ skills. In many cases, however, funding fails simply because the entrepreneur in South Africa and the German investor never meet. Social entrepreneurs are not yet well enough known to gain attention in a different continent. Other hurdles include cultural differences and poor investor understanding of markets and their potential.

“Investors have their own criteria of what they mean by investment readiness, (...) It almost feels like it is based on some hidden criteria which is probably more based on gut feel. This causes confusion between the investors and the entrepreneurs,” Jumi explained to the Siemens Stiftung interviewer. Reh and Jumi were two of more than 40 participants in the Innovative Financing for Social Entrepreneurs round table organised last July in Cairo by Siemens Stiftung and its non-profit partner enpact. The focus was on standardised solutions for investors. Searching for a hand-picked social entrepreneur is an inefficient and expensive task for any investor, so standardised solutions are seen as the way forward, potentially facilitating large-scale social change.

The participants particularly identified the massive potential of digital platforms. Online matchmaking sites could partly automate the process of helping social entrepreneurs and investors to find each other. This would make investors’ due diligence processes more effective and cost-efficient. Ideally, preliminary screening of suitable candidates would be based on an evaluation of facts and figures and not on vague preconceptions. However, platforms based on machine learning require large data sets, which are not available in every country for every sector.

Another innovative option could be financing vehicles that pool capital from different sources and allocate it to social entrepreneurs in tailored packages. The needs of an agricultural enterprise, for example, differ from those of an enterprise operating in the health sector. According to the Siemens Stiftung report, such pools could be created with a focus on a particular region or sector. They would thus attract investors seeking specifically to create impact in that area. This form of financing could also be helpful for many foundations, which are often bound by rules that make it difficult for them to invest in social enterprises. According to the report, however, foundations in particular should use their standing to attract more private capital for blended finance.

LINK
The African Development Bank (AfDB) reckons that about two thirds of employable people in Africa are either unemployed or underemployed and thus not making full use of their skills. The young generation and women are affected in particular. The international finance institution proposes strategies for generating more jobs fast.

By Florian Gaisrucker

In October 2019, the AfDB launched a flagship report on African labour markets. In the first chapter, “An African manifesto”, Célestin Monga, the bank’s chief economist, summarises the most important points. According to him, some 12 to 15 million jobs must be created fast. Industrial parks could contribute to making that happen, and the point is to benefit from Africa’s comparative advantages. In the author’s eyes, it does not make sense to copy the industrial models of other countries.

Monga argues that commodity processing and manufacturing offer the greatest opportunities. He wants the sheer endless potential of globalisation to be tapped in order to provide young people with gainful employment and stem their flight from rural areas.

So far, agriculture has been the most important sector, the AfDB author states, but it can neither absorb all people who need work, nor is it productive enough to ensure anything but very small incomes. Automation and modernisation could transform agriculture, giving rise to new kinds of jobs, for example in food processing or agriculture-related services. Facilitating non-farm employment is said to be essential (also note Shenggen Fan and Ousmane Badiane on p.13 in this e-Paper). Industrial parks could prove useful in this context, contributing to the reduction of food imports and the increased involvement of smallholder farmers in global supply chains.

Monga proposes that every African government should strive to generate industrial jobs for 80% to 90% of those whose work is currently of low productivity. He insists that it must become easier and cheaper to start businesses, and that the prospect of rising productivity is essential. Governments should assess what industries are competitive – or might become competitive fast – and support them by establishing special zones with low production and distribution costs.

All too often, poor infrastructure and rigid labour laws are disincentives, Monga writes. Special economic zones could make a difference, especially if they attracted foreign investors. Relevant aspects include good infrastructure, low taxation and flexible labour regulations. Linking industrial parks to export zones, moreover, could drive foreign trade with positive impacts on issues such as technology transfer, vocational training, human-capacity development and knowledge management.

The author advises African governments to cooperate with the private sector, educational institutions and civil-society agencies on improving vocational training. He warns that foreign investors often shy away from African engagements because they fear skills shortages. Meaningful policies include:

- well-designed skills training in strategically relevant industries,
- coordination with school curricula,
- financial contributions from employers,
- financial compensation for productive work during skills training,
- skills training for unemployed persons, especially in rural areas,
- advanced skills training for people who are already employed, and
- job centres that deliver employment services.

Monga emphasises that the demand for skilled labour is rising fast, but African education systems tend not to be up to task. Drop-out rates are very high, with girls and young women being affected in particular.

SOURCE
No place for the Twa

The Twa, a people of Pygmy origin, are the oldest and smallest ethnic group in Burundi. Their numbers run to tens of thousands but they are barely acknowledged and do not have the same rights as Hutus and Tutsis. But the Twa have now had enough. They refuse to be marginalised any longer.

Minani is a Mutwa (the singular of Twa) from Cibari in the northern province of Muyinga. He lives with his wife and six children in a hut that consists of only one room. “When it rains, it rains in,” Minani says. “We have no fertile land to farm; we live from pottery but it is increasingly difficult to find clay.”

Karorero from Buganda in Cibitoke Province in the west of the country has a different problem. He can find plenty of clay but struggles to find buyers for his pottery. He says the Hutus and Tutsis today use modern household and kitchen utensils and have stopped buying the housewares that the Twa make. Twa are now forced to work as hired hands on other people’s land. Minani and Karorero both feel that their ethnic group is being discriminated against.

Burundi’s constitution of 2018 formally recognises the Twa and requires that they be represented in the National Assembly by three co-opted deputies. Co-option is based on lists of proposed candidates submitted by Twa organisations in the various regions of the country. UNIPROBA (Unissons-nous pour la Promotion des Batwa) is one of those organisations. However, it rejects co-option and fights instead for fair representation for the Twa across Burundi’s institutional landscape.

Libératé Nicayenzi, a member of UNIPROBA and representative of the Twa on Burundi’s Truth and Reconciliation Commission, says: “For various institutions, the constitution prescribes that Hutus and Tutsis should be represented on a 60-40 basis. So where do we fit in? How does that prescription square with Article 1 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights: ‘All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights?’”

Emmanuel Nengo, who is also a member of UNIPROBA, stresses that discrimination is only one of the Twa’s problems; many more stem from poverty. Children are not sent to school, for instance, or they are taken out of school early because they are needed at home to make pots. They also lack school materials. According to Nengo, development is out of the question if people have no land to farm, no proper housing and no education.

Nicayenzi points out that the Twa should also do some soul-searching themselves. She appeals to all Twa parents to cast off old conventions and send their children to school. Even the government would like more cooperation from the aboriginal inhabitants.

A local official from Muyinga complains: “When a philanthropist builds houses for the Twa to raise their standard of living, they immediately sell the roofing sheets.”

Mireille Kanyange
is a journalist and reporter for Radio Isanganiro in Burundi.
mika.kanyange@gmail.com
Current frustration with Twitter in India shows why the big internet multinationals require global regulation. Democratic societies must be protected from lies, disinformation and corporate discrimination.

By Arfa Khanum Sherwani

In India, social-media platforms are very important. Hundreds of millions use them, and the mainstream media have largely caved into the Hindu-supremacist government. It therefore was a shock to see that Twitter is not the open space it pretends to be. People from the Dalit community, the lowest caste group, have ample reason to accuse Twitter of casteism and discrimination.

India’s caste system is an age-old social hierarchy that fosters discrimination and violence. In the past, Dalits were called “untouchables” and later “Harijans”. Officially, India’s constitution abolished “untouchability” after independence in 1947, and a law of 1989 is supposed to prevent atrocities against Dalits. Another law mandates affirmative action to compensate for – and facilitate an escape from – poverty and marginalisation. That this law is still needed today, shows how deeply entrenched caste discrimination is.

The advent of the internet inspired hopes for more inclusion. Platforms that give access to everyone such as Facebook and Twitter were expected to serve as open spaces that give voice to marginalised people. As we learned in the past few weeks, however, Twitter has not been levelling the playing field. Rather, the accusations are that it has been reinforcing the caste hierarchy by halting the verification of accounts owned by Dalits. Verification means that an account of considerable public interest is authentic and believable. If these accusations are true, that would amount to serious discrimination.

In response, Dalit activists began to campaign against Manish Maheshwari, Twitter’s managing director in India. They asked Twitter to expel him, but so far without success.

Dalit activists allege that high-caste people get verification easily. A prominent example is Jay Shah, the son of Home Minister Amit Shah. Though he barely had any followers on Twitter and not tweeted even once, his account got the blue tick. By contrast, anti-establishment people with a history of many relevant tweets and much larger followings did not get it. In India, social-media sites are aimed at being the third-party body.

It is similarly worrisome that, as we also learned in November, over a dozen Indian politicians, activists, lawyers and scholars were spied on. Sophisticated software called Pegasus was used to track them online via WhatsApp. Pegasus is owned by NSO, an Israeli software firm, which has recently been sued by WhatsApp in the USA because of privacy breaches. In response, NSO stated that it does not support Pegasus use against human-rights activists or journalists, and only sells it to “government intelligence and law enforcement agencies to help them fight terrorism and serious crime”. Did India’s government use this technology to monitor people it does not like?

In the USA, public debate is focusing on whether social-media platforms should allow politicians to spread lies in advertising. According to Facebook, which allows such ads, this is ultimately a matter of freedom of speech. Twitter, by contrast, has banned political advertising. But the underlying and more important question remains open: Who is the proper authority for taking such crucial decisions: self-regulating multinationals, the government or an independent third-party body?

Issues of fake news and hate speech are even more pressing in developing countries where public institutions tend to be weaker. Political advertising, moreover, is not the only problem. India’s social-media sites apparently have a growing pro-government bias. We need global regulations to ensure that democracies around the world are not undermined by internet multinationals that ultimately care about nothing else than their profits.

ARFA KHANUM SHERWANI
is senior editor with the independent news website TheWire.
Twitter: @khanumarfa
https://thewire.in/
Waves of protest are rocking multiple countries in the Middle East and North Africa (MENA), bringing back memories of the Arab Spring of 2011. Sustainable development will be possible only if social issues are addressed and regional conflicts are resolved. It is in Europe’s own interest to contribute to finding solutions.

