STUDIES IN POLITICS, SECURITY AND SOCIETY 20

Roman Kuźniar

Europe in the International Order

PETER LANG

STUDIES IN POLITICS, SECURITY AND SOCIETY 20

Roman Kuźniar

Europe in the International Order

The subject of this work is the rise and fall of Europe's aim to rebuild its position in global politics after the Cold War. With success in the unification of Europe and the subsequent deepening and enlargement of its integration, the Union set itself the ambitious task of becoming a global power, even a superpower. However, starting with the first decade of the XXI century, we have witnessed a rapid erosion of the international position of Europe (the EU). The author carefully analyses the causes of the EU's failure in pursuing the role of European representative, Europe thereby pretending to the role of one of three world powers. Besides cultural and demographic trends, the author identifies the main factors leading to this failure: the divergent interests of individual European powers, their incapacity to act in a geopolitical context and the rapid erosion of Europe's civilizational identity.
The rapid decline of Europe's international position threatens the appearance of a new and bipolar global arrangement together with the further marginalisation of Europe.

The Editor
Roman Kuźniar is Professor at the Chair of Strategic Studies, University of Warsaw. His research and publications focus both on Poland's and international security, human rights in international relations, contemporary world politics, Poland's foreign policy, strategic issues and Europe as an international actor. In the years 2010–2015, he was advisor to the President of Poland (Bronisław Komorowski) on international affairs. He also served as director of the Polish Institute of International Affairs and head of policy planning at the Polish Ministry for Foreign Affairs.

www.peterlang.com

Europe in the International Order

STUDIES IN POLITICS, SECURITY AND SOCIETY

Edited by Stanisław Sulowski
Institute of Political Science of the University of Warsaw

VOLUME
20

PETER LANG

Roman Kuźniar

Europe in the International Order

PETER LANG

Bibliographic Information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek
The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data is available in the internet at http://dnb.d-nb.de.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
A CIP catalog record for this book has been applied for at the Library of Congress.

This publication was financially supported by the Faculty of Political Science of the University of Warsaw.

Translated by Patrick Trompiz

ISSN 2199-028X
ISBN 978-3-631-75885-4 (Print)
E-ISBN 978-3-631-75886-1 (E-PDF)
E-ISBN 978-3-631-75887-8 (EPUB)
E-ISBN 978-3-631-75888-5 (MOBI)
DOI 10.3726/b14256

Peter Lang – Berlin · Bern · Bruxelles · New York · Oxford · Warszawa · Wien

This publication has been peer reviewed.

www.peterlang.com

Contents

Introduction

This book is about Europe's attempt to find its place in the international order today – in an international order which is, in fact, largely of Europe's own historical making. This attempt was undertaken after the end of the Cold War, the fall of the Iron Curtain and the abolition of the division of Europe into East and West, under the control of superpowers from outside of Europe. These efforts, made "in the name of Europe", were undertaken by the European Union (EU), itself a dream-come-true for many generations of Europeans and a response to their dramatic experiences, especially from the first half of the XX century. Europeans united as the EU not only for reasons of security and economic development, but also because they wished to rebuild the position of Europe on the world stage enabling its influence on the international order *post* Cold War. Europeans believed that the "Old Continent" could offer the world much in the way of values – its cultural heritage, ideas, a model of economic growth and social life. Yet much that we have witnessed in the second decade of the XXI century seems to indicate that this attempt is ending in fiasco before our very eyes.

Europe's current situation in international relations and its prospects for the future require that we take a step back and study its historical path to greatness – the long centuries it took to create its unique civilisation, the good and bad experiences undergone while building its identity and its relations with the outside world. There are elements of this identity to be found in ancient Greece and Rome – elements which come together to shape Europe's later shape and fortune. However, Europe itself – with an identity strongly marking it out from the surrounding world and forming the basis for relations between European nations – appeared in the Middle Ages, at the end of the first millennium. Turbulent centuries of war between European nations and against external invaders will come to pass – exhibiting a fascinating spiritual and material development. Finally, stable politico-territorial structures appeared on the basis of a shared civilisational foundation, enabling foreign policy and lasting relations between counterparts across the entire continent.

In this way, we arrive at the first genuine international order – that which developed in the Europe of the XVI and XVII centuries. The literature on our subject sometimes gives a contrary impression, but in fact neither the order represented by ancient Greece nor the orders created by ancient China or imperial Rome amounted to international orders in the sense intended here. Claiming otherwise is to fall victim to terminological and/or methodological imprecision. A variety

of authors have taken [these] imperial formations to represent an international order, with even superficial contacts between the frequently tentative territorial–political entities being granted the status of "international relations". The problems are compounded by the use of the terms "international order" and "world order" as interchangeable.[1] Equally careless is the common use of the concept of "international system",[2] also used interchangeably with "international order".

Without engaging at this point in deliberations of a terminological or methodological nature, let me say that for the purposes of this work I understand an international order to be a distinct geopolitical whole, made up of participants; relations between those participants regulated by agreed-upon norms (institutions); a balance of power stabilising the order, whereby questioning that balance of power may destabilise the order or even hasten its demise; an economic formation represented by the order's participants and finally a cultural–ideological sphere which sustains its coherence and legitimacy. Just such a whole arose in Europe and was raised up to ever greater heights of development in Europe itself. At the same time the European powers, in virtue of their level of advancement, extended the influence of Europe across the world – via colonialism, imperialism – and ensured Europe's hegemony in the global order which Europe itself had created (the turn of the XIX and XX centuries). After World War I, Europe added to its order a normative dimension in the form of the system of the League of Nations. Thanks to its economic and military superiority, colonial influences and its leadership role in the League of Nations, Europe appeared to sit on top of the pyramid implicit in the world's international order.

This position of dominance as a world power was suddenly challenged by two revisionist powers: fascist Germany and the communist Soviet Union. Those powers had appeared in aggressive opposition both to the newly created international order – at this moment in its "Versailles stage" – and to the very economic and political system of "old Europe". As a consequence of World War II, Europe not only lost its former position, but it was also deprived of real influence on the international order. One part of Europe became a protectorate of the United States, while the other part became a vassal of the international system created

1 Including H. Kissinger, the author of the fundamental work: *World Order*, New York, 2014. However, Kissinger has no doubts that, "What passes for order in our time was devised in Western Europe nearly four centuries ago…", pp. 3–4.

2 An example of the aforementioned "carefree attitude" to methodology is the well-known work (one indeed based on extensive historical material): *International Systems in World History: Remaking the Study of International Relations* by B. Buzan, R. Little, Oxford, 2000.

by the Soviet Union. The western part of this division was, however, able to preserve and develop its own cultural identity, laying the foundations for impressive economic growth. It was in the west too that the first steps were taken towards a united and integrated Europe (the European Community).

After the gaps of the Cold War period had been bridged, Europe took up the most ambitious, peaceful unification project of its history – the EU. The goal of this project was both to support Europe in its quest to become a "global power" – even a "superpower" (in the words of the British Prime Minister) –, one ready to participate in the resolution of the leading international issues of the day, and to influence the very parameters of the world order. To this end, the first decade of the EU's existence witnessed the birth of a whole series of institutional mechanisms, beginning with the Maastricht Treaty of 1991–1992. These institutional innovations were meant to serve the effective representation of the Union, its interests and initiatives on the international stage. They were also meant to maximise the combined potential of member states in exerting their influence on regions both nearer to and further from Europe, in accordance with Europe's values, security and stability. Above all, at stake was a common foreign and security policy. Somewhat later a military component was added as well as one-person organs representing the EU to the world – the High Representative and the President of the European Council.

For the first fifteen or so years of the EU, everything went according to plan, for all appearances following the plot of a well-written script. Success followed success for the Union – the Schengen Zone, the eurozone, the expansion of the Union, defence policy. Then, all of a sudden, at the end of the 2000s, this line of development collapsed. Internal crises combined with publicised divisions to deprive the EU of its ability to impact the global region surrounding it. At first one might have thought that this was a transitory stage that the Community would overcome as it had in the past, emerging strengthened, perhaps even going on to take a further step in the process of integration. But this time nothing of the sort looked on the cards. On the contrary, on top of a passing but deep crisis (financial or political) there appeared long-term problematic tendencies. At the same time, a contributing factor was the so-called "return" of the rest of the world to the international stage. Everything seemed to suggest that Europe, and with it the Union, was in something of a "Spenglerian" crisis. While it is true that perhaps the first work to declare a new phase in the international order came with the title "Post-American" (F. Zakaria), it might have been more appropriate to speak of a "post-Western" order, and in particular of a "post-European" order.

Though one must be concerned by the accelerated erosion of the civilisational foundation of Europe and the dramatic shrinking of its demographic potential,

this work is not going to be one about Europe's "twilight". Proclamations of this kind would be premature, for Europe still has at its disposal significant material potential and superiority in some areas. If it is indeed appropriate to speak of a twilight, then it is only one in its first phase. This book speaks of the contribution of Europe in the development of the global international order, and then about the necessary and ambitious attempt of Europe to find its place in the latest, post-Cold-War version of that order. That this attempt has ended in fiasco – a fiasco also brought on by the fact that the European powers have begun to treat the EU as they once treated the League of Nations – should not deter the nations of Europe from searching for a better way to express their collective interests and projects. We should begin by restoring the EU's former functionality. This is not an easy task and is one of the subjects at issue here. It is hard to say whether this restoration is still possible, or whether a new institutional form will be required. This in turn will depend on whether the situation we are currently witnesses to is merely a passing "illness" of the European organism and a crisis of form alone, or whether Europe's "civilisational fuel" is simply running out. In the case of stars, once their energy has gone, their light continues for a time to reach us – though the star itself has already disappeared.

Roman Kuźniar

Part I The March of Europe through History: From Charlemagne to the Cold War

1 Europe Becomes an International Order

1 The ancient roots of the European international order – Greece

The early first signs of a future international order in Europe were provided by the microcosmos of ancient-Greek city-states. Two thousand years later Europe would be able to witness how the instincts, practices, logic and ideas of those times came to shape the now full-blooded international relations of European modernity. From the VIII to the VII centuries BC, not only where Greece lies today but also along the Mediterranean coasts (and the coasts of the smaller seas of the region), there emerged a constellation of city-states representing ancient Hellas. These Greeks were capable warriors, travellers and merchants. Thanks to their mastery of the craft of sailing in the waters around them, they easily gained control of the scattered islands and established colonies in Asia Minor. However, it was mostly on the continent of Europe that they developed a territorial–political form of organisation that had not been seen before and has not been seen since – the autonomous city-state or *polis*. The polis came, with time, to be the subject of the relations within the constellation of city-states as well as those with the outside world.

Two axes or poles came rather quickly to structure this region – Athens and Sparta. They fought between themselves for leadership position, but perhaps were even more motivated to *block the other* from acquiring a position of hegemony over the rest of the world of Greek *poleis*. These two poles did not impose a sharp duality: from time to time other pretenders came forward, but above all because Athens and Sparta joined forces to face common foes – especially the Persians. These two centres also represented two kinds of political system in the Greek city-state: democracy and oligarchy. Sometimes "tyranny" took hold, but this was not at that time a cruel system based on oppression and the persecution of subjects. Tyranny rather meant *autocracy*, which of course does not mean there were not cases of abuse of power by the "tyrants". And democracies and oligarchies were also capable of being cruel systems with "democracy" in any case excluding slaves and women from the enfranchised. The division of systems was at least significant to the extent that it gave reason to go to war: democratic Athens desired the overthrow of oligarchies and Sparta the oligarchy lent support to city-states which resisted or overthrew democracy – to return power to the "rightful" oligarchs.

The kind of political system will also come to play an important role in the international relations of contemporary Europe, which is why it is worth recalling what was said about the virtues and vices of democracy by one of democracy's greatest supporters, the Athenian politician Pericles (end of V century BC). It was because of democracy that they were an example to others. "We have a form of government which does not emulate the practice of our neighbours: we are more an example to others than an imitation of them. Our constitution is called a democracy because we govern in the interests of the majority, not just the few. Our laws give equal rights to all in private disputes, but public preferment depends on individual distinction and is determined largely by merit rather than rotation: and poverty is no barrier to office, if a man despite his humble condition has the ability to do some good to the city. We are open and free in the conduct of our public affairs […] in all public matters we abide by the law […] We cultivate beauty without extravagance, and intellect without loss of vigor; wealth is for us the gateway to action, not the subject of boastful talk".[3] But it was Pericles who already pointed out the weaknesses of this system, weaknesses that came to light in the first stage of the Peloponnesian War. The Athenians did not heed the words of Pericles and "did the opposite […], and in other ways too which seemed to have no relevance to the war they pursued policies motivated by private ambition and private gain, to the detriment of Athens herself and her allies…". Commenting on this speech, Thucydides wrote: "What was happening was democracy in name, but [was] in fact the domination of the leading man". Nevertheless, he tried to be fair to Pericles, adding: "Pericles' successors were more on a level with one another, and because each was striving for first position they were inclined to indulge popular whim even in matters of state policy".[4] And as our Greek historian continues, the main sickness of democracy turned out to be the fighting of various factions which shook the state and weakened it. "The cause of all this was the pursuit of power driven by greed and ambition, leading in turn to the passions of the party rivalries thus established. The dominant men on each side in the various cities employed fine-sounding terms, claiming espousal either of democratic rights for all or of a conservative aristocracy, but the public whose interests they professed to serve were in fact their ultimate prize…".[5] We may easily perceive

3 Thucydides, tr. Hammond, Martin, *The Peloponnesian War*, Kindle Edition, OUP, Oxford, 2009, pp. 91–92.

4 *Ibidem*, p. 106.

