

Jantzen, Günther

**Article — Digitized Version**

**EC — Focus on the mediterranean**

Intereconomics

*Suggested Citation:* Jantzen, Günther (1973) : EC — Focus on the mediterranean, Intereconomics, ISSN 0020-5346, Verlag Weltarchiv, Hamburg, Vol. 08, Iss. 8, pp. 230-, <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02927688>

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/138867>

**Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:**

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

**Terms of use:**

*Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.*

*You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.*

*If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.*

## EC - Focus on the Mediterranean

The Mediterranean has been in the news for years. Public attention has been focussed on it constantly by the Middle East conflict, the EC's association policy, the problem of internal harmony in Nato and the infiltration of the Soviet navy, by speculations about a neutralisation of the Mediterranean, and by the oil supply crisis, to say nothing of the happenings in and around Malta, Greece and Cyprus. The European Community is attaching major importance to the Mediterranean region; its concept of a "Common Mediterranean Policy" however might give an impression that the Europeans have already explored the terrain from the Pillars of Hercules to the shores of Asia Minor with such care that they could present the world with an almost self-consistent trade and development system for it. In this system the Mediterranean would appear as a kind of inland sea in a region stretching from the North Cape to the Zambezi. The idea of such an expanse is fascinating and deserves being given consideration also under the aspect of regionalisation for the sake of balance in the world economy. Decisive however is bound to be what forces are set in motion for and against its creation.

There was a connection between the Mediterranean concept and the European Community's policy of association for black Africa and the "Associables" among the Commonwealth states. The reaction of the associables to the offers from Brussels remains to be seen. It has implications for the attitude of several Mediterranean countries which look on the

OAU, the Organisation of African Unity, as a useful means of representing common interests.

Mediterranean politics and Nato politics have meshed in the past; the Mediterranean ambitions of the "Community" have, understandably, been watched with suspicion in Washington. Disenchanted with Europe, the Americans have been asking themselves whether the US 6th fleet should protect Europe's southern flank when Mediterranean markets are barred to US exporters by preference agreements with the Europeans.

Some Europeans find it unpleasant to contemplate the consequences of US naval withdrawal; others do not seem to be adverse to talking about "neutralisation" with their Mediterranean neighbours who are trying to influence developments from Africa. The idea that only states with a direct coast-line should be allowed to station warships in the Mediterranean and the two world powers — the USA and the USSR — should in this way be politely turned out is not a new one. It would be something new if the Russians could be made to give up the claim to coast-line country status. "Neutralisation" however is being talked about; Malta's Dom Mintoff caused something of a stir last spring when he travelled to Tunis and afterwards talked to Col. Gaddafi about proposals to put before the Helsinki "Conference on Security and Cooperation".

Algeria has intervened in the strategic talks on the strength of the potent position which this economically strongest country of the Maghreb claims in aware-

ness of its importance for Europe's power supplies. This instance shows clearly that no Mediterranean concept of the European Community can be free of political question marks. This would be so even if one proceeded only from considerations of trade and development policy. Algeria is evidently willing to agree to associate status with the "Community" if the Community gives it substantially better terms than Tunisia and Morocco receive under the current agreements. Apart from other matters, the Algerians have solid preferences in the agricultural sector in mind and possibly also safeguards in the nature of a market order inside the European market.

This would make for more differentiation between Mediterranean countries and hamper a consistent Mediterranean policy by the European Community with the aim of equal treatment for all. If "privileges" of a special kind were conceded to individual countries, the EC would be in a difficult negotiating position. Algeria is here a pace-maker for demands by Morocco and Tunisia. Any concession must be weighed under political and trade aspects and, since Helsinki, also with an eye on East-West relations and an open ear for grievances by "third" overseas countries which feel discriminated against and will certainly not keep silent. It will be interesting to see what course the EC ship is going to steer in the Mediterranean — if it is one ship and not a convoy of nine whose skippers are holding different views about navigation and about their destination as well!

*Günther Jantzen*