By Nassir Djafari

The images resemble one another. In the Arab world, large numbers of predominantly young people have taken to the streets, insisting on their right to a decent life – just like they did eight years ago. Mass protests occasionally flare up in individual countries, but this is the first time since 2011 that we are witnessing a series of them. They began in December 2018 in Sudan with what were at first local protests against the tripling of the price of bread. Local protests triggered rallies all over the nation, and they led to the toppling of Omar al-Bashir, the dictator, who had been in power for three decades.

In Algeria in February 2019, tens of thousands of people rose up when President Abd al-Aziz Bouteflika, who is elderly and has long been unfit to serve, announced his candidacy for a fifth term in office. He was also swept aside. In Egypt in September 2019, information about the exorbitant self-enrichment of the president’s family sparked large demonstrations. In Lebanon in October 2019, a tax on internet-based calls was the straw that broke the camel’s back and drove people into the streets. And since early October 2019, people in Iraq have been demonstrating in huge numbers against their precarious living conditions. On 30 November, Prime Minister Adel Abdul Mahdi resigned. In the meantime, anger about high fuel prices had driven crowds to rally in Iran, Iraq’s non-Arab neighbour. People’s economic pain has dramatically worsened under US sanctions. In the eyes of the demonstrators, their own regime must bear some of the blame.

As in 2011, the current protests were sparked above all by social grievances, then quickly grew into attacks on the entire political system. And just like in the past, those in power are responding with a mix of brutal violence and half-hearted concessions.

Most of the countries in question have experienced war and/or civil strife. They are now in a phase of economic weakness and are subject to the influence of external powers. They have little fiscal leeway because the economies are barely growing, their public sectors are bloated and inefficient, and the governments are heavily indebted (particularly in Lebanon and Sudan). The governments are trying to restore their short-term capacity to act by delaying overdue state investments and cutting social services.

Private, and especially foreign companies are also holding back investments, so steady demographic pressure is producing an army of unemployed people. Exorbitant levels of youth unemployment are particularly explosive. According to the International Monetary Fund, in all of the region’s countries, youth unemployment remains steady at 25 to 30% or higher.

Half a million young people stream onto the labour market every year in Iraq, for example. A lack of employment opportunities combined with a worsening supply...
of water, electric power and other public services are creating a climate of dangerous social tension. Things can erupt surprisingly fast.

It is particularly risky when social grievances escalate in conditions of fragile statehood. That is especially true of Iraq and Lebanon, not only because of their proximity to civil-war-torn Syria, but also because both countries have deep sectarian divides. Whereas in Iraq the Shias have dominated the government since the US invasion of 2003, in Lebanon, the Shia Hezbollah is a state within the state.

Throughout the region, Iran’s Shia regime is supporting Shia organisations and militias, whereas Saudi Arabia funds Iran’s Sunni opponents (see Maysam Behravesh in Focus section of D+C/E+Z e-Paper 2019/10).

Against this backdrop, it represents a welcome surprise that Shias and Sunnis are rallying together in Iraq, and in Lebanon, they are joined by Christians. Across the faith communities, people are uniting to challenge the political establishment.

That they are overcoming religious difference is encouraging, but the violent response by security forces in Iraq brings back bad memories of the repression of the protests in Syria in 2012. When this comment was finalised in late November, some 300 people had been killed.

Things have remained relatively peaceful in Lebanon so far. However, it remains to be seen how the radical Shia Hezbollah will respond to public discontent in the future, and what impact the mass protests will have on Iran and Saudi Arabia, the two regional powers. Forty-five percent of all terrorist attacks worldwide take place in the MENA region. Forty-seven percent of all displaced people and 57% of all refugees who have had to leave their home countries are from it too.

The MENA region will only find its way back to peace and development once its social issues have been resolved. In order to do that, its countries will have to overcome structural barriers to development, including the lack of international competitiveness, ossified public administrations and the people’s exclusion from economic opportunities and participation in public life.

The EU should make its contribution. It should not only invest in development cooperation, but above all conduct its trade relations with countries in this region on a more equitable playing field.

The second precondition for sustainable development in the Middle East is a resolution of the conflict between Saudi Arabia and Iran. That cannot be achieved by applying ever more pressure on Iran. What is needed is the framework of a comprehensive regional peace strategy that takes into account the interests of all parties involved.

The EU must break away from their currently passive role as an outraged observer and set an appropriate foreign policy in motion, engaging the international community. There is no other way to achieve sustainable social development in this challenging world region which is quite close to Europe.

NASSIR DJAFARI
is an economist and freelance writer.
nassir.djafari@gmx.de
Rural areas must become more productive, more climate-resilient and more attractive to live in. Revitalising them means improving infrastructure and boosting people’s opportunities. Ultimately, sustainability depends on linking the advantages of rural economies with those of urban ones. In this context, small and mid-sized towns are particularly important.

By Shenggen Fan and Ousmane Badiane

The deadlines to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and the Paris climate goals draw ever closer. The ambitious imperative of the SDGs is to “leave no one behind”. The implication is that we must urgently revitalise rural areas, especially in sub-Saharan Africa. Now is the time for a dramatic, system-wide transformation to make rural areas more productive, more sustainable, more climate-resilient, healthier and more attractive places to live.

Around the world, rural areas benefit less from economic growth than cities. Rural people make up to 45% of the world’s population, but bear a disproportionate burden of poverty, malnutrition and poor quality of life. South of the Sahara, poverty and malnutrition are relatively high – and that is especially true in rural areas.

The global poverty rate is 17% in rural areas, but only seven percent in urban areas. Rural people comprise 70% of the world’s extremely poor. In sub-Saharan countries, 82% of the extreme poor live in rural areas. Rural areas lag behind urban areas in reducing rates of child stunting (low height for age). They often lack basic infrastructure and services. Consider, for example, education, health care, roads, water, sanitation and hygiene. At the same time, rural areas are exposed to ever more pollution while natural resources are dwindling fast. The climate crisis is exacerbating the challenges.

Today, African countries are working on the revitalisation of rural areas. They want to sustain and accelerate progress.

AFRICAN OPPORTUNITIES

One opportunity is rapid urbanisation. Small and mid-sized towns matter in particular. To meet rising urban demand, agricultural production must increase, and that means better livelihoods for farmers and those involved in agribusinesses.

Several countries – Ethiopia, Kenya and Niger, for example – have scaled up investments in irrigation. The benefits include longer growing seasons, more scope for crop diversity and the mitigation of weather risks.

Some countries, including Ethiopia, Mali and Morocco, have increased agricultural mechanisation, enhancing productivity along the supply chain. This approach improves the business environment, by fostering domestic machinery businesses, facilitating investments in human resource development and triggering interest in research.

Growing urban food demand offers opportunities too. In Senegal, new processing technologies have fuelled a rapid expansion in small firms. They specialise in ready-to-cook and ready-to-eat millet products. Many new employment opportunities are thus emerging in the agri-food system’s off-farm segments.

In Nigeria, 45% of all food spoils due to a lack of refrigeration. The potential for solar-powered cold stations has been recognised and is already being tapped.

To take advantage of the opportunities from urbanisation we need to strengthen the interconnectedness between rural and urban areas. High-quality roads and electricity are critical to bringing food commodities from farm regions to urban markets. From 2012 to 2016, African governments have been investing an average $30 billion in infrastructure annually. Private investments in solar power have surged. This technology can drive refrigeration and rural enterprises. Multilateral institutions are aware of infrastructure needs and promoting investments in both the public and private sectors.

Information and Communication Technology (ICT) can make a difference.
Thanks to digitalisation many of the institutional, physical and technological obstacles can now be overcome faster and at lower cost than previously assumed. The price for mobile internet, for example, has dropped by almost one third in Africa in the past four years.

ICT is relevant for smallholder farmers who want access to financial services. Mobile money applications are spreading from country to country. Penetration rates are high in many countries, including Kenya, Mali and Senegal. More generally speaking, rural finance must improve – from banking to insurance.

Farmers who want to diversify must be empowered to finance investments. In Nigeria, innovative start-ups are mobilising potential investors in crowdsourcing models. In numerous countries, mobile-based hiring services for machinery, tools and related inputs have been introduced. Such innovations make sense and should be scaled up. The impact on women and youth deserves particular consideration.

**LEARNING FROM OTHERS’ EXPERIENCES**

African countries are working collectively to sustain and accelerate progress. In 2018, African leaders launched the Africa Agriculture Transformation Scorecard and the Comprehensive Africa Agricultural Development Programme (CAADP) Biennial Review. Both tools serve accountability. Moreover, 49 countries signed the African Continental Free Trade Agreement, which will create a single African market for goods and services, along with free movement of businesspeople and investments and the elimination of import duties.

One essential driver of rural revitalisation is “rurbanomics”. This approach emphasises the interrelatedness and inter-dependency of rural and urban economies. The point is that urban growth creates rural opportunities. Rural and urban areas must be partners, and rural areas can do much more than produce commodities. They should be seen both:

- as launching points for national, regional and global value chains and
- as providers of indispensable environmental services.

Indeed, rural revitalisation goes far beyond agriculture (see box below). It includes the development of non-farm opportunities. Accordingly, cutting-edge technology and innovation are linchpins of rural growth.

There is ample evidence from around the world that rural revitalisation can dramatically improve rural residents’ lives. One example was South Korea’s Saemaul Undong (New Village Movement) initiative in 1970. Investments in irrigation, agricultural inputs, electrification and transport and related efforts led to farm households’ income increasing fivefold within a decade. They caught up with urban counterparts. More recently, in Bangladesh, investments to improve rural roads reduced extreme poverty by three to six percent while boosting enrolment in secondary school for both boys and girls.

Rural governance must also be revitalised. Local governments should be held accountable for the delivery of high-quality services. China chose this approach when it announced a new strategy in 2018 to close the growing rural-urban income gap. The goal is to improve the quality of rural life.

Obviously, ICT can prove useful in this context. Widespread access to mobile phones can help otherwise disconnected citizens to get involved in public affairs or business.

The rurbanomics approach, moreover, has health dimensions. Obesity is increasingly haunting developing countries, but consumer preferences are changing too, especially in cities. Rural farmers could shift to more nutritious and high-value foods, such as fruits, vegetables and animal-sourced foods. Scientific and technological innovations would help retain the value of these nutritious products throughout the supply chain.