5 *Ibidem*, p. 171. Thucydides also writes that, "in this out-and-out contest for supremacy they committed the most appalling atrocities and took their acts of vengeance yet further, imposing punishments beyond anything required by justice or civic interest,

an analogous situation in the politics of contemporary Europe. The primitive instincts which sustain internal conflicts are also present in the relations *between* the various Greek poleis.

The logic and principles of these relations will develop both out of the instincts of the rulers of internal city-state politics and out of the necessity of defence from the outside world. Which is why the reality of these external relations will remain above all war. The Greeks will have their first serious encounters with war with their Eastern and for some time powerful neighbour – the expansive Persian empire. The series of "King of kings" – from Cyrus and Darius in the VI century BC – attempted to subdue the Greek colonies in Asia Minor as well as the city-states from the border areas. These Greek cities, in rebellion against the Persian rule, looked to Athens – by then a Hellenic "power". So, it was that the turn of the VI and V centuries was marked by the Greco-Persian wars. Further chapters in this historical epic will be: the conquest and destruction of the Greek Miletus by the Persians (494 BC), the failure of the Persian expedition against the Athenians at Marathon (490 BC) and the battle of Thermopylae ("Passerby, go tell the Spartans…") (480 BC), where Hellenic solidarity in the face of a common enemy was evident but which nevertheless did not protect Athens from destruction. Zygmunt Kubiak writes that out of the wars with the Persians, "the idea of freedom – or perhaps it was the idea of independence – took hold in Greece. This was the idea of the independence of the *poleis*, whether democratic like Athens or subject to a structure of stern discipline, like Sparta".[6] To protect them, the Greeks were forced to found for the first time a coalition, known as the Delian League. Run by Athens, it was a kind of system of joint defence which became a model for subsequent alliances. But Athens also used the League to consolidate their leadership position, sometimes hegemonic in nature, towards the other city-states that made up the League. It is also worth recalling that there were not infrequent cases where Greek city-states went over to join the Persian side that was able to influence the city-states in a variety of ways, including pecuniary.

With time, the Persian threat diminished (internal problems befell the empire) and the Greeks were able to focus on their own goals. These were not limited to literature, art, games, the cult of gods or the cultivation of vineyards. Greece will enter a series of internal wars and persistent battles with her neighbours, as well as embarking on pointless expeditions which with time will come to exhaust

and limited only by their supporters' appetite at the time…". And he concludes: "Thus civil wars brought every form of depravity to the Greek world…" (p. 171).

6 Z. Kubiak, *Dzieje Greków i Rzymian* [*The History of the Greeks and the Romans*], Świat Książki, Warsaw, 2003, p. 66.

Greece and make her easy prey for the external conqueror. The first of these wars will be the Peloponnesian War, made familiar to Europe by the work of Thucydides. Greece never learnt the lesson of this war: by its length (twenty-seven years), pointlessness, the level of destruction and cruelty it may be compared to the European Thirty Years' War.[7] The Peloponnesian War was a war between Athens and Sparta for leadership position in the Greek world. Though both sides were prompted by predominantly low motives, the ultimate cause of the conflict was the greater ambition of Athens and her intolerance of the strength, independence and political character of Sparta. Sparta, on the other hand, was ready to upset the hegemonic plans of its rival, exhibiting at the same time an aristocratic–democratic sense of superiority. Some twenty-odd centuries later, the account of this war – with a precise description of the parties' underlying instincts and arguments, the logic and principles of the ongoing conflict – will form the basis of the realist school of thought in international relations.

Thucydides emphasises "human nature" which dominates over laws and justice and pushes people towards evil. By human nature he had in mind one's self-interest, fear of one's enemies and ambition.[8] The primacy of power over law – the foundation stone of the realist school – was frankly laid out by the Athenian representatives at the beginning of the Peloponnesian War. "Nor again did we start anything new in this, but it has always been the way of the world that the weaker is kept down by the stronger. And we think we are worthy of our power. There was a time when you thought so too, but now you calculate your own advantage and talk of right and wrong – a consideration which has never yet deterred anyone from using force to make a gain when opportunity presents". And further: "The reason is that those who can get their way by force have no need for the process of law".[9] The Athenians were not the only ones of their times who presented and practiced the hard rules of realism (as we well know, these rules are present in the thinking of world powers at the beginning of the XXI century AD). The Corinthians, encouraging their Peloponnesian allies to confront the Athenians, said: "A peace won through war has a firmer base: to

7 In view of the costs borne, it is hard to see the point of the Thirty Years' War, yet religious freedom was a stake besides the interests of the powers involved, that is the freedom from the imposition of a given religion which was important for the future peace of Europe. This element of the pursuit of religious freedom is missing from the Peloponnesian War.

8 Thucydides, *op. cit.*, p. 172; K. Kumaniecki in the Preface to his Polish translation of the Peloponnesian War, *Wojna peloponeska*, Czytelnik, Warsaw, 1988, p. X.

9 *Ibidem*, p. 38.

refuse war for the sake of the quiet life runs the greater risk".[10] The Athenians were notorious for the severity of their treatment of allies who were not willing to bear the burdens of their protection (i.e. payment of tribute, ruthlessly levied by the Athenians). The harsh punishments served as a deterrent, discouraging others from rebellion against the hegemony of the metropolis which lay under the Acropolis. A paradigm of this severe realism is the argumentation with which they defended the necessity of subduing the peaceful inhabitants of the Island of Melos. The Athenian ambassadors explained that, "we are here in the interests of our own empire, yes", but they also wish to save Melos, "Our desire is to take you under our rule without trouble…". The Athenian demand was simple: they wanted the Melians to become their allies and pay them tribute. When the Melians, invoking justice and honour, offered them friendship and neutrality, the Athenians refused, arguing in the following manner: "Your friendship is more dangerous to us than your hostility. To our subjects friendship indicates a weakness on our part, but hatred is a sign of our strength". The Melians, however, did not succumb to the imperial overtures of the Athenians and took up arms in defence of their freedom. In the end, they gave in to the overwhelming force of the Athenians who murdered all their men, sold their women and children into slavery, and then colonised the island.[11]

The Peloponnesian War, though cruel and pointless, became the paradigm case for future alliances. Many and short-lived were the alliances that were established in this war, and this despite the fact they were often agreed for long periods of time – even for fifty years! Such was the term of the alliance between the Athenians and the Lacedaemonians that it envisaged mutual support in the event of external attacks, guaranteeing that neither party would have to fight off an aggressor alone. The parties did not trust each other from the start, however, and other city-states tried to pull their alliance apart – with success in fact, when, after a few years, the former allies renewed their war. Somewhat later, a similar alliance – concluded for a period of hundred years – united the Athenians with other Peloponnesian city-states. It was an agreement to provide mutual support in the event of aggression from outside parties and the commitment to refrain from hurting the interests of the other party to the alliance. The alliance was concluded with an oath: "I shall abide by the alliance on the terms agreed with all justice, fidelity, and honesty, and I shall not violate it by any means or contrivance". The individual clauses of the text and the language of the covenant

10 *Ibidem*, p. 60.
11 *Ibidem*, pp. 301–307.

could have appeared without shame in the Treaty of Washington or the Warsaw Pact from the middle of the XX century AD.[12] Yet this alliance did not last long either. In the history of Greece, there were many relations which were similar to alliances and were for either collective security or collective defence; some were aggressive, some were ad hoc. Some, especially those concluded by Athens, enabled a party to influence the internal situation of an allied polis, that is these alliances were a means of extorting protection and strengthening (in this case) Athens' leadership position. In various constellations of city-states, besides the opposition of Athens and Sparta, a permanent problem of the relations was the autonomy of the city-states, preserving a balance between them, the pursuit of a leadership role or hegemony.[13] The Athenians themselves often referred to their hegemony as an empire "which they richly deserved".

Let us say it once again: these relations breathed the air of war. Thucydides writes about the nature of war in the same way as war's greatest theoretician Clausewitz, writing twenty-two centuries later. The greatest historian of the Greeks writes that, "War is not something that proceeds on set rules – far from it: for the most part war devises its own solutions to meet any contingency".[14] The Greeks will go on to become the masters of pointless, self-destructive wars. Already at the time of the Peloponnesian War, the Athenians, wanting to make up for their lack of success in the confrontation with the Greeks from the peninsula, made a decision to mobilise against Sicily. They decided to embark on this expedition democratically, easily convinced by those who promised easy loot, which after all the empire "deserved", at the same time being able to consolidate their security. How European were the arguments for war laid out to the Athenians by Alcibiades, the aristocrat and demagogue: "And we cannot ration ourselves to some voluntary limit of empire. Given the position we have reached, we have

12 *Ibidem*, pp. 283–284, 298–299.

13 M.A. Cichocki, *Problem politycznej jedności w Europie* [*The Problem of Political Unity in Europe*], PISM, Warsaw, 2012, pp. 30–35.

14 Thucydides, *op. cit.*, p. 58. Von Clausewitz writes of war as "*more* than a chameleon" [emphasis added] but it is at least that: "War is more than a true chameleon that slightly adapts its characteristics to the given case. As a total phenomenon its dominant tendencies always make war a paradoxical trinity – composed of primordial violence, hatred, and enmity, which are to be regarded as a blind natural force; of the play of chance and probability within which the creative spirit is free to roam; and of its element of subordination, as an instrument of policy, which makes it subject to reason alone." V. Clausewitz, M. Howard and P. Paret (ed. and tr.), Princeton University Press, New Jersey, 1989, Book One, Chapter One, Section 28: The Consequences for Theory.

no choice but to keep hold of our present subjects and lay designs on more, because there is the danger that, if we do not rule others, others will rule us".[15] For Greece did not only produce strategists (in the narrow sense of this word), but above all it also produced demagogues (in the worst sense of the term), demagogues who destroyed their democracy. The extravagantly equipped Sicilian expedition ended in unprecedented catastrophe, contributing to the final failure of Athens in the Peloponnesian War. Athens never again reached its former glory, and in the ensuing chaos it was easier for the rather small Macedonia – ethnically and culturally akin – to gain control of the conflicted and weakened nebula of *poleis*. Macedonia's King Philip II entered Hellas almost without a fight, because the Athenians, despite the wonderful speeches of Demosthenes, were neither inclined to fork out on defence nor come to the aid of those who were in the first line of danger from the Macedonians. Athens brings to mind our own Rzeczpospolita during the last 150 years of its existence.

After Philip II, power passed to his son, the favourite of historians – Alexander the Great. His expedition into the heart of Asia (334–323 BC) – financed by his almost complete conquest of Greece – was as pointless and destructive as the Athens' Sicilian expedition nearly a century before. This aspiring empire of a madly ambitious, despotic and capricious leader – despite also being an exceptional general – collapsed and vanished without trace within two decades of his death. Neither his education with Aristotle nor his legendary, ingenious cutting of the Gordian knot was to any avail.[16] After his death, Athens became a mere province.

The reality of Greek wars was sometimes exceptionally cruel. The victors might completely destroy the conquered city and murder its population (especially the men – women and children were more often sold into slavery). Which is why the Sicilians defended themselves against the Athenians with such

15 *Ibidem*, p. 318. Alcibiades' argumentation is reminiscent of the behaviour of the current president of Russia, Vladimir Putin.

16 This did not stop Zygmunt Kubiak – in any case a great classicist – from writing with characteristic emphasis: "Jakiej to jednak wymagało męki, tak zmienić świat, jak on zmienił" ["What a struggle it was, to change the world as he did"], *op. cit.*, p. 183. Yet Alexander's "empire" was only a region controlled directly by his ever-advancing army. He had no influence on the rule over these provinces, each being run by a local or a Macedonian satrap. Nor was Alexander's expedition a channel for the transmission of Hellenic culture. Influence went rather in the opposite direction – Alexander being affected especially by Persian culture.

determination.[17] When it came to their own security, they stubbornly ignored the criticisms made by the Corinthians both towards themselves and towards their allies. These criticisms were made in the context of their joint efforts to fend off the ever-advancing Athenians: the accusation of a lack of reason, weakness of character and carelessness. By not heeding the warnings, they fell into a complacence which blinds and brings the greatest of harm.[18]

The end of the Greek order of city-states came at the turn of the III and II centuries BC when their relations (coalitions) – whether formed to fight among each other or with an external enemy (still Macedonia) – began to impact Rome, the rising power, and connect their security arrangements. The decisive step was taken by the Aetolian League who invited Rome to settle the question of its domination of Greece – which, it turned out, did not require any great battles. The final episode in the transformation of the microcosmos of the Greek *poleis* into a Roman province came with the pacification of the Achaean League (Corinth and its vicinity) by the Roman forces in around 150 BC.[19] The new power gratefully accepted the most valuable achievements of Greek civilisation. Greece was unable to form an international order – its inhabitants belonged to a single nation, believed in the same gods, had the same culture. Yet they bequeathed to what was to become Europe bad and good experiences of a pluralistic, decentralised society of city-states, the experiences of war and peace, attempts at hegemony and alliances aimed at restoring balance, political thought of distinction combined with scurrilous political practice. The Hellenic "proto-order" permits us to speak of Greece as a "proto-Europe".

