

Diplomacy and International relations

Nadine Piiskopf
Kaunas University

Abstract: Diplomacy is the maintenance of relations between states through accredited persons, in order to satisfy the interests of the state that designates them.

Historically, diplomatic recognition was automatic. It was enough for a political entity to present the attributes of a state to be recognized as such. Recognition provides legitimacy and external support to any state.

In this 2nd half of the century, there have been states that have achieved diplomatic recognition before their attributes (countries of decolonization) are recognized. First they asked to be at the United Nations to get their recognition.

In addition, the recognition of states as such, we should also talk about the recognition of governments. Generally, it does not usually have problems when it occurs after an election, but it does when the government comes through a coup d'état. For example, China.

If a government is not recognized, this can be a huge mortgage when it comes to acting internationally, but it also breaks diplomatic relations if they were already established. Breaking these relationships is a form of political pressure to show dissent.

Keywords: Diplomacy, International Relations, international cooperation

Introduction

There are three degrees of rupture:

- Fully break relations with a state.
- Reduce the rank of diplomats who hold responsibility for these relations.
- Remove the representation of your country, with whose government you disagree.

Diplomacy has its origins in the Italian city-states of the fifteenth century, which developed a diplomatic service that had two features:

- Its permanence: Diplomatic accreditation was constant or permanent.
- Professionalism: The exercise of Diplomatic Relations began to be carried out with professionals.

In its origins, diplomacy owed much to trade relations. In the mid-seventeenth century, the monarchs copied the new diplomacy, and in the eighteenth century diplomacy was already recognized, although diplomatic measures did not have a very good reputation.

There are big differences between this diplomacy and the current one:

- Ancient diplomacy was surrounded by the king and his advisors.
- Agreements were kept secret.
- Growing importance of diplomacy through multilateral institutions; It used to be bilateral. There is great interdependence between states. Meaningful relationships of one state can have repercussions on others.
- Complexity due to the greater number of problems to be dealt with in bilateral relations, so what remains of bilateral diplomacy is increasingly complex.

In the eighteenth century, diplomats discussed politics, military,...., but modern ones have more problems of economic, technological, labor relations,... that require a larger and more specialized diplomatic corps.

- Another difference is that the role of ambassadors has been in decline and the spectacular advances that have been made in the media and transport. These have allowed ministers or ambassadors to establish direct relations with the government of another state.

It has been said that this development has its drawbacks because heads of state are not sufficiently knowledgeable and can make mistakes. The entry into play of politicians, in addition, can unlock negotiations.

Over time, a code of rules of behavior has been created between states. Among them, we can highlight the following:

- Those referring to the protocol.

- Diplomatic immunity.
- Non-interference by diplomats in the internal affairs of a country.

1. The protocol is very important. By rank is understood diplomatic law to the different categories that may exist. The question of preference refers to the place occupied in a ceremony or act. In the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, it was the Pope who resolved civil affairs and exercised the work of diplomat.

No agreement on rank would be reached until 1815 (Congress of Vienna). Three large groups of diplomats were established:

- Ambassadors and papal nuncios.
- Special envoys and plenipotentiary ministers.
- Case managers.

A minister plenipotentiary is a diplomat with great powers who has great importance, especially in matters of ending wars or armistices.

There were still problems with precedence since in the same act, for example, they could all be ambassadors. In 1818 this problem was solved. Thus, preference would be given to the one who had been serving in that country the longest. This figure, that of the ambassador who has more years of service in his country, is the one called "Dean of the diplomatic corps".

2. The immunity standard is very important. The representatives of a country in a state should enjoy complete freedom. This rule of immunity extends to an embassy building, i.e. the floor of an embassy is from that country. Immunity also reaches the means of transport. Nor can diplomats be tried by the criminal laws of the state in which they serve. Previously, centuries ago, messengers enjoyed immunity.

The declaration of persona non grata authorizes a government to expel an individual from a territory. This could happen if the diplomat has not maintained a good attitude.

99% of those declared "non gratos" is due to having been introduced into the country's domestic politics, believing that they spy or by unfortunate statements about the country. Espionage has been the mistake that diplomats have made the most.

A golden rule in diplomacy is that ambassadors should not be involved in the domestic politics of the country they represent. They cannot talk about parties, about the economic or social situation of a country, they must conduct through official channels, especially through the Ministry of the Interior,... and so on.

For example, in the US and USSR in the Cold War. Both intervened helping specific groups, training troops,...

Functions of the diplomat

It is dedicated to performing the following tasks:

1. Protection of nationals.
 2. Symbolic representation.
 3. Obtaining information.
 4. Provides advice and participates in policy making.
1. It affects the defense of the interests of nationals who live or travel to the country where that embassy carries out its tasks. This work does not have great relevance, except when there are catastrophes or civil wars.
- Generally, the defense of the nationals is in charge of the consuls: they attend to executives,... etc. Consulates are usually the only offices open to the public that are not located in the state capital.
2. The ambassador is the maximum representative of his state in another country. He is the visible head of that state, so he participates by representing it in all acts that have anything to do with his state.
 3. Obtaining information is one of the most important tasks. When a Ministry is going to decide what policy it is going to use with a country, it needs to have information from that country so that there are no errors with that policy in that state. It is also necessary to decipher and know that data to know how that state will respond with our policy.

Diplomats know the information through reports, magazines, debates, radio, television,... Since the volume of information is very extensive, the diplomats of an embassy have to specialize.

En realidad, la función fundamental de los diplomáticos es:

- Tratar de desarrollar acuerdos y/ colaboraciones.
- Conseguir información.

Hay otra información que se obtiene ilegalmente a través del espionaje, ya que en casi todas (o, mejor dicho, en todas) es conocido que hay embajadores de inteligencia que se encargan exclusivamente de espiar.

La vida diplomática también tiene cócteles, fiestas,... y estos actos también permiten obtener información, incluso más que en los actos formales, donde los diplomáticos han de ser correctos y formales.

4. Si un diplomático es serio y con prestigio, actuará de una forma activa en la elaboración de la política exterior de un país; a veces, los diplomáticos tienen una imagen mucho más acabada y perfilada de un país que los políticos del Ministerio de Exteriores de ese país.

Negociación

Cuando dos estados negocian es que entre ambos hay un conflicto, por lo que ambos tienen que querer llegar a un acuerdo. Así, ha habido países en muchos años de conflicto, países que deseaban vivir en conflicto porque posiblemente entienden que cualquier solución es más cara (política o económicamente),... etc.

No todos los procesos de negociación son iguales. Aquellos entre estados con buena relación no tendrán nada que ver con negociaciones en los que los dos crean que hay unos intereses vitales en juego.

In a negotiation there are three vital parts:

1. The framework of the negotiation.
2. Preparation of the rules of the game.
3. Substantive phase of the negotiation.

The framework of the negotiation

- 1.1 Bilateral or multilateral relations.
- 1.2 Participation of a mediator.

Sometimes, the parties are so opposed that the mediator is essential, since even the two parties do not sit at the same table, stay in the same hotel or are in the same city or country.

- 1.3 Crisis situation or more normal political climate.

If immediate action must be taken, if there is a crisis, if the climate is not one of crisis, if the negotiators have time and are not pressured.

- 1.4 Available time (open or closed).
- 1.5 Meetings open or closed to the press.

The fact that secret meetings are so means that negotiators do not have to address public opinion. It could also be that the agreement is leaked and thus be able to test the consequences that applying that agreement would have on the people.

Preparation of the rules of the game

- 2.1. Place of meetings.
- 2.2. Parties participating and the size of delegations.
- 2.3. Arrangement of the meeting room
- 2.4. Work documentation.

Work material that will serve to illustrate certain points, to make proposals.

- 2.5. Working procedure:
 - 2.5.1. Breaks.
 - 2.5.2. Language to be used.
 - 2.5.3. Agree on what working text (if any) to use as a basis for negotiation.
 - 2.5.4. Agree that there will be minutes of the talks.

Substantive phase of the negotiation

The substantive phase is one in which both parties start talking. The parties, in a 1st stage, explain the reasons why it is there, and seek a statement on the positions of the other party. This declaration of initial positions constitutes maximum positions, and it is possible to reach agreements.

When the demands have been established, each party tries to figure out how far the other party is willing to give in ("Resistance Points").

The weight of the negotiation for each of the parties is to reach an agreement that is so far from the objectives of the rival and very close to our maximum objectives.

The result will depend on our ability, to assess the elements of our opponent to pressure us,... But if these factors are important, the real ability of each party to influence the rival is also important.