**Policy recommendations**

Rural revitalisation is essential for transforming rural areas, not only in Africa. The International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) offers tangible advice.

As IFPRI spells out in the recent “2019 global food policy report”, it is possible not only to end hunger and malnutrition, but also to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals and to protect the climate. It will take evidence-based action geared to rural revitalisation in all world regions. Relevant steps include:

- Adopt a “rurbanomics” approach. This means appreciating the interlinkedness of rural and urban economies and grasping the opportunities that arise from it. Rurbanomics does not simply concern the relations of rural areas with megacities. Small and mid-sized cities matter very much.
- Transform agri-food systems to benefit both rural and urban areas. Agriculture must be seen as a business enterprise that can nutritiously, safely and sustainably feed all.
- Scale up agricultural productivity and invest in the rural non-farm economy to create wage-earning opportunities, particularly for disadvantaged population groups, including the poor, women and youth.
- Improve living conditions in rural areas, by providing better access to social protection, boosting basic services and supporting a healthier and more climate-resilient environment.
- Reform rural governance to improve accountability. Policy outcomes depend on well-funded budgets, capable staff and transparency.

**LINK**

The death of Dag Hammarskjöld, who was the second UN secretary-general, in an airplane crash in 1961 remains shrouded in mystery. UN investigations have not lead to convincing results so far. A recently published book offers insights into the matter, along with an appraisal of Hammarskjöld’s role in decolonisation and his lasting impacts on the development of the UN.

By Hans Dembowski

Henning Melber’s book on Hammarskjöld is not an impartial account. The Swedish-German scholar is the former director of the Uppsala-based Dag Hammarskjöld Foundation, and he also belonged to the committee whose work made then UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon reopen the investigation into the airplane crash near Ndola in today’s Zambia. Melber readily admits that he is personally engaged. (Full disclosure: he has contributed to D+C/E+Z very often and, over the years, has become a friend.)

“Dag Hammarskjöld, the United Nations and the decolonisation of Africa” is a short, but ambitious book. On a mere 180 pages (of which 50 are notes, references and acknowledgments), Melber delves deeply into complex issues that he has been dealing with for much of his professional life. For anyone unfamiliar with the history of the UN and African decolonisation, the reading is likely to prove a rewarding challenge.

The tragic death of the Swedish UN leader is obviously of particular relevance. The background was the Congo crisis of 1960/61. On 30 June 1960, the Belgian colony gained formal independence. Not even two weeks later, its territorial integrity was threatened by the secession of the resource rich Katanga region. Belgium supported the secessionists with troops in violation of its agreement with Congo’s government. In view of military clashes, Congo’s President Joseph Kasavubu and Prime Minister Patrice Lumumba requested the UN to intervene.

Melber gives a detailed account of how Hammarskjöld tried to control the damage and what limitations he faced. The greatest challenge was that the Security Council was split. While western governments basically sided with Belgium, the Soviet Union wanted to reduce the influence of the USA and the former imperial powers. In this setting, decisive UN action was impossible.

Nonetheless, Hammarskjöld managed to bring about a UN resolution. Its wording remained ambiguous however. UN troops were deployed, but since their mission was not clearly defined, they could not act effectively. The mission stayed controversial, with interested parties either stating that the blue helmets were doing too much or doing too little.

Melber recounts how Hammarskjöld handled the matter. To a large extent, he relied on the growing group of non-aligned nations, which were mostly newly independent colonies. To bypass stalemate in the Security Council, he turned to the General Assembly, in which their membership kept increasing.

The leaders of the non-aligned group appreciated Hammarskjöld’s approach. The secretary-general wanted the UN to shield them from undue influence of hegemonic powers. In his eyes, the young nations deserved ample policy space. In today’s parlance, he was endorsing the policy ownership of developing countries. Trying to prevent the spread of the Cold War into Africa, he neither pleased western nor eastern leaders.

Matters became even more complex when Congo’s leaders, Kasavubu and Lumumba, had a falling out. For some time, Lumumba lived under UN protection, but he decided to move on in an attempt to reclaim power. UN troops were present when he was arrested, while another UN contin...
In Melber’s account, Hammarskjöld felt devastated by diplomatic failures, but nonetheless stayed determined to do his best to prevent further escalation. After UN troops clashed with secessionist forces in Katanga, he arranged a meeting with Moïse Tshombe, their leader, in Ndola. Back then, this town belonged to Northern Rhodesia, a part of the British Central African Federation run by a white minority regime. The airplane crashed when approaching Ndola on 18 September 1961.

At the time, the Northern Rhodesian authorities concluded that a pilot error caused the crash. Later research, however, showed that they had not taken all evidence into account. In particular, they neglected black eyewitnesses. Some reported that a second airplane had been in the sky, and others saw Hammarskjöld’s plane in flames before it came down. As Melber further reports, it took officialdom unreasonably long to find the airplane, so Rhodesian security forces probably arrived first, with ample time to manipulate the scene. The author spells out that various parties might have had an interest in killing the assertive UN secretary-general and that they probably had the capacity to do so. They included the Katanga secessionists, southern Africa’s white minority regimes as well as member countries of the Security Council.

The UN believes that the secret services of several countries are likely to still have relevant recordings, for example of the radio communication between the pilot and Ndola airport. In October, the Guardian reported that UN appointee Mohamed Chande Othman believes the UK and the SU to possess such evidence, but they did not follow requests to declassify such information.

THE INDIVIDUAL PERSON MATTERS

Melber’s main intention, however, is not to revisit the tragedy at Ndola. As the title of the book suggests, his main topic is what impact Hammarskjöld and the UN had on decolonisation. Critics have argued that the Swedish policymaker promoted capitalism, served imperialist interests or had racist tendencies. Melber defends him convincingly.

The author grew up as teenager in what is now Namibia. He joined the freedom struggle and is a member of SWAPO, the former liberation movement which is now the ruling party. Melber is just as interested in the topic of decolonisation as he is in Hammarskjöld’s legacy.

The Africa scholar insists that Hammarskjöld was a child of his time. His father was a high-ranking official and diplomat, and many of his ancestors were loyal civil servants and clergymen. The UN leader’s roots in Sweden’s political culture, which shies away from confrontation and is geared to brokering compromises that serve all parties, were deep. He himself was an economist who, as a technocrat, played a crucial role in designing his nation’s welfare state, before becoming a diplomat.

Melber elaborates how this personal background, including his Lutheran faith, shaped Hammarskjöld’s action as UN secretary-general. He emphasised integrity – both his own and that of the UN. He believed that multilateral action could prevent political disasters and mass suffering if the parties involved acted in a spirit of honesty and probity. The book quotes extensively from Hammarskjöld’s writing and public speeches.

Some accuse Hammarskjöld of coming from a white middle-class background. Melber rectifies such criticism. Everybody has a personal background, and what really matters is what we do on this basis. The author further points out that being male and white brings privileges, but that does not mean that every white man endorses those privileges – nor does it mean that every white man exploits and abuses women or people of colour. He also notes that UN staff will always be likely to have a middle-class background. The simple reason is that it is impossible to do UN work unless one has an academic education and speaks at least one world language.

Melber does a fascinating job of showing how personal relations matter within the UN administration itself. Indeed, interaction within the UN team that was handling the Congo crisis was often difficult. Communication problems were probably more important than ideology. The questions of whether Hammarskjöld was sufficiently anti-capitalist and anti-racist probably mattered less than communication problems.

Back then, Nikita Khrushchev, the top Soviet leader, prominently accused Hammarskjöld of promoting capitalism. Others have reiterated that charge. As we know today, the idea that capitalism can easily be replaced with something better, has proved a fallacy in many countries. Melber could make this case, but he takes a different approach. His entirely valid point is that Hammarskjöld’s legacy. Successful UN diplomacy has indeed always been – and had to be – a balancing act.

Under Hammarskjöld, UN diplomacy was a well-considered balancing act, as Melber writes. That is part of Hammarskjöld’s legacy. Successful UN diplomacy has indeed always been – and had to be – a balancing act.
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HUMAN RIGHTS

Battle cry “blasphemy”

Many predominantly Muslim countries have penal laws against “blasphemy”, “defamation of religion” and “apostasy”. These laws are incompatible with human rights. In practice they serve as highly effective weapons to settle personal animosities, family vendettas and land disputes. Fanatics feel justified to hound minorities, to rob, abuse and murder as they please.

By Thomas Krapf

Asia Bibi on death row: an illiterate woman in solitary confinement, for almost a decade – 20% of her life in living hell. Finally, in early 2019, the Pakistani Supreme Court acquitted her. That story made international headlines, but the international public is hardly aware of her ongoing suffering after being released. In May, she could leave for Canada – but her nightmare continued there: a religious fanatic posted a video demanding she be murdered. And that video-post still makes her fear for her life.

Bibi’s blasphemy charges? Fabricated nonsense, unworthy of further comment – but in Pakistan altogether normal. What is equally normal is the indifference of the international media. Bibi was the exception that proved the rule: the final stages of her ten-year-ordeal was a global media story, but the early chapters got little attention.

Tragedies like this shed light on the complexities of the ongoing blasphemy mess. Hers has dragged on for over a decade, resulting in two assassinations.

Ten years ago, Salman Taseer, the governor of Punjab, visited Bibi on death row. Stepping out of her cell he branded Pakistani blasphemy legislation “black laws”. In 2011, he paid with his life, and so did Shahbaz Bhatti, the federal minister for minority affairs. Both were targeted because they had dared to defend Bibi and criticise the blasphemy laws.

The governor’s assassin was his bodyguard. In a fair trial – which is worth noting in Pakistan – Mumtaz Qadri was sentenced according to the law of the land: capital punishment. Millions of Facebook followers and masses of typically illiterate sympathisers supported the cowardly, big-mouthed killer, who basked in the limelight of a martyr (shaheed), for whom the doors of paradise are wide open.

In late 2015, the Supreme Court confirmed his death sentence. Pakistanis held their breath. Would then President Mamnoon Hussain pardon the killer? And would Taseer’s assassination thus become the precedent for legalised murder on blasphemy pretexts? When the murderer was indeed executed on 29 February 2016, the public was taken by surprise. For over a week millions of enraged blasphemy fanatics rallied in public, paralysing the capital and other urban hubs.

