

Consolidating International Peace and Security by United States and the European Union in International Politics: Challenges and Prospects

Sheriff Ghali Ibrahim

Institute of Political Science, Huazhong Normal University, Hubei-Wuhan, Central R.P. China

Abstract: Peace and security has remained the global challenge in international relations and politics, through out the history of international relations. The study tries to capture the historical and theoretical development of efforts made by states and unions at providing and maintaining global peace and security in international relations. It analyses the contradictions and the implications of such efforts to global peace and security. Findings show that some states leaders had sincerely contributed their ultimate effort with utmost good faith towards peace and security in the world, while some have even manouverously instigated insecurity and tension within the international political atmosphere. The study concludes that states and nations struggle for power and some, for the elimination of others. This process, however, dislocates the stand, for global peace and security.

Key words: International peace, security, United States, European Union, international politics, prospects

INTRODUCTION

While remembering the D-Day, which marked the launch of Operation Overlord, the aerial and amphibious Allied invasion of Nazi German-occupied France, we must all become advocates of international peace and security. On the D-Day itself, 160,000 American, British and Canadian troops crossed the English Channel and breached Adolf Hitler's Western Wall of fire and fortifications.

In the next 9 weeks, 3 million Allied troops landed in France, including units of the Free French, Polish, Czech, Belgian, Greek, Dutch and Norwegian Armies, all of whose countries were occupied by the Germans. By August 21, 1944 the Allies suffered 209,672 casualties, while German casualties were estimated at 450,000. Some 70,000 French civilians also died in the campaign (Walter, 2009).

That sounds very tragic, until you remember Operation Barbarossa, the German invasion of the Soviet Union beginning June 22, 1941. Barbarossa was the largest military operation in human history in terms of manpower, area traversed and casualties suffered. Adolf Hitler deployed 4.5 million troops, 3,600 tanks, 4,389 planes and 46,000 artillery pieces and invaded the USSR along a 2,900 km front from North to South. Germany suffered 800,000 casualties, inflicted 3 million casualties on the Soviets and captured 3 million Soviet soldiers. And that was just the beginning. Spare a thought for the Battle of Stalingrad, which took place between 17 July 1942 and 2 February 1943, adjudged by

historians to be the bloodiest battle in modern history. The Russians launched a counterattack with 1 million men, 15,000 artillery pieces, 1500 tanks and 1100 planes. They killed 750,000 Germans and captured 90,000, while they suffered 1 million casualties of their own (Walter, 2009).

Spare another thought for the Battle of Kursk of July-August 1943, the largest tank and artillery battle in human history. The Germans deployed 3,000 tanks and 900,000 men, while the Soviets deployed 3,600 tanks and 15,000 artillery pieces. There were 1.2 million casualties on both sides in this battle alone. Think for a minute of Marshal Joseph Stalin's great operations to rid the USSR of the Nazi invaders-the Great Winter Offensive of 1943, the Great Spring Offensive of 1944 and the Great Summer Offensive of 1945. In each case, millions of troops and thousands of tanks and planes were deployed, with combined casualties on both sides in millions (Walter, 2009).

Spare a thought for the Battle of the Bulge of December 1944 to January 1945, fought in northern France, Luxembourg, Belgium and western Germany. Hitler deployed half a million troops, 500 tanks and 2000 guns, while the Anglo-American Allies deployed 840,000 men and 700 tanks. Some 91,000 Germans, 90,000 Americans and 1,400 Brits died in this battle. Reflect for a minute on the Battle of Arnhem of September 1944, in which an Anglo-Polish paratroop division tried to seize bridges in northern Holland and unexpectedly landed atop two German Panzer divisions. It was a big slaughter in a small place (Walter, 2009).

You may say all those battles were fought far away from here, think of the Battle of El-Alamien, which was fought in 1943 in the North African desert, 150 miles west of Cairo, between Field Marshal Erwin Rommel's Afrika Corps, which had 110,000 men and 500 tanks and the British Field Marshal Bernard Montgomery's Eighth Army, with 200,000 men and 1,000 tanks.

During World War Two, mayhem reigned on the ground, but also in the air. Think of the Battle of Britain of July-October 1940, when the German Airforce, the Luftwaffe, waged a relentless air campaign against British airports, radar, factories and cities. With only 1,900 available planes, the Royal Air Force (The Few) was able to beat back the Luftwaffe despite its 4,000 aircraft. Spare a minute's thought for Pearl Harbor, which brought the American juggernaut into the war. On December 7, 1941, the Japanese Admiral Isoroku Yamamoto led a secret Naval Task Force of 6 carriers, 2 battleships, 2 heavy cruisers, 1 light cruiser, 9 destroyers, 8 tankers, 23 submarines, 5 midget subs and 414 planes, sneaked up on the American Pacific Fleet at Pearl Harbor, Hawaii and launched an attack (without a declaration of war) that sunk and damaged a dozen ships, killed 2400 Americans and wounded another 1300. That evening, President Franklin Roosevelt asked Congress to declare war on the Japanese Empire (Kaufman, 2009).

Spare a little thought for the many major naval skirmishes that followed in the ensuing 4 years. Think of the Battle of Midway of June 4-7, 1942, near the Midway Atolls, when the American Admiral Chester Nimitz came up against Yamamoto. Nimitz avenged for Pearl Harbour when he sank 4 Japanese aircraft carriers and several hundred planes, thereby crippling Japan's naval power in the Pacific. A month before Midway, there was the great Battle of the Coral Sea, fought between May 4-8, 1942, when carrier forces from the two sides exchanged air strikes over 2 days and both sides suffered heavy naval losses. After Coral Sea, there was the naval Battle of Guadalcanal in the Solomon Islands on November 12-15, 1942 when the American Admiral Charles Halsey beat back Japanese attempts to reinforce their troops in Guadalcanal. Both sides suffered heavy losses, but it was a strategic Allied victory (Kaufman, 2009).