2 The pre-European experience of empire – Rome

Ancient Rome bequeathed to Europe – what Europe would apply in its attempts at an international order – the idea of an empire, the imperial instinct and a model empire to imitate. Rome is already much closer in time to Europe than the

17 As one of leaders declared to inspire them to greater determination in their self-defence, "the Athenians are not only enemies but the worst of enemies. They came against our country to enslave it. If they had succeeded in this, they would have brought the ultimate suffering on our men, the worst indignities on our children and women, and on the whole city the most shameful name there can be." Thucydides, *op. cit*., p. 401.

18 *Ibidem*, p. 57: "People whose present comfort makes them reluctant to act will quickly find that inaction brings the loss of that agreeable ease which caused their reluctance: and people who make grand presumptions after military success have not realized the fragility of the confidence which excites them."

19 Z. Kubiak, *op. cit*., pp. 303–306; M.A. Cichocki, *op. cit*., pp. 42–43.

Hellenic "proto-order", partly because when Europe proper came into existence with the Carolingian Empire, the Eastern Roman Empire (the Byzantine Empire) was still in existence. Rome provided an attractive example because of her size. Furthermore, it was in Roman territory that Christianity developed – at first ruthlessly resisted, then granted a legal place, finally become the official state religion. The process by which Rome metamorphosed into an empire lasted a long time – even for technical reasons it could not have happened faster. Rome had no imperial design or ideology to follow, though various Roman Caesars and consuls before them had demonstrated imperial instincts. Nevertheless, Rome was an empire pure and simple, and there were attempts to replicate Rome in Europe once Europe – thanks in part to Rome – had become a political–territorial entity conscious of its own identity.

During the first few centuries of its existence (regardless of the date and legend we adopt as constituting that beginning), Rome built its position of primacy in Italy, that is in its own backyard, in the V to the III centuries BC. Subsequently, its neighbours provoked its expansion – the Greek colonies of the Italian peninsula and Greece itself seeking Rome's protection. A similar challenge presented itself in the conflict with Carthage for the Greco-Italian Sicily, which led to the series of Punic Wars (three altogether). From northern Africa, passing through Spain and the Alps, came Hannibal himself. He arrived in the direct vicinity of Rome, expressly with the purpose of holding back the rise of his Roman rival in the western part of the Mediterranean. Victory over the aggressive Carthage in the III century BC allowed Rome to dominate the region. The acquisition of the "windfall" of Greece's territories up to and including those in Asia Minor, as well as northern Africa and the northern coast of the Mediterranean, unexpectedly made Rome master of this extensive sea. In the II century BC, these successes only whetted Rome's appetite for more. All this took place in the times of the Republic when consuls oversaw the Senate. Despite civil wars between the ambitious governors of individual provinces and the generals of legions, as well as slave revolts (Spartacus), Rome in the I century BC did not lose its desire to conquer.

In hindsight, the most significant conquest was that of Gaul, achieved by the "Roman Alexander the Great", Julius Caesar, in the middle of the I century BC. Julius Caesar's conquests differed from those of the Macedonian: he connected the conquered peoples and regions to the metropolis and they thereby became a part of the empire with its power structures, culture, law and administration. Julius Caesar went on to expand the empire to include the rest of Iberia and a small part of North Africa. His successor Octavian continued in like manner, expanding the borders of Rome in Europe, North Africa and Asia Minor. The Empire would later stretch from the Persian Gulf through the Pillars of Hercules

(the Gibraltar Strait), from Egypt to the English Channel and the Rhine and the Danube. But the most significant of these conquests and assimilations was Gaul. It was in Gaul that the seeds of the future Europe would lie dormant and later sprout into the first European empire – the state of Charlemagne. Neither the Greeks nor the Romans regarded themselves as Europeans, indeed the very term "Europe" had a merely geographical connotation, concerning the northern coast of the Mediterranean, as opposed to the eastern coastline (Asia) and the southern (Africa),[20] all three being parts of the greater whole that was a single empire consisting of some fifteen-odd provinces.

An empire modelled on the Roman example might have seemed attractive to the Europe of the Middle Ages if we take the period from Octavian Augustus (27 to 14 BC) through Vespasian to the times of Trajan and Hadrian at the turn of the I and II centuries AD. Those were Rome's glory days, even if we leave out the madness of Caligula and Nero. The *Pax Augusta* was a period of sufficient peace, of restrained governance, a rule which ensured stability, security and the stable prosperity of citizens. Rome's territory expanded, but not as the result of bloody conquest but through a combination of *soft power* and, of course, military force, but even then mainly in response to barbarian intrusions. Borders shifted to strengthen the security of the existing extent of the empire. The divine Augustus himself preferred to be known as the Restorer of Rome (the initiator of many constructions, renovating and developing infrastructure) once the period of civil war had finished. He himself had been a party to that conflict, reaching the zenith of his power only after defeating Mark Antony with whom he had earlier formed the triumvirate.[21] The honorific "Father of the Country" (*Pater Patriae*) was very much deserved. After nearly two centuries of prosperity there came a long period of crisis – degeneration in the manner of ruling; the decline of republican virtues; the spread of the parasitic role of the aristocracy; the neglect of domestic production, especially agricultural, progressive depopulation; and the need to acquire cheap labour, soldiers and products from foreign sources. The Empire was able to continue living off previously acquired wealth for some time. The Diocletian Reforms at the turn of the II and IV centuries seemed to revitalise the empire, but it was only to be for a short time. After 395, when Theodosius formally divided the empire into two parts, its western part (Europe to-be) did not survive even a hundred years despite centuries of history.

---

20 The term "Europe" appeared at that time, that is between the II century BC and the II century AD, in the work of a few geographers and historians, including Polybius, Strabo and Ptolemy.

21 Z. Kubiak, *op. cit.*, pp. 435–483.

(The division of the empire into west and east had in fact appeared much earlier with Diocletian if not earlier.) By 476, the German military leader Odoacer had overthrown the last emperor in Rome, sending his crown to Constantinople and himself becoming king of Italy. The weaknesses of the Roman Empire opened the way for barbarians pressing in from outside. They wanted to enjoy the fruits of Rome's civilisation but were unable to sustain it, unable as they were to assimilate its code of culture, its public ethos.

As an empire, Rome owed its greatness to the excellent organisation of its state authorities and of the space it ruled over. For its first centuries it had been a republic, but even when it became an empire it held onto many republican tools of governance. Individual institutions of this system long ensured what was for those times the highly efficient operation of the republic. The assemblies (representative of the people) expressed opinions and sometimes took decisions, the Senate gathered the most distinguished personalities (qualified advisors, including legislative advisors), officials and executive offices (consuls, proconsuls), the judiciary, that is the praetors, censors with a variety of roles (including the gathering of statistical data), the equites who also dealt with a range of issues (from trade to taxes), tribunes of the people – the ombudsmen of the rights and opinions of the people. These were elected, rotating positions and, what is important, they could be occupied by people coming from the lowest levels of society. This principle also applied to the emperors who were most often selected from among the most successful military leaders. Besides good organisation and civilisational superiority, it was precisely the army which was the basis for the empire, the instrument of its expansion, the demonstration of its vitality and, of course, the guarantee of its security and territorial integrity. Rome had at its disposal what no other power at that time in that part of the world had – a professional army. Conscripts served for fifteen to twenty years. They had time to learn their craft, to master the technology and tactics of battle and to learn how to solve the problems of logistics and related issues concerning army supplies (in this the legions of Julius Caesar were unrivalled.) It was thanks to these skills that Julius Caesar was able to carry out "Blitzkrieg" wars – something no one else managed until Napoleon. Julius Caesar's *Gallic Wars* were ahead of their times by some fifteen centuries.[22] Still, it bears repeating: the foundation stone of Rome's military successes and its expansion was its entire *civilisational superiority* to the rest of the world at that time.

22 J. Caesar, *The Gallic War*, Loeb Classical Library, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1989.

Rome's advance as an empire led to tensions between the republic and the centralisation of power. For centralisation meant in the hands of someone able to ensure effective rule and success in relation to the outside world (with victories over barbarians, expansion of territory and glory to Rome). The republican framework was not able to satisfy the ambitions of the victorious Julius Caesar. Glorified as the conqueror of Gaul, he pursued a brutal civil war and became the sole ruler – an emperor. He united in his own person the roles of consul, commander in chief of the army, the head of the Senate and highest priest (*pontifex maximus*). Thus he aspired to divine status. The speeches of Cato, the defender of the republic, were to no avail and he took his own life unable to bear the fall of the republic. Julius Caesar ruled for a short time, just a few years, stabbed to death in the Senate by supporters of the republic. Yet their triumph was also short-lived – the empire needed an emperor, and that emperor (following another short civil war) was Octavian Augustus. He also concentrated in his hands the same powers as Julius Caesar had, and this situation remained unchanged until the final Roman provinces enjoyed a considerable measure of administrative autonomy, to facilitate the management of such an enormous empire. The empire was superbly integrated by, among other things, its network of roads enabling rapid travel and communication. The empire's strength, besides the general organisation of state authority, was also a unified legal system. It is said that Greece gave Europe philosophy and the aesthetic canon while Rome, besides the organisation of the state, gave Europe law. First there was customary law; this was followed by positive law, with clear procedures and sanctions enforced and amended in the codes of particular Caesars (the greatest codifier being Justinian the Great, the emperor of the East Roman empire in the VI century AD). There was a veritable army of professional jurists, creating great legal works and schools of law. Particular attention was paid not only to the law defining the personhood of a physical person, citizenship (i.e. freedom), property – but also to the status of other inhabitants of the empire. After the fall of the Western Roman Empire, in the area Europe would come to occupy, the region underwent a deep legal regress. "Pre-Europe" witnessed a period of wildness, lawlessness, chaos, in short – barbarity. The later nostalgia for empire was also a longing for the rule of law – "it might be severe law, but it was law nonetheless" (*dura lex, sed lex*). From the XII century, Roman law would find its place in European universities.

Ancient Rome achieved fame for its many civilisational achievements. In the actual exercise of power as an empire, however, it revealed its weaker sides. The majority of Caesars suffered unnatural deaths often accompanied by their wives and children. (Cleopatra preferred to take poison after Mark Antony's death rather than wait for her fate at the hands of the people of the victorious

Octavius.) Christians were fed to wild animals and the conquest of Gaul led to the deaths of a third of its population. In the civil wars alone whole legions were decimated. And yet it was a better life under the empire than beyond its borders. The excellent Polish classicist Zygmunt Kubiak, though at times uncritical towards the empire, seems to hit the mark when he cites the opinion of a wise Greek: one prayed that the dominion of Rome would last for ages. Subjects of the empire felt liberated from the constant, pointless fighting they had had to deal with pre-Rome. The Greek cities under Rome no longer clamoured over illusory goods but sought to outshine each other in wisdom and beauty. Why were the Romans able to rule? Because they combined strength with gentleness.[23]

3 The emergence of Europe and the European international order

It is hardly surprising after the early part of the Middle Ages, the so-called "Dark Ages", Europeans longed for empire to overcome the brutal chaos around them. "Europeans" came onto the scene nearly 300 years after the fall of the (Western) Roman Empire. The term "European" was used for the first time to describe the army of Charles "the Hammer" Martel. The Battle of Tours of 732 held off the army of the Umayyad Caliphate who had earlier taken Iberia with ease. In this area, there already existed the country of the Franks who had much earlier conquered Gall after it was abandoned by Rome. There the Franks encountered Latin culture – preserved by Christianity and preserving the memory of empire – and they assimilated that civilisation as best they could. As far as the conception of empire was concerned, it was still highly simplistic. The ideal of empire has been accurately reconstructed by Marek A. Cichocki[24] – "the pursuit of universalism, the pursuit of hegemony by expansion, globalism, territorial expansion, conviction of the universal validity of the model" – but still this was far from the thinking and efforts of the Middle Ages. The creators of the first European empire (Charlemagne and his milieu, as well as his immediate predecessors and heirs) had a much simpler ideal – a state and a ruler completely in charge of their territory, that is a sovereign political and territorial entity, with a supranational scope (able to encompass several nations). Charlemagne's state was supposed only to include Christian nations, whereas all of Rome's borders lay in lands which effectively resisted Rome. The expansion of Rome was not justified much or at all by religious or ideological motives. It was a matter of civilisational superiority as

23 Z. Kubiak, *op. cit.*, p. 483.
24 M.A. Cichocki, *op. cit.*, p. 55.

evidenced by their military power and to which the weaker and less developed must succumb, accepting Rome's dominion and the principle that might makes right. An unquestioned legitimation of empire, however, and one Charlemagne was also able to prove, was its provision of peace and security. Empire allowed for stable development – of production, agriculture, trade. People ceased to live in fear of their neighbours; they could *travel* once again, as they had under Rome. Against the bleak backdrop of contemporary Europe with its war of all against all where various marauding tribes and their leaders brought death, destruction and pillaging (whether Huns, Ostrogoths, Alemanni, Vandals, Pannonian Avars and their like), the imperial alternative was highly attractive.

It is worth recalling a certain paradox: whereas the monoethnic Greece was a "proto international order", the multi-ethnic Rome was an out-and-out empire. Perhaps that is why Europe first developed as an empire yet the attempts to sustain it in this form were not successful – neither in the Middle Ages nor later. The empire of Charles the Great was perhaps an essential stepping stone, but it was nevertheless only a stepping stone *en route* to the international European order which at first was reminiscent of Greece's constellation of city-states. Charles, who ruled the Franks from 768 and quickly became known as "the Great" (Charlemagne), decided that he would bring all the lands of western Christendom under his sceptre. And he was successful: from central Italy to Belgium, from eastern Germany (where western Slavs also lived) to Gaul (almost in its entirety). In recognition of this feat, the Pope crowned him Emperor (800 AD), in some way requiring of Charles that he build Christian Europe after the imperial model. This is another irony of our story: Christians had been persecuted by the Romans, managed to survive the fall of that empire, now served to legitimise a new emergent empire, even playing the role of co-host of that empire. This was also Charlemagne's wish: he consciously built up his empire on the spiritual and ideological foundation of Christianity, as well as in opposition to neighbouring lands – the barbarians and the East Roman Empire, at that time a more advanced civilisation. Christianity was supposed to support the acceleration of Europe's development, and it did.