The death penalty is incompatible with fundamental human rights and has been abolished throughout most of Europe, except Russia (suspended) and Belarus (in force). In the 50 states of the USA it has been suspended in 13 and abolished in 21 states. In other parts of the world capital punishment remains the law of the land, including Pakistan. In this context the President’s refusal to pardon Taseer’s assassin amounts to an unmistakable rejection of a “blasphemy shaheed” taking the law into his own hands. This is a robust rebuttal of what is effectively becoming customary law in many parts of the Muslim world.

The battle cry “Blasphemy!” continues to serve as a perfidious, but highly effective weapon for people who want to settle property disputes, family vendettas and any other personal scores. Pakistan holds the record for both vigilante killings and (often life-long) imprisonments of perceived “blasphemers”. Decades of persecuting anyone, anywhere, anytime on spurious blasphemy accusations – frequently with the blessing of the authorities – have profoundly affected cultural mores and social attitudes.

In the 21st century, several predominantly Muslim countries uphold laws against “blasphemy”, “defamation of religion” and “apostasy”. In Pakistan, Iran, Afghanistan, Saudi Arabia, Nigeria and Somalia both blasphemy and apostasy are punishable by death. Apostasy is also a capi-
tal offence in Malaysia, Maldives, Qatar, United Arab Emirates, Yemen, Sudan and Mauritania. In other Muslim countries draconic enforcement of proscriptions against apostasy and blasphemy prevails. Cruel and humiliating punishments (public floggings), severe prison sentences and other infractions of the 1984 Convention against Torture are wide spread.

INDONESIAN DRAMAS

Inevitably, ostracising blasphemy results in witch hunts, absurd conflicts of interests, unmistakable hypocrisy and leads to blatant infringements of human rights. Two recent cases from Indonesia, the world’s largest Muslim-majority nation, illustrate much of this:

● From 2017 to 2019 the former governor of Jakarta, Basuki Tjahaja Purnama, known as Ahok, served a two-year prison sentence for voicing an opinion on a verse in the Quran. An ethnic Chinese Christian, Ahok was denied the right to disagree with some Islamic scholar, who is apparently at least as authoritarian as his followers may deem him authoritative.

● In another 2018 case, Meiiliana, an ethnic Chinese Buddhist, was jailed for 18 months. Her crime? She had complained about the excessive volume of calls to prayer from a minaret in her neighbourhood. That was read as “insulting Islam”… Freedom of opinion? Freedom of expression? Entitlement of a religious-ethnic minority to protection? Such “non-Islamic” issues are sacrificed on ubiquitous altars to the voracious, insatiable idol of ostracising “blasphemy”, “defamation of religion” and “apostasy”.

This practice flies in the face of fundamental human rights, which are unneogotiable. It is insane to undermine these principles which the UN adopted in 1948. At the time, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights was a response to World War II, its genocidal violence and horrific war crimes. Depressingly, brutalities of this kind still occur, but when they do, human rights are always neglected and infringed upon first. Other human-rights agreements are meaningful too, for example, the 1966 International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR).

Freedom of opinion and expression (ICCPR, article 19) is indispensable. Therefore article 20 prohibits hate speech. This is imperative, not least to strengthen another cardinal fundamental human right: freedom of religion or belief (article 18). This fundamental human right guarantees freedom of conscience, thought and opinion. Therefore it includes the right of the individual to change his/her religion and to convert to another religion.

Ostracising “blasphemy”, “defamation of religion” and “apostasy” exacerbates religious intolerance, extremism and violence. Criminalising such “issues” is inherently anachronistic and untenable. A sobering reality check is furnished by states that respect, protect and fulfill fundamental rights. Attuned to the 21st century they tend to have good records of political and social stability, of economic prosperity and of long-term sustainability.

The pernicious agenda of ostracising is unacceptable. It must end.

THOMAS KRAPF is a human-rights lawyer and policy advisor.

thomaskrapf87@gmail.com
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Whether Britain will actually leave is still not clear.

Why the world needs the EU

After recent crises, the EU looks weakened. However, it has not unravelled in view of Brexit. Rather, it seems to have become more coherent. Whether Brexit will actually happen, of course, will only become clear after Britain’s general election in December at the earliest. It is evident, by contrast, that the EU has an important role to play in global affairs – for instance in regard to trade, aid and environmental protection. Global public goods matter. Humanity needs more supranational policymaking and less our-nation-first thinking.

This focus section relates directly to the 17th Sustainable Development Goal (SDG): Partnerships for the goals. It is also pertinent to several other SDGs, including peace, climate action and zero hunger.
Germany will assume the presidency of the EU Council in the summer. Gerd Müller, Germany’s federal minister for economic cooperation and development, says it will contribute to shaping the EU’s foreign relations and boosting its development cooperation. In his essay for D+C/E+Z, he points out that the focus should be on Africa in particular.

By Gerd Müller

We all are Europe. Every global problem that we do not help to solve eventually becomes a European problem. Global challenges such as climate change, population growth and increasing migration require European responses. Moreover, we see ourselves confronted by new geopolitical alliances, and in many places faith is dwindling in the multilateral system’s problem-solving capacity.

In these circumstances, Germany will assume the presidency of the EU Council for six months on 1 July 2020. As Germany is Europe’s political and economic heavyweight, much is expected of us.

We intend to grasp the opportunity and contribute to shaping Europe’s foreign relations, not least in terms of adopting a future-oriented development policy. The European Union must rise to its global responsibility. It will be held accountable for good partnerships with our neighbours, equitably shaped globalisation and fighting climate change. I am actively championing this agenda. Our response to the global challenges must not be less, but rather “more EU”.

A NEW PARTNERSHIP WITH AFRICA

Nowhere are the opportunities and challenges of our era more evident than in Africa. With a huge potential of young people, commodities and renewable energies, our neighbouring continent will play a large role in determining our future. By 2050, Africa’s gross domestic product may actually exceed those of the EU and the USA combined. Apart from the shifting global balance of power, this is one reason why competition over Africa and in Africa is becoming ever more intensive.

Europe needs a new deal with Africa to build the future, and to follow on from the Cotonou Agreement. In this context, I welcome the fact that Ursula von der Leyen, the new commission president, has announced as a top priority the drafting of a new and comprehensive Africa strategy.

During our Council presidency, we want to contribute to the relaunch of the EU’s Africa policy. Germany’s international development policy offers good starting points. By launching the Marshall Plan with Africa, I have initiated a paradigm shift in cooperation with Africa. Taking our lead from the African Union’s Agenda 2063, we are focusing our support on reform-minded governments with an eye to improving governance in areas such as the rule of law, transparency and fighting corruption.

By promoting such causes, we are creating the environment for the private sector to invest. We also need to build new partnerships between the public and private sectors. The Marshall Plan is a key stepping stone towards a new partnership with Africa that is based on shared values and interests.
sector to invest sustainably, generate more employment and build something like an African “Mittelstand”, similar to the small and medium-sized enterprises that mark the German economy. At the same time, we are leveraging private investments by means of our newly established development investment fund (“Entwicklungsinvestitionsfonds”), which will make up to €1 billion available to European and African enterprises.

The Compact with Africa, an initiative started under the German G20 presidency, takes the same approach. The Africa summit in Berlin in November showed what can grow out of this new quality of cooperation with Africa. Several investment agreements were signed with the involvement of international organisations and companies.

That kind of experience will inspire our proposals for a new and comprehensive European Africa policy.

**EQUITABLE GLOBALISATION**

If Europe is to become a stronger player in global affairs, it must lead the way towards making globalisation more equitable. At the start of every value chain there are people who need to be able to earn a living through their work. We need social and environmental standards that apply throughout international value chains and supply chains.

Private-sector businesses bear some of the responsibility for making this happen. Accordingly, we must pass European regulations to protect trailblazing companies and ensure a level playing field. Businesses that safeguard human rights must not be put at a competitive disadvantage.

Free trade is an important precondition for growth and prosperity. Growth, however, will not be sustainable unless trade is not only free, but equitable too. The EU would do well to include binding and uniform sustainability standards in all comprehensive free-trade agreements. Tariff concessions should only be granted if goods (palm oil, for example) are produced in a sustainable manner.

On top of this, the EU must remove all remaining trade barriers such as tariffs, quotas and non-tariff barriers, so African economies – and particularly North African ones – can become competitive. The priorities include high-quality infrastructure, education and vocational training.

**ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AND INNOVATION**

To an unprecedented extent, human-made climate change and environmental depletion are now threatening prosperity, standards of living and peace. Therefore, Europe must commit unambiguously in the 21st century to a policy of sustainability – and set an example by implementing it.

Europe must become climate neutral by 2050. The EU has to assume a leading role in regard to climate protection in order to have the credibility to demand equivalent efforts from emerging markets and developing countries. For good reason, Commission President Ursula von der Leyen has announced a “European Green Deal”. This Green Deal, however, will have to involve our partner countries because only joint action will allow us to fight climate change successfully.

Africa’s enormous dynamism offers the opportunity to choose climate-friendly, sustainable development trajectories right from the start. Africa must play a decisive role if climate change is to be contained and development is to become sustainable in environmental, economic and social terms.

For these reasons, our development cooperation supports African countries in building renewable energy systems. Africa can become the “green continent” by tapping its huge potential for wind, solar and bio energies. The European Union’s development cooperation should make such leapfrogging feasible.

At the same time, our cooperation – ranging from infrastructure construction to agriculture – must address the impacts of climate change that are being felt already, so people still have prospects. One aspect of the European-African Green Deal is that we are campaigning for an ambitious climate-finance target for the years after 2025 and we want the broad-based involvement of donor governments. We have a long-term duty to support our partners in developing countries in regard to financing the mitigation and adaptation efforts that climate change requires.

In this setting, we must invest more heavily in innovation. Generating green hydrogen with solar power from African deserts, for instance, would help to solve climate and energy problems, and it would contribute to generating jobs and improving people’s prospects in Africa. Block chain technology can be used for digitised administration and customs procedures; drones can deliver pharmaceuticals to remote areas. Quantum leaps are possible due to digitalisation. We must tap that potential to drive development. The European Union with its high standards, for example in regard to data privacy, can create the right framework.

