The decline and fall of Rome terminated a vast centrally organised imperium; an imperium primarily formed upon the Greco-Roman stratum. A prolific European powerbase, with significant longevity, it commanded a geography spanning three continents. Its demise was markedly compounded by the disappearance of the Latin Romans – as a significant binding force – as well as further mass invasions of their West European provinces by East European tribal elements. Elimination of the Roman World helped to create a severely fragmented Europe.

A specific timeline reveals that after a period of serious decline, Christianity re-emerged with a revitalised set of values; in conjunction with a surviving Greco-Roman stratum, it established fertile ground for the formation of European nations encompassed within a single Civilisation. This stage is referred to as the Medieval Period or the Middle Ages. Yet there are marked differences between the first and second halves of that timeline. As internal nations by criteria – inclusive of state structures – only the Greeks and Armenians possess histories directly emanating from the BC era.

Although an advancing and strata based ‘European Civilisation’ – as an overall binding force – was created by the combination of the aforementioned fundamentals, with additional enhancements incorporated during the forthcoming centuries, most severe rivalries – regional and at times practically all-European – caused numerous wars, conflicts and upheavals that were significantly worse than the Roman civil wars of the past. Such disunity prolonged the occupation of vast sections of southern Europe – continental and maritime – by non-European forces. Some even cooperated with such external adversaries, thus exasperating that destructive problem even further. After their liberation, the occupied nations strived to progress once more by reviving aspects of their destabilised cultures and effectuating the projections of the European Civilisation that had been undermined considerably.
In more recent times, the development of modern technologies only helped to aggravate inter-European matters even further. The first half of the Twentieth Century saw two devastating European wars. Such widespread destruction had never been seen. The second half of the same century, however, witnessed a thoroughly necessary volte-face of significant proportions. Thus, after numerous centuries, a particularly narrow timeline proved to be the prodigious onset of a progressive and unifying European project, forged among West European nations that could begin the elimination of assertive rivalries collectively and subsume the ability to establish an overall peace with longevity. It was the initial phase of an inter-state and multicultural European society. Two decades earlier such a development, within the European political spectrum, would have been unthinkable. Western Europe, unlike its Eastern sector, possessed sufficient freedom in order to be able to embark upon such a progressive avenue.

On the 25th of March, 1957, two relevant treaties were signed in Rome. The primary one established the European Economic Community – EEC. A brief account of subsequent internal developments record that in 1968 the customs union was completed eighteen months ahead of schedule. During 1987 the Treaty of Rome was updated significantly by the Single European Act, signed in 1986. It restructured the Single Market and the European Political Cooperation. The latter is the predecessor of the European Union’s Common Foreign and Security Policy. In 1993, with the advent of the Maastricht Treaty – signed in 1992 – the EEC was renamed the European Community – EC, thus highlighting the fact that in addition to its extensive economic projects it also embraced key political and cultural objectives. The same treaty also initiated the single currency. The Euro has been a unifying factor that advanced well beyond its fiscal objectives. Notes and coins were first circulated in 2002. Thus, with the establishment of the Eurozone – at least from the monetary point of view – a two speed EU was created. This overall forthright position was further strengthened by the Treaty of Lisbon – signed in 2007 – and the EC was renamed the European Union - EU. The same treaty, from the Human Rights point of view, also established the “Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union”. The Lisbon Treaty entered into law on 1st December, 2009.

The Paris Summit of 1974 pioneered a path for direct elections to the European Parliament. On the 20th of September, 1976, the Decision and Act on European Elections was signed in Brussels and ratified during 1978 by all member states. Thus, Parliament was elevated from being an appointed assembly to an elected legislature. The first direct elections took place on the 7th and 10th of June, 1979; thereafter conducted at five year intervals. Subsequent years witnessed greater control by Parliament over the European Commission. The latter is the domineering executive and administrative body of the Union, where each member state appoints a pragmatically idealist commissioner regarding the European vision. The Commission’s President – appointed for five years – is the most powerful official of the Union. Additional equilibrium and guidance is provided by the Council of Ministers, composed of ministerial representations from each member state. Its forum – referred to as the Council of the European Union – has an internally appointed President with a term of two and half years. The Union also possesses a political infrastructure whereby leaders of member states are appointed to a rotating Presidency for a six month term of office. The administrative offices of the European Parliament remain in Luxemburg. Most parliamentary Committee Meetings – inclusive of plenary sessions – take place in Brussels.
Parliamentarians – MEPs – however, conduct the voting process in the city of Strasbourg, where the European Parliament is situated; it is led by a President chosen from its members – for a term of two and half years – assisted by a team of Vice-Presidents.