Firstly, as H.G. Wells wrote, thanks to Christianity the empire "conquered its conquerors, the barbarians". He also argues that, "Had it not been for the monks and Cristian missionaries Latin learning might have perished altogether". It is true that the empire, when it came to lack reason and the will to survive, died. But something else was born in its place: "the Latin-speaking half of the Catholic Church". The Church survived the early Middle Ages, a time of darkness and dread, rife with warlords, because "it had books and a great system of teachers and missionaries to hold it together", "it appealed to the minds and wills of men"

and these, Wells concludes, were "things stronger than any law or legions".[25] To the Christian foundation of the Carolingians – above all to Charlemagne – the Church accorded "gravity and unity to the power of the state [powagę i jedność władzy państwowej]" (Jan Baszkiewicz).[26] The lands of the Holy Roman Empire were not mere provinces that conquered and attached to a "centre" as in Roman times; they were constituents of equal standing. Latin became the official state language and the whole was welded together not only by Catholicism but also by sound military organisation, efficient civil and Church administration, and the development of infrastructure as well as of literature, science and art, all which were patronised generously by Charlemagne. The empire was vertically organised according to the feudal system. This system required the loyalty which still obtained in the times of Charlemagne himself, but later disintegrated due to the increase in wealth, power and autonomy of the counts and bishops – that is the entire, diversified aristocracy. Which is why the empire of Charlemagne did not survive long after the death of its founder who has with justice been referred to as the Father of Europe. The empire lasted sufficiently long to allow for the process of the synthesis, the joining of three defining constituent elements for European identity. The borders of these three subsequently defined the borders of Europe: the borders of Greece, Rome and Christendom. "Europe" acquired an *identity* and was no longer merely the name of a geographical region.

Charlemagne's empire fell apart along ethnic borderlines. They were still weakly designated at the time, but still they were already the basis for the formation of political societies. The grandchildren of the great predecessor first started to fight among themselves, until in 843 they signed a treaty at Verdun. On its basis, the empire was divided into three states: the west went to Charles, the central-southern region to Lothar and the east to Ludwig. Broadly speaking, these states represented the future France, Italy and Germany. The title of Emperor first fell to Lothar I, but relatively quickly came to the Ottonian house and the German imperial line. The Ottonians, especially Otto III, had the ambition of recreating the empire of Charlemagne to be comprised of *four* equal parts: Italy, Gaul, Germany and the Sclaveni. The last of these and the newest were otherwise known as Slavs; they were represented by the Polish Bolesław Chrobry. Otto came in 1000 to Gniezno with the express purpose of empire-building, encouraged by Pope

25 H.G. Wells, *A Short History of the World*, The Collected Works of H.G. Wells, Pergamon Media, 2015.

26 J. Baszkiewicz, *Historia Francji* [*History of France*], Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, Wrocław, 1974, p. 24.

Sylvester II who came from Burgundy.[27] Poland here also represented another broader process which was underway: around 1000 AD Europe, western Christianity reached its pinnacle in terms of geographical area covered. As a result of their contact with the empire of Charles the Great and the Christianity which was being reborn there, peoples were baptised (in practice their leaders were baptised). These were peoples who had not been a part of the Roman Empire: central-European peoples (Magyars, Moravian-Czechs and the tribes organised under the state of Mieszko II and his son Bolesław) and the Normans living in today's Denmark and Scandinavia. The Rus from the Kiev region were baptised by Byzantium in 984. Latin Europe coincided with these new geopolitical borders. So, the schism of 1054 did not have as much impact as it might have done – it only served to confirm the "actual" borders which had already been established.[28]

The fleeting and chimerical "empire" the Ottonians created could not contain Europe's march towards a pluralist and decentralised international order. The "Empire" was an empire only in name, unable to consolidate real power because it did not have at its disposal executive apparatus – it lost its "imperial capacity". Europe moved towards its pluralistic destiny in the late Middle Ages. Surprisingly, it was then that Europe gained a clear identity, in a period of dramatic conflict and change. From a political perspective, this was a time of a kind of entropy, the collapse of the unity that had been previously taking shape. Instead there appeared a nebula of countless states – kingdoms, earldoms, bishoprics, republics, free cities. Some of them were formed as part of quasi-federal or feudal relations and some attempted to preserve their autonomy but were only able to sustain independence until they were absorbed into larger geopolitical entities or unities, through royal marriages or other dynastic relations. None of the countries of today's Europe is close to the form it took in its formative stage in the Middle Ages, an excellent example being Poland, a promising state of the first two Piasts, but one which was to become engulfed in 300 years of civil war, to return to the map of Europe at the time of the last of the Piasts in a greatly deformed state, nothing like its original territory (the Poland of Chrobry and Kazimierz the Great).

---

27 One might suggest, in a light-hearted manner, that this event anticipated the future Weimar Triangle (a Burgundian, i.e. a Frenchman, sent a German to a Pole). It is a pity that it took a thousand years to fulfil the intention! The appearance of the Triangle can indeed be seen as confirmation of the geopolitical-cultural intuition of Sylvester II, Otto III and Bolesław Chrobry.

28 O. Halecki, *The Limits and Divisions of European History*, Sheed and Ward, New York, 1950.

The dominant form of relations at the political level was armed conflict. To begin with, if for no other reason than the limited resources of the participants, these were local conflicts. Of exceptionally large scale for the times were the expedition of Frederic Barbarossa against Italy, the wars between Italian states, the German–Danish conflict and the Franco-English conflict which was only getting going. Many conflicts were private wars, with marauding bandits – often brutal and cruel. It seemed Europe had returned to the situation following the fall of the Roman Empire.[29] This situation intensified at the same time as the newly forming states increased in strength. Fully fledged, all-out war came with the Hundred Years' War between England and France (1337–1453), against a backdrop of dynastic conflict as was typical for the times. Accounts of the crime, the rape, cruelty, the sheer scale of destruction freeze the blood, especially in view of the fact that both sides were Christian. No less cruel was England's civil war[30] – the War of the Roses (between the Lancasters and the Yorks), later an inspiration for Shakespeare and Hobbes. In Central and Eastern Europe (including Poland and Hungary), similar destruction, robbery, depopulation, civilisational collapse followed the invasions of the Tartars in the XIII and XIV centuries. Only the XV century brought relative peace, a peace which immediately bore fruit. However, a new threat to Europe was coming on the scene: the Ottoman Empire, which was growing in strength. It conquered Byzantium and took over its Balkan territories, thereby appearing geographically in Europe. Until then Europe might have thought – after regaining Spain and repelling the Saracens who had been the scourge of Europe from the south – that they had seen off bellicose Islam.

In a sense, European civilisational identity developed as opposition to endless fighting and wars. Johan Huizinga's "autumn of the Middle Ages" is Europe's spring. The XI–XIII centuries, following the emergence from the cultural and economic crisis of the X century, is a period in which Europe flourishes both culturally and economically – indeed the two were intertwined. Europe owed its spring to Christianity which – though not without sin in its upper echelons – developed at the grassroots of ordinary people, the parish and, especially in the beginning, the monastery. Over the course of three centuries, Cistercians, Dominicans, Franciscans and other orders – including the Benedictines of earlier times – transformed the cultural landscape of Europe. In particular the Cistercians, "the

29 G. Duby, *The Age of the Cathedrals: Art and Society, 980–1420*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1983, introductory pages to Part 1, The Monastery; French original: *Les Temps des cathédrals: L'art et la société, 980–1420*, Gallimard, Paris, 1976.

30 N. Davies, *Europe: A History*, OUP, Oxford, 1996, pp. 419–423; M. Howard, *War in European History*, OUP, Oxford, 2009, Chapters 1 and 2.

white brothers", were famous not only for their prayer and asceticism but also for their achievements in husbandry, herbal medicines and mineral products. They took the Benedictine *ora et labora*, but placed their emphasis on *labora*. This was a conscious plan of their spiritual leader of the time – St. Bernard – also evident in the excellent organisation of the abbeys and monasteries and the logistics of their interconnections. The Cistercians sowed the seeds of civilisation in many hitherto dangerous and remote regions of Europe. The monastery was a bearer not only of faith – and the word of God, sacred art, the tradition of holidays – but also of education in general, as well as health care and compassion for the needy. Step by step, steadily they were a force transforming a mere species, *Homo sapiens*, into "humanity". However inadequately Christianity performed this civilising mission, they were often the only "game in town". The pilgrimages initiated by the monks to holy places, sometimes a thousand or more kilometres away, allowed the faithful to get to know their emerging European homeland, which referred to itself as *Christianitas*.

At the same time there came the development of the gothic cathedral – one of the wonders of the world, phenomenally combining metaphysics with the art of building and logistics on a grand scale.[31] Towns were developing and becoming more and more numerous; there appeared whole series of larger and smaller conglomerations of people across Europe from east to west and from north to south. Cities create civilisation (municipal laws and local government!), and the level of urbanisation of Latin Europe was initially behind that of the East Roman Empire. "Where there is gothic, there is Europe" – gothic constructions like the Pillars of Hercules would come to mark the boundaries of the emergent civilisation. In cities, by cathedrals there were created universities – another miracle of the Middle Ages and a wonderful invention of Western civilisation. Their creation was the ambition of popes and bishops who believed that the development of learning required autonomy, and the universities from the start had that autonomy assured. The university – besides theology – is philosophy, law, medicine. The study of law and philosophy brought Europe back into contact with Greece and Rome. The spread of the university across the whole of Europe of that time gave Europe a powerful impulse to develop and gave our civilisation a Promethean element – the desire to expand the borders of knowledge, a refusal to accept received wisdom as well as the ability to question oneself. The development of cities and universities, education in general, created an environment in which once again – after centuries of absence – art and literature could appear;

31 G. Duby, *op. cit*., "The Threshold", pp. 77–89.

the novel, poetry and painting flourished. Dante's *Divine Comedy* and Petrarch's *Sonnets to Laura* took Europe by storm. The whole of educated Europe followed with baited breath the dialectics of Thomas Aquinas, the father of the humanities, as he taught in Paris about the harmony of reason and faith; the passionate argumentation of Abelard the rationalist fascinated its audience and the drama of his feelings towards and relationship with Heloise moved them. The university's "republic of reason" is the European reality from the XIII century on. The XI-century *Song of Roland*, about a knight of Charlemagne, became the source of the chivalric code for the whole of Europe in the late Middle Ages.

Advances in agriculture released a huge number of hands for non-agricultural tasks, such as crafts and trade or the processing of raw materials found in nature. As Fernand Braudel claimed, this brought on a peculiar economic turnaround in the middle of the XV century. Handicraft products came to achieve higher prices than agricultural goods, yet the latter brought the market to life (in the form of numerous town markets), which marked the beginnings of capitalism. The dynamics of the market became a powerful integrating factor for Europe and its development in other domains – building, learning, art.[32] Referring to similar conclusions of other researchers, Krzysztof Pomian in *Europe and Its Nations* writes about "the religious, cultural and social unity of Latin, Christian society, a unity of beliefs and church institutions, a unity of liturgy, calendar and holy days, a unity of the state organisation of society, of a similarity of institutions representing states before the country, a unity of writing and language of the educated, a unity of learning and secular knowledge, a unity of architecture and the plastic arts, a unity of monastic, chivalric and urban culture".[33]

In these circumstances, it might be expected that there would be one more attempt at unification, on the basis of *Christianitas* – with a uniform political construction, a "soft" empire. The very young King (soon-to-be emperor of Habsburgian Spain) Charles V took up the challenge. He had come from the Netherlands, which was still under the control of Spain. His long struggles against Italy – the Italian wars bringing most suffering to the native population, especially to Rome, which was horribly desolated by German soldiers in 1527 – finally collapsed in the face of opposition from France (also a Catholic country). France did this in the name of balance in Europe and out of fear of a hegemony of the Habsburgs who were already well established in central Europe. France

32 F. Braudel, *La dynamique du capitalism*, Arthaud, Paris, 1985.

33 K. Pomian, *Europa i jej narody* [*Europe and Its Nations*], PIW, Warsaw, 1992, especially pp. 32, 51.

did not hesitate to seek an ally in the Islamic Ottoman Empire with whose help they kept the Habsburgs at bay in the Balkans. Charles' unification plans were also frustrated for another important reason: assuming the title of Emperor in the year 1519, he could not have picked a worse moment for the realisation of his goals. Two years before, in 1517, Martin Luther had nailed his ninety-five theses to the doors of the church in Wittenberg, demanding the reform of the Church and the Christian faith. The Reformation would not only come to divide western Christianity but also wherever it was accepted it strengthened statehood and, in its various versions (Lutheranism, Calvinism, Anglicanism), was a national movement, whereas Catholicism (the "Papists") was still universalist, by the standards of the time. Charles's efforts, rather weak in any case, to suppress reformist tendencies came to nothing. The wave of local religious wars, brought on by the Reformation and the Counterreformation, finished in 1555 with the decision of the Imperial Diet (the Peace of Augsburg) and the acceptance of the principle of *Cuius regio, eius religio*. This was recognition of sorts of the sovereignty of the German principalities, since it allowed the dukes a free hand in defining the faith of their territory. The solution was such a total fiasco that a year later Charles V abdicated the imperial and the royal crown.