**STRONG STRUCTURES, SUSTAINABLE FINANCING**

One thing is sure: changing track towards a policy of global sustainability will require institutional and structural innovation, and it will cost money. But it is an investment in our future!

Preparing the EU for a stronger role in tackling global challenges also requires additional earmarks in the EU’s Multiannual Financial Framework for the years 2021 to 2027. It makes sense to increase the funding for migration matters.

That is the kind of increase we also need for cooperation with Africa. So far, such funding is only set to rise from €5 billion to €6 billion per annum. By contrast, we keep paying ten times as much for the EU’s common agricultural policy. We need to invest much more in international development. Migration will not be reduced unless people find prospects in their home countries, and that requires education, jobs and incomes. At the same time, it is essential to gear development to climate protection.

The new partnership with Africa; tangible proposals for more equitable globalisation; more innovation in climate and environmental protection; coherent and sustainable funding; Germany will promote these causes during its EU Council presidency in the second half of 2020 with an eye to boosting European development policy. Our vision is to turn Europe into a global force for peace and sustainability.

**GERD MÜLLER**

is Germany’s federal minister for economic cooperation and development.

[http://www.bmz.de/en](http://www.bmz.de/en)
Decolonisation often led to arbitrary borders that became the cause of lasting grievances. Britain, a former imperial power, is itself affected by a border it drew across the island of Ireland. Regional integration in the EU context allowed peace to take root in Ireland. The same approach might, in theory, work elsewhere. Whether the fragile Irish peace can survive the United Kingdom’s exit from the EU is an open question.

By Ciarán Ó Maoláin

During World War I, the independence movement in Ireland reignited and eventually forced Britain to withdraw from all but the north-eastern fifth of the island. That territory, renamed Northern Ireland, remained a part of what is now called the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. (Great Britain is the main British island.) A heavily policed border was created less than 100 years ago, separating Northern Ireland from what would become the Republic of Ireland.

Back then, Northern Ireland contained a substantial majority of people who identified as British. They were predominantly Protestant and called “loyalists” or “unionists”. A repressed minority identified as Irish – the “republicans” or “nationalists”, who were mostly Catholic. Today both communities are of almost equal size.

There were recurring periods of conflict, involving armed groups from both communities. The longest such period lasted from 1968 to 1998. Over 3,500 people, mostly non-combatants, were killed in those years. This part of a G7 member was plagued by what one would call “fragile statehood” in Africa, Asia or Latin America. The security forces were far from neutral in the conflict: the police and army were intimately linked to illegal loyalists.

In 1998, the Good Friday Agreement finally established peace. The parties involved in the negotiations were representatives of both communities, with the governments of Ireland and the UK confirming the outcome in a treaty, and the EU and the USA providing support. The two communities agreed to share power in Northern Ireland. The national governments cooperated in a spirit of friendship. The agreement confirmed the right of people in Northern Ireland to choose the citizenship of either state or opt for dual citizenship. Both the UK and the Republic belonged to the EU and the single market, so people were free to move from one part of the island to the other, and there was no need for any customs controls.

The peace settlement accelerated economic integration. People commute daily to work between the two jurisdictions. Northern businesses have expanded south and vice versa. For almost 20 years, the island has exemplified the EU ideal of the free movement of goods, labour, services and capital. Regional integration underpinned Irish peace.

Today, travellers hardly notice when they cross from one state to the other. There are no border controls. The road signs are monolingual in the UK and indicate distances in miles. In the Republic, road signs use kilometres and offer both the Gaelic and anglicised names of places.

Violence has dissipated to a level that most countries would regard as tolerable. Since 1998, most politically motivated killings have involved criminal elements within loyalism, though a smaller number was carried out by republican groupings that rejected the peace agreement.

On the island, few people foresaw the possibility of our English neighbours losing sight of the advantages of being part of the world’s largest trading bloc. In the Brexit referendum, 56% of Northern Irish voters chose “Remain”, but in the entire UK, “Leave” won with 52% (see box next page). People in Northern Ireland find it frustrating that a small majority of voters in the state with sovereignty over them has decided to pull them out of the EU – with no regard for the potentially deadly consequences on the Irish island.

Peace took root the more the arbitrary border that had been drawn a century ago became obsolete. With the UK leaving the EU, the border issue was suddenly back on
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The government in Dublin pointed out these things accurately. The other 26 EU countries supported its stance that a new hard border was unacceptable. Economic interests played a role, but the main goal was to protect the fragile peace.

Most people in Northern Ireland – whether Catholic or Protestant – endorse the Good Friday agreement. On both sides, however, some radical elements do not do so. The loyalist extremists tend to get less attention, but they are actually more dangerous.

Sinn Féin, the mainstream Republican party, which has links to the militant IRA (Irish Republican Army), accepted the peace agreement because its leaders understood that, in the wider context of EU economic integration, the two parts of Ireland were locked together to an extent that partition was becoming obsolete. The IRA did not make peace because of cowardice or weariness; it had sustained a long campaign including serious attacks on targets in Great Britain, but it decided to disarm and disband, and is no longer active. Nonetheless, a small minority of militant Republicans still see the Good Friday Agreement as a means of legalising British occupation. If customs huts, police controls and army patrols were re-established, the militant fringe might consider them “legitimate targets” for attacks. While this threat to peace was instantly obvious to the Irish, it was more than two years after the referendum that the British public began to understand that fact.

The UK media typically referred to the “Irish border” problem, but that term itself proved that they did not understand the issue. “It’s not the Irish border,” was the accurate comment of Dara Ó Briáin, a comedian. “It’s the British border. The Irish border is the beach.”

HARD BORDER OR NOT

It took the UK government excruciatingly long to understand that a hard border had to be prevented. Only a few weeks ago did UK Prime Minister Boris Johnson finally accept this. He had been severely critical of the deal his predecessor Theresa May had struck with the EU. She would have kept the entire UK in the EU customs union until the conclusion of a new bilateral trade agreement between the UK and the EU. Johnson adamantly opposed her deal, stating that it amounted to an unacceptable loss of sovereignty. In October, however, he concluded a deal with the EU according to which there will be a new customs border in the Irish Sea, separating Great Britain from the whole island of Ireland.

What will happen is anybody’s guess. It depends on the results of the British general election in December. If Johnson’s Brexit deal is implemented, Northern Ireland will effectively remain in the EU’s single market, but there would be unprecedented controls on traffic between this minor part of the UK and Great Britain. Radical loyalists hate the idea and have reason to feel betrayed by Johnson.

Like most republicans, most loyalists want peace. However, they too have a small and well-armed extremist faction. It includes elements of two large illegal militias – the Ulster Volunteer Force (UVF) and the Ulster Defence Association (UDA). The extremists have threatened to instigate a violent campaign against Johnson’s proposed post-Brexit regime. It is too early to judge whether they have enough popular support to sustain a campaign of street demonstrations and disorder.

There are several loyalist parties, but the largest, the Democratic Unionist Party (DUP), is one of the most radical. It never really accepted the Good Friday Agreement, worrying that regional integration would eventually lead to the reunification of Ireland. It therefore supported Leave in the Brexit referendum and now feels left in the lurch by Johnson and his Conservatives who obviously do not care much about what happens in a small offshore territory. It is ominous that the leader of the DUP has met with illegal militias. In most countries, such an encounter between a policymaker and paramilitary gangsters would be regarded as a scandal. As usual, however, the UK press pays little attention to what is going on in any part of Ireland. The budding alliance between mainstream unionism and murderous loyalist thugs is now the greatest threat to Irish peace.

CİARÁN Ó MAOŁAİN
is a journalist based in Ireland.

ciaran@omaolain.com

twitter: @OMaolainCiaran

English populism and Scottish nationalism

A wave of populism and xenophobia has infected many European countries in the past 20 years. In Britain – and especially England – it took the form of a movement to leave the EU.

The anti-EU movement gained momentum thanks to years of austerity, the slow recovery after the global financial crisis and a mainstream press controlled almost entirely by right-wing owners. Reckless politicians spread falsehoods about the EU imposing stupid rules about everything from the curvature of bananas to the rights of criminals, and stated that Britain urgently had to “take back control”.

A referendum was held in 2016, and to everyone’s surprise, “Leave” won. Exiting the EU proved more difficult than expected, however, and it may yet not happen at all. If the December 12 general election results in a pro-EU majority or a hung parliament, the next government might cancel Brexit or hold a second referendum.

The potential impact of Brexit has caused dismay not only in Northern Ireland (see main story), but also in Scotland, where 62% voted to remain in the EU. The pro-independence Scottish Nationalist Party is in favour of remaining in the EU and has recently been gaining ground. Opinion polls predict it will do very well in the December elections. It might eventually lead Scotland back into the EU – and then there could be a new hard border in Great Britain.
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"Swimming against the tide"

The Bangladeshi scholar Saleemul Huq has been observing international climate negotiations from the start. In our interview, he assessed the EU’s role. The multilateral system has failed he says, but he appreciates the European Investment Bank’s recent decision to back off from fossil fuels.

Saleemul Huq interviewed by Hans Dembowski

In what sense is the EU important in climate talks?

It is extremely important because it is a block of rich nations which are still willing to be ambitious. By contrast, the USA under President Donald Trump is abandoning the Paris Agreement on Climate Change. His administration is now arguably the most corrupt government in the world. It has entirely sold out to the special interests of fossil fuel industries. The governments of other important countries, such as Japan, Australia and even Canada, have not declared intentions to quit the Paris Agreement, but they really aren’t doing much to live up to the promises made in Paris. The EU is thus the only block of prosperous nations that developing countries can still rely on in climate negotiations, and without its proactive stance in past talks, we would never have got the Paris Agreement. We must not forget, moreover, that the prosperous nations emit much more greenhouse gases than least-developed countries do. It is therefore good that the EU, as a big group of countries, is still committed to climate action.

European environmentalists find its action unconvincing however.