In the development of the negotiation, threats and rewards intervene. One of these is a positive sanction (increase our foreign aid, cheap credits, that more products enter our country,...) Threats are the opposite, and generally much more widely used.

If a party decides to use threats, they must be credible, so if they are not, they will be worthless. Generally, oversized threats are useless. In addition, threats can be problematic because the rival party can remain immovable and the threatener has to step up and carry out those threats.

There are also so-called "questions of principle", which are issues that, for the parties to the negotiation, are not negotiable. For example, for Palestinians the capital of the Palestinian state must be East Jerusalem, although for Israelis the unity of Jerusalem is essential. In this way, we see that the more issues of principle there are, the less flexibility there will be and, therefore, the more complicated the negotiation.

La cuestión del cumplimiento del acuerdo tiene gran importancia, sobre todo en cuanto a acuerdos de desarme. En casi todos éstos, existe una "cláusula de verificación" por la que se puede hacer verificaciones *in situ* (en el lugar o territorio contrario) y así ver si el acuerdo se lleva a cabo.

En los últimos años ha habido pocos acuerdos de desarme, sobre todo por la imposibilidad de hacer verificaciones, porque se pensaba que en ese proceso se producían labores de espionaje (por ejemplo, en la Guerra Fría con EE.UU. y la URSS).

Los negociadores pueden agotar distintas técnicas negociadoras:

- Un medio es el llamado "Paso a paso", por el cual las partes aceptan recurrir al acuerdo yendo, primero, con problemas que no son centrales. Aquí es difícil crear una inercia negociadora, aunque este procedimiento es muy habitual.
- Otro procedimiento es abordar de golpe los problemas principales. Una parte es capaz de hacer grandes concesiones esperando que el otro vea su buena voluntad y haga también una gran concesión. Pero si la otra parte no la hace, nos podemos encontrar con que tenemos que hacer nuevas concesiones para que el rival ofrezca una por fin.
- Otra técnica es explotar la impaciencia de la parte rival: retrasos de negociación por problemas de agenda, introduciendo nuevos temas,... etc. Esta técnica es utilizable siempre que una parte muestre ganas de esperar tanto.
- La última técnica es la de amenazar con que si no acepta las condiciones ahora, más tarde tendrá que aceptar otras condiciones más duras aún que las primeras.

Puede llagar un momento en que la solución de un problema no se puede arreglar pacíficamente; así, sólo se puede hacer a través de la guerra. Es este fenómeno (la guerra) el que caracteriza las Relaciones Internacionales.

There is no period in history not marked by war. In our own century, there have been two fundamental confrontations: World War 1 (the first war of industrial society) and World War 2.

After this, the Magna Carta of the United Nations tries to eliminate war as an element of foreign policy of the signatory countries of that treaty. Article 2 of this Magna Carta obliges countries to refrain from the use of war. It also renounces the formulation of threats that imply violent actions.

Technological advances have led human beings to acquire nuclear weapons. The world was faced with a real paradox since the human being and had created an element that produced total destruction that war ceases to be possible. Since the advent of nuclear weapons there have been no wars with great powers, but with small states conventional wars have been "successful."

Classes of wars

Basically, they are as follows:

- **International war and civil war.**

It is called international war to that conflict that involves two or more states. For example, between Iran or Iraq, or World War 2. Civil wars occur within a state, and pit one or more internal groups fighting for control of state territory.

It should be noted that there are links between the two types of wars. An international war can be the trigger for a civilian one. For example, Russia and the Bolshevik Revolution. The opposite can also happen: that a civil war is the cause of an international war. For example, in Zaire, there is a kind of civil war, although other African countries have been involved in it.

- Total war and limited war

Total wars involve many countries and the scene of battles is planetary. The goal of those who fight is usually the unconditional surrender of the enemy.

Limited wars are confined to a smaller geographical space, and the objectives for which they fight are more concrete, such as gaining an extension of territory. An example of total war was World War 2, while Vietnam was an example of total war.

Between both types, as in the previous case, there are also connections. A limited war can be transformed into an all-out war. For example, when NATO countries threaten and intervene to deter Serbs. Russia, their ally, helps them and on numerous occasions has been against NATO.

- Conventional war and nuclear war

Conventional warfare is one in which conventional war materiel (tank, submachine gun,...) is used, which is based on traditional explosives.

Nuclear war is a concept today, except for the 1945 Hiroshima and Nagasaki bombs.

There have been times when nuclear war was thought to happen, mainly in the 80s. The fact that it could be hit with total accuracy by dropping a bomb from 5,000 km away on really small targets presaged that the use of this type of weapon would soon occur.

- Conventional warfare and guerrilla warfare

Conventional warfare is the one that confronts conventional groups, with traditional weapons and with tactics drawn on an open field. Guerrilla warfare is made up of irregular armies with irregular attacks and never offering open field warfare.

The guerrilla forces intend to confuse themselves with the towns and villages, so it is very difficult for the enemy to destroy it unless it creates a high damage to the civilian population.

La guerra de guerrillas es muy común en los países del Tercer Mundo. Un ejemplo de guerrilla sería la estrategia que utilizaron los vietnamitas en la Guerra de Vietnam, que ganaron ya que los americanos utilizaron las estrategias convencionales.

La intervención está muy asociada a las guerras civiles. La intervención es la interferencia de un país en los asuntos de otro y casi siempre suele ser de carácter armado.

Las intervenciones pueden ser:

- Intervenciones legales: Cuando se produce a instancias del Gobierno de un estado que se ve en peligro por movimientos de gentes de su propio estado.

- Intervenciones ilegales: El resto de los casos.

Generalmente, las intervenciones son protagonizadas por países poderosos (Gran Bretaña, EE.UU., Urss), que lo hacen en países más débiles.

JUSTIFICACIÓN DE LA VIOLENCIA

Las teorías se han clasificado en 3 grandes grupos:

1. - El individuo y la naturaleza humana:

a) Teoría sobre el instinto y la agresión.

b) Ciclos de paz y guerra.

2. - La guerra y la naturaleza del estado:

a) Nacionalismo y sus variantes.

b) La búsqueda de la unidad nacional.

(c) Economic causes of war.

(d) Relative impoverishment.

3. - War and the nature of the system:

(a) Power imbalances.

(b) Arms races.

(c) Conflict reduction tools.

(d) Misperceptions and war.

The only constant of all wars is man since he has actively participated in them.

The Individual and Human Nature

Theory about instinct and aggression

There has been a comparative study between human and animal violence. For many of these studies, aggression plays a big factor (for example, carnivores will kill for food). But these studies highlight that aggression is normal between species but not intra-species, since animals generally do not kill each other.

The explanation for this fact, for Konrad L., is that the human being has not been born endowed with physical means (molars, claws,...) to kill, so he has not developed mechanisms similar to those of other animals of inhibition, but that the human being has used the brain to build weapons and thus destroy himself.

For others, war is the result of socialization, so that war is learned. To reinforce their position, they tell us that there are human communities that have not resorted to war and in which even the term "war" does not exist in their vocabulary. This reflection leads us to think about the importance of the environment (both economic and cultural) in which the human being finds himself.

* **Cultural misunderstandings:** In many academic and economic circles, ignorance is believed to be one of the main causes of war. The logic of UNESCO's founding was that through education, peoples would acquire a respect and affection that would avoid or marginalize violent behavior among them.

UNESCO says that ignorance of other ways of life has been a cause of suspicion and mistrust among peoples, which has often led to war.

Cycles of peace and war

If we hold that the Theory of Instinct and Aggression is true, the history of the world would have to be an incessant succession of constant wars. If human nature has aggressiveness, it will also have times of peace because history has also had moments. If you have peace and war, you have nothing to explain about the instinct for violence.

According to some authors, there are periods of peace followed by periods of war. One answer to this is that in the aftermath of a war populations are disillusioned with the devastation of wars. If another conflict arises at that time, the populations will restrain themselves or think twice about it, so as not to endure or suffer another war.

On the other hand, with the passage of time, the new generations are losing references of the war (they only obtain them through the lyrics of text). If this conflict situation occurs, it may happen that those generations think and resort to violence because they believe it is the best solution. If there is war, we would start another cycle, and so on.

War and the Nature of the State

There are authors who say that more than the individual we must look more at the State since it has been due to wars.

Nationalism and its variants

Wars far precede the emergence of nationalism, which occurs in the nineteenth century. From this century onwards, wars have gained in intensity. There are different types of nationalism:

- Expansionista: Actitud de países que persiguen expandir su control territorial y dominar otros estados (política o económicamente).
- Expresionista: Caracteriza a grupos dentro de un Estado que buscan la autodeterminación.