Summing up this attempt, Jean Delumeau wrote in his exceptional *La Civilisation de la Renaissance*: "For the future belonged to territorial structures founded on an authentic sense of nationhood".[34] And somewhat more broadly about the same process: "At the beginning of the XIV century, Europe was still a constellation of indefinite shape with an uncertain future. By 1620, quite to the contrary, political divisions on the continent, if not fully settled, were at least clearly marked out. […] The map of Europe in 1850 does not fundamentally differ from the form it took at the beginning of the Thirty Years' War" (the only key difference which Delumeau points to being the fall of Poland). "In this great period […] Europe defined itself in the political sphere, acquiring for example Italy; and thanks to France's resistance to Habsburg ambition the golden rule of the balance of powers was established. A certain relationship of powers came to take the place of the ideal of European unity under the rule of the Emperor".[35]

---

34 J. Delumeau, *La Civilisation de la Renaissance*, Arthaud, Paris, 1993.

35 *Ibidem*. Delumeau also draws attention to the birth of national individualism already at the beginning of the renaissance, encouraged by the religious factor as well (the translation of the Bible into various languages following Luther's example) and the flourishing in this period of national languages and great literature (represented in Poland, according to Delumeau, by the work of Mikołaj Rej).

This is no way, in Delumeau's opinion, weakened the process of the deepening cultural unity of Europe and its separation from the rest of the world.

The bloody culmination of this process was the Thirty Years' War which, we might say, began as "reluctantly" as World War I (here the defenestration of the Emperor's emissaries, there the assignation of the Archduke Ferdinand in 1914). The Czech nobility did not want the Viennese court to choose their religion (and in Czech the reformation had a definite national hue – Hussitism). The initially local conflict dragged in all the European powers, especially the military of all of Europe. The conflict mainly took place in Germany, at that time still highly divided, and it was Germany's population and civilisational achievements that suffered the most. The death toll in some countries reached a level of 50% of the population; the brutality of soldiers from northern and southern Europe even led to racial changes in the population in central parts of Germany. Production and trade regressed by several decades. Once again, France was the victor – under Louis XIV, France entered a golden age. Other key changes were as follows: for a short time Sweden became an international power; the Seventeen Provinces gained their independence; Switzerland was recognised and a status quo was preserved in the geopolitical strategic territories of Germany and later Germany would enter the European stage in a leading role. Another result of this war was the beginning of Spain's marginalisation, not held back by their mass robbery of ore from the New World. The treaty ended the war more effectively than the Peace of Augsburg (whose resolutions mainly affected German territories – after all the St. Bartholomew massacre happened *after* the Peace of Augsburg).

The Thirty Years' War drained Europe, especially its central region. The Treaty of Westphalia, concluded at the end of the hostilities in 1648, has been variously interpreted. For example, in France, which had actively participated in the war and has been regarded as the war's main beneficiary, the geopolitical resolutions of the treaty are almost all that is perceived.[36] In the Anglo-Saxon school of thought, "Westphalia" has been made into a foundation stone of the European international order. This perception is above all due to Henry Kissinger, whose opinion holds some sway in the interpretation of international issues, including historical ones. In his opinion, "The Peace of Westphalia became a turning point in the history of nations because the elements it set in place were as uncomplicated as they were sweeping. [Here "elements" refers to the elements of international life – R.K.] The

36 Delumeau presents the matter in this way and the French *Nouveau Larousse* of 1904 in a similar vein presents under "Westphalia" exclusively the religious and geo-political resolutions of the treaty, Volume 7, p. 1380.

state, not the empire, dynasty, or religious confession, was affirmed as the building block of European order". There are also – as he continues – other important elements of the international order: the conception of sovereignty (the shaping of the internal political order without intervention from outside), diplomacy and talks as an art of preserving peace (to avoid wars as terrible as the Thirty Years' Wars) and the development of international law which was intended to serve the same purpose. The legitimation of the European order was henceforth to come not from the papacy (from religion) or from the empire, but from a balance of powers assuming ideological neutrality.[37] It is worth, however, recalling that the treaties of Münster and Osnabrück announced "peace for the glory of God and the security of Christendom" – the community of Christian nations. Kissinger's position and the whole of his school may easily be relativised. Europe in 1648 was only in part a Europe of countries. Most of the parties to the treaty were not countries but tiny republics, bishoprics, dukedoms or principalities the size of a county today. Sovereignty was a function of power and it had been practised and promoted before, as had the balance of powers which had its origins in the relations between the Italian states, as evidenced by the much earlier Treaty of Lodi of 1454. As long as the law of nations granted (sovereign) states the right of war (as was very much the case at the time), the principle of non-intervention was a facade.[38] The Fall of Poland or the Napoleonic Wars provide striking confirmation of the fleeting nature of the Westphalian resolutions. Without getting into a more detailed polemic with this position, it is more appropriate to recognise the *ex post* myth-making significance of Westphalia, what does not diminish its status in the eyes of researchers in international relations.[39]

---

37 H. Kissinger, *World Order*, Penguin Press, New York, 2014, pp. 25–27.

38 B. Simms even considers that the Westphalian treaties were an expression of agreement between the statesmen of the time as to the "direct link between domestic liberty, the balance of power and the right to intervene", the treaties being "nothing less than a charter for intervention", and "by placing the whole German settlement under international guarantee, they provided a level for interference in the internal affairs of the empire throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries". B. Simms, *Europe. The Struggle for Supremacy, from 1453 to the Present*, Basic Books, New York, 2013, p. 64. Simms also considers "Westphalia" a myth.

39 A. Gałganek, *"Westfalia" jako metafora genezy w nauce o stosunkach międzynarodowych* [*"Westphalia" as a metaphor of genesis in the science of international relations*], in: M. Pietraś, K. Marzęda (eds.), *Późnowestfalski ład międzynarodowy* [*The Late Westphalian International Order*], UMCS, Lublin, 2008. The "Westphalian Myth" is a term used by western historians outside of the United States.

Regardless of whether it is worth arguing about key turning points, it is now received wisdom that every international order has its own name. The adjective "Westphalian" has found its place in the literature. From the perspective of this book, Europe's approach in the XV to the XVII centuries is important as the first international order worthy of the name (the previous period being concerned with the development of European *identity*). From the XVII century, regardless of the role played by the treaties of Münster and Osnabrück, the leading actors in international life are states – some being more equal than others – and big powers, which together define the changing balance of power. Secondly, there appeared at this time the first and still simple principles governing the mutual relations of countries: the principle of sovereignty and the principle of balance (anti-hegemony). Thirdly, there also appeared institutions regulating international relations – permanent diplomacy, congresses, law in the form of doctrine which is also its source. And fourthly, the first European international order had support, strengthening its legitimacy, in the form of peace for *Christianitas* according to the provisions of the treaties of 1648. The papacy lost its ideological pre-eminence – Pope Innocent X condemned the Treaty of Westphalia – but Christianity remained the ideological source for Europeans. The divisions created by the Reformation were deep and painful, but no one questioned the realities which formed the basis for "the family of Christian nations", nor the membership of the various countries in one circle of faith and spirit. Finally, the fifth change from the XVII century, Europe started to become one rather integrated economic structure, both in terms of the level of trade or close relations in production and finance, or in the institutions of economic life which illustrated the homogeneity of the economic region that was Europe (more on that in Chapter 2). Finally, it is notable that the most mature of the plans for an ideal international order for Europe at that time – the perpetual peace of King Georg von Podiebrad from the mid-XV century and the European Federation of Maximilien de Béthune, the Duke of Sully, from the beginning of the XVII century – both invoke the idea of a pluralist community of sovereign states.[40]

40 For a more detailed discussion, see: R. Kuźniar, *My, Europa* [*We, Europe*], Scholar, Warsaw, 2013, pp. 37–39, 45–46.

2 Europe Conquers the World

1 Europe's discovery of the world

Having formed her identity and built her first international order, Europe set off to conquer of the World. To begin with, however, this conquest was not deserving of the name "European venture", nor was it even one carried out in the name of Europe. Europe's initial spread across the globe was undertaken by *individual European countries*, as they acquired the ability to discover, explore and then gradually subjugate the peoples they discovered and the faraway lands they encountered. In the first three or four centuries of these endeavours, only a few of Europe's nations – including her main powers (Spain, Portugal, England, the Netherlands and France) – were in a position to carry out these complex operations. These countries exhibited a combination of extraordinary courage and enterprise, technical competence, a thirst for discovery – and a desire for plunder and profit. At the same time, the same countries ignored threats closer to them: from the south of the continent, from the Ottoman Empire which was enlarging its territory at Europe's expense; and from the east of Europe, from Muscovite Russia which had been growing in might from the XIV century on.

Europe's conquest of the World took place in three broad phases. The first phase was one of discovery and exploration, beginning with Columbus's discovery of America in 1492. (It is worth noting that by that time Portuguese sailors had already been exploring Africa's western coast, far to the South, for many decades.) The second phase, European settlement, secured Europe's presence in the new lands. This was ostensibly a matter of establishing outposts to facilitate stable trade relations, even if this "facilitation" meant the plundering of such resources as were interesting to the Europeans, be that slaves or spices. In time, settlement would also become an option for those seeking a better life outside Europe. The third phase was ruthless conquest, driven by profit. This required the full subjugation of the conquered lands, turning them into extensions of Europe's economy and her international order. We may call this the imperialist phase. The three phases are only approximate as they took place in a non-linear, asynchronous fashion and frequently varied as forms of domination, as well as in terms of benefits and final consequences.[41]

41 J. Kieniewicz, in his excellent work *Od ekspansji do dominacji. Próba teorii kolonializmu* [*From Expansion to Domination. An Attempt at a Theory of Colonisation*], Czytelnik,

The entire process was, however, only possible because Europe was becoming a more unified economic system, with a centre and peripheries. This allowed for sufficient accumulation of capital to build up an energy which sought release outward. Some historians place the birth of the European economy around the reign of Emperor Charles the Great, at the end of the IX century. This economy was supported by a lively trade in people, in essence the sale of inhabitants of Central Europe to the Arabs to gain the requisite capital for development of other areas of business.[42] Subsequent developments do not bear this out, however. Although the regression of the X century was followed by three centuries of growth, as witnessed by rising urbanisation, development of trades and crafts, and the appearance of the Gothic cathedral and the university[43]. The XIV century and the beginning of the XV century were marked by another deep regression, by numerous plagues, including the Black Death, and by wars, such as the destructive Hundred Years' War. Progress and regression followed each other unpredictably in different parts of Europe. Economic development mostly took place within individual countries, but their borders, in most cases, remained shifting. Cross-border trade in luxury crafts, say goldsmithing, was but a fraction of the turnover of the largely self-sufficient national or local economies.

This all begins to change rapidly during the "long sixteenth century" (F. Braudel's term), that is from the middle of the XV century to the middle of the XVII century. This period saw lasting economic development and a shift of Europe's economic epicentre from the Mediterranean, especially Italy (Venice, Genoa), to the North-West. As noted by the Polish economic historian Andrzej Lubba, changes which took place in the XVI and XVII centuries led to the establishment of an economic system, "a relatively well-formed whole, whose constituent economic and political organisms form lasting economic relationships which, at the

---

Warsaw, 1986, p. 46, separates out four phases of this process, each with its associated set of actions: arrival (exploration), contact (violence), actualisation (plunder and exchange) and fixing (the factory and imperium).

42 According to M. McCormick in *Origins of the European Economy: Communications and Commerce, AD 300–900*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2001, especially Chapter 9, *Traders, Slaves, and Exiles*, pp. 237–253. The author carefully reconstructs even minor mercantile exchanges, but his work demonstrates that those had little importance for the "national" economies of the time. Those were highly localised as well as transient in terms of their borders and the structure of production.

43 As we know, this was due to the development of agricultural technology, which led to rapid increases in efficiency and, as a result, freeing up of labour force. This made people available for work other than agriculture.

same time, define each country's place in the system's internal division of work". Within this system the West and North-West of the Continent specialised in the production of processed goods ("industrial items") and increasingly monopolised continental trade and financial transactions, while the north-eastern and eastern parts of Europe concentrated on the production, sourcing and export of agricultural products (especially grain and cattle), timber and mined resources. An interdependency is thus formed, but the West finally gained the upper hand through rapid urbanisation and the adoption of a capital-based economy. The East adjusted the structure of its production to the demands of the Western countries and returned to feudalism.[44] Through this, an increasingly anachronistic social and economic structure was put in place through the region, impacting the Polish Republic in particular. Thus, the "(North)West" became the "centre" while the "(North)East" became the "periphery" of Europe's economic system.[45]

Through the evolution of manufacturing (from individual crafts to small-scale to large-scale production) and through trade, England, the Netherlands, northern Germany and the Baltic countries accumulated capital at a scale allowing them to further grow their industry. A special role in this process was initially played by "Holland, which already half-way through the XVI century is Northern Europe's most powerful centre of industry, trade and finance, far more urbanised than Italy" (A. Lubbe). The might of the Dutch, and then English, manufacturing and trade demanded the creation of new, specialised services in transport, banking and administration, and associated occupations from sailors to commercial agents. Intra-continental migration also contributed to the development of European production and mass-market products, especially in relation to specialist professions. Jewish people made a particularly strong contribution in this area. Of great importance was also the mining of precious metals as the foundation of monetary trade, and the establishment of a European banking

44 A. Lubbe, *Imperium europejskie? Ekspansja Europy a powstanie gospodarki światowej* [*European Empire? The Expansion of Europe and the Emergence of a Global Economy*], Państwowe Wyd. Naukowe, Warsaw, 1982, pp. 17–18, 27–36.