Yes, and they have a point. We should acknowledge, of course, that it is difficult to achieve consensus in a supranational organisation with so many members. At the same time, there is an irritating ambivalence. Germany, for example, tends to be a leader internationally when it comes to spelling out ambitions, but your country is currently lagging behind the targets your own government set. Let’s hope you will speed up climate protection and not begin to lower the ambitions. The international community really needs to aim much higher. The climate crisis is escalating faster than even some of the most worried scientists predicted, but policymakers are not responding to the growing danger. The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) has evidently failed. In its context, we keep patting one another on the shoulder for all too moderate aspirations. At the same time, extreme weather keeps having worse impacts – from wildfires in California to drought in the Sahel region and the devastating typhoons, cyclones and hurricanes that build up over all three oceans. The multinational system is not working.

What do you want Europe to do in this setting?

At this point, I no longer expect much of governments. What I find inspiring is the energy and dynamism of protest movements like the school strikes or Extinction Rebellion. The young people understand that their future is at risk, and they are taking the lead. Greta Thunberg, the Swedish teenager, inspired millions of her peers to rally for climate protection. It adds force to their protests that they are skipping lessons and thus breaking rules. This international movement started in Sweden, spread to other European countries and is now mobilising young people everywhere. This is the spirit we need. We need global action to rise to global problems, and global solidarity must be the foundation. Nation states on their own cannot rise to the climate challenges. As governments tend to respond to public opinion, however, protests may yet make a difference, egging them on to more effective cooperation.

Is it a coincidence that both the school strikes and Extinction Rebellion started in Europe?

No, it is not. First of all, the young people want their governments to rise to the challenges and fulfil environmental promises made in the past. That is the same in the USA, where the young generation is demanding a Green New Deal. It also matters that international media are still dominated by institutions like the BBC, CNN or Deutsche Welle. They are based in prosperous nations and define what is considered important around the world. However, they really only take into account what is happening in their own world regions. Teenagers in Dhaka, our capital city, are just as worried about global heating as members of their age group are in Europe, but they cannot get the kind of attention that Greta got in Stockholm. The international media are only interested in our
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countries when we suffer disasters. They do not cover the legitimate policy demands we raise. Al Jazeera is different. It does not run the same headlines. The good news, however, is that the climate protests we have been witnessing for about a year now are indeed international.

You say the multilateral system is not working. How do you assess the Sustainable Development Goals, which, by the way, EU members endorsed?

I think the SDGs are valuable. They are not legally binding, so they are only soft law, but they do reorient policymakers’ attention to crucial issues. Our prime minister, Sheikh Hasina Wajed, for example, keeps referring to them as a yardstick. She is also a UN champion, promoting the water SDG at an international level. It is crucially important, moreover, that the SDGs are a truly global agenda and not just something developing countries are supposed to finally take care of. That was what was irritating about the Millennium Development Goals. The SDGs emphasise global efforts, and that we need that, cannot be stated too often. My impression is that we are all swimming against the tide, but we have to keep on fighting. Perhaps we can still make a difference, and in that context, the SDGs are a resource.

Soft law is not enough for rising to global challenges though. We need binding commitments. Do you see the EU as a model for supranational governance?

As far as I can tell, various regional organisations are copying the EU approach to trade issues, establishing free trade areas, customs unions et cetera. How effective those organisations are, varies from region to region. The Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) is more dynamic than the South Asian Association for Regional Co-operation (SAARC), which has been hampered by India and Pakistan always being at loggerheads. However, not even ASEAN is doing anything to stop the human-rights offences against the Muslim minority in Myanmar’s Rakhine state, and Bangladesh must take care of the refugees on its own. So no, I don’t see supranational governance evolving according to the EU model.

Unlike most other regional organisations, the EU has powerful joint institutions, including an administrative body, a law court and a parliament. It has indeed pooled sovereignty. Is that desirable?

Yes, I think it is. I have lived in Britain with my family for two decades. We have dual citizenship. We very much appreciated the growing sense of a European identity which is increasingly supplementing many people’s national identity. The Erasmus programme which allows students to spend a semester at a university in another EU member country is wonderful in this regard. My son went to Spain. It is interesting to note, moreover, that many Britons now appreciate their European identity more than they ever did in the past. Before the Brexit referendum, the European flag was hardly ever seen in the United Kingdom. Now, “remainers” are displaying it all the time. That said, Brexit has proven incredibly disruptive and it has been distracting people from more urgent matters, especially the climate crisis.

But doesn’t the British government insist it will not trim down environmental standards?

That is what it says, but the deregulation agenda it is pursuing speaks a different language. The Brexiteers pretend that British industries will become more competitive once they are basically allowed to do whatever they want. Environmental regulations obviously limit that freedom. More generally speaking, I find it striking that climate denial is common among right-wing populists everywhere, and that is true of many Brexiteers too. It is quite evident that powerful fossil industries are supporting this trend. We know now that Exxon scientists accurately predicted how the climate crisis would evolve in the 1980s, so the top management must have known too. Nonetheless, fossil industries have always fought determined climate action and they still are doing so.

So they are running the show?

Well, apart from mass climate protests, there is another bright light: Private-sector investors have been shying away from coal for some time, and are now beginning to back off from oil and gas as well. In this context, the European Investment Bank, a EU institution, deserves praise for its recent decision to phase out investments in these fossil energies by the end of 2021. Private-sector investors pay attention to that kind of signalling. It is worth pointing out that only governments worried about voters in coal-mining regions still invest in coal. Who knows: if mass rallies manage to raise more awareness internationally yet, that may stop too.

SALEEMUL HUQ

is the director of the International Centre for Climate Change and Development (ICCCAD) at Independent University, Bangladesh (IUB) in Dhaka. He is also a senior fellow at the London-based International Institute for Environment and Development. This interview took place before the European Parliament declared a climate emergency on 28 November.
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Hurricane damage in the Bahamas in the summer of 2019.
Moving away from simple commodity exports

Trade can stimulate development. As of 2018, Mozambique has been able, in principle, to benefit from an Economic Partnership Agreement with the EU. The agreement offers the country opportunities, which it must grasp.

By Friedrich Kaufmann and Winfried Borowczak

While there is still relatively little regional exchange within Africa, many African countries engage in robust trade with Asia, America and Europe. Since the colonial era, trade has mostly followed the same pattern: commodities and mostly unprocessed products are exported from Africa, while finished goods with high added value are imported. That is true of Mozambique today (see box below).

The EU uses trade agreements to break this pattern. It has promoted “Economic Partnership Agreements” (EPAs) to establish free-trade zones that include itself and regional organisations in Africa, the Caribbean and Pacific (ACP). EPAs are not only meant to boost trade. They are also designed to stimulate industrial manufacturing, generate exportable products and thereby create jobs and income. EPAs comply with rules of the World Trade Organization (WTO), but experts disagree on whether EPAs lead to the desired results (see Monika Hellstern in D+C/E+Z e-Paper 2019, Focus section).

Mozambique continues to primarily export commodities like coal, aluminium and titanium, as well as fish, sugar and tobacco. The EPA it could take advantage of has been in force in some SADC (Southern African Development Community) countries since 2014. It applies to Mozambique since 2018. The new agreement does not depend on a state having developing-country status. That is an advantage over the “Everything but Arms” (EBA) rule. EBA means that developing countries are allowed to export everything except weapons and munitions to the EU free of tariffs. Another advantage is that the EPA facilitates cross-border trade within Africa. Integration into supply chains of South African companies and from there to the EU could speed up industrialisation in Mozambique. Furthermore, export procedures have been simplified.

The agreement could prove particularly advantageous if, due to the enormous gas reserves in the northern part of the country, Mozambique’s trade with Germany

Germany imports coal from the Tete mines, raw aluminium from the MOZAL smelter near Maputo and tobacco from central Mozambique. Gemstones, including rubies, round out the import portfolio. This pattern has been comparatively stable for years. The export of raw graphite was recently added because a German firm commissioned a graphite mine. Conversely, sugar imported from Mozambique has lost its former relevance.

The trade volume between Germany and Mozambique amounted to about $400 million in 2018, compared with $330 million in 2017 and about $300 million in 2016. Unlike in its relations with most of its foreign trade partners, Germany has not done much to achieve an export surplus with Mozambique. In 2018, the trade deficit was $150 million – about 25% less than in the previous year.

Germany exports machines, chemicals, vehicles and electronic devices as well as grain to Mozambique. The exports tend to be project-related and therefore vary considerably from year to year. It is striking that Germany exports grain, which is used in the bread and baking industry, to Mozambique. Generally speaking, German companies primarily see the country as a sales market. They hardly invest in Mozambique and thus create rather few jobs. They perceive the country merely as a sales market.
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Mozambique should someday lose its status as a developing country. Thanks to the EPA, the country would stay exempt from duties.

The EPA requires Mozambique to exempt from duties about 74% of imports from the EU over the course of ten years. For fiscal policy reasons, it is allowed to maintain 26% of tariffs. The reason is that Mozambique has traditionally generated state income primarily through duties. Moreover, the still permissible duties could shield domestic industries from excessive competitive pressure. So far, however, there is very little industry in Mozambique, so this concern is relevant more from a theoretical than from a practical perspective. Once infant industries are established, additional safeguards can be activated.

Taken advantage of intelligently, the EPA could drive industrialisation and economic development in Mozambique. Unfortunately, the country still lacks an effective and comprehensive policy for exploiting EPA opportunities. Important steps would include building infrastructure, fighting corruption, cutting red tape, breaking up the oligarchic cartels of the political elite and promoting non-oligarchic business associations at local levels.

The business climate is currently still too poor to encourage more investment. It adds to the problems that Mozambique does not have a coherent export strategy that would systematically put businesses in a position to manufacture exportable products. The EPA could be the launch pad for a strategic industrial policy. That opportunity, of course, will stay worthless as long as the government does not grasp it.
The EU has a vital role to play in global affairs, according to political scientist Dirk Messner, but whether it is up to task, remains to be seen.

Dirk Messner interviewed by Hans Dembowski

The EU must be a “superpower project”. That is what Gideon Rachman, the Financial Times’ foreign policy columnist recently wrote. Do you agree?

Well, at very least it must muster the strength to position itself coherently in regard to issues of great world-order relevance. Otherwise, we will be under the pressure of other powers. The performance of the US administration is currently volatile. Its stance is at once protectionist and market liberal. Its style of governance is authoritarian and resembles what used to be called “crony capitalism” in Washington. After Donald Trump, that will hopefully change again, but this is the current scenario. China and Russia are authoritarian regimes, though Russia only has a strong military, but not a strong economy. In this setting, the EU must promote renewed multilateralism and project a vision of capitalism that is embedded in democracy and the rule of law in ways that facilitate social welfare and environmental health. That authoritarian and populist trends are evident in EU member countries, adds to the difficulties, of course.