Dentro del nacionalismo expansionista encontramos el Nazismo, que es / era una ideología importante en Alemania. Para los nazis, los alemanes eran superiores a otras razas, por lo que podían expandir su territorio a expensas de otros estados. Para los nazis, la lucha entre estados era un proceso en el que sólo el más fuerte conseguiría sobrevivir. Este punto de vista fue alentado por el resentimiento alemán debido al trato que se le dio, según ellos, en el Tratado de Versalles.

El irredentismo puede dar lugar a grandes guerras, sobre todo cuando una parte cree que históricamente este territorio fue robado ilegalmente. Hay una multitud de irredentismo nacionalista. Por ejemplo, el territorio de Casimira, que es reclamado desde 1947 por Pakistán; o el caso irlandés, donde pedían una misma unidad política para la isla.

El nacionalismo expresionista toma generalmente la forma de separatismo, que tiene su origen en el hecho de que una comunidad nacional desea poseer su gobierno propio, por lo que desea separarse de su gobierno actual. Este nacionalismo se basa en diferencias étnicas, ideológicas,...etc. Por ejemplo, los kurdos, que se encuentran en 4 Estados diferentes (Iran, Irak, Turquía y Siria).

Un conflicto nacionalista puede dar paso a una guerra civil, y ésta sobrepasar las barreras nacionales y convertirse en una guerra internacional. Hoy en día, la posibilidad de guerra internacional está prácticamente limitada a este hecho.

La búsqueda de unidad nacional

Esta teoría sostiene que los dirigentes políticos comienzan guerras para unificar su país, pensando que los ciudadanos dejarán de lado sus diferencias para hacer frente a un enemigo común. Aún así, esta estrategia puede volverse contra el que lo crea, pero si vence la guerra, el creador ganará enteros. Si la guerra es desfavorable, ésta puede originar la caída del Gobierno.

Causas económicas de la guerra

Las causas económicas de la guerra podría estar en la organización del Estado. Dentro de este epígrafe encontramos la teoría de Lenin.

Lenin dice que, para muchas empresas capitales, los mercados nacionales son demasiado pequeños, por lo que tienen que expandirse hacia fuera. Conforme esto pasa, las empresas llegan a un acuerdo para repartirse el mundo (materias primas, venta,...). Hay, pues, un acuerdo político y territorial del mundo entre los países capitalistas. Una vez repartido este mundo, aparece la *Ley de desarrollo desigual*, que dice que no todos los países se expanden y crecen igual.

Para Lenin, a finales del siglo XIX, el mundo ya estaba repartido entre los países capitalistas, pero las viejas potencias no aceptaron la redistribución económica y política del mundo, por lo que los estados ascendentes sólo podían forzar el medio de la guerra.

Para Lenin, la guerra era inevitable. Una vez en guerra, uno vencía y éste avanzaba más que el otro, otra guerra y uno avanzaba más que el rival, y así sucesivamente.

La teoría de Lenin ha tenido mucho éxito. Para finales del siglo pasado, los países capitalistas del mundo ya se habían repartido el mundo (las colonias), pero Alemania venía creciendo y reclamando una porción importante. Sólo a través de la guerra se podría dividir otra vez el mundo, pero Alemania no sólo no ganó sino que con la guerra perdió los territorios que tenía.

Teorías de mal: Estas teorías culpan de las guerras a pequeños grupos productores de armamento, que se ven favorecidos por el estallido de las guerras. Por ejemplo, la 1ª Guerra Mundial fue provocada por fabricantes de armas.

But a war also creates enormous damage: it supposes an almost total severing of relations, property is destroyed, activities are diverted to carry out weapons, high inflation, government effort,... etc.

Theories of evil have a certain connection with Marxist theory. For Marx, the capitalist system would eventually collapse on its own. One of the contradictions of capitalism, according to Marx, was whether, like the entrepreneurs, they wanted to increase surplus value, but did not give the purchasing power to the people, necessary to buy products. But finally the time passed and capitalism did not collapse.

Military-industrial complex: It was fashionable in 1960, when it was warned about the excessive power of the **military-industrial complex** of the United States, which could lead the US to complicated situations internationally.

The military-industrial complex includes military, tycoons and politicians, so military spending is promoted, leading to international distrust and, ultimately, war.

Relative impoverishment

If the economy is the cause of international wars, it can also be the cause of civil wars. This theory says that as people's expectations for economic improvements grow, they can become frustrated if governments are unable to meet them; If the mismatch grows, it is possible that there will be revolts. This theory emphasizes the relative.

This theory insists that conflict begins when a good economic epoch suddenly slows down or when the revolution is too slow. They are what is called *the Revolution of growth expectations*.

War and the nature of the system

Power imbalances

One of the most accepted theories is that of power imbalances: wars occur because there are strong asymmetries in the distribution of power. Among the best-known explanations of World War 1 and 2 is this theory.

The balance of power is not a guarantee to avoid wars. Politicians may have misperceptions when it comes to seeing whether there are balances of forces or not; And they can start a war when they believe there is no balance of power and make mistakes.

One state may decide to attack another by surprise, thinking that by attacking him from this mdod he will benefit.

Arms races

They usually lead to wars. There are States that acquire weapons to defend their national interest from external threats, but, by doing the same thing, they also increase all their armaments and, therefore, the advantage of this country is nullified.

In crisis situations, this arms race can grow unchecked and bring states in conflict to the brink of war. However, there are some questions; The Cold War is the clearest and greatest example of an arms race, although this did not lead both superpowers into war.

Arms races can make war unnecessary: military technology evolves a lot, so weapons quickly become obsolete. Obsolescence can be a substitute for war.

Arms races in and of themselves do not provoke war. If there is conflict between States, it is that there are profound differences that generate conflict. There is no denying that armament and increased defense spending may increase the problem of war.

Conflict reduction tools

Seguramente, negociar o hablar será lo primero que hacen los países pero la negociación puede llegar a un punto muerto, por lo que los políticos creen que la única salida es la guerra; de hecho, en el pasado la guerra fue considerada como un instrumento para resolver los conflictos, aunque hoy no ocurre lo mismo.

Desde el punto de vista internacional, la guerra no será una gran amenaza porque no serán guerras totales. Sí lo serán la proliferación de armas nucleares, biológicas y químicas. Actualmente, en el mundo hay 5 potencias nucleares: EE.UU., Rusia, China, Gran Bretaña y Francia.

En los años 60, la tecnología nuclear tenía también aplicaciones civiles: producir electricidad, en el terreno médico, explosivos en obras de construcción, etc. El dilema era que las grandes potencias no podían evitar estas fuerzas nucleares.

* *Tratado de no proliferación nuclear*: Este tratado distingue entre Estados nucleares y Estados no nucleares.

Los Estados nucleares se comprometen a:

- Disminuir su armamento nuclear (algo que hasta hoy no se ha hecho).
- No vender armas nucleares a países que no las tienen.
- Transferir sus conocimientos en tecnología nuclear para uso civil a cualquier Estado que lo solicite.

Los Estados no nucleares aceptan:

- No fabricar armas nucleares.
- Que una vez se les haya transferido tecnología nuclear, sus instalaciones sean revisadas cada cierto tiempo por la Agencia Internacional de la Energía Atómica para garantizar que esta transferencia nunca se desvíe.

El tratado entró en vigor en 1970 y tenía una duración de 25 años, por lo que en 1995 hubo otra reunión en la que se prolongó el contenido de este tratado. Todos los años se hace un análisis del proceso nuclear de las potencias.

Hay países en los que hay proyectos de fabricación de armas nucleares: Corea del Norte, Argelia, Irán, Irak, Libia y Siria. Hay otros que han renunciado a adquirir el estatus nuclear: Argentina, Brasil, África del Sur, Bielorrusia, Ucrania y Kazajistán.

Una de las amenazas más serias de la paz no es la guerra en nuestro caso (como país occidental), sino la proliferación de armas nucleares. También son peligrosas las armas biológicas (emitir virus vivos [bacterias]) y las armas químicas (emisión de gases). Estas armas han sido calificadas como las armas nucleares de los países pobres ya que la adquisición de éstas es muy sencilla.

There have been international treaties (such as that of 1972) prohibiting the use, creation and stockpiling of biological weapons. As of this date, biological weapons warehouses were destroyed, although countries such as Israel and Syria are suspected of having such weapons.

It is also suspected that 21 States, in addition to those already confirmed, have chemical weapons. The Geneva Protocol (1995) prohibited the use of chemical weapons.

In 1995, the chemical weapons convention was signed by 159 countries and called for the elimination of existing chemical weapons. The firm did not guarantee that the States would comply since the agreement was voluntary.