Spare one small thought for the Battle of Corregidor, the May 5-6, 1942 battle when 75,000 Japanese troops defeated 90,000 US and Filipino troops to seize the island bastion of Corregidor, in Manila Bay, with its network of tunnels and formidable defensive armament. A quick thought for the Invasion of Poland on September 1, 1939 by 60 German and 33 Soviet divisions, leading within days to 200,000 Polish casualties and 700,000 POWs, the event,

which precipitated World War Two. Another quick thought please for the Battle of France of May-June 1940, when 166 German divisions rapidly conquered France, Holland and Belgium and sent the British Expeditionary Force scampering to Dunkirk. Shed a small tear for the Fire-Bombing of Dresden by the Royal Air Force (RAF) and United States Army Air Force (USAAF) between February 13-15 1945, when in four raids, 1300 heavy bombers dropped more than 3,900 tons of high-explosive bombs on the capital of the German state of Saxony. The resulting firestorm destroyed 34 km² of the city centre, with an estimated 40,000 casualties (Kaufman, 2009).

Spare some thought for the Battle of Berlin of April-May 1945, when the Soviet Marshals Georgy Zhukov, Konstantin Rokossovsky and Ivan Konev led a combined force of 2.5 million troops, 6,250 tanks, 42,000 artillery pieces and 7,500 warplanes to take the German capital in one of history's bloodiest battles. Now, to round up, shed another small tear for Hiroshima and Nagasaki, upon whom the US Air Force dropped atomic bombs on August 6 and 9, 1945, respectively. The bombs killed 140,000 people in Hiroshima and 80,000 in Nagasaki by the end of 1945 and many later died of radiation illnesses. Six days after Nagasaki, Japan surrendered to the Allied Powers, as had Germany 3 months earlier. It's all worth a moment's thought (Kaufman, 2009). But enough is enough, the world has suffered enough; the planet is becoming feeble from explosives and people becoming conscious of civilization, security and peace.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This research work is a result of scientific adoption of library materials such as text books, journals, periodicals, government reports from the methodological division of descriptive-secondary data. The submissions emerge, from the empirical contribution of game theory and content analysis. Game theory is the study of the ways in which strategic interactions among rational players produce outcomes with respect to the preferences (or utilities) of those players. It is defined as the formal study of rationality and consistent expectations that participants can have about each other's choice (Robert, 1960). International politics is being played like a game by the international actors and states. The game can be zero-some or non-zero-some, depending on the interest of the players. Some states want peace to reign, while others want war and conflict so that they reap the benefit of the crisis by having spoils of the war or directly or indirectly developing their market economy by selling weapons to the warring party.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The background of us efforts towards international peace and security: The United States has historically paved a room for global peace and security from the timely devotion of Woodrow Wilson as the president of the country.

It is axiomatic that in the history of international relations and world politics, there has never been a president, in America or in Europe that contributed whole-heartedly to such trend like Wilson. He united Europe during the hey days of inter-state wars and civil strife; he initiated the research towards international peace and security by forming the League of Nations, which (though not ratified by the American congress) but led the world to a peaceful ground. Though the league of nations was not able to stop the outbreak of the second world war, but it has reduced tension in the world, brought about political alliance and led the foundation for the concurrent international political organization known as the United Nations Organization (UNO).

In the spring of 1914 President Wilson sent his close friend and advisor, Colonel Edward M. House, to Europe as an unofficial ambassador for peace. House met with German officials and the Kaiser explaining that with the community of interests between England, Germany and the United States they could together maintain the peace of the world. However, England was concerned about Germany's growing navy.

House went to Paris and then London, where he conferred with Edward Grey about negotiating with Germany. Even after the assassination of Archduke Ferdinand, the event which precipitated the war, House returned to Berlin and appealed to the Kaiser through a letter that England, France and Germany could settle their differences peacefully. Many years later the Kaiser admitted that the mediation offer by Wilson and House had almost prevented the war. However, the German militarists were intent on fighting and the war broke out with Austria leading the way. President Wilson on August 19 declared that the United States was neutral and he requested that the American people be impartial. He tried to mediate peace between the European powers through his pacifist Secretary of State William Jennings Bryan and in January 1915 Wilson again sent House to Europe on a peace mission; but both efforts failed (James, 1982).

On his effort towards internal and external sovereignty of states as well as the territorial integrity of nation states, Wilson did not ignore human rights and

freedom of all kind of people in the world and the contribution that his country could offer to establish international peace and security. Wilson (Arthur, 1955) therefore, stated:

Universal association of the nations to maintain the inviolate security of the highway of the seas for the common and unhindered use of all the nations of the world and to prevent any war begun either contrary to treaty covenants or without warning and full submission of the causes to the opinion of the world a virtual guarantee of territorial integrity and political independence.

With the outbreak of the first world war, Wilson's position was that the war must end and the world be ushered into an era of balance of power so that no victor could serve as a threat to the security of others and respect to be paid to smaller countries.

Human right in all its ramifications be respected, the issue of life, property and development be allowed to reign. It was in line with the above that Wilson (Arthur, 1955) also argued:

Governments derive all their just powers from the consent of the governed and that no right anywhere exists to hand peoples about from sovereignty to sovereignty as if they were property. That henceforth inviolable security of life, of worship and of industrial and social development should be guaranteed to all peoples.

It was quite clear that Wilson, never intended to participate in the First World War as he knew that it was destructive to human civilization. But in 1917, the American ships were attacked by Germany, which served as an impediment that necessitated the President proposed a declaration of war to the Congress on April 2. He appealed to international law and the freedom of the seas. Because of the loss of noncombatants' lives he interpreted the German submarine warfare against commerce as warfare against mankind. He did not recommend revenge or the victorious assertion of physical might as motives for action but rather the vindication of human right and a refusal to submit to wrongs. Therefore since the Imperial German Government was at war with the United States, they must accept the belligerent status thrust upon them. This has led Wilson to take another new strategy towards a conventional or practical teaching of peace in international relations by

applying fire brigade approach. Wilson as written by Arthur (1955), believed that the purpose of the United States:

Is to vindicate the principles of peace and justice in the life of the world as against selfish and autocratic power and to set up amongst the really free and self-governed peoples of the world such a concert of purpose and of action as will henceforth insure the observance of those principles.