What must the EU be capable of in the global arena?

It has to be in a position to spell out coherent policies in every significant field of world politics. Five topics of overarching relevance matter in particular:

- The UN needs more support, and the EU’s interest in multilateral cooperation is strong. Peace depends on it. Moreover, the SDGs, the Sustainable Development Goals, constitute a frame of reference that endorses universal human rights, reflects European values and can guide global initiatives.
- The EU must promote a global economic order that reconciles market competition with social and environmental protection. The major challenge of the 21st century is to facilitate – within the limits of the earth system – equitably shared prosperity for a world population that will soon amount to 10 billion people. The EU’s strong standing in global trade is a good starting point.
- The EU’s interest in multilateral cooperation is strong. Peace depends on it. Moreover, the SDGs, the Sustainable Development Goals, constitute a frame of reference that endorses universal human rights, reflects European values and can guide global initiatives.
- The UN needs more support, and the EU’s interest in multilateral cooperation is strong. Peace depends on it. Moreover, the SDGs, the Sustainable Development Goals, constitute a frame of reference that endorses universal human rights, reflects European values and can guide global initiatives.
- In this context, digitalisation and innovative technologies deserve particular attention. It is noteworthy that no single nation state, with the exceptions of the USA and China, has an influence that is even close to the EU’s influence on the regulation of major internet multinationals like Facebook, Google and Amazon. Private-sector corporations cannot afford to ignore the EU; its market is far too big. The EU would do well to develop a shared vision for sustainable societies in a digital age (see Sabine Balk on related WBGU proposals in Monitor section of D+C/E+Z e-Paper 2019/07).
- Stabilising the earth system is of existential urgency. The climate crisis, the state of oceans, deforestation, the erosion of biodiversity – a lot needs to be done.
- As a major civilian power, the EU must promote peace and reconciliation, but that implies that it needs a minimum level of military capacities. Relying on the USA as in the past is no longer an option.

Global problems require global solutions, and they will not be brought about unless we have players with global reach. The EU must be one of them.

Are you considering the EU’s self-interest or the global common good?

A strong global role serves the EU’s self-interest, but not only. Who would benefit if the EU withdrew from the global arena? Certainly not poor economies and small countries. Their development perspectives depend on a rules-bound and reasonably fair world order.

Does conventional official development assistance (ODA) matter in this regard?

In 2017, the EU and its members spent about $75 billion on ODA. That was 57% of the global total. The better the EU coordinates such efforts, the more they add up to a coherent and convincing proposal in the eyes of partners overseas. ODA fragmentation, by contrast, thwarts effectiveness. The focus must be on overarching issues such as the climate, poverty, inequality and security.

Does that mean that the EU should primarily reach out to developing countries? What other potential allies are there?

We need new alliances, and, among other things, they must bridge the old north-south divide. This does not only concern the poorest and smallest countries. Some 60 nations no longer belong to the least-developed group, nor are they among the fast-rising emerging markets. Classical ODA is hardly attractive to them. Examples include Indonesia, Peru or South Africa. And who says that we always have to cooperate with the same partners? A climate alliance with China is not only feasible; it is imperative. The opposite is true when it comes to human rights. It would be wrong, moreover, to only think of sovereign governments as potential partners. Cooperation with subnational authorities makes sense too. Consider, for example, the governors of California or New York in the USA. Reaching out to sub-national and municipal leaders can

Facebook, Amazon und Google pay attention to Margrethe Vestager, the competition commissioner.
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be meaningful, especially in places where it is difficult to cooperate with the national government. Let’s not forget private-sector companies and their associations. They are important players. Finally, interaction with scientific institutions and civil-society organisations is important.

The EU looks weakened after being hit by crises – sovereign debt, refugees and especially Brexit. Is it up to task?

The citizens of member countries basically perceive the EU to be a project of elites who focus on the single market. Citizens’ attitude to the EU would certainly change if they felt the EU was serving their own social protection and human security. Opinion polls show, moreover, that Europeans would appreciate a more effective joint foreign policy.

Over-indebted banks were a serious pan-European problem a few years ago, but there was no joint solution. National responsibility was emphasised, so Spanish and Irish tax money was used to bail out Spanish and Irish banks to the extent that they could service the loans they had been granted by banks in Germany, France and Britain. Needing more money for this purpose, the Irish and Spanish governments incurred huge debts, were then blamed for irresponsible spending and had to impose harsh austerity on their country. The irony was that the sacrifices made in Spain and Ireland prevented people in Germany, France and Britain from suffering similarly harsh constraints. Unfortunately, there is a long-established pattern of member governments trying to shield their citizens from any kind of hardship. They like to declare anything that goes well to be their own achievement, but they blame “Brussels” for any difficulties. The European Central Bank (ECB) is increasingly scapegoated as well. One lesson of the euro crisis is certainly that Europe needs joint solutions for joint problems. That, in turn, will mean yet more pooling of sovereignty in economic affairs and social protection in order to sustain the monetary union. Another recent lesson is that populist agitation against European institutions must be avoided. Brexit is a result, among other things, of decades-long entirely overblown right-wing anti-EU propaganda. A similar trend is becoming apparent in Germany, with the ECB being attacked. However, the German public is hardly aware of how much our economy is benefiting from the euro. Without it, our exchange rate would be much higher, and our economy would be struggling with similar problems as the Japanese and Swiss economies are. The three economies are actually quite similar.

Is the EU a model of supranational policymaking?
Well, that is how it was seen not long ago. Given its serious internal frictions, it now looks more like a “teetering continent” – to use the words with which the historian Philipp Blom described Europe before World War I. In many ways, the years 1890 to 1910 resembled the time we live in now. Societies, industry and science were undergoing deep and turbulent transformations. What followed from 1939 to 1945, was an era of European self-destruction, with devastating impacts far beyond the continent’s shores. After World War II, Europe then indeed became the world’s most interesting laboratory for cross-border cooperation. We must hope that, once again, the EU will emerge stronger from crisis.

DIRK MESSNER
co-chairs the German Advisory Council on Global Change (Wissenschaftlicher Beirat Globale Umweltveränderungen – WBGU) and is a director at the United Nations University. He will become the president of Germany’s Environmental Protection Agency next year. messner@ehs.unu.edu

Decades of peace after an era of destruction: top leaders of Germany and France commemorating in 1984 the dead of World War I.

That is hard to tell. It has often emerged stronger from crises.

Would joint social-protection policies help? Might tangible pan-European solidarity boost a sense of a shared European identity?
Yes, proposals of this kind are meaningful. The citizens of member countries basically perceive the EU to be a project of elites who focus on the single market. Citizens’ attitude to the EU would certainly change if they felt the EU was serving their own social protection and human security. Opinion polls show, moreover, that Europeans would appreciate a more effective joint foreign policy.

Over-indebted banks were a serious pan-European problem a few years ago, but there was no joint solution. National responsibility was emphasised, so Spanish and Irish tax money was used to bail out Spanish and Irish banks to the extent that they could service the loans they had been granted by banks in Germany, France and Britain. Needing more money for this purpose, the Irish and Spanish governments incurred huge debts, were then blamed for irresponsible spending and had to impose harsh austerity on their country. The irony was that the sacrifices made in Spain and Ireland prevented people in Germany, France and Britain from suffering similarly harsh constraints. Unfortunately, there is a long-established pattern of member governments trying to shield their citizens from any kind of hard-
Libyans have mixed feelings about the EU. On the one hand, they admire what Europeans have achieved, but on the other, they feel let down.

By Moutaz Ali and Walid Ali

On the southern shores of the Mediterranean Sea, most Libyans used to rate highly what was happening on the northern shores. They considered EU countries to be models of prosperous and well-organised societies that enable people to live good lives. In the 20th century, thousands of Libyan students attended European universities, and what they told their compatriots reinforced the EU’s good reputation.

At the same time, many other Libyans have a rather bad impression of the EU. In their eyes, some of its member countries – especially Britain, France and Italy – have contributed to the security chaos the country is currently suffering. After all, a NATO intervention led by European governments facilitated the downfall of Muamar al-Gaddafi’s regime in 2011 (see box next page). Security has never been restored. For almost a decade, competing militias have been fighting over Libyan territory. Erratic fighting can erupt anywhere at any time.

Some armed groups, moreover, are involved in the people smuggling industry. Large numbers of Africans want to migrate to Europe. Many are from sub-Saharan Africa, others are from Arab countries. As Libya has become a transit country, ever more Libyans want to move to Europe themselves.

HIGH HOPES

Everywhere in North Africa, people take great interest in European affairs. Masses would like to prosper in a democratic society – and that has been true for a long time. Obviously, such inclinations cannot be expressed freely under dictatorial rule. The revolutions of the Arab Spring revealed oppressed people’s desires.

At the time, Libya, Egypt and Tunisia got rid of autocratic leaders. It fits the pattern that popular uprisings have this year toppled authoritarian regimes in Algeria and Sudan. The painful backlash in Egypt, the security chaos in Libya and the brutal civil war in Syria must not distract from the fact that people long for freedom. We are aware of the EU’s long history of preaching democratic principles. Now we find its track record of supporting democracy disappointing.

Gaddafi, the strongman who ruled Libya from 1969 to 2011, did his best to convey a sense of national unity and to foster hostility towards the west. Many Libyans, however, disagreed. Mohamed Omar, a retired engineer, says: “Gaddafi was delivering a false message; Libyans did not see the EU as an enemy.”

Many other people see European governments at fault – at least partially. Shying away from deploying boots on the ground, they left a violence-torn country to its fate.

MIGRATION WORRIES

The refugee crisis is compounding the problems. It bears repetition that increasingly Libyans themselves want to leave for Europe. In the lack of visas, there are no safe routes. Moreover, Libyans who follow European media tend to see the coverage distorted. Libyans are normally depicted as perpetrators of crimes, not as people living in danger of violence. European leaders want refugees to stay in Libya, but they blame our people when foreigners are mistreated and abused here. Do European media not understand that Libyan statehood is extremely fragile? That, in itself, causes suffering.