Having chemical, nuclear and biological weapons is useless if you do not have a delivery or transport system, whatever their technology. Here too there is concern about the proliferation of these systems. For this reason, 7 States established in 1987 a missile technology control regime to limit the diffusion of this technology with regard to the capacity to deliver nuclear weapons; This regime was extended to also exclude missiles capable of carrying biological or chemical weapons. The signatories of this regime were already 1995 States in 32; But within this agreement there are not all, nor is there an element that guarantees compliance with what has been signed.

Crisis of the state - nation

The nation-state has entered a crisis. Before the Peace of Westphalia, there were great empires, so it is possible to think that in the future the nation-state will not be "forever". It has been said that this nation-state will have to endure a process of erosion due to:

- A) Growing economic interdependence.
- B) The evolution of military technology: With nuclear weapons, no State in the world could prevent an attack on its territory.
- C) International organizations: They will give thanks to their performance to the international system, a greater solidity.
- D) Transnational movements: All these movements overcome the barriers of States and the loyalty of human beings is shared with beings of other States.

That is why most authors say that the nation-state is in crisis. Another element of crisis is internal fragmentation through movements demanding greater autonomy.

A) In the not too distant past, one of the goals of the nation-state was to achieve the broadest possible self-sufficiency. But, in our days, this is impossible and only a few countries pursue autarky.

What leads States to interrelate with each other? The impressive development of international trade. Two states trade for *comparative advantage*, selling what they produce and buying what they need.

Today, the rise of international trade is linked to enormous technological advances. These determine that to benefit companies they have to produce as much as possible, so that national markets remain small and, in turn, it is necessary to reach international markets to accommodate our products.

New technologies require specialization. For example, Britain depends on 30% for GDP, the Netherlands on 53%, Canada 36% and the United States has a rate of 12%.

The internationalization of production is the birth, expansion and development of multinational companies. Today, there are multinationals (such as Sony, General Motors or British Petroleum) with more power than many countries, and they displace large capitals, experienced personnel,... etc. This fact means that States do not have in their hands the well-being of a country, but the decisions that determine its situation are taken in Paris, London or New York.

B) La aparición de las armas nucleares causó una gran conmoción en los EE.UU y eliminó para siempre el hecho de que el estado - nación pudiera dar seguridad o evitar problemas bélicos de sus ciudadanos, sobre todo ya que nunca se había producido una gran guerra en suelo USA.

Un autor norteamericano llamado Herz dijo que a lo largo de la historia, las unidades políticas básicas habían sido aquellas que mejor habían garantizado la seguridad de los ciudadanos (por ejemplo, el imperio y la ciudad amurallada).

Para Herz, el tránsito de una unidad política básica a otra venía dada por el estado de la tecnología militar. Por ejemplo, no había posibilidad de asaltar la ciudad amurallada pero la invención del cañón permitiría a los soldados destruir los muros, por lo que de la unidad política de ciudad amurallada se pasó al Estado, mucho más efectivo.

A lo largo del siglo XVII, el Estado ha guardado su independencia y la impermeabilidad de su territorio. Pero Herz dice que de la misma forma que una invención militar (cañón) hizo caer la utilización de la ciudad

amurallada, en el siglo Xxlas armas nucleares han hecho que el Estado - nación haya dejado de proporcionar seguridad a sus ciudadanos.

Herz hablaba de un gobierno mundial que monopolizara todas las armas nucleares como seguidor de la figura del Estado - nación.

Definiciones

Nación: Un grupo de individuos que se sienten ligados entre sí a través de afinidades lingüísticas, culturales, históricas, étnicas,...etc.

Estado: Entidad geográficamente delimitada que engloba una población organizada políticamente bajo un gobierno con derechos soberanos.

Nacionalismo: Expresión de un sentimiento de pertenencia, de identificación con un grupo humano que suele manifestarse generalmente en el deseo de los miembros de una nación de controlar y gobernar el territorio en el que viven.

Estado - nación: Aquellos casos en los que se produce una coincidencia estricta entre nación y Estado.

Puede haber una nación sin que exista Estado (Kurdos); puede haber un Estado sin que haya nación (Alemania). En otros casos, un Estado puede abarcar más de una nación, por lo que es heterogénea en su composición étnica.

When we talk about the nation-state, we have something homogeneous in mind. But an analysis in the world would lead us to the co-inclusion that it is ethnically heterogeneous. This, today, is not very strange. One of the pioneers on this subject was Connor (political scientist), who published in 1972 an article entitled *Building or Destroying the Nation*, in which he highlighted this heterogeneity.

Out of a sample of 132 states, only 12 (9%) were ethnically homogeneous. But in 39 states (30%) the largest ethnic group did not exceed 50% of the population. 53 States had 5 or more significant ethnic groups on their territory.

In international relations, the question of minorities is important because it is today one of the problems capable of creating more international instability. The risk is that the conflict will spill over into a genuine international conflict.

The problem of minorities occurs not only in Africa and its colonization, but also in developed countries (France, Great Britain, Spain,...). The minorities in the 2nd World (socialist countries), in the case of Russia or Yugoslavia, for example, also had significance.

When we talk about today's globalization, we are not just talking about interdependence; Reference is also made to the growing importance of minorities. The growing role of the local and globalization can question the role of the nation-state and bring about another form of basic political unity.

(C) There are new actors in the international system, such as international organizations. These are entities formed by 2 or more States for common objectives in different fields. They are a phenomenon of this century and, above all, of its second half.

There are 3 big reasons for its appearance and development:

1. - Peace / security: The creation of international organizations aims to eradicate the anarchy trait of the international system by creating something like a global government. This idea grew after World War 1 and 2; It was thought that the creation of these organizations could be the ideal instrument to avoid a new conflict.
2. - Advances in interdependence, which have their origin in the revolution of transport and in the media. Today international organizations are needed to control trade and the transport of goods, to regulate air traffic,... etc.
3. - Humanitarian reasons: There are underdeveloped, poor parts of the world,.... This is not a new problem but before it was not talked about, try to solve this global poverty. The powers want to eliminate it because they cause conflicts that create instability.

How to classify international organizations

Through two criteria, they can be classified into four groups:

1. - According to the composition:
 - Global or global: All States.
 - Regional: States located in a given geographic region
2. - According to the purposes of the organizations:
 - General: They will promote the cooperation of States in a wide range of fields: politics, education, etc.
 - Limited: They are born to promote cooperation among their members in a specific field.

Composition / Purpose	General	Limited
Universal orglobal	League of Nations, United Nations,...	UNESCO, WHO (World Health Organization),...
Regional	Organization of American States, Organization of African Unity	OTAN (Organización Territorial Atlántico Norte), Pacto de Varsovia, CCE (Comunidad Económica Europea),...

Naciones Unidas

Es la organización más importante. Nació en 1945 en la Conferencia de San Francisco. La idea de una organización internacional había sido discutida por los aliados en 1943 ya que se entendía que una organización internacional era necesaria para preservar la paz y evitar que se repitiese otro conflicto como la 2ª Guerra Mundial.

Entre sus propósitos, encontramos el de la paz y la seguridad, sobre todo al principio. También perseguía objetivos en otros campos, que se recogen en el Artículo I:

- Mantener la paz y la seguridad internacional.
- Fomentar entre naciones relaciones de amistad basadas en la igualdad de derecho y la libre determinación de los pueblos.
- Promover la cooperación internacional.
- Defensa de los derechos humanos.

En la consecución de estos objetivos, los Estados Firmantes se comprometen a acatar unos principios (Artículo II):

1. - Principio de igualdad soberana de los Estados miembros: Todos los Estados son legalmente iguales y todos los Estados que firmen la carta se comprometen a resolver los conflictos de forma pacífica.
2. - Los Estados se abstienen de recurrir a la amenaza de la fuerza, a la violencia.
3. - Prestación de toda clase de ayuda a la ONU.
4. - La ONU no puede actuar cuando comienzan las fronteras de un país y tampoco puede intervenir en conflictos internos de un país.

Desde el fin de la Guerra Fría, la ONU ha intervenido en muchos conflictos (Yugoslavia, Haití, Somalia,...).

There are a number of governing bodies in the UN that try to achieve the objectives we have named above. There are 6 main organs:

- General Assembly.
- Security Council.
- International Court of Justice.
- Board of Directors of Trust.
- Economic and Social Council.
- Secretariat.

General Assembly

The General Assembly consists of one representative from each State, who casts one vote. This is where we see the equality of States.