In 1918, similarly, Wilson submitted the summary of his famous 14 points as they relate to the world, to the American congress, of the American stand point to international peace and security (Baker, 1937). These points, however, are:

- Open covenants of peace, openly arrived at"-no secret treaties
- Free navigation of the seas outside territorial waters
- Equality of trade and removal of economic barriers
- Adequate guarantees given and taken that national armaments will be reduced to the lowest point consistent with domestic safety
- Impartial adjustment of all colonial claims weighing equally the interests of the populations with the claims of governments
- Evacuation of Russian territory and the opportunity for Russians to choose their own institutions and aid according to their needs and desires
- Evacuation and restoration of Belgium under her own sovereignty
- Liberation and restoration of invaded French territory and the return of Alsace-Lorraine to France, correcting the wrong of 1871
- A readjustment of the frontiers of Italy should be effected along clearly recognizable lines of nationality
- The peoples of Austria-Hungary should be freely allowed autonomous development
- Romania, Serbia and Montenegro should be evacuated and restored and the Balkan states ought to be established along lines of allegiance and nationality with international guarantees of independence and territorial integrity, with access to the sea for Serbia
- Turkey itself should have secure sovereignty; but other nationalities should be freed of Turkish rule and be assured of autonomous development and the Dardanelles should be open to all ships and commerce under international guarantees

- An independent Poland should include territories of Polish populations, have access to the sea and guaranteed territorial integrity
- A general association of nations must be formed under specific covenants for the purpose of affording mutual guarantees of political independence and territorial integrity to great and small states alike

According to Arthur (1955), the great ideals America was fighting for in a 4th of July speech at Mount Vernon over a million American men had already been shipped to France, the four goals stated by Wilson are:

- Destruction of every arbitrary power that disturbs the world's peace.
- Settlement of political and economic questions with the consent of those involved, not according to the material interests of other nations
- Consent of all nations to live under common law and mutual respect for justice
- Establishment of a peace organization of the free nations' combined power to check violations of peace and justice according to the tribunal of international opinion to which all must submit

By the end of summer 1918 the Central Powers were breaking up and on September 27 Wilson appealed to the peoples of those countries by suggesting more specific peace proposals. Once more he emphasized that right must be made superior to might. The idea of a League of Nations was beginning to take a more definite shape. Each government must be willing to pay the price necessary to achieve impartial justice, to be made effective by the instrumentality of a League of Nations. The constitution of the League of Nations must be a part of the peace settlement; for if it preceded peace it would be confined to the nations allied against a common enemy; and if it followed the peace settlement, it could not guarantee the peace terms. Wilson then outlined five particulars:

- Impartial justice means no discrimination or favoritism between peoples
- No special interest of a single nation should infringe upon the common interest of all
- There can be no leagues or alliances or special covenants and understandings within the general and common family of the League of Nations
- There can be no selfish economic combinations or boycotts except as "may be vested in the League of Nations itself as a means of discipline and control

- All international agreements and treaties of every kind must be made known in their entirety to the rest of the world (Baker, 1937)

It was obvious that the historic effort made by Wilson at maintaining international peace and security was broken and ended by the aggression of Japan, Italy and Germany that resulted in the Second World War. On April 7, 1939, the Italian army invaded Albania and Mussolini forced its government to resign from the League. On August 23 the new Soviet foreign minister Molotov and Germany's Ribbentrop announced a Nazi-Soviet non-aggression pact. As German troops invaded Poland on September 1, it became clear that Poland had been divided between them. Britain and France gave Hitler an ultimatum and then declared war on Germany. Avenol and the League did nothing until the USSR invaded Finland on November 30, 1939. On December 14 the League Assembly expelled the Soviet Union for violating its Covenant. Technical assistance was offered to Finland but it was over-run by Soviet armies by March 1940. During World War II the League survived at Geneva, though Avenol resigned on July 25 and was replaced by Irish Sean Lester. Finally the League of Nations itself was replaced and its remaining functions were taken over by the United Nations Organization in April 1946 (Robert, 1960).

The background of E-U and peace/security initiatives in international politics: This year (2009) is the 52nd anniversary of the establishment of the European Community. This event represents an opportunity for reflection on the historical meaning of the European unification. At the beginning, the EC was a union of six countries. Now it stretches from Lapland to the Mediterranean and from Poland to the Canaries and includes 27 countries. It is a Community of 487 million inhabitants where 23 official languages are spoken and includes approximately 100 ancient ethnic minorities. It has an executive commission, a parliament, an upper house, a court of justice, a central bank, a currency, a citizenship, a flag, an anthem, a passport. National borders have been abolished (Lucio, 2007).

Historically, the most important achievement of what became known as the E-U was the stability it brought in Western Europe's heartland between France and Germany. It is universally known, the warring factions of Europe for centuries ago. The real beginning came in 1950, with the announcement by Robert Schuman, the French foreign minister, of a plan by France and Germany, later joined by Belgium, Italy, Luxembourg and the

Netherlands, to surrender power over their coal and steel industries, which had long provided the base elements of European militarization. Power was transferred to a new supranational High Authority, the future European Commission, under its first president, the Frenchman Jean Monnet. In announcing his plan, Schuman said, The coming together of the nations of Europe requires the elimination of the age-old opposition of France and Germany (Graham, 2005).

The 1957 Treaty of Rome took integration further, setting up the European Economic Community, a customs union. In the 1960s, the mechanics of the new community took clearer form with the emergence of the three distinctive institutions that now run the EU: the European Commission, which originates and enforces EU law; the European Council, which represents member governments and the European Parliament, which holds the two other bodies to democratic scrutiny. After the first generation of Schuman, Monnet, Chancellor Konrad Adenauer of Germany and President Charles de Gaulle of France, came a new generation of French and German founding fathers: Helmut Schmidt and Valéry Giscard d'Estaing, Helmut Kohl and François Mitterrand and Jacques Delors. They extended the EEC into new areas, such as the single market, the formal establishment of the EU and by 2002, the single currency, the euro. The very early history of European integration was explicitly about stopping war, said Anand Menon, director of the European Research Institute at Birmingham University in England. Even during discussions about European Monetary Union during the 1990s, Helmut Kohl warned that if we didn't get this next big step, then we would have war. This is what we needed to prevent us returning to the Dark Ages (Graham, 2005).