By 2013, twenty-eight states will have been incorporated, having the most important unifying factors in place; an outstanding achievement. Further development – inclusive of deeper consolidation and wider incorporation – may require, however, a multi-speed approach. Disparities, especially economic, fiscal and at times sociological, as well as new stringent commitments, practically impossible to deliver by less developed members, may hinder significantly a core group of states intending to advance at a greater pace.

In any case, due to new global currents, as well as a number of internal policy failures, an expeditious rate of European integration has practically become a necessity. Nonetheless, the broader European political psychology continues to be unreasonably rigid; démodé it remains. Currently, there is no European policy that disseminates the European Civilisation effectively within the European Cultural Frontiers. Shields of Europe: a Past and a Future. Thus, inclusive of educational aspects, the emphasis rests mainly on outdated national psyches, projected by individual nation-states, causing a disjointed state of affairs. A balanced approach appears to be long overdue. Nevertheless, it is prudent for those specific nations situated at the forefront of the said Cultural Frontiers to continue and maintain strong national psychologies, in addition to the aforementioned enhancement. Such an approach will further assist the defence of Europe’s endangered zones; a number of which hold important connotations for the future. Strategic Europe: Prospective Outreach.

Population levels in Western or Greater Europe continue to be disconcerting. It appears unlikely that normal population growth of any significance can be sustained as far as the foreseeable future is concerned. This is a problem impregnated with dangers. During the past centuries Europe populated vast sections of the new world. It may be prudent to establish an immigration policy that may reverse that long standing tradition effectively. In the most key outlying regions of the European Cultural Frontiers the situation is even worse, as such regions have been inflicted with significantly declining demographics, while the populations of civilisations facing the said European zones have increased dramatically. The primary reason for this derogatory state of affairs is the lack of economic development. In the markedly affected regions the unemployment rate is approaching the forty percent mark; hence the high levels of emigration and the distressing levels of poverty. Dangers emanating from such developments are augmented when one considers that the defence arrangements regarding some European sectors continue to be unsatisfactory.

European defence in general, of course, is a further point of weakness. The EU lacks a major integrated defence force, a significant handicap in global politics. Checkbook diplomacy, impregnated with limitations, is of little help. Even worse, an all-European, non-aggression treaty, with a mutual assistance clause, does not exist. Undoubtedly, a treaty of this nature can also strengthen the outlying Cultural Frontiers significantly. As the situation stands, the common space within the European Cultural Frontiers does not possess even the most basic defence agreement for the security of all Europeans.
Aspects of defence are also linked to geographic realities. Within its current borders, the EU remains significantly confined. On the other hand, Greater Europe’s format – encompassing the European Cultural Frontiers effectively – provides an outstanding primacy. *Frontiers of Europe: Union of Cultures within a Civilisation*. This intercontinental and maritime geography bestows upon Europe an unequalled global standing, inclusive of geopolitical, strategic, economic attributes and, of course, an impressive array of natural resources. Although it will possess a reasonably well educated demography of some magnitude, that demography will be approximately five hundred million less than that of China or India. Nevertheless, Greater Europe’s outstanding merits, due to its superior geography, will overbalance this demographic drawback.

It is also possible to classify China and India as ‘greater’ states since they have managed to encircle reasonably well their civilisations – incorporating a number of languages and internal cultures – within *de jure* state frontiers. This, of course, is not an acknowledgement that their frontiers are entirely appropriate as far as the aforementioned criterion is concerned. Although the European coalescence holds significantly less rigid characteristics, in this respect Europe continues to lag behind the two aforementioned greater states.