Its attributions are:

- In conjunction with the Security Council, elects the Secretary-General and the members of the International Court of Justice.
- Gives its approval to the entry of new States.
- Approves the budget of the organization.

Within it there are constant debates on different topics. Many of the deliberations are usually determined by a resolution, which must be adopted by the majority; In the case of important issues, approval must get 2/3 of the vote. An important issue may be, for example, the admission of States, exclusion of rights, election of members of UN bodies, etc.

The discussions are of a strong political nature but do not bind, i.e. do not oblige Member States to abide by resolutions.

Security Council

It is composed of 15 members, 5 of whom have a permanent seat and veto power; the remainder is elected every 10 years by the General Assembly. The 5 are Russia, USA, China, France and Britain.

Its main attribution is security since it is responsible for implementing the *Collective Security* system, which is the response of the international community to preserve peace and security.

To take decisions, all five votes must be in the affirmative; In the event that only one is negative, there are still chances of approving the decision.

The Security Council cannot debate any resolution, as the General Assembly does, but only security. In this case, its resolutions are binding and all States must accept them.

There is much debate about the composition of the Security Council. For example, Japan and Germany do not enter it despite being powers and contributing a lot to the UN. This is not easy because if they had seats there would be 4 European countries and African countries would feel that Europe is overrepresented. There has been talk of France, Germany and Britain sharing a representative.

International Court of Justice

It is composed of 15 judges, two of them not being able to be of the same nationality. They are elected by the Security Council and the General Assembly.

Its attributions are:

- To serve as a consultative entity to the principal organs: Security Council and General Assembly.
- Act as a court that tries to resolve disputes brought by Member States.

For the Court to render a judgment, the vote of at least 9 judges is required. For these judgments to be binding, a prior declaration is necessary in which States affirm their willingness to abide by the judgment.

Economic and Social Council

It is composed of 54 members. It has been proposed that instead of one vote per state, there are members, who are elected by the General Assembly for 3-year terms. The deliberations of this council are due to economic and social issues, although this Council can only make recommendations. The actions to be taken are approved by a majority and deal with issues of education, development, protection of women,... etc.

Board of Directors Trust

After World War 2, the colonies of the defeated were placed under the supervision of this Council; Its function was to monitor the administration of these colonial territories so that they could accede to independence as soon as possible. Of the 11 colonies placed under supervision, all are now independent units.

Secretariat

It is the body that assumes responsibility for the functioning of the organization. At the head is the Secretary-General, who has several occupations:

- It must submit an annual report and intervene before it.
- Submit resolutions to the different committees of this body.

The General Secretariat is also empowered to draw the attention of the Security Council whenever it understands that a situation capable of breaking the peace is taking place.

Evolution of the United Nations

The United Nations was dominated by the US; the USSR had to adopt a defensive position. For years, the U.S. boasted of not using the veto and did so for the first time in 1970. Later, however, he began to put more vetoes as the USSR gained control. For the first 15 years, the United States enjoyed a hidden veto because its political influence did not require it to resort to the veto.

The membership of the organization had increased, mainly due to decolonization. If in 1945 less than 1980/50 of the members came from Asia and Africa, in <> the number of African and Asian countries exceeded <>% of the member states.

It would also push for a substantial change in the issues to be addressed in the organization. The concern was, in principle, to prevent a new world war but with the arrival of Third World countries, the 2 main issues discussed are:

- Decolonization.
- Economic development.

But these changes would cause problems in the organization and tensions between rich and poor. On the one hand, poor countries have enough political power to decide the budget (how much and how it is spent), but rich states, which contribute the most, are in the minority in General Assembly votes.

It has been proposed that instead of one vote per state, more votes be given to whoever contributes the most money. It is quite possible that this will not happen, but it does seem that it is going towards another form of voting, taking into account the population, the territory,... etc.

UN funding is another matter. Attempts have been made to make the UN independent of the United States. The economic problem, in addition, is given by the increase in shares of blue helmets, payment delays of some countries,... etc.

A reform of administration was adopted in November 1997. This reform removed a Deputy Secretary-General, lost 1000, <> jobs in the organization, saved funding,... etc.

Collective Security was intended to be a new approach to move the State away from the practices of alliances. Collective Security came to propose that any State that resorted to violence would find itself with an international response.

Steps of the Collective Security System

First step: The Security Council determines the existence of a threat, act of aggression or breach of the peace, and the Council has recognized it as such.

Second step: The Council takes actions of recommendation to the two countries so that both parties stop violence.

Third step: If one of the parties ignores it, the Council takes non-violent measures with this party. The actions or sanctions can be the elimination of communications, rupture of economic relations.

Step four: If these sanctions are not successful, the Charter of the United Nations says that if the Security Council finds that the actions are ineffective, it can take whatever action is necessary to establish international peace and security.

Fifth and final step: Authorizes nations to use violence. In this case, the Member States undertake to help the Security Council, which signs agreements to know the amount of aid that each State is going to offer.

The Collective Security system has worked twice: the first, in 1950, when North Korea attacked South Korea, and it was able to work because Russia was not in the United Nations and could not, therefore, veto. The second case occurred in 1990 when Iraq invaded Kuwait, and Collective Security worked because the Cold War had ended and its two powers collaborated on the same side.

Why has it taken 40 years between the first and second intervention of the Collective Security system? There are several reasons:

- The character of the international system because the distribution of power must be homogeneous. When the US or USSR attacked, they were too powerful states to be deterred by the United Nations. It was a bipolar system and the policy of alliances came to reinforce this system because almost all countries were going to be placed in one bloc or another and, therefore, the security of the international system was not reliable.

The drafters of the UN Carte Blanche were trying to avoid a new world war, a new Hitler; but the Charter still contained references to the Allies or the defeated. After the 2nd World War we began to talk about different and confronted blocs.

Collective Security implies that States must be faithful to the Security Council, there are responsibilities, and many times States, to be faithful, have to incur expenses and problems even if it is a distant region of the world and without interests for the State (for example, Bosnia).

Even so, the United Nations has devised other ways not provided for in the Charter to guarantee peace; it is so-called *Peacekeeping*. After World War 2, global instability could create wars, but the international system could prevent these wars from expanding. Thus, peacekeepers would stand between states to put the conflict aside.

The origin of peacekeeping is in the 50s. Wanting to overcome the problems in the Security Council, the US wanted that if there was a veto break, that this discussion could continue in the General Assembly, which, if pronounced positively, could set in motion Collective Security. This American proposal was called *the Pro-Peace Union*.

However, the pro-peace Union first functioned in 1956 during the Suez crisis. The Asmblea General decided in this case to send a team or militia of Blue Helmets to separate the armies from the conflict. As of this year, the shipment of Blue Helmets has been frequent (Arab-Israeli conflict, Cyprus,...).

Peacekeeping has been transformed after the Post-Cold War period. Interventions have multiplied, but there has also been a change in the nature of their operations. Before the Cold War, blue troops were sent mainly

to inter-State conflicts, between States the Blue Helmets interposed; After the Cold War, the Blue Helmets have been in charge of wars within states, civilian, in conflicts that until recently were matters of the State itself.

European Union

There is a logic that induces States to group themselves into this type of entity. In the case of Europe there are a number of justifications:

- World War 2 was the 2nd great war in Europe and its devastating consequences. The excesses of nationalism seemed to be the culpables. War required an overcoming of the traditional nation-state, creating a free Europe, where war was meaningless. It was an aspiration of all anti-Nazi movements.
- World War 2 brought changes in international power since the bipolar system was implemented with this war (USA). USA vs. USSR). In these circumstances, European states such as Britain, France or Italy were relegated despite their glorious past. The Suez crisis in 1956 is an illustrative example and has been said to have prompted European politicians to create an inclusive European structure.
- The economic question. The U.S. had a domestic market of more than 150 million people; the USSR, with a planned socio-economic order, was emerging. There was little European companies could do to fight, with States fragmented and each with its own laws. Therefore, if Europe wanted to progress, it had to create wider spaces.
- European political-military situation. Western Europe of the war lived with the threat of USSR expansionism. This perception of threat was to act in the direction of uniting the countries of Western Europe (in fact, the authors believe that unification would not have been so fast if it were not for this factor).

There were also two conceptions on how to cope with the construction of Europe: one was called *Federalism* and the other *Functionalism*.

Federalism is trying to make the European union more aliasive once and for all. The federalists were in favour of creating a comprehensive Constitution at the level of the whole of Europe.

It had many drawbacks. As policies were restored, building a Europe all at once was going to prove impossible. Therefore, functionalist ideas became more important.

Functionalism suggested not building a Europe "all at once" but step by step. He said that more modest objectives had to be selected in order to arrive at successive projects.