Germans in particular adopted the cause of European integration as a source of a new identity, replacing, according to Stefan Wolff, professor of European studies at Bath University in England, traditional German nationalistic identity. Germany, a constant source of instability for several hundred years, has found a new identity for itself as part of a democratic structure in Europe, he said. The success of the project can be measured by the fact that Western Europe has seen no wars since 1945. The foreign ministers and grandees who a century ago confronted each other across Europe's chessboard now meet monthly and know each other well. There are fights, but they are diplomatic battles around the tables of Brussels rather than in the fields of Flanders (Graham, 2005).

Prior to the establishment of the European Union, the Euro zone has been the most devastated and ruined

region in the world, instigated by inter state and civil wars. But this picture and how it ended was best captured by Graham (2005) when he wrote:

More than 50 million dead. A continent where, in the words of Winston Churchill, "a vast quivering mass of tormented, hungry, care-worn and bewildered human beings gape at the ruins of their cities and homes. Amid the devastation left by World War II, Europe looked around after 1945 for a way to make sure such a disaster never happened again and found an answer in the European Union.

The EU and two international peace paradigms: The European Union operates basically on the two paradigms of international peace as adopted by the union. The two paradigms, however, are: defence and security and peace as reduction of violence and conflict management.

The issue of defense and security has to do with some contending paradigms. There is normally a hierarchy of priorities attached to the E-U, which emerge when one asks the 'opposite' question: could we cope without a military? and the answer is no! Could we cope without giving aid to developing countries? We could indeed! Could we cope without having relations with or dealing with other countries? Certainly some, but it depends. Could we cope as well if we were not tightly bound to allies and those we view as friends, for example, the U.S.? Absolutely not! Despite the fact that intellectuals and also many politicians who believe in this paradigm often talk about human security, environmental security etc., at the end of the day it is the military means-either what is employed for prestige or as a threat, or what is actually used that constitutes the primary instrument in real situations when a particularly threatening situation develops. At the core is the nation state; the task of the state is to defend itself and its people in a threatening world. Naturally, we profess to not want war but it may-unfortunately be necessary to defend ourselves and our interests against those who threaten us (Jan, 2006).

While on the other hand, accordingly, the school of Peace as reduction of violence and conflict management states that a more peaceful state of affairs can only be created if security, defense and development work together with lower levels of violence. In order to be able to achieve this, we need to approach underlying conflicts in a new way. The idea here is that, by having the greatest possible conflict knowledge, we can hope to find other ways of solving the problems than by threats and the use of violence. But the EU wants to create supra-national structures. It is said of the EU again and again that it is an instrument for a greater peace, partly within the EU as a

group, partly for a better world. And this is seen clearly in the title of the European Security Strategy, a Secure Europe in a Better World (Jan, 2006).

The E-U and international peace mediation: There is a difference between peace keeping (which is militaristic) and peace mediation (which involves round table discussion). Albeit the E-U has not participated in much international peace mediation, but it has profusely participated in peace keeping missions around the world. It is in line with this that Ante (2008) believes: When questioned whether the EU has been active in international Peace and mediation, the most prevalent answer is that it has not been. Interestingly enough, when asked to consider specific cases where the EU did play a distinctive and successful mediation role, there is a number of almost exclusively cited cases. Up until July 2008, the following cases have been mentioned:

The mediation between the Macedonian majority and Albanian minority in the FYROM that led to the Ohrid Agreement, which in essence was a joint EU/US effort, where the EU (Javier Solana and François Leotard, former Defence Minister of France) and the US (James Pardew, former US envoy to the FYROM), with support of the US, NATO and Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), engaged in what was essentially power (strongly outcome-oriented) mediation using the possibility of NATO troops and strong EU financial support as leverage.

The Ukrainian Orange Revolution, in which Ukraine's Parliament voted to ask for international mediation. Here, the role of former President of Poland, Alexander Kwasniewski (an expert of the region and personal friend of Ukrainian President Leonid Kuchma) was coupled with the institutional weight of the EU, personified by Javier Solana. This team proved enough of an incentive for all Ukrainian parties to the conflict to agree to a central role for the EU as a mediator, which resulted in the settlement in December 2004.

The Aceh Peace Process, where former Finnish President Martti Ahtisaari, supported by the Crisis Management Initiative, mediated a peace agreement between the Government of Indonesia and the Free Aceh Movement. Ahtisaari used his friendship with Javier Solana as an entry point to acquire EU support for a monitoring mission, which arguably served as leverage.

The Middle East Process, where the EU has attempted to play a role within the Middle East Quartet, attempting to do so 'impartially and independently', 'advising and serving as intermediaries'. The EU is arguably the next important actor after the US in this instance (Ante, 2008).

The E-U and global peace building: In the aftermath of World War II, the major objective of the European project was to remove the short and long-term causes of war and secure common processes and structures of democratic cooperation, decision-making and consensus building. The causes of war to be superseded were: nationalism as an ethno-centric and belligerent world and life view; the nationalist mode of institutional organization and behavior of European nation-states; the fierce adversarial competition between national economies (often referred to as economic nationalism); the exclusive association of national security with military might; the power differential between European states and the relentless competition for colonies. Throughout the decades that followed the end of World War II, the European response to these underlying causes of war has been both unique and creative in regard to the search for peace. It was a first attempt to move beyond the Westphalian world order of nation-states and the 19th century nationalism that accompanied it to a form of governance that could effectively sustain peace, particularly under increasingly globalizing conditions (Harry, 2007).

However, the quest for European peace did not stop with high-level politics. It was accompanied by a series of complementing peace-enhancing initiatives undertaken by civil society at various levels of European societies. In his research *The Forgiveness Factor: Stories of Hope in a World of Conflict*, Henderson (1996) recounts cases of how European citizens became engaged with each other across ethno-national lines, at the level of both formal politics and civil society, in innumerable post-war successes in conflict-resolution and reconciliation. The thousands of multi-ethnic citizen groups working with their former foes on peace-building projects; the twinning of cities and towns among formerly enemy nations; the progressive eradication of the stereotypical nationalist enemy images from school textbooks and public media culture; and the increasing inter-societal interaction through free trade, travel and exchange, all have contributed to the creation of new and unparalleled conditions conducive to inter-national cooperation, symbiosis and peace.