Currently, as far as Greater Europe is concerned, it is appropriate to incorporate its internal enclave-type exceptions with the necessary safeguards. The smaller European nations – with or without nation-state infrastructures – should have their cultures protected accordingly. The same, of course, is also true for minorities.

As noted previously, it took a considerable period of time before a union of nation-states could establish a multicultural European society. However, amalgamating nation-states that do not belong to the European Civilisation and are situated outside the European Cultural Frontiers, to the above mentioned multicultural society, appear currently to be an impossibility. As such, a concept would transform the said multicultural society to an unworkable multi-civilisation structure. In history, the multi-civilisation model has been unsuccessful and remains fraught with dangers.

European integration is a vast and demanding project, yet the recent past has demonstrated that it has moved forth relentlessly. Negative elements may hamper its progress. The ‘enemy within’ propensity may intensify and develop into a more hazardous problem, hence it may require monitoring. Adverse elements, however, can only delay matters. The European Civilisation is a binding force of significant magnitude. Accordingly, the superlative project in hand can be accomplished successfully.
Cultural Frontiers of Europe

Map 1. Frontiers of Greater Europe are determined primarily by cultural realities projected by the European Civilisation in conjunction with requisite geographic factors; accordingly, the European Union’s forthcoming global position can be determined incrementally.
Map 2. Western Europe, the Atlantic Ocean and the Mediterranean Sea; as a landmark, Lisbon is the most westerly city situated on the Atlantic.
Map 3. The Pacific Ocean outlook; as a landmark, Vladivostok is the most easterly city.
Map 4. Intercontinental frontiers of Greater Europe in the frozen north are extensive. A Polar view of the Northern Hemisphere demonstrates that the European zone faces North America across a vast maritime expanse. The divide is primarily political as both landmasses belong to the same Civilisation.
Map 5. Due to the receding sea ice in the Arctic region, the Northwest and Northeast passages can now be utilised as practical shortcuts during certain months of the year, connecting the Atlantic and Pacific oceans. This inhospitable and sparsely populated region carries practically no geopolitical risk. Its security can be effectuated by the continental states of the region.
Map 6. The most relevant internal geography from the latitudinal point of view, at its greatest continental expanse, stretches southwards from north-eastern Scandinavia, located in the Arctic Circle, to the Southernmost point, situated in warm climes.
Map 7. The European Cultural Frontiers stretch eastwards from the Strait of Gibraltar. The western Mediterranean is a major maritime frontier.
Map 8. Minor seas situated in the northern Mediterranean region. The Aegean Sea is a maritime Cultural Frontier. The eastern Balkans – or Thrace – is a land frontier that proceeds to the Black Sea.

Endangered Zones of Europe
Map 9. The Black Sea, between its northern and southern sectors, is a maritime frontier. The vast continental frontiers stretching eastwards towards the Pacific Ocean commence from the northern Caspian Sea region.
Map 10. The above illustration is a detail from a European map published during the second half of the Twentieth Century. Hochland von Armenien is the Southernmost continental demarcation of the European Cultural Frontiers. Currently, only the eastern sector of that country is situated within the said Frontiers.
Maps 11a & 11b. Northern Caspian to Vladivostok: the southern sector of this vast demarcation is controlled by four states – one being the most populous in the world – the northern sector is controlled by only one. Albeit, from territorial and demographic points of view, that northern state remains Europe’s leading nation and possesses the most effective defence capabilities within the European Cultural Frontiers.
Map 12. Although the Central Region of Western Europe currently remains at a significant distance from the contemporary continental External European Cultural Frontiers, in the past it has been challenged decisively by external non-European forces. Nevertheless, since the fall of Rome’s Imperium in the west, it has maintained a resolute defence against external adversaries. Its geography and population density have acted as defensive factors. With its dynamic spectrum of European cultures and a developed industrial base, ‘the heart of Europe’ it remains.
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