Functionalism prevailed already in 1950 since the French Foreign Minister presented in that year a project to create a common market in coal and steel. The ECSC was a success and two other initiatives followed; one of those was to create a union for atomic energy and the 2nd idea to create the European Economic Community. Thus, by 1957, we would have the three main European unions: the ECSC, Euroatom and the EEC.

Britain and many countries were left out of these three communities because the British did not want such an integrated Europe but a free trade market. In reality, there was a split in Western Europe because only 6 created the EEC.

Concepts

Free Trade Area: It is an economic area in which the signatory States undertake to eliminate any type of obstacle to free trade. Generally, it refers to industrial products.

Customs union: It is a free trade area but also creates around itself a common sandy barrier that protects companies in that territory. Everyone who enters is taxed by tariffs.

There must be a common tariff union that can then conclude trade agreements with other countries in order to reduce the recording. The negotiation takes place on behalf of the Member States.

For example, the German Confederation or the European Economic Community.

Common market: It is also a single economic space in which goods, people and capital move freely.

If we continue to ascend you would reach a Monetary and Economic Union, which would be a common market plus a monetary union (a single currency) with a single monetary policy.

The next step in Political Unity, which is to complete economic union with a political union, which is:

- 1st. - A common defence army.
- 2nd. - A common foreign policy.

European Economic Community

Proposes:

- Creation of a customs union, to be completed by 1970.
- Formation of a common market, for which no specific date of creation was set.
- Development of common policies in agriculture, transport, trade, economic or social fund policies, etc.
- Association agreements with former colonies of countries such as Belgium, France and the Netherlands. Thus, the former colonies were linked to the EEC.

In July 1968, the customs union, which had been scheduled for 1970, was completed. Even so, European integration was not without crisis because there were clashes between the 6 Member States:

1st. - Starring De Gaulle (France). The EEC approved the measures by qualified majority and De Gaulle did not understand how a group of officials in Brussels could take decisions against France. Thus, de Gaulle was absent from meetings and bodies.

In 1966, the Member States undertook to accept the agreements unanimously rather than by qualified majority (Luxembourg Agreement).

2nd. - It was related to the accession of Great Britain. The United Kingdom was well placed and in the 50s did not see the need to introduce experiences. But the British took notice and in 1962, seeing themselves in need, they made their first application for membership. They also did so in 1967. But both were rejected by de Gaulle because he thought Britain was going to kick the EEC in favor of the US.

Another critical point is found with the Hague Conference (1969), which brought together the Heads of State of the six countries. The customs union had been consummated and everyone had projects, which were discussed at this conference. The points that were discussed were:

- 1st. - European political cooperation.
- 2nd. - Enlargement of the community (1972).
- 3rd. - Proposals for economic and monetary union.
- 4th. - Entry into force of new policies.

2) Community extensions:

- * 1973 – United Kingdom, Ireland and Denmark.
- * 1981: Greece.
- * 1986: Spain and Portugal.
- * 1995: Austria, Finland and Sweden.

At this same summit an economic and customs union was also proposed, and there was even so much optimism that the date was set for the proposal (1980), although due to the change in the international economic system it could not be carried out. In any case, from these discussions the European Monetary System was born.

The main one was the regional policy which sought to reduce the economic disparities of the regions forming the EEC. The creation of this common space has gone hand in hand with a policy against unemployment, against competition that eliminated companies, etc.

The optimism of 1969 was to be short-lived. The 70s were going to be years of economic recession:

- In 1971 the dollar ceased to be convertible into gold, thus disappearing one of the main forms of budget.
- In 1973 the petroliferous crisis occurred, multiplying its price by four.

In this climate of crisis, European integration was going to come to a standstill. This will be the *Eurocrisis*.

En 1979 entraría en vigor el Sistema Monetario Europeo. Habría que esperar hasta 1986 (Acta Única) cuando la integración europea volvería a moverse hacia delante. En aquellos años, la economía europea había retrocedido frente a la japonesa y americana. Ante ello, los jefes europeos crearían un mercado único para que las empresas tuvieran salida para sus productos, conseguir beneficios y poder sufragar la investigación acerca de la competitividad.

The Single Act was called the Treaty amending the founding Treaties. It would create the single market, a very old idea. Until then, goods moved well through Europe but there were obstacles of workers and capital; There were also *non-tariff barriers*, which hindered the transit of goods. For example, there were sanitary laws or technical requirements that could protect local or national commerce.

The Single Act therefore sought to eliminate these non-tariff barriers and to ensure the free transit of goods. Qualified majority voting is also introduced, so no member country could vote. The Single Act also extended the powers of the European Parliament. In this way, the Member States cede powers to the new bodies set up in Brussels.

In the 70s, they wanted to set in motion, trying to correct the problem, a direct election to the European Parliament. Until then, members of national parliaments were appointed. In 1979, this indirect form was eliminated.

In addition, the Single Act creates the first vestige of European political integration, coordination and consultation between Member States. It also expands the number of fields of work in the Economic Community. Each critical moment is characterised, first, by the increase in the power of the European Parliament and, secondly, by an increase in the fields of work.

In 1968, cohesion policy was restructured around three funds:

- Social fund.
- Agricultural guarantee fund.
- R-Regional Fund.

The Single Act itself envisaged the launch of an intergovernmental conference. The logic of the common market necessarily led to monetary integration; The existence of different currencies was synonymous with commercial problems. In addition, monetary union will act by increasing European competitiveness because it will lead companies to sell more generally and, therefore, a decrease in prices.

The single currency

There were already attempts before, and from 1979 the European Monetary System was launched to create a single currency once and for all. European subsidies, debt issues, budgets,... etc. would be in *ecus*. What this system sought was to reduce the difference in the price of each currency to eliminate the risks that this would entail. For this:

(1) A *central parity* was defined for each currency: between the peseta and the lira, between the peseta and the franc,... For example, between the peseta and the deutsche mark there was a central parity of 100 pesetas.

The European system set movement limits, so that it could not exceed 2.25% (neither above [102.25 pta] nor below [97,75 pta]). This would reduce significant costs for companies.

Monetary Union consists of three stages

1. - It would have to be completed by the end of 1992 and would affect the free movement of capital, which would occur with the Single Market.
2. - It began on 1 January 1994, with the creation of the European Monetary Institute.
3. - Occurs between 1997 and 1999; there is monetary union and the emergence of the *euro*. Also the control of central banks.

2) The European Monetary Institute is hereby established. The main functions were:

- To coordinate the monetary policies of the Member States so that there is a common policy at a later stage.
- Had responsibility for following up on convergence plans.

Se había acordado que una unión monetaria era incompatible con la existencia de economías diferentes; Estados con endeudamiento, déficit, ...etc. podían poner en peligro la estabilidad, por lo que se veía necesaria la igualdad. Por ello, todos los Estados tuvieron que presentar planes de convergencia.

Los criterios de convergenciaa eran:

- * La tasa de inflación, la estabilidad de los precios. No debía superar en 1,5 a la media de los tres Estados con menores incrementos de precio.
- * El déficit público (la diferencia entre ingresos y gastos) no podía ser superior al 3 % del PIB. Se quería controlar el volumen de gasto de los Estados en todos los ámbitos.
- * También se quería rebajar el endeudamiento de los Estados. El conjunto de deuda pública no podía superar el 60 % del PIB.
- * The currencies of the individual states had to be between the limits of 2.25% above and below the world parity. For this, for 2 years of the currencies that wanted to enter the union, no devaluation should have occurred.
- * Long-term interest rates will be two points lower than the 3 most solvent states.
- A third function was to pave the way for the single currency to become a reality.

3) This phase was the creation of a single currency. In Maastricht it was agreed in 1996 that it would be studied whether these criteria had been achieved by the majority (8/15), the creation of the European Union and the creation of central banks, formed by:

- European Central Bank.
- Central banks of the Member States.

The European system of central banks will follow the German model and seek price stability, manipulating prices with the objective in mind. They shall be independent of both institutions and States.

If 1996 was fulfilled, the EU would enter into force on 1 January 1997; otherwise, it would do so on 1 January 1999; this is what the Maastricht Treaty said. The problem was that in 1992 and 1993 there were monetary storms by which countries like Spain, Great Britain,... etc. would pass. All these monetary storms were going to call into question the projects drawn up at Maastricht.