45 The shaping of this structure was studied and presented in detail by Marian Małowist, whose work is fundamental to the theory of the World system, initiated by the "World economic system" (as put forward by F. Braudel and fully developed by Immanuel Wallerstein). M. Małowist, *Wschód a Zachód Europy w XIII–XVI wieku. Konfrontacja struktur społeczno-gospodarczych* [*East and West in Europe in XIII to XVI Centuries. Confrontation of Socio-Economic Structures*], Wyd. Naukowe PWN, Warsaw, 2006.

network and stock exchanges, beginning with the largest one in Amsterdam.[46] In other industries, such as cloth and textile manufacturing, mining, metallurgy, armament production and fisheries, the scale of activity encouraged the establishment of capitalist-type enterprises. Economic historians have no doubt that all of those changes, including the accumulation of capital, took place without the participation of colonial trade. The great merchant capital of the XVI century was almost exclusively invested in trade *within* Europe. Andrzej Lubbe writes: "The success of colonial trade would have been impossible without a substantial base which, at the time, consisted of almost the entire European economy. Oceanic journeys were also immensely costly and risky enterprises, demanding great seamanship and substantial trade knowledge. The experience which the English and the Dutch had gained in European trade were also required", as was the trans-Europe water transport, from the Baltic to the Mediterranean.[47] The Dutch and the English East India Companies, established at the beginning of the XVII century, were prototypical for Europe's colonial and subsequently imperial activity. They took advantage of both the experience and the capital gained through intra-European trade. Portuguese and Spanish expansion represented a different paradigm: conquest and plunder. It was devoid of a capitalist base, broke down quickly, and was even the source of the subsequent regression and backwardness of both European countries.

However, Europe's expansion beyond its geographic boundaries, across the surrounding seas and oceans, began paradoxically with expeditions sponsored by the kings of Portugal and Spain. Columbus' journey was of course the breakthrough which opened up new horizons, although the Portuguese had been sailing relatively regularly along the western coast of Africa as far as the Congo Delta – a greater distance than that between Europe and America. Still, Africa had been Europe's neighbour for centuries, even if knowledge of it had been confined to its coastal areas. The discovery of America, on the other hand, confirmed the theory of the earth's spherical nature and the existence of other, heretofore unknown lands. The superiority of Europe's civilisation over the peoples of America was attested to by the ease with which pre-capitalist Spain easily conquered the rich and remote nations of the Maya, Aztecs and the Inca. Groups of several hundred conquistadors armed with firearms – unknown to the locals – and led by Hernan Cortes (known for his determination, religious zeal and cruelty) conquered vast

46 A. Mączak (ed.), *Historia Europy* [*History of Europe*], Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, Wrocław, 1997, especially the chapter by J. Kieniewicz, pp. 240–245.

47 A. Lubbe, *op. cit.*, p. 33.

swathes of territory. By the middle of the XVI century, almost the entire South and Mesoamerica was within the Spanish imperium. An unprecedented period of robbery and exploitation of the local population began, from plunder of precious metals and other riches to use of forced labour in mines and on plantations. La Conquista also led to demographic catastrophes among the Indians and to ecological changes on the continent. Settlers from the Iberian Peninsula, and then mestizos, began to displace the Indians. It was there that the exploration phase turned into the colonial phase the fastest.

Even before the end of the XV century, Vasco da Gama circumnavigated the globe and established Portugal's presence in Asia, though this proved to be a spotty and superficial presence (mere exclaves on the coast of India). The Portuguese would soon be pushed from that part of the World by the more enterprising Dutch and English. Things looked somewhat different with Portugal's conquest of Brazil. It resulted in mass-scale development of another phenomenon already known in the past – slavery. The slave trade enlivened transatlantic business. Ships from Europe would sail do Africa where European products would be exchanged for slaves who would then be transported to the West Indies (Caribbean) and Brazil. There, in turn, the slaves would be traded for local produce such as sugar or rum, which would then be transported back to Europe. Later slaves began to be transported to North America. The Atlantic would quickly become for Europe what the Mediterranean had been for the ancient world, in particular Rome. It would also enable Europe to play a global role.[48]

This came to pass as a result of England and, to a lesser degree, France joining the process of European expansion. British colonialism was from its beginnings a capitalist, business-oriented undertaking, resting on a solid administrative base. Once Francis Drake circumnavigated the globe (1577–1579) and the English fleet defeated the Great Armada (1588), it became clear whose model of conquest and domination would triumph. It was to be, however, a drawn-out process. It was only at the beginning of the XVII century that the English settled in New England. In the first few decades of settlement, France was to keep the English company on the east coast of North America, and in Canada and Louisiana. From the beginning of the XVII century, it would be the English, the Dutch and the French who would rapidly become rivals with Spain and Portugal. However, with a few exceptions that strengthened the settlement of North America, this was to be a mercantile expansion motivated by trade (England and Holland in particular being more motivated by business). To be sure, there were other

48 A. Mączak (ed.), *op. cit.*, pp. 280–286.

states which began to support the expansion and increased their interest in it, but for some time (and especially in the case of France, Spain and Belgium) this was more due to a need for prestige and rivalry against their European competitors ("court ambitions") than to the economic interests of the country or its ability to dominate politically the territories discovered by its sailors, merchants and missionaries. The English, Dutch and French made inroads into Asia, too, efficiently limiting any initial influence gained by the Portuguese and the Spanish. The East India Companies set up at the beginning of the XVII century played an important role in their owners taking of control over the Asia trade. These organisations quickly became private empires – supported by their capitals but at the same time enjoying immense independence, with private armies at their disposal, able to defend their presence and their interests in Asian beachheads, whether on the coast of India, in Indonesia, or in individual locations in China and Japan. During this phase, Africa was only lightly "touched" by the Europeans who kept to the coasts to a degree sufficient only to enable trade and the export of slaves, as well as to secure support centres for sailing ships bound for India. Of particular importance in this context is the territory surrounding the Cape of Good Hope, discovered by the Portuguese in 1488. It would later become a Boer[49] country, then a British colony and finally the Republic of South Africa.

To begin with, the best sailors, merchants, financiers and organisers of this expansion were Dutch, though later they had to give way to the English whose might had been growing. Both nations, as well as others who took part in this expansion, were driven by a desire to discover combined with expansive entrepreneurship, thirst for profit and adventure and missionary zeal. The Jesuits played a primary role in this respect. By spreading their faith, they frequently attempted to protect locals from the cruelty and exploitation imposed by the whites, though this influence largely ended in the second half of the XVIII century, following the dissolution of the Order in 1773. In any event, Christianity took root only in South and Mesoamerica – in the North it was only ever the religion of the white settlers. For two centuries, trade consisted of spices, precious metals, later cloth – depending on the direction of trade in question. A certain role in Europe's money economy was played by the import of precious metals from America at the turn of the XVI and XVII centuries, and later by the slave trade aimed at increasing the capital of its stakeholders.[50] Economic historians agree, however, that all of this

49 The Boers, that is Calvinists, Lutherans, Protestants or Huguenots from Northwestern Europe.

50 Text of the Act, *ibid.*

expansion and trade did not have major influence on the economic development of Europe herself until we reach the end of the XVIII century.[51] Trade and expansion brought benefits to capital groups, and entrepreneurs, but with time even the East India Companies began to generate losses while Spain's American adventure would drive it into bankruptcy, crisis and relegation to Europe's second rung of nations. It was actually Europe's own development that made exploration possible. It was the Europeans who discovered distant regions, took their products there, popularised their cultural and organisational models, not the other way around. This lengthy initial period was, however, important for events which would come later. It was during that time that Europeans came to know the "Rest of the World" and built a network of connections. This made Europe the "centre" of the future international order while the "Rest of the World" was becoming its periphery. This was not yet a relationship of domination – that would come later – but the rapidly growing and evolving model of relations of advantageous trade, plunder or exploitation based on technical and organisational superiority was taking hold in pockets of overseas territories, heralding the domination to come. The "Rest of the World" was oblivious to how, over the next hundred years, a distant and almost unknown western piece of Eurasia – a small peninsula sticking out of a vast continent – would come to dominate it, building its own international order.

2 Europe breaks away from the Rest of the World

Between the exploration phase and the initial, violent forms of contact and exchange – leading to the advantage of the discoverers over the discovered – and the phase of permanent presence turning the exchange into an imperial (imperialist) relationship, Europe underwent important changes. Two revolutions took place, an economic one (capitalism) in England and a political one (republic, human rights) in France. Further, following the Napoleonic wars, a new international order was established on the Continent. By ensuring a long period of relative peace, it enabled a hastening of Europe's general development, and made possible for her powers to expand outwards, by way of colonisation. This,

51 J. Milewski, *Dlaczego Europa? Źródła przyspieszenia wzrostu gospodarczego Europy – przegląd literatury* [*Why Europe? The Sources of the Accelerated Economic Growth of Europe – A Review of the Literature*], in: M. Koźmiński (ed.), *Cywilizacja europejska. Wykłady i eseje* [*European Civilisation. Lectures and Essays*], Scholar (Commissioned by ISP PAN), Warsaw, 2004, p. 162.

finally, would lead to imperialist domination over large portions of the "Rest of the World".

The phenomenon of Europe's hastened economic development and her resultant "breaking away" from the remaining regions and civilisations is covered in quite extensive literature, both global and Polish. It includes the already mentioned works of Andrzej Lubbe or Jan Kieniewicz. Of particular value there is Jan Milewski's overview "*Dlaczego Europa? Źródła przyspieszenia wzrostu gospodarczego Europy – przegląd literatury*" [*Why Europe? The Sources of Europe's Accelerated Economic Growth – A Review of the Literature*].[52] As already mentioned, the moment in which Europe lurched forward is often placed around the year 1000. At that time, nothing was yet determined, and that move was non-linear, tortuous and marked by long periods of war and regression. However, as it is also believed, around the year 1500 Europe began to outdistance China in terms of economic activity and technological innovation, gaining in speed along its own developmental trajectory. For a long time, this was not, however, a meaningful advantage. Until half way through the XVIII century, China was seen as wealthier than Europe and a more advanced civilisation, even if it had been mired in stagnation for a long time. Only around 1830 would Europe overtake China in terms of volume of production. At that time the later Third World was producing 60% of the World's industrial production (processed goods). By around 1900, however, Europe's output would exceed 62% while the non-Western World's would fall to around 19% (!) This chasm was even larger, and widening, when it came to value of production and revenue per head of population. The years 1750–1900 are the key period during which the gap grew from a scale of "a few times larger" (up to three to six times, depending on which region of the World we consider) to "forty-fifty times larger". This chasm continued to widen during the XX century and in addition, the United States's share in the gross world product grew from 1% to 24% during the same period.[53]

This sudden leap was possible thanks to the industrial revolution which had begun in England. Machines began to be used not just in production but also, and this is important in this context, in communication and transport. This radically strengthened Europe's chances of reaching any corner of the world it desired. Demographic growth also contributed to its expansion. In the period we

52 Published in the first volume of the excellent work by M. Koźmiński (ed.), *Cywilizacja europejska. Wykłady i eseje* [*European Civilisation. Lectures and Essays*], Scholar (Commissioned by ISP PAN), Warsaw, 2004. Among other authors dealing with these issues we ought to also mention M. Małowist, M. Kula and A. Mączak.

53 J. Milewski, *op. cit*., pp. 149–155.

examined earlier – 1750–1900 – Europe's population grew by 300% while other parts of the world grew by about 50%. Between 1800 and 1914 alone, Europe grew from around 150 million to 400 million, or more than twice the increase of the previous three centuries. Colonial expansion, most closely connected to migration, solved part of Europe's demographic problem (surfeit of labour) – increasing population created the pressure for migration.[54] The rapid natural increase of the population of Europe was due to economic and technological advances, which had made possible massive increases in food production as well as substantial improvement of the sanitary conditions in the cities and in health care. The average life expectancy of people as well as their number of productive years increased, while infant mortality dropped at the same time.