When the Soviet bloc collapsed, during the late 1980s and 1990s, many analysts were predicting a relapse of European instability and even wars, while others anticipated that with reunification Germany would regress back to its old nationalism and hegemonic aspirations (Leonard, 2005). Certainly, the Balkan crisis of the 1990s may be presented as substantiating this theory. However, while media attention was engrossed with the vicious inter-ethnic conflicts of the Balkans, public opinion, particularly in the US, missed other significant

developments which played a crucial role in containing the dangers that emanated from the broader collapse of the Soviet bloc. Immediately following the collapse, the EU reached out to the eastern European countries, proposing an engaging process of arms reduction under conditions of mutual supervision and surveillance. A total of 30 European countries signed the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces. Within 5 years the objective had been achieved. Working together with the former cold-war adversaries, EU member states managed to reduce the arsenals, on equal terms, across Europe, thus rendering easier the management of military power across the continent. But more importantly, in the process of working together, western and eastern European countries started to build functional relationships, increased the level of trust and paved the way for what eventually led to the largest wave of EU enlargement (Leonard, 2005). This EU initiated development ought not to be underappreciated as a factor in stabilizing Eastern Europe, particularly when viewed against the backdrop of the evolving Balkan crisis and the possible broader impact it could have had.

The EU pulled toward it the former Soviet bloc countries of Eastern Europe at the very moment they were emancipated from the Soviet monolith and at the very moment they were in search of a tangible future. These former Soviet bloc countries turned to the EU seeking membership, as they understood that the EU and its approach to Eastern Europe, did not constitute a threat, but rather a helping hand in their hour of need. Cases in point were Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Hungary, Poland, the Czech Republic, Slovakia and Slovenia and later Romania.

The E-U Peace building and the Northern Ireland Conflict Economic aid in peace building carries the possibility for a variety of outcomes. It can contribute to employment countering the effects of poverty including ill health as well as barriers to education and self-esteem. Moreover, it can create opportunities to bring homogenous communities together to provide resources and training and it can encourage local networks to branch out across sectarian divides (Leonard, 2004). In addition, regional bodies benefit from so called peace dividends that emerge from stable societies including foreign trade and investment. In this way, peace processes allow marginalized populations to come in from the periphery and regional parties to actively engage local populations with an aim at balancing some of the structural inequalities that led to conflict in the first place (O'Hearn, 2000). Economic sustainability may be the power to thrive and endure (Sernau, 2006) but sustainable peace requires that long-time antagonists not merely lay

down their arms but that they achieve profound reconciliation that will endure because it is sustained by (society) (Lederach, 2004). Byrne and Irvin (2002) observe that persistent economic inequalities were not the only reason for the mobilization of the Nationalist community in 1968 and the counter mobilizations of the Unionist community' but historically Northern Ireland was deliberately underdeveloped (McGarry and O'Leary, 2007). Protestant Unionists and Catholic Nationalists lived segregated lives with separated communities and little intermarriage. The polarization of Northern Irish society has benefited each community by forging close-knit social bonds and networks for resources (Dixon, 2007). Economic aid initiatives support the realization that peace agreements between political parties do little to foster relationships between ethnic groups whose inter-societal heritage includes generations of hostility and divergence (Kaufman, 2006).

Peace, poverty and foreign aid to Africa: One of the major source of violence and conflict in Africa, has apparently remained the over increasing level of poverty on the black continent: governments are becoming more and more corrupt, unemployment becoming rampant, social vices escalating, lack of security for life and property becoming disturbing and inadequate infrastructural development for the masses to mention but few. The scourge of poverty is the major source of conflict in Africa. By realizing this fact, the United States and the European Union have consolidated their relation with Africa in the area of foreign aid.

The EU has also been active in Africa on the security front. The African Peace Facility (APF) is an EU-funded instrument created in 2003 to support of peace and security in Africa. The EU has earmarked €300 million to the APF under the 10th European Development Fund for 2008-2010. The EU has also been active in peacekeeping operations on the continent. Most recent examples include the deployment of 2500 EU troops to the DRC (EUFOR) to support the UN mission (MONUC), as well as their contribution of troops to support the UN Mission (MINURCAT) in Chad and the Central African Republic in late 2007. Besides the EU's commitments to Africa at a continental level, it has also made significant headway in elevating its bilateral relations with South Africa. By virtue of the importance and relevance South Africa holds in its region-politically, economically and militarily it is now considered the key strategic partner to the EU in Africa.

The EU-South Africa relations have deepened substantially since 1994. Despite the rise of China, the EU remains South Africa's biggest trade and investment

partner, accounting for over 33% of total trade, as well as for 70% of FDI. The EU is also South Africa's largest development partner representing approximately 70% of all Overseas Development Assistance (ODA), with South Africa earmarked to receive €980 million for 2007-2013. The European Investment Bank has also approved a loan of €900 million for South Africa (Chevalier, 2009).

The EU is the world's biggest trading bloc and largest Overseas Development Assistance (ODA) contributor. Europe accounts for around 90% of worldwide commitments to scale up aid and around 90% of the increase in aid to Africa. Half of EU aid increase will go towards Africa-\$24 billion extra a year by 2010 and an additional \$55 billion a year by 2015. Not only is there an improvement in quantitative commitments, but also in its mode of delivery and implementation, as well as in its coordination (Chevalier, 2009).

Keeping the EU on track: A report by DATA, the aid organization set up by rock stars Bono and Sir Bob Geldof, said the G8 had only provided 14% of the \$21.8bn it pledged to give to Africa in aid by 2010. France, Germany, Italy and Britain promised to provide the largest percentages of their national wealth. Together they will provide 75% of the \$22bn committed, if the targets are reached. Britain pledged \$6.51 billion for 2010 and has given \$3.64 billion to date. The US target is \$8.8 billion. So far, it has given \$5.41 billion (Chevalier, 2009).

The US gesture: Although the US has been had long-standing relations with Africa, there has been a recent mapping exercise done of its initiatives on and with the continent. During former US President George W Bush's five-nation trip to Africa in February 2008, he reviewed progress made in two of his pet creations, namely the Millennium Challenge Account (MCA) and the Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR/Emergency Plan).

PEPFAR is the largest commitment by any nation for an international health initiative dedicated to a single disease. Over the past five years PEPFAR has provided \$18.8 billion in support for HIV/AIDS prevention, treatment and care, providing 1.4 million people in SSA, Asia and the Caribbean with anti-retrovirals. The MCA, on the other hand, has worked successfully to increase development assistance on a bilateral and sectoral basis, based upon conditional adherence to political and socio-economic requirements (Chevalier, 2009).