The tense economic situation led States to reconsider the dates of the projects. Important decisions on this were taken at the Madrid Summit in 1995. It was decided as follows:

1. - The date of 1 January 1995 was abandoned for 199.
2. - The final name of the currency was agreed and changed from *ECU* to *Euro*.
3. - It was thought that the Member States should be evaluated in the first months (May) of 1998 and the figures for 1997 analysed in order to see which States would join the single currency in 1999. Thus, it was determined that 4 would be left out (three of them because they did not want [Denmark, Sweden and Great Britain] and one because they did not meet the criteria [Greece]).
4. - Exchange rates will be fixed in January 1999, so that there will be no devaluations in the States that enter. Monetary policy will also be directed by the European Central Bank, although national banks will become a kind of delegations of interests from the States.
5. - From 1 January 1999, the euro will be only one unit of account until 2002. The single currency "for real" as a means of payment will be on January 1, 2002, although the peseta will not disappear until July 1 of the same year.
6. - The public debt issued by the Member States from 1999 will be in euros. Even the quotes, the Stock Exchange,... They will also appear in euros.

Even so, the convergence criteria (the majority, at least) will be a reference for the States. For example, those whose public deficit exceeds 3% of GDP will be fined. This has been called *the Stability Pact*.

With the single currency there will be more possibilities to deal with speculative operations. There are in day, the changes between them can vary the price due to speculation. It is assumed, however, that the value of the euro will be much more stable against the yen or the dollar, thus achieving greater monetary stability.

Treaty on European Union

Perestroika ultimately resulted in the liberation of Central and Eastern Europe, thus reaching a more pluralistic market. Also with Perestroika communism and Russia would fall, thus creating 15 states.

These changes in the Soviet Union were well followed by the leaders of the European Union because of the consequences they could bring. The problems and concerns were:

That Germany tried to create a kind of Central European empire that would continue the historical integration process. Therefore, the political union wanted to attract Germany.

That the instability generated could eventually spread to all of Europe and, therefore, there was a possibility that Western peace would be broken, but it was wanted that Eastern and Central instability would be broken with the unified Western peace.

The Treaty on European Union is one of the most important steps in the history of European integration. It has three main pillars:

1. - Community pillar.
2. - Introduce a foreign and security policy.
3. - Cooperation in the field of justice and home affairs.

The sum of these three things makes up what is called the *European Union*, which would be the content of the 3 communities plus external policy and security and more justice and interior.

The Treaty on European Union embraces the idea of European citizenship. For the first time, European citizens, wherever they reside, can act as voters and be eligible in municipal processes and in the European Parliament. It also includes the right of petition, which is the right of every citizen to submit legislative proposals to the European Parliament (right of legislative initiative).

The Treaty also expands the number of areas where common policies can be arbitrated by the European Union (public health, consumer,... etc.). But the most notorious part is the one that proposes the creation of a single currency.

Within the field of justice and home affairs, we include civil, criminal, police matters,... all a field that corresponds to the social union that until now has been in the hands of the States. The idea is to harmonize civil and criminal legislation.

The EU Treaty provided for an intergovernmental conclusion in 1996 in order to make changes. There were 3 fields where there was greater dissatisfaction:

1. - Disconnection between citizens and European integration.
2. - Desire to improve all the governing bodies of the EU in order to be able to open up to new states.
3. - For many, the content of European political union needed to be reviewed.

This conference was launched in March 1996 and would run until June 1997, just when a new amendment to the Treaties was adopted in Amsterdam. It is the Treaty of Amsterdam on which the European Union's interest has focused ever since.

According to this treaty:

- An employment treaty is introduced in order to appear favourable to the public. All countries have submitted a plan, and employment policy has become the most important.
- Consolidation of social policy: health, public health, etc.
- States will agree that some important policies or actions will be carried out in Brussels. From Amsterdam onwards, everything referring to asylum or divorce laws, for example, is carried out in Belgium.

In addition to this, the Treaty of Amsterdam will also give greater powers to the European Parliament. The treaty will fail by renewing the organization of the European Union, so the European Union had no choice but to postpone this institutional reform. Amsterdam, compared with Maastricht, makes very little progress (i.e. it tries to strengthen the idea of *Europol*).

En Amsterdam se decide que si se violan los derechos humanos, el Estado queda excluido de la Unión Europea durante un tiempo determinado. También se le da importancia a la cooperación reforzada (consagración de Estados a diferentes velocidades).

Actualmente, el Tratado de Amsterdam se encuentra en periodo de ratificación.

Unión Política

¿Qué persigue un política exterior y de seguridad común? Salvaguardar los valores comunes, reforzar la seguridad, mantener la paz y la seguridad internacional, cooperación de seguridad, velar por la sseguridad internacional, promover, estimular, desarrollar y consolidar la democracia en todo el mundo.

Como método para conseguirlo, se usan las estrategias comunes, que son puntos de encuentro en torno a aquellos temas que los Estados miembros creen que es mejor actuar juntos. Para hacerlas efectivas, la Unión Europea puede aprobar acciones comunes (enviar observadores a las elecciones de la ex Unión Soviética) o posiciones comunes.

¿Cómo se toma una decisión

1. - Los principios y orientaciones generales son aprobados por el Consejo Europeo y por unanimidad. Las estrategias comunes se aprueban por y de igual manera.
2. - El Consejo de Amsterdam también ve la *Abstracción Cosntructiva*, ya que, aunque un país se abstenga, el resto de los Estados pueden aprobar una resolución.
3. - Acciones y posiciones comunes son aprobadas por el Consejo de Ministros por mayoría cualificada.

El máximo grado de cooperación sería el ejército común, aunque la Unión Europea está todavía muy lejos de esto.

Unión Europea Occidental

Es una alianza militar occidental que surgió en 1954, pero no es parte de la Unión Europea aunque ambas mantienen relaciones. Es una alianzamilandependiente.

The European Union will be able to carry out aid, peace and cooperation missions. For example, in Sierra Leone, Kosovo or the Persian Gulf. In any case, the progress of the CFSP was nothing to write home about. That is why, with the Treaty of Amsterdam, there is already a mechanism for change that will deal with these problems.

Institutional structure of the European Union

There are four basic institutions:

- European Commission.
- Council of Ministers.
- European Parliament.
- Court of Justice.

European Commission

It is the body in which the interests of the European Union as a whole are fully reflected. Its attributions are:

- Save and ensure that treaties are complied with.
- Legislative initiative: All decisions and rules adopted by the European Union are based on it.
- Executive initiative: Responsible for making decisions.
- Responsibility in external relations.

The European Commission is based in Brussels and consists of some 15,000 officials, of whom nearly 5,000 are translators. The European Commission is composed of 20 commissioners (the 5 most populous states have 2 and the rest 1). Each Gonierno appoints its commissioners, whose term ends after 5 years. Commissioners must operate according to their own discretion, free from any pressure from governments. That is why the Commission clearly defends the interests of each country.

The Commission has a President, whose functions have been strengthened by the Treaty of Amsterdam. The President has to give his consent to Commissioners who will be responsible; It will also exercise political guidance functions for Commissioners and may make portfolio changes between Commissioners.

Council of Ministers

It represents the interests of the Member States. Its functions are:

- Orientation.
- Impulse.
- Decision.
- Coordination of both Community policies and Member States.

The essential task is to decide, and the legislative power of the European Union lies with this Council. It is assisted by the European Commission, the General Secretariat and the Committee of Permanent Representatives (COREPER). The latter discusses the initiatives of the Council of Ministers before reaching the Council table.

From 1975, the Council of Ministers began to be called the *European Council*. It is not Community but it takes the most important decisions of the European Union.

The European Council meets 2 times a year, although it is not excluded that they may meet extraordinarily. The presidency rotates, 6 months for each Member State.

Decisions are taken by the supranationality of the European Union. The qualified majority is that any matter that is discussed will be approved if it has 62 of the 87 possible votes of the Council of Ministers. A reform is being proposed: reducing the number of members in 2 ways:

- 1) That they had 15 commissioners and that other States were left out. This approach is not accepted by the large countries.
- 2) Solving the distribution of votes is difficult. Despite proportionality, small countries benefit. For example, Luxembourg, with 400,000 inhabitants, has 2 votes; Germany, with 80 million inhabitants, only 10.

In the Europe of Fifteen, the 5 most demographically powerful States have 48 votes in the Council, 55% of the total votes. On the other hand, the remaining ten States, a population of 20%, have 39 votes, 45% of the possible votes.

To tackle this problem, we can increase votes for large countries. Another second bet is to maintain the system but with a second criterion: this suggests that apart from the 62 votes, it should be supported by countries with a large population (which have 70% of the entire European population) so that the important countries also participate.

The Council of Ministers is the institution that decides. The acts approved by the Council of Ministers are:

- Regulations: These are rules that bind all Member States and are applicable to all territories. It usually serves to regulate common policies: structural, agriculture,... etc.