Another factor commonly taken as influencing growth and expansion was Europe's system of political institutions, whose ideals were represented by both the English and the French revolutions: freedom, equality, property. Rule of law (including the constitutional system which began in France and spread through Europe) and property rights were particularly important. They secured the safety of individuals and their property and released creativity and market competitiveness which, in return, stimulated innovation and entrepreneurship. The attitude of "greed is good" had already begun to develop. A new social class – the bourgeois – emerged and stimulated changes in the organisation of the state and contributed to economic nationalism, at least at a certain stage. All those changes meant that from the middle of the XVIII century in a large part of Western Europe a capitalist economy began to develop, with mass industrial production which required labour and resources. All this output required a market, which was internal to begin with but soon became international. Technological innovations in industry and transport (mainly in England) took us into the "age of coal and steel" – the XIX century. Long-distance voyages became commonplace. Economic, social and political changes (Karl Polanyi's "great transformation") were also the context of a revolution in the military, one which had already begun in the XVII century with widespread use of firearms and artillery but whose greatest stimulus were the Napoleonic wars. The immense size of armies and the scale of their operations, the engineering advances, mass production of weapons and their unprecedented lethal power caused the emergence of professional military staff and strategists, able to prepare and carry out incomparably more complex military campaigns. The accompanying readiness or, at times, necessity to sacrifice many thousands of casualties became standard – killing on a large

54 *Ibidem*, pp. 165–169.

scale ceased to make a big impression.[55] These new skills and abilities would be useful in expeditionary force operations, which would come to characterise the imperialist conquest phase. The "Rest of the World" lagged behind Europe in this aspect too, a fact which enabled Europe to conquer much larger, distant states with relatively little effort.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, Europe's advantage over the "Rest of the World" in the modern era has stemmed from the presence of the university in the social and political life of the Continent's nations. "The university" here means the whole culture of constant development knowledge and the emergence of scientific corporations whose achievements in many disciplines became very helpful, and eventually vital, to social, technical and economic development. No other place had anything like it, especially in terms of basic science. Innovation and discovery became Europe's domain. For instance, the discovery of the mechanical clock meant that time became a valuable commodity, put into the service of the development of both the economy and society. The university *sensu stricto*, a late mediaeval European invention, had ceased to be a "cloister" six centuries later and was becoming a source of Europe's civilisational advantage over the "Rest of the World".[56] The interaction of knowledge, technology and technical inventions which the university fostered became the nature of economic growth, along with changes in management practice (market, competition) and many institutions and political mechanisms. In time, this energy would have to seek release. Jan Milewski concludes that the extent of mutually stimulating transformations in many disciplines, at the same time and in the one place, was the basis for Europe's hastened economic growth and her "breaking away" from the "Rest of the World". Only a few managed to follow Europe along that path, to take advantage of her developmental paradigms and take part in expansion and division of the World (Japan, the United States).[57]

Another important thing happened to Europe between its discovering the World, establishing lasting relations with it, starting to create a European World system (centre/peripheries) and building Europe's particular form of government within the framework of that system – imperialism-to-be. This new thing was her own new order, called the "Concert of Powers". Perhaps, with a less

55 M. Howard, *The Military Factor in European Expansion*, in: H. Bull, A. Watson (eds.), *The Expansion of International Society*, OUP, New York, 1984; R. Kuźniar, *Polityka i siła. Studia strategiczne – zarys problematyki* [*Politics and Power. Strategic Studies – An Outline of the Issues*], Scholar, Warsaw, 2006, pp. 30–39.

56 J. Milewski, *op. cit*., pp. 175–181.

57 *Ibidem*, p. 185.

rigorous understanding of the category of international order, we can actually talk about a new phase (or stage, version) of the European international order which emerged for the first time in the XVII century from the constellation of late mediaeval and late feudal entities, as mentioned in Chapter 1. The order of the "Concert of Powers" has its own rich literature, with Henry Kissinger's classic work at its head. Besides this, its nature is of a secondary value to us, so it will be introduced here only cursorily.

Napoleon's attempt at creating an empire missed its historical context, which is why it had to end in failure. In any event, Napoleon did not desire "unification" of Europe – he wanted an imperium, and France's hegemony, with him at the imperial helm. We ought to remember that Napoleon's France was the largest of all the historical empires in Europe – it covered almost the entire continent – but also the most short-lived. At the time Europe was already a Europe of states and a Europe of nations, so Napoleon had no chance of creating a lasting empire, despite his undoubted strategic genius. "The God of War" was late by a few hundred years. Napoleonic France did, however, set free two phenomena, two ideas which would have strong influence over the European order for the subsequent hundred years or more: liberalism and nationalism. Nationalism would keep appearing in both large states and small: as a path to independence in the small ones, and in the large ones as a path to imperialism. In the second case, nationalism would be frequently lined with liberalism, using the latter as a kind of fig leaf, covering up the imperialist goals of European powers.

Napoleon's collapse following the defeat at Waterloo gave the victorious powers a chance to lay down a European order anew. This occurred at the Congress of Vienna, which saw the emergence of the "Concert of Powers", commonly called the "Concert of Europe" – the "European Directorate of the Five". To begin with, its core was the Holy Alliance of three big powers – Russia, Prussia and Austria – together guarding the legitimacy of the new order. Russia, outside of Europe in terms of civilisation, became one of the guarantors (stabilisers) of the European order following an intra-European war which involved Russia. This situation bears some resemblance to Ancient Greece. The other two big powers involved were Great Britain and France. Overseas expansion became also a stabilising factor on the Continent. Formal restoration of the "old order", along with Talleyrand's masterful diplomatic craft, allowed France to avoid punishment for Napoleonic excesses. Next to the Concert of Europe, including the Holy Alliance, the constituent parts of the order were the anti-hegemonic balance of power, written into the Final Act of the Congress, and the right to intervene within smaller neighbouring states to maintain internal order. More precisely this was to preserve the legitimacy of the dynastic power, in opposition to the

revolution, although the political achievements of the French Revolution remained untouched in France herself. It was further decided that regular congresses should be held to review the situation in Europe from the perspective of balance and legitimacy. This ensured continued cooperation by the big powers in preserving lasting peace (stability) in Europe. This was the goal of the Holy Alliance, and the Concert of Powers which was formed a little later. Within that order international legal regulations began to appear, though to begin with those did not touch on any fundamental issues. The Congress of Vienna already saw the emergence of the first diplomatic law (the Vienna-Aquitaine Regulation of 1815–1818) followed by bans on the slave trade and looting of works of art, and respect for neutrality (of Switzerland).

The Vienna order, despite its rules of legitimacy and the right to intervene, did not manage to halt the development of both nationalist and liberal movements – even in France the Empire fell and the Third Republic was born – but it did prevent larger conflicts from appearing. Those that did arise between the powers which made up the Concert were limited in their scope: between Prussia and Austria in 1866, the Crimean War of 1853–1856, the Franco-Prussian War of 1870–1871. With its short and relatively limited conflicts, the Vienna order is known as the "hundred-year peace" in Europe. This was in marked contrast to the preceding 200 years (1600–1800). Peace laid groundwork for the "Great Transformation" of European civilisation which Karl Polanyi discussed. This was a transformation "from the pre-industrial world to the era of industrialisation, and the shifts in ideas, ideologies, and social and economic policies accompanying it".[58] According to Polanyi, XIX-century Europe rested on four pillars: the balance of power system, the international gold standard, the self-regulating market and the liberal state. In the international sphere, peace was made possible by the invisible and uncoordinated conjunction of two factors: the Concert of Europe ("European directorium in a suborganized form") and "the pressure of private interests" which penetrated the entirety of life, reached across borders and was the "invisible mainstay of international reciprocity".[59] In Polanyi's view, however, of greater significance is the belief that people react defensively to the socially destructive consequences of the "self-regulating market" (both in theory and in practice). That is why they reach for contrary political doctrines which

58 Page vii of J. Stieglitz's Foreword to: K. Polanyi, *The Great Transformation. The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time*, Beacon Press, Boston, 2001.

59 *Ibidem*, pp. 3–4, 271–272.

they hope will put an end to the process of the economy being "uprooted" from society. Hence, the rise of Communism and Fascism following World War I.[60]

3 Europe imposes its rule on the World

The global expansion of Europe was a function of the processes which took place within Europe herself, as previously discussed. Importantly, the hastening of Europe's development, her growing economic and demographic potential and the laying down of a new order following the Napoleonic turmoil activated the next phase of expansion. This led directly to Europe's conquest and rule of the World – though not necessarily the entire World. Paradoxically, the countries of both Americas, which were colonised earliest, were the first to liberate themselves. The United States were the first to reject London's power. In this manner, Europe (England) lost a marvellous overseas possession, but Europe's civilisation would anyway soon become "Western Civilisation", including a strong North-American pillar. Following in the footsteps of the United States, the countries of South America and Mesoamerica freed themselves from European, mainly Spanish, dominion (1810–1826.)

Unfazed, Europe enlarged its rule in places where its presence had been hitherto limited to the coastal regions, and largely trade oriented. True colonisation, that is permanent settlement, began and aimed to take full control over the conquered area. The English led the way in this process and began to dominate "East of Suez". The Suez Canal, built by the French and completed in 1869, was soon taken over by the English, becoming a significant asset for them. Particularly impressive was the spread of British domination over the ancient and mighty civilisation of India (the Moghul Empire) which had been second in greatness only to China in all of Asia. The old and highly developed Asian cultures were defenceless against the technology, organisational abilities, and military skill of the Europeans. Great Britain quickly took control of Central Asia and large swathes of the Middle East, along with East Africa, including Egypt. British expeditionary forces mercilessly broke the resistance of the local coloured populations, with no regard for casualties. France reached for Africa, to begin with the North (Algeria became virtually a part of France) and then the East. The Portuguese also placed themselves there, as did the Belgian king Leopold II, with the Congo becoming his own personal property (!) The French also colonised Indochina. The Germans arrived late and gained only a few modest possessions in Africa. The

60 *Ibidem*, pp. 3–4 and following pages.

speed with which Europe swallowed up Africa is borne out by the fact that while in the 1870s only about 10% of that continent was in European hands, by 1914 all of it had been colonised with the exception of Ethiopia and Liberia. The ancient and gigantic, but at the time powerless, China became a kind of British–French protectorate in 1901. While the Europeans needed to reach for their colonial bounty far overseas, Russia had an easier job. During the XIX century, Russia finished colonising the great void of Siberia, reached the Pacific and began to put pressure on countries to the South, in Central Asia and beyond the Caucasus.[61]

In their attitude towards conquered peoples and territories, the Europeans employed a logic made plain during the Berlin Congress of 1818. The Congress itself dealt with the division of influence in the Balkans but at a micro-scale served to demonstrate the low and imperialist instincts of the European powers. Spheres of influence were agreed to and borders were drawn with no regard for history, geography, social relations, or for ethnic or cultural divisions. The interests of the local populations were of no importance. The last quarter of the XIX century, therefore, saw the culmination of Europe's conquest of the World. Colonialism turned into imperialism, although it could be said that both were merely two sides of the same process of expansion and domination, leading to the creation of a world system with Europe at the centre and the global capitalist economy as foundation. The creation of a colonial system preceded the next phase of domination: imperialism. In Europe's case, this phenomenon can be extended to World War II or even some years following its conclusion. Jan Kieniewicz writes that "the years from 1875 to 1945 can be seen as a period of particular importance for the colonial system, colonial expansion, colonies and the ultimate domination of the capitalist system over the rest of the World".[62]

In practice, the colonial system meant the use of almost free labour, provided by the colonised populations, the exploitation of the colony's resources, the imposition of changes in the economic structure of the colony by imposing a monoculture whose beneficiary was the metropolis, as well as the imposition of social and cultural norms aimed at imitating the life and culture of the metropolis, albeit at an inferior level. Those changes had the effect of creating not only dependency but also pauperisation and, worse, creeping backwardness which replaced the existing stasis. Destabilisation and destruction of local social and quasi-national systems took place. Colonies became the furthest peripheries of the global system. "White man's" rule was marked by cruelty, with the aim of

61 A. Mączak (ed.), *op. cit*., pp. 569–573.
62 J. Kieniewicz, *op. cit*., p. 262.

maintaining obedience and destruction of any resistance to exploitation or slavery. It was accompanied by an ideology intended for both sides: white superiority, whose worse version was simple racism. According to this ideology, the whites did not employ inhuman methods to impose their power but sought to "bring a superior civilisation", in other words leading a "civilising mission", which can be seen particularly in the English and French versions of colonialism. At least the French version, lined by ideas of republicanism, gave the local population a chance at gaining citizenship and performing more important functions within that system. The tenor of Rudyard Kipling's *The White Man's Burden* (1899) is, however, more indicative of the entirety of the situation. White Man's burden combined ruthlessness towards conquered populations with generosity in sharing the gifts of civilisation, such as education or health care, what did indeed take place in many cases. The "Rest of the World" was included into the broad map of the culture of Europe, especially by means of (global) language – the medium of cultural messaging, which could unite regions by means of communicated world view, and could communicate the paradigms of social and political order which for the Europeans signified progress. On the other hand, the Europeans preferred not to remember the dark sides of this whole process, or its many degenerations personified by the sinister Kurtz in Conrad's *Heart of Darkness*.