Refugees found in distress at sea off the Libyan coast in early 2018.
Sajida is a six-year-old girl with a rare blood disorder. She required a bone marrow transplant. This kind of treatment is not available in Libya. Therefore, her father wanted to take her to Europe for proper treatment. “I applied several times for visas but all my applications were refused,” he reports. “I think they were afraid that I wouldn’t be able to afford the treatment costs.”

In 2016, he decided to sail to Europe with his daughter in a small rubber boat. After 33 hours, an Italian coast guard vessel found them and took them to Sicily. The girl got the lifesaving treatment.

Others are not so lucky and do not survive their attempt to cross the Mediterranean in inadequate ships. Nonetheless, people increasingly want to leave Libya in order to escape violence and lawlessness. They hope to get asylum in Europe but have no safe way to get there.

The irony of the matter is that, in European history, Libya was seen as the gateway to Africa. Now Africans see it as the gateway to Europe. Though the EU and the Gaddafi regime considered one another to be adversaries, they actually cooperated on several issues, including monitoring and restricting illegal migration.

In the chaos following his downfall, no authority has been able to assume the role of being an effective governmental partner for the EU. Libya is now a transit country with porous borders and ineffective state agencies.

Zuhier Abusrewil, a Libyan journalist who specialises in migration issues, says that “Libyans in general understand the rights of Africans who seek to escape to Europe looking for a better life.” In that sense, they do not share European worries.

Migration has considerable downsides, however, as the journalist points out: “Libya has been negatively affected because it largely relies on foreign workers.” Today, however, foreigners no longer want to stay in Libya. Now there is a shortage of workers, and wages are increasing.

The worst problem, however, is organised crime. The revenues of people smuggling amount to hundreds of millions of euros. Local gangs have teamed up with armed militias in Libya as well as mafia cliques from Italy and Malta.

The power vacuum that resulted from the NATO intervention has thus not only undermined security, it has also given rise to a lucrative illegal industry. Daily life in Libya is nowhere close to the EU standards that people hoped for when Gaddafi fell. This disparity now defines Libyans’ idea of Europe.
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Disappointment in EU leaders

In Libyans’ eyes, 2011 was not so much the year of liberation as the beginning of constant civil strife. While they disagree on whether the NATO intervention was legitimate or not, there is consensus on it having caused permanent insecurity.

Several EU member countries – especially Britain and France – played leading roles in bringing about the UN Security Council decision to impose a no-fly-zone over Libya in March 2011. The Security Council argued that this measure would stop Muammar al-Gaddafi, the dictator, from cracking down with full military force on the popular uprising against him. Western members of the Security Council endorsed that decision, though Germany abstained together with Russia, China and Brazil.

In view of Gaddafi preparing to repress any kind of opposition brutally, European leaders like President Nicolas Sarkozy of France and Prime Minister David Cameron of Britain insisted the UN had to live up to R2P, its “responsibility to protect” people from harm in civil wars. With a Security Council mandate, NATO then took action. Typically, the US administration let European partners lead the mission.

Today, Mohamed Khaihaf Elakroun, a retired Libyan diplomat, says that “the majority of the Libyan elite accepted the western intervention as they believe that the ousting of the long-standing dictator was impossible without an external intervention”. He adds that they misconceived the consequences of Gaddafi’s overthrow and did not expect extended civil strife.

However, many Libyans now think that the intervention intentionally exceeded its R2P mandate by actively supporting the rebels instead of merely blocking Gaddafi’s air force. They think military action was designed to topple him in the pursuit of foreign interests. Yet others opposed the NATO-led intervention of 2011 right from the start.

There is widespread consensus, however, that the international community in general and western powers in particular failed in terms of R2P. The reason was that, after Gaddafi’s death, their support for a political transition remained inadequate. They let the country slide into civil war.

It is true, of course, that EU members contributed to bringing about the Libyan National Agreement in 2015. However, this agreement neither settled all important questions nor ensured effective implementation.

According to Ahmed Almugassaby, a Libyan journalist, EU members must bear some of the blame. He says that local polarisation in Libya was linked to different EU countries having different priorities. “Contradictory influences led to a flawed agreement in 2015”, he says. Moreover, it has become increasingly clear that Italy and France have different agendas in Libya and form alliances with local players accordingly. In other words, Libyans must suffer because the EU is not united in foreign affairs. As for Libyan politicians, Almugassaby accuses them of not serving the public interest in this context, but opportunistically siding with European partners.
Kiran Klaus Patel is a historian who does an excellent job of deconstructing EU mythology. He shows that, while there is a grain of truth to the ideas of the EU being a peace builder, a driver of prosperity and a potential world power, there never was a master plan to make that happen. Instead, its history often evolved in incremental steps in response to various crises.

By Hans Dembowski

Patel is a professor at the University of Maastricht. His book "Projekt Europa" was published in German by C.H. Beck last year. Cambridge University Press is preparing an English translation that is scheduled to appear in April 2020.

Let’s take a brief look at the three myths Patel deconstructs. As he shows, the EU did serve a peace-building function, but it did not play an important role in reconciling the war-torn continent immediately after 1945. At the time, many different international organisations were established to promote peace. The first precursor of what is now the EU, the European Community for Coal and Steel, was only started a decade later, and it had a mere six members: West Germany, France, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg. The same countries started two other communities in 1957, pooling their policymaking on nuclear technology (Euratom) and establishing a common market (European Economic Community). Only by the end of the 1950s, were the three communities merged, and Euratom was long believed to be the most important component. In the 1990, the European Community became the EU.

In regard to peacebuilding, the community was actually somewhat ambivalent in its early years, according to Patel. On the upside, it reinforced trust and cooperation among its members, tying them closer together and turning Germany and France, the former enemies, into close allies. On the downside, the Soviet Union and its allies considered it a reinforcement of the western block. In the early 1980s, by contrast, the EU insisted on maintaining trade relations with the Soviet block and thus mitigated to some extent Washington’s re-escalation of the Cold War.

In Patel’s eyes, the EU only really became a major peacemaker in the 1990s after the collapse of the Soviet Union by offering perspectives to Eastern European countries. EU enlargement proved very important in ensuring peaceful transitions.

In regard to economic affairs, Patel does not deny that the European Community was always useful, but he argues convincingly that it was not a driver of growth in the early years. In his assessment, economies were expanding fast due to opportunities provided by post-war reconstruction and the introduction of new technologies. National governments, however, used the European Community to manage difficult transitions. For example, joint agricultural subsidies cushioned off rural change, slow-
ing down the pace at which smallholder farming was becoming unviable. In a similar sense, inner-community migration, especially from southern Italy to industrialised cities in northern member countries, reduced social tensions and helped employers cope with labour-market bottlenecks.

As for making the EU a world power, Patel not only elaborates how this aspiration was always tampered by pragmatism, but also shows that the USA was generally supportive of its allies’ regional integration for geostrategic reasons. Washington may sometimes have found “Brussels” to be a difficult partner during the Cold War, but its stabilising impact on Western Europe was most valuable. Donald Trump is the first US president to speak of the EU with open resentment.

Over time, the EU became a powerful player in trade affairs with an increasing influence in other policy fields. In regard to official development assistance (ODA), for example, it has long been making a difference. A large share of member countries’ funding is channelled through the EU. While they still pursue international-development policies of their own, their joint funding makes the EU an additional force to be reckoned with. As Patel notes, moreover, the EU contributed a lot to changing the rhetoric from one of colonial dominance in the 1950s to eye-level partnership by the turn of the millennium. Rhetoric has a bearing on policy-making even if the latter typically does not fulfil every promise.

In some policy fields, however, the EU is still basically a non-entity. The most striking example is military affairs. NATO is quite obviously much more important. What Patel fails to point out, however, is that EU members’ position within NATO is certainly strengthened because their leaders are familiar with one another, are used to coordinating action among one another and are more likely to consider joint interests rather than narrowly focused national interests as in the past.

**WHAT MADE THE EU STRONG**

It is important to understand, of course, why a six-member community of West European countries evolved into the dominant supranational organisation in Europe, becoming a global model for regional integration. According to Patel, the EU and its precursors differed from other international organisations in several important ways:

- They were not merely intergovernmental entities, but had strong supranational components which concerned administration, legislation and judicial matters. There were joint commissions that administered the joint policies, and they were later merged into a single commission. Moreover, there was binding joint legislation that all member countries had to implement. A joint court of law ensured that this happened. In other words, the member countries pooled sovereignty and that made their community especially effective.
- The EU and its precursors played a crucial role in economic policymaking. Building the common market, which in the long term proved to be the most important initiative, meant that market-relevant regulations had to be coordinated. Such regulations have an immediate bearing on people’s lives. Accordingly, major industries, lobby groups and trade unions paid close attention. This community increasingly mattered in citizens’ eyes.

For these reasons, the late-comer among international organisations increasingly overshadowed competitors. The European Free Trade Organisation, in particular, proved a less coherent and weaker initiative, so Britain, Ireland and Denmark switched sides in the early 1970s. Since then, ever more countries have joined the EU. In spite of many crises and the British referendum decision to leave, it has proven surprisingly resilient.

Patel’s book explains why. It elaborates how the EC started in the 1950s and grew into the EU by the mid-1990s. It does not discuss more recent crises. Brexit, refugees and sovereign debt do not figure. Nonetheless, the author’s insights help to understand what the EU is today, and why it has proven so resilient. The most important point is that it serves members’ interests. Another is that its institutional setup and decision-making processes are flexible enough to rise to challenges. Indeed, Patel shows, that the EU’s history is best understood as a series of successful responses to crises rather than as the implementation of a rigid master plan.

The EU is a complex and multi-layered supranational organisation in which national governments still play decisive roles. It makes many things easier for them. Patel expresses the evidence-based hope that the EU is not about to disintegrate, but more likely to evolve into an even more important supranational organisation. As in the past, he expects such a development to be marked by fuzzy compromises and sudden innovations rather than to be guided by strict principles.
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Rural areas need to become more attractive, they need better infrastructure and employment opportunities for people to stay or even come back: harvesting millet in Senegal.