- **Directives:** They bind all States, although they are more flexible than regulations. They leave the authorities free to implement their own legislation.

- **Decisions:** They have specific recipients, either a State, an economic sector or a company.

- **Recommendations** or opinions: They are not binding but can be a preliminary step for the Council of Ministers to take decisions.

European Parliament

It controls the European Commission, which must present a report to be adopted by Parliament. Parliament also legislates and intervenes in the adoption of budgets, which is a fundamental exercise of power by parliaments.

In this institution there is also allocation of seats among the States, trying to distribute them populationally. It has 624 seats, which are elected in elections by universal suffrage in all Member States.

Members of the European Parliament are organised into parliamentary groups according to their ideology. Groups are considered 10 parliamentarians if they are from 3 different countries, 15 parliamentarians if they are from 2 and 21 if they are from the same State.

There has been a strengthening of the power of parliament. The codecision procedure favours Parliament's opinion, and the Treaty of Amsterdam provides that the number of seats in the chamber will never exceed 700 seats.

The progress made in the Treaty of Amsterdam was:

1. - Increase in the number of issues approved by codecision, giving greater voice to the European Treaty.
2. - Simplification of codecision with the deletion of third readings.
3. - The composition of Parliament shall be limited to a maximum of 700 members, including possible enlargements.
4. - Parliament shall participate in the elaboration of a regime of an election "law" to be followed in all member States.
5. - Parliament shall approve the nomination of the President of the European Commission.

Conclusions

It is the court responsible for ensuring the uniform application of European law. Its county seat is Luxembourg. It is composed of as many judges as members, plus an additional judge elected by the five states with the greatest demographic weight. These judges are appointed for periods of 6 years renewable for another three.

All members of the Tribunal must be highly professional and independently guaranteed. Once appointed, they are immovable unless they resign for some special circumstance.

The functions of the Court of Justice are essentially threefold:

- Annul the minutes, rules adopted by the institutions as long as the Court considers that they are incompatible with the founding treaties of the Union. It can also rule against decisions taken by Member States.

- It must rule at the request of judges belonging to the Members on the interpretation to be given to certain postulates of Community law (all the acts and rules approved by the institutions). It is a preliminary ruling.

Once the Court issues a response to the consultations, it is now mandatory.

- The Court is a source of Community law.

Community law consists of:

- Primary law: Content of the Treaties establishing the European Communities (ECSC, Euroatom, EEC and Single Act, Maastricht Treaty, EU).

- Secondary law: Constituted by the norms approved to the protection of the communities of original law.

- Community legal acquis: Sum of primary law plus secondary law plus the case-law of the Court of Justice.

Community law also has two principles:

- Primacy: In the event of a conflict between a Community rule and the legislation of a State, the Community norm has primacy.

- Direct applicability: Once a Community standard has been approved, it is immediately mandatory.

The revenue and expenditure of the European Union are set out in a budget. This, although important from the point of view of expenditure, is relatively modest when compared with the volume of public expenditure.

The budget comprises only 2.4% of the European Union's public expenditure. At a time when the Community budget is being debated, there is tension because all the Member States want to benefit.

The States that benefit most are the States with smaller economies. The distribution of budget funds is a compensation to States with low levels of wealth or income.

Bibliography

- [1]. Armstrong, J. A. (1988). Toward a framework for considering nationalism in East Europe. *East European Politics and Societies*, 2(2), 280-305.
- [2]. Andor, L. (2015). Fair mobility in Europe. *Social Europe Occasional Paper*.
- [3]. Bergson, A. (1991). The USSR before the fall: how poor and why. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 5(4), 29-44.
- [4]. Daviddi, R., & Ilzkovitz, F. (1997). The Eastern enlargement of the European Union: Major challenges for macro-economic policies and institutions of Central and East European countries. *European Economic Review*, 41(3-5), 671-680.
- [5]. Delsoldato, G. (2002). Eastward enlargement by the European Union and transnational parties. *International Political Science Review*, 23(3), 269-289.
- [6]. Draxler, J., & Van Vliet, O. (2010). European social model: No convergence from the East. *European Integration*, 32(1), 115-135.
- [7]. Dreger, C., Kholodilin, K., Lommatzsch, K., Slačálek, J., & Wozniak, P. (2008). Price convergence in an enlarged internal market. *Eastern European Economics*, 46(5), 57-68.
- [8]. Dunay, P. (1994). NATO and the East: A Sea of Mysteries. *World Policy Journal*, 11(3), 123-127.
- [9]. Gorodetsky, G. (1990). The impact of the Ribbentrop-Molotov pact on the course of Soviet foreign policy. *Cahiers du Monde russe et soviétique*, 27-41.
- [10]. Grieco, J. M. (1995). The Maastricht Treaty, Economic and Monetary Union and the neo-realist research programme. *Review of International Studies*, 21(1), 21-40.
- [11]. Guiraudon, V. (2001). Weak weapons of the weak? Transnational mobilization around migration in the European Union. *Contentious European*, 163-86.
- [12]. Healey, D., & Healey, D. (2002). Homosexual existence and existing socialism: New light on the repression of male homosexuality in Stalin's Russia. *GLQ: A journal of lesbian and gay studies*, 8(3), 349-378.
- [13]. Hillion, C. (2014). The Copenhagen criteria and their progeny. *EU enlargement (Oxford, Hart Publishing, 2004)*.
- [14]. Kandogan, Y. (2000). Political economy of eastern enlargement of the European Union: Budgetary costs and reforms in voting rules. *European Journal of Political Economy*, 16(4), 685-705.
- [15]. Kojevnikov, A. (2002). The Great War, the Russian Civil War, and the invention of big science. *Science in Context*, 15(2), 239-275.
- [16]. Levesque, J. (1974). Modèles de conflits entre l'URSS et les autres états socialistes. *Canadian Journal of Political Science/Revue canadienne de science politique*, 7(1), 135-142.
- [17]. Pejovich, S. (2006). 3. The effects of the interaction of formal and informal institutions on social stability and economic development. *Institutions, Globalisation and Empowerment*, 56.
- [18]. Peterson, J. (2017). Juncker's political European Commission and an EU in crisis. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 55(2), 349-367.
- [19]. Price, J., Sloman, L., Gardner, R., Gilbert, P., & Rohde, P. (1994). The social competition hypothesis of depression. *The British Journal of Psychiatry*, 164(3), 309-315.
- [20]. Sapir, A. (2006). Globalization and the reform of European social models. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 44(2), 369-390.
- [21]. Scherpereel, J. A. (2010). EU cohesion policy and the Europeanization of Central and East European regions. *Regional & Federal Studies*, 20(1), 45-62.
- [22]. Stephanson, A. (2002). Fourteen notes on the very concept of the Cold War. In *Rethinking Geopolitics* (pp. 74-97). Routledge.
- [23]. Threlfall, M. (2003). European social integration: harmonization, convergence and single social areas. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 13(2), 121-139.
- [24]. Troitiño, D. R. (2021). La «Década Digital» de la Unión Europea: desarrollos e impactos sobre su ciudadanía y economía. *IDP. Revista de Internet, Derecho y Política*, (34), 1-14.
- [25]. Troitiño, D. R. (2022). The European Union Facing the 21st Century: The Digital Revolution. *Tal Tech Journal of European Studies*, 12(1), 60-78.
- [26]. Troitiño, D. R. (2022). La estrategia de las instituciones de la Unión Europea ante el reto de digitalización. *Revista CIDOB d'Afers Internacionals*, 17-40.
- [27]. Troitiño, D. R. (2022). El futuro digital de la política europea.

- [28]. Waaldijk, K. (1994). Standard sequences in the legal recognition of homosexuality-Europe's past, present and future. *Australasian Gay & Lesbian LJ*, 4, 50.
- [29]. Walby, S. (2004). The European Union and gender equality: Emergent varieties of gender regime. *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society*, 11(1), 4-29.
- [30]. Whitman, R. G. (2004). NATO, the EU and ESDP: an emerging division of labour?. *Contemporary security policy*, 25(3), 430-451.
- [31]. Wivel, A. (2005). The security challenge of small EU member states: interests, identity and the development of the EU as a security actor. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 43(2), 393-412.
- [32]. Wodak, R., & Boukala, S. (2015). European identities and the revival of nationalism in the European Union: A discourse historical approach. *Journal of language and politics*, 14(1), 87-109.
- [33]. Young, J. W. (1994). Cold War Europe, 1945-1989: A Political History. *The English Historical Review*, 109(433), 1039-1040.