The predatory form of colonialism, which reveals the economic and political underpinnings of international colonialism in general, was defined and described most fully by the British sociologist and economist John A. Hobson in his 1902 work *Imperialism: A Study*. The imperialism we are considering was not the same as earlier imperial forms which had amounted to the conquest of the weaker by the stronger and whose aim was rule for its own sake, be it for the glory of the ruler or for national security. The source of the later imperialism, according to Hobson, lay not in the state (or government) but in capitalist oligarchy or, deeper still, in the nature of the organisation of capitalist economy. Imperialism was, in his view, not necessary, while also being immoral. It came from a desire for easily gained profits which would normally have to be attained by the capitalists through increasing the purchasing power of their employees (mostly workers) – which would require a better distribution of wealth through more complex state mechanisms; it would require greater justice and equality. Capitalists, said Hobson, rejected this more difficult path towards enrichment and preferred to gain their wealth faster and in greater extremes. They preferred to seek profit through exclusive access to new overseas markets and investments. This required a state and its instruments, that is a diplomatic service and an army. Thanks to the capitalists' ambitions, their own states would shape other

more distant countries and territories, to achieve that goal. Imperialism, according to Hobson, was an economic, political and cultural practice, through which European powers included other countries and peoples into the sphere of their own economies and the global capitalist system, which was thus enlarged. Those lands and peoples had to become "civilised" along the norms of the nations of the centre.[63] This is how Great Britain become the "factory of the World" in the XIX century – and not just the factory but also its financial centre and its main sea power. Hobson began an entire school of study of imperialism, whose most important figures were Vladimir Lenin, Rosa Luxemburg and Karol Kautsky. While Hobson analysed imperialism, they worked towards its downfall. In his brilliant work *Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism*, Lenin added another, inherent, characteristic of imperialism to the description: war. Imperialism could not exist without war. This thought came all the more easily to him writing, as he was, during World War I.[64]

Importantly, the shift from colonialism to imperialism awoke in the European powers an instinct for military expansion, for battle and victory – an instinct which came to dominate all other thoughts of politics or international relations. Since there was nothing left to take over, the imperialist powers began to grab their prizes from each other, turning against each other as they did. An arms race began. Germany, the mighty but late arrival, became the main advocate of this process. Following unification, Germany quickly overtook Great Britain in steel production. Steel means armaments and a fleet – more of a navy than a merchant fleet. Soon, what would have been unthinkable not long before, Germany caught up with the Royal Navy. The German gauntlet thrown at the feet of Great Britain could be seen all the more clearly as Germany became the continent's leading power. London's policy, ever since the Peace of Westphalia, had been to provide balance for a potential hegemony in Europe. At the turn of the XIX century a realignment of allegiances took place, altering the Vienna Congress paradigm. It had already begun earlier, and before the outbreak of World War I the roles defined and the "decorations" were ready: the earlier Triple Alliance (Germany, Austro-Hungary, Italy) stood against the Triple Entente (France, England and Russia). A longish overture began, starting with the war between Japan and Russia (1904–1905), through the conflicts in the Balkans and North Africa. All of this had the same basis – a fight for influence. The powers' determination to defend or extend their dominions must have been great if an event so "marginal"

63 J.A. Hobson, *Imperialism: A Study*, George Allen and Unwin, London, 1938.

64 V. Lenin, *Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism*, Penguin Classics, London, 2010.

as the assassination of Archduke Ferdinand in Sarajevo on the 28th of June 1914 meant that a month later Europe was already engulfed by the Great War, later renamed World War I as it extended to the Middle East, North Africa and East Asia – as Japan entered China and the United States joined in.

3 Europe Creates a Normative Dimension for International Order

The politicians promised that the Great War would end in a few weeks, before the winter at the latest. It lasted four bloody years (until 11 November 1918), left huge numbers of casualties and effectively ended the previous international order (as laid down at the Congress of Vienna). The enormity of the war, its direct results and costs, and its long-term geopolitical consequences forced the leaders of the entente countries to think deeply about the framing of the post-war order. Even before the end of the war, there had been many opinions about the conditions and the future foundations of Europe, and beyond – it had been a world war, after all. The Paris Peace Conference faced this subject in the first half of 1919. It not only took on the issue of settling the War's results – in particular in relation to Germany and its allies (the conditions imposed on them were often severe) – but also attempted to establish, for the first time in history, a normative view of the international order. The aim was not an order set down and regulated according to a mechanism of power relations (a balance of one kind or another), but rather one governed by *norms* of international relations, with multilateral institutions keeping watch over those norms, enabling the development of international cooperation. Adam Watson noted that this was the third stage of Europe's creation of an international order, this time through a type of transposition onto the World of its own model.[65]

1 Inspiration

As is well known, the ideas of American president Woodrow Wilson, put before the US Congress on the 8th of January 1918, gained a wide audience before the beginning of the Paris Conference. The last of his Fourteen Points said that a "general association of nations must be formed under specific covenants for the purpose of affording mutual guarantees of political independence and territorial

65 For Watson, the first stage was overseas exploration, in parallel with the shaping of the order. The second stage was the extension of power over the World thanks to the means afforded by the industrial revolution. The third stage was the imposition onto the World of rules and institutions. A. Watson, *European International Society and Its Expansion*, in: H. Bull, A. Watson (eds.), *The Expansion of International Society*, OUP, New York, 1984.

integrity to great and small states alike".[66] A number of other points in that speech also referred to future bases of international relations (the openness of treaties, arms control). Leaders and representatives of France and Great Britain were particularly active in the discussions over the text of the Pact, as were the Italians and the Japanese. In its entirety, the Pact of the League of Nations would draw mostly upon projects of European federation and the plans for eternal peace which had been proposed for many years by various European thinkers and rulers, but which had never before been subject to serious discussion or negotiation. Previously ignored, they were now the point of departure for creation of an audaciously constructed world order.

In support of this thesis, we should point out two main inspirations to be found in the spirit and the letter of the Pact of the League, and in the League's activities. To begin with, let us consider the relatively well-known "A project for settling an everlasting peace in Europe" ["Projet pour rendre la paix perpétuelle en Europe"], penned by Abbot Charles de Saint-Pierre between 1714 and 1716, following the War of the Spanish Succession and the Treaty of Utrecht. We will find a great majority of its elements in the League of Nations. De Saint-Pierre also postulated that a permanent association of nations be formed, guaranteeing them security and integrity of their borders. A fundamental rule of avoiding the use of force would therefore need to be accepted, along with non-interference in the internal affairs of other states (sovereigns). The project assumed a political status quo. Rule breakers would be required to pay reparations, and aggressors would be disarmed. Prevention of the use of force would consist of peaceful means of resolving conflicts (conciliation, mediation, arbitration). The main organ of the association would be a senate or a congress, whose main task would be to police the fulfilment of obligations and participation in conflict revolution, and imposition of sanctions.[67] De Saint-Pierre's project bears great resemblance to what would be agreed more than 200 years later at the Paris Peace Conference.

---

66 Text of the speech, English original: http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/wilson14.asp. A Polish edition is found in: K. Kocot, K. Wolfke (eds.), *Wybór dokumentów do nauki prawa międzynarodowego* [*A Selection of Documents for the Study of International Law*], Państwowe Wyd. Naukowe, Wrocław–Warsaw, 1976, pp. 45–47. We should mention that Wilson's ideas stemmed largely from projects discussed by various organisations made up of international lawyers of the day.

67 *A project for settling an everlasting peace in Europe.* Gale ECCO, Andover, Hampshire, 2010. Polish edition: *Leksykon pokoju* [*A Lexicon of Peace*], KAW, Warsaw, 1987, pp. 186–187.

It is a wonder that his ideas were not made use of a hundred years before, in Vienna.

In approaching the future international order, Woodrow Wilson (who probably was unaware of de Saint-Pierre's plan) was inspired more by the key assumptions of Immanuel Kant's *To Perpetual Peace* (1795). Seeing wars as immoral, Kant also postulated that they ought to be banned and that international institutions be established charged with protecting that ban. The Königsberg hermit also formulated three main conditions conducive to the preservation of peace: 1) a republican (in practice – democratic) system of state government, 2) federal alliances to promote peace and 3) international law, to which all would be subject. To these he added a ban on expansion into foreign territory, and gradual disarmament.[68] This is why Kant and Wilson are considered the precursors of the idealist approach to international relations. With earlier projects for peace in Europe becoming the reference points for work on a global organisation, it is not surprising that it was on the forum of the already established and functioning European organisation that the only governmental project for organisation of Europe was presented. This was the project to establish a European Union, introduced by France's 1929–1930 foreign minister, Aristide Briand, at the League. Faced with many objections, mainly from London and Berlin, that project never entered the stage of serious discussion. Briand had undoubtedly been influenced by the concepts discussed within the Pan-European Movement, of which he had been the honorary president.[69]

The project of a normative international order, which became the League of Nations, was inspired not just by plans for a European federation and perpetual peace, but also by earlier attempts at regulating certain aspects of international conduct. Those had come from Europe but had universalist ambitions. The idea of the League of Nations was a response not only to World War I but also to war

68 I. Kant, (tr.) Ted Humphrey, *To Perpetual Peace. A Philosophical Sketch*, Hackett Publishing, Indianapolis, 2003.

69 The Pan-European Movement was initiated by Count Richard Coudenhove-Kalergi in 1924. He was an Austrian aristocrat with international roots, essentially a textbook example of a cosmopolitan. His main inspiration came from his experience of the "soft" Habsburg Empire. Original and frequently controversial, his ideas were concerned primarily with European unity, but because the Movement included many intellectuals, politicians and diplomats, many of those ideas were carried onto the forum of the League of Nations. Expanded in: J. Łukaszewski, *Cel: Europa. Dziewięć esejów o budowniczych jedności europejskiej* [*Goal: Europe. Nine Essays on Building European Unity*], Noir sur Blanc, Warsaw, 2002, pp. 17–47.

in general. As we know, that had become something of a dark "speciality" of Europe, due to her extraordinary technical prowess and superior military strategy and materiel, the destructive power of which had already then begun to be terrifying. A reaction to the cruelty of wars waged by Europeans was the emergence of international law and the Red Cross movement. A beginning had been made in 1864 when sixteen nations accepted the Geneva Convention aimed at improving the lot of the wounded and infirm in the armed forces. It took a young Genevois named Henri Dunant to witness the battlefield at Solferino in 1856, a day after the clash fought as part of the Austro-Italian war. After that, instead of becoming a banker,[70] Dunant devoted himself to the cause of creating the Red Cross and the signing of the aforementioned convention. This signing was already incredibly late, given the general scale of civilisational development of Europe and the growing scale of European wars and battles, accompanied by growing numbers of casualties. When it came to warfare, the apparently civilised Europe took a very long time to become civilised. The convention, though limited, was a first attempt at introducing a humanitarian element into international affairs, an element resting on international law. We owe the emergence of the convention not to politicians or military leaders who had been waging wars with gusto, but a representative of what we would today call "civil society". And it would be civil society that would turn out to be Europe's contribution to the civilisation of international affairs.

The next, much broader, approach at solving the issue of war and peace from a normative perspective was represented by the Hague conferences from the turn of the XIX century. Although initiated by politicians – the Tsar of All Russia and the Queen of the Netherlands – they were actually inspired by a Polish entrepreneur and philanthropist of Jewish extraction, Jan Bloch. He became interested in the results of a future war in Europe and was convinced that those would be so catastrophic that any such war had to be prevented.[71] The Hague Conference of 1899 gathered twenty-six nations – the United States, China and Japan among the non-Europeans adopted several conventions limiting the use of military force during war and also called for further conferences. The participants also stated that, "The Conference is of [sic] opinion that the restriction of military

70 Henri Dunant was the recipient of the first Nobel Peace Prize in 1901.

71 J. Bloch, *The Future of War in Its Technical, Economic and Political Relations*, Hansebooks, Norderstedt, 2017 (reprint of 1899 edition). This work was created in stages during the last decade of the XIX century. Tsar Nikolai II became interested in it and extended his personal invitation to Bloch to take part in the first Hague Conference in 1899.

charges, which are at present a heavy burden on the world, is extremely desirable for the increase of the material and moral welfare of mankind".[72] Self-awareness, it seemed, was in ample supply; actual politics somewhat less so. The second Hague Conference of 1907 had a far broader reach. Forty-four nations took part in it – mostly still European ones but also sixteen from Latin America, plus the United States and a few from Asia and Africa.[73] A full thirteen conventions were drawn up, dealing mostly with limiting the means and ways of conducting both land and naval warfare, as well as the customs and laws governing war on land. Most important was the First Hague Convention of 1907, which dealt with peaceful settlement of international disputes. The title of its first section already sounded promising: "The Maintenance of General Peace". Here, too, the sides agreed to prevent "as far as possible recourse to force in the relations between States" and to use peaceful methods to settle international disputes. As it turned out seven years later, in 1914, the capacity of countries to refrain from the use of force were rather limited. And this was despite the fact that the convention offered an entire spectrum of means of achieving peaceful settlement, from useful assistance through fact-finding to arbitrage. Our point here is not to criticise the actions of the big powers at the time – that is obvious – but to notice those early attempts by Europe to introduce a normative dimension into international relations.

2 The League of Nations as a normative dimension of international order

The League of Nations was the first comprehensive project for an international order, whose value lay primarily in its unprecedented normative and institutional aspects. Evidence for this thesis is the fact that the treaty established, firstly, rules and regulations of law and international relations; secondly, universally available membership of the international organisation; and thirdly, an international security system. The latter is important since security is always a key issue in any international order, and it is the first role of a state. In this sense, the League of Nations, its make-up and tasks, reached far beyond what President Wilson had

72 Point A.2 in: http://opil.ouplaw.com/view/10.1093/law:epil/9780199231690/law-9780199231690-e305; 1907 Conference: http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/pacific.asp#art1. Polish edition: Text of the Final Act of the Hague Conference, K. Kocot, K. Wolfke (eds.), *op. cit*., p. 282.

73 The second Hague Conference was convened by the Queen of the Netherlands, the Tsar of Russia and the President of the United States.

postulated in his Fourteen Point speech. This is because it was created from within the European tradition of how eternal peace and the organisation of Europe were thought of.

In terms of values, the sense of the League of Nations written in the preamble of the Pact, lay in its care for peace and security, in refraining from warfare, in the transparency of international relations, justice and honour (perhaps the last time the word "honour" would appear in an international treaty) and the respect for binding international law. The League's structure as an organisation was simple, made up of members states, representing mainly Europe and South America at the time, plus a few countries from beyond those two continents. At the beginning there were thirty-two member states; at its peak there were fifty-eight. (The United Nations [UN] would start with fifty-one states.) All member states sat in the Assembly and the work of the League was to be undertaken by committees in addition to plenary sessions. The League's Council was to be a continuation of the concert of powers victorious in