In the past 5 years the US has provided billions in debt relief to Africa. Two examples: \$394 million debt has been forgiven from Liberia. In addition, the US has provided over \$1.7 billion to support Liberia since the civil

war ended there in 2003, including \$750 million in direct bilateral support. Since 2006, the US has forgiven debt of \$280 million from Zambia. Within SADC, minerals and metals are also important export products to the US market, having grown 6-fold between 2002 and 2004. According to full-year 2006 data, key exports sectors under AGOA for South Africa were chemicals and related, minerals and metals, transportation equipment and agricultural products. ECOWAS has the same positive trade performance but this is due to Nigerian oil. COMESA has a much more balanced trade with the US because Sudan, the only major oil exporter in the regional economic community, does not trade with US (Chevalier, 2009).

US Africa Command (AFRICOM): Africom is the US strategic, geographic military command to start operations in October 2008 in Stuttgart, Germany (plans are however to base it in Liberia). The goal of Africom is to allow the US to respond to military and humanitarian emergencies on the continent in a more coordinated fashion (instead of the continent being divided among three commands as before) and also to better coordinate military assistance and training programmes. This presents a new paradigm for US-Africa security relations. South Africa and Libya have been vocally wary of the intentions of this initiative.

US engagement in peace and security initiatives: In the area of conflict resolution, the US has provided over \$400 million to AU peacekeeping operations in Darfur since 2004. The US aim has been to buttress AU peacekeeping capabilities through initiatives like the African Contingency Operations Training and Assistance (ACOTA) programme, which is working with a number of African militaries to build up an AU standby force of 25,000 troops to respond to emergencies. \$1.7 million in US funding has been devoted to the support of the AU political affairs directorate with another \$250 000 going for the support of diplomatic initiatives by the organisation (Chevalier, 2009).

US foreign assistance to Africa: Has tripled since 2002 to approximately \$4 billion. The Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR) is the largest commitment made by any nation for an international health initiative dedicated to a single disease. Over the past 5 years PEPFAR has provided \$18.8 billion in support for HIV/AIDS prevention, treatment and care, providing anti-retroviral treatment for 1.4 million people in Sub-Saharan Africa, Asia and the Caribbean. The US increased its contribution to the Initiative that targets Neglected Tropical Diseases (NTDs) from \$15 million in 2008 to a total of \$350 million

from 2009-2013, expanding the number of target countries from 10 in 2008 to 30 by 2013. Other social programmes include: Basic Education Initiative, African Development Foundation (Bush first-term doubled aid to continent), Infrastructural Development Initiative (Trans-Kalahari Multimodal Transportation, Coal Bed Methane Commercialization), Peace Corps and Bush's Malaria Initiative (Chevalier, 2009).

In 2006, 15% of all US oil imports come from Africa. Lesotho now possesses Africa's largest clothing export industry, almost 100% of the output goes to the US and most if not all of the growth is attributable to AGOA. Writing in TIME magazine (March 2008), musician and humanitarian Bob Geldof lauds the Bush administration for, though its programmes, putting an additional 29 million African children into schools.

The US-EU building international peace/security: The United States and other countries that make up the European Union have a potential power in building a good atmosphere of peace and security in the world. But it is quite unfortunate that these countries have always tried to first of all look at their interest and the interest of their allies even if they are oppressors and criminals of war. This, however, contradicts the original objective of the League of Nations, the United Nations etc.

The UN and the US have had a love-hate relationship over the last forty years. Within this time period, the method the United States uses when dealing with the United Nations has swung from the idealistic to the pragmatic and on a few occasions, hostile. During its idealistic phase (roughly the first 5 years), the US contributed tremendously to the basic setup of the UN. The United States was one of the founding members of the United Nations. The US directly influenced the construction of the UN charter. As Thomas (1985) asserts *inter alia*:

The UN Charter was a sort of extension of the US constitution...being built in a large part to American national specifications... the Charter, like the US Constitution, would become the fundamental law of society, determining and umpiring basic power relationships.

These fundamental laws would be enforced by collective security armies (supplied by the permanent members of the Security Council). Precisely how and when these armies were to be created was never agreed upon and the use of collective security armies never happened. The optimistic attitude towards the UN disappeared as the Cold War developed during the late 1940's. The United States then adopted a pragmatic

approach to the United Nations. The value of the organization was viewed almost in direct proportion to how much use it could be to American foreign policy. During the early part of the Cold War, US policies were successful at the UN and the Soviet Union (using its veto power) constantly blocked the resolutions at the Security Council. The one notable exception was Korea in 1950, where the Soviet delegate left the meeting before exercising his veto. The United States and its allies moved swiftly and passed a resolution authorizing the use of force in Korea.

During the 1960s and 1970s, the UN environment changed. The Soviet Union allied with Third World Nations, many whom were newly created states emerging as a result of the end of European colonialism (ironically, the US had a lot to do with the end of European colonialism after WWII). The Soviet Union made the policies and the United States exercised its veto. Thus, the United Nations became an organization in which the two superpowers competed for influence according to their own national interests. For example, during the Arab/Israeli wars of the 1970s, the Soviet Union would support resolutions condemning Israel's aggression. Israel's ally, the United States, would veto the resolution at the Security Council. Therefore, the United States would look like the supporter of aggression. Unable to achieve its policies through the United Nations, the United States entered into a number of bilateral/multilateral arrangements (such as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) in the late 1940s) to fulfill its interests.

The aim of these bilateral and regional arrangements was to contain the spreading influence of the Soviet Union. These arrangements were to lead the United States into the Vietnam War and the subsequent bitter experience. It was during the 1960s that the idea of an "impartial" peacekeeper arose. Peacekeepers, to be impartial, came from nations considered to be impartial by those who were involved in the conflict being mediated. A group of middle powers (Canada, Norway and some non-Western states) arose who were willing to contribute to peacekeeping missions. A peacekeeping mission generally consists of a group of military observers who would establish a presence between two fighting states.

During the 1960s, civil wars were not candidates for peacekeeping. It would be the late 1980s before peacekeeping missions would be sent into civil wars. The mission typically had terms to which each side had agreed. It was the task of the observers to report violations of the agreement and to act as impartial go betweens for either side. In order for peacekeepers to be deployed, it was necessary to have the consent of both

fighting parties. Normally, the situation involved two sovereign states, involved in a dispute. In fact, the initial idea of the UN was based around conflicts between states, not groups of people within a state. If in many cases the US could theoretically do it alone, why did it involve the UN at all? Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara expressed one of the recurring themes of US foreign policy in 1966 when he addressed the American Society of Newspaper Editors and was written by Arthur (1967).

Neither conscience nor sanity itself suggests that the United States is, should, or could be the global gendarme. The United States has no mandate from on high to police the world and no inclination to do so. There have been classic cases in which the deliberate non-action was the wisest action of all.

Accordingly, the United States has usually attempted to involve others, with varying degrees of success, in helping to solve the problems that arise in the world. "World's Policeman" reoccurs. If necessary, the US can and will act alone to achieve its own national interest unilaterally. Korea was an example of cooperation with the UN. Vietnam was an example of the US acting alone. But how does the United States determine its foreign policy? Does the US follow some grand design? Former Secretary of State, Henry (1974) Kissinger, a noted historian, best summarizes how the United States makes foreign policy. He believes that, Issues are dealt with only as the pressure of events imposes the need for resolving them. Foreign policy remains static for long periods of time and then as the pressure of events builds, it will take a big change all at once. Henry (1974) feels that this is due to the people who make the policy for the United States and how the bureaucracy works. He describes it as a,

Bureaucratic-pragmatic leadership-when a problem arises it is assigned to one group/person, then it is resolved, long term thinking is neglected since it has no bureaucratic consequence this causes Foreign Policy to be rigid for long periods of time, then to change all at once as the solution is attempted.

Henry (1974) contends that the bureaucratic-pragmatic leadership, combined with the fact that the vast majority of America's leaders come from a legal background, lead them to make decisions based upon a Constitutional conception whenever possible. Therefore, he feels most leaders are good at high competence in dealing with technical issues and much less virtuosity in

mastering a historical process (Henry, 1974). The United States political system produces an American decision maker who is a legalistic, pragmatic and results oriented individual somewhat weak on the historical process. Combining that decision maker with a political system which can rapidly change the Administration, profoundly affects how the United States works on any foreign policy issue. A good example of this would be the differences between President Carter and President Reagan. President Carter's foreign policy towards the Soviet Union was generally low key with only a modest emphasis on defense spending. President Reagan came to power and US foreign policy took a massive shift. The United States embarked upon a tremendous military expansion and took a very hard line approach towards the Soviet Union going as far as to call Russia the evil empire.

In a very short period of time, Washington's foreign policy shifted drastically. Sudden shifts in foreign policy are characteristic of how Washington deals with the UN and peacekeeping as well. A quick review of Cold War (1945-1989) historical themes, are: an idealistic idea (i.e., charter modeled after US constitution), which conflicts with a pragmatic-bureaucratic style decision making process; a desire not to become the world's policeman; a two superpower deadlock in the UN leading to peacekeeping missions being undertaken by impartial middle powers and finally, the concept of consent of the belligerents (normally two sovereign states). But the world changed after the collapse of the USSR and the end of the Cold War and so did the fundamental nature of the type of peacekeeping missions the UN would attempt.

The United States and the European Union, however, have done a great job in trying to maintain peace and security around the world. But this effort is rather misleading, hypocritical and dishonest. The US and EU never want to see the reign of peace in the middle east-hence, supporting the terrorist state of Israel by supplying weapons and even financial support. The people of Palestine are suffering from lack of freedom, sovereignty, social infrastructure and general security of life and property. Bush has invaded Iraq as a result of faulty intelligence report that led to the death of innumerable lives. During the Rwandan genocide, the European forces under the United Nations could not restore any peace in the country but rather, they left, which led to the death of an uncountable number of people.

It is also very clear that the United States and Israel have a strong alliance. America also supported Saddam to fight Iran by giving him all supports that he needed. The U.S. support of Saddam was a vengeance against the Islamic revolution that shoved the shah regime in Iran.

Shah happened to be a loyalist to American interest. With Iraq emerging to have a formidable power in the gulf region, it posed a security threat against Israel and her American ally. Some analysts believe that, America fought Iraqi- war for the protection of Israel in the region. It is, however, on this debacle that Meretz (2006) wrote:

With all of the Saddam-obsessed, pro-Israel neocons in high places, the stage were set for a long-dreamed of war to oust the Iraqi dictator. The 9/11 attacks gave them the chance they had been waiting for and Bamford writes, "they dusted off their preemptive war strategy and began putting it to use. The fact that several of the key players most aggressively pushing the war had originally outlined it for the benefit of another country raises the most troubling conflict of interest questions.

Consequently, peace and global security is still a mirage, when super powers are still maintaining regime's terrorism such as America under bush, Britain under Blair and Israel with her perpetual bombardment of Gaza. The issue of global peace and security is still utopia instead of reality.

CONCLUSION

The political divide in international politics: as Russia supporting communist states and US supporting their allies in terms of war and conflict, without objectively looking into the situation, serve as a potential threat in international politics.

The sales of weapons to states like Israel by the US is another major threat and set back that may perpetuate insecurity and political instability within the Middle East region.

Continuous invasion of Muslim countries by the US with the name of fighting terrorism can not also ensure peace and stability in international relations and politics, as the spirit of vengeance will continue to reign among those called terrorists.

More balances of power should be considered among nations and states. This will ensure and guarantee egalitarianism and equal justice within the framework of international law and politics.

RECOMMENDATION

The following recommendations are proffered, as are seen as potentially ideal and primary for the maintenance of international peace and security:

Any form of domination, invasion, aggression or oppression of one country by another should be condemned and dealt with in proportion of the damage incurred on the oppressed victim.

The power of the United Nations has to be independent, neutrally sagacious and impartial. It must be dedicated at fighting domination and state form of terror against other states.

Peace is only obtainable when the international court of justice will be independent and just in any form of war crime as treated in the tribunal; state violence, international conspiracy and crime of aggression.

George bush must be brought to book together with his cohorts for the crime they committed in Iraq. The killing of innocent Iraqis (women and children), the American soldiers and the traumatized ones. This will serve as a lesson for states leaders and make them become cautious of any act of violence against humanity.

REFERENCES

- Ante, H., 2008. Perceptions of International Peace Mediation in the EU: A Needs Analysis. 1st Edn. IFP Mediation Cluster: Crisis Management Initiative, pp: 1-27. www.initiativeforpeacebuilding.eu/pdf/Needs_analysis.pdf.
- Arthur, M.C., 1967. Prospects for Peacekeeping. 1st Edn. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, No. 30 pp: 1-13. www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&se=gglsc&d=93967446.
- Arthur, W., 1955. The Messages and Papers of Woodrow Wilson. Princeton University, Harlan, 1: 275. www.questia.com/library/encyclopedia/101278338.
- Baker, R.S., 1937. Woodrow Wilson-Life and Letters. 1st Edn. Facing War: 1915-1917. N.Y., Doran: Doubleday, Vol. 6. www.ilab.org/db/detail.php?lang=ch&booknr.
- Byrne, S. and C.I. Irvin, 2002. A Shared Common Sense: Perceptions of the Material Effects and Impacts of Economic Growth In Northern Ireland. Civil Wars, 5 (1): 55-86. www.informaworld.com/smpp/.../title~content=g782228688~db=all.
- Chevalier, R., 2009. European Union and the United States. 2nd Edn. The Good News, Africa, pp: 1-2. www.africagoodnews.com/search.html?searchphrase.
- Dixon, P., 2007. The Northern Ireland peace process: Choreography and theatrical politics. Routledge, London, pp: 20-21. ISBN: 978-0-415-36545-1. www.routledge-ny.com/.../The-Northern-Ireland-Peace-Process-isbn9780415348607.
- Graham, B., 2005. Can EU Bom From War, Survive Peace? International Herald Tribune, pp: 1-3. www.stefanw-olff.com/media/ihf5.pdf.
- Harry, A., 2007. The EU as a Peace Building System: Deconstructing Nationalism in an Era of Globalization. Int. J. Peace Stud., 1 (2): 1-19. vlex.com/.../eu-deconstructing-nationalism-globalization-55284673.
- Henderson, M., 1996. The Forgiveness Factor: Stories of Hope in a World of Conflict. UK Grosvenor Books, London, pp: 61-70. www.thefreelibrary.com/Forgiveness+factor:+stories+of+hope+in+a+world+of+conflict-a030080253.
- Henry, A.K., 1974. American Foreign Policy Expanded Edition. WW Norton and Company, New York, pp: 30-52. books.wwnorton.com/books/detail.aspx?ID=11804.
- James, B.S., 1982. The Hague Peace Conferences of 1899 and 1907. 2nd Edn. Oxford, London, New York (etc.). Clarendon Press, pp: 77-400. openlibrary.org/b/OL6607694M.
- Jan, O., 2006. Does the European Union Promote Peace?: Analysis, Critique and Alternatives. The Transnational Foundation For Peace and Future Research (TFF)-New Agenda Think Tank, pp: 3-47. www.transnational.org/SAJT/.../Oberg_EU_Promote_Peace.pdf.
- Kaufman, S.J., 2006. Escaping the Symbolic Politics Trap: Reconciliation Initiatives and Conflict Resolution in Ethnic Wars. J. Peace Res., 43 (2): 201-218. DOI: 10.1177/0022343306060622. jpr.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/43/2/201.
- Kaufman, J.E., 2009. American GI in Europe in world war11: The March to D-Day. Mechanicsburg: Stack pole books. Vol. 1. ISBN: 0811704491, 9780811704496.
- Lederach, J.P., 2004. Building Peace. 6th Edn. Sustainable Reconciliation in Divided Societies. Washington D.C., US: United States Institute of Peace Press, pp: 10-43. www.monitor.upeace.org/archive.cfm?id_article=418.
- Leonard, M., 2004. Bonding and Bridging Social Capital. J. Br. Sociol. Assoc., 38 (5): 927-944. jcmc.indiana.edu/vol11/issue4/yuan.html.
- Leonard, M., 2005. Why Europe will run the 21st century. Public affairs-Fourth Estate Ltd., New York, pp: 100-140. ISBN: 10-0007195311, 13-978-0007195312. www.amazon.co.uk/Why-Europe-Will-21st-Century/.../0007195311.
- Lucio, L., 2007. The Unaccomplished Way toward the European Unity. The New Federalist, pp: 4-6. https://www.taurillon.org/taurillon.org/_Lucio-Levi?lang=en.

- McGarry, J. and B. O'Leary, 2007. Politics of antagonism: Understanding Northern Ireland. Routledge, Abingdon. www.flipkart.com/politics-antagonism-understanding-northern-ireland/0485801108-fyw3fzfmqd.
- Meretz, W., 2006. Iraq War: Pro Israeli Conspiracy. A U.S. Web log. meretzusa.blogspot.com/.../iraq-war-pro-israel-conspiracy.html.
- O'Hearn, D., 2000. Peace Dividend, Foreign Investment and Economic Regeneration: The Northern Irish Case. *Social Problems*, 47 (2): 180-200. www.allacademic.com/meta/p252553_index.html.
- Robert, F., 1960. Peace in their time. *National Daily*, pp: 1-2. www.rollingstone.com/nationalaffairs/.../from-the-issue-robert-f-kennedy-jr-and-greg-palast-on-gop-vote-blocking.
- Sernau, S.R., 2006. *Global Problems: The Search for Equity*. 2nd Edn. Peace and Sustainability. Boston: Pearson Education Inc., pp: 5-20. ISBN: 10-0-205-57884-5, 9780205343928. www.amazon.com/Global-Problems-Search-Equity-Sustainability/.../0205343929.
- Thomas, M.F., 1985. *Nation Against Nation*. Oxford University Press, New York, pp: 15. ISBN: 13-978-0-19-503587-2, 10-0-19-503587-9. www.us.oup.com/.../InternationalStudies/InternationalOrganizations/?.
- Walter, S.D., 2009. *Hitler's Nemesis: The Red Army, 1930-45*. Stack Pole Books, Mechanicsburg. ISBN: 0811735435, 9780811735438. www.gazelle-bookservices.co.uk/Marketing/.../Military%20&%20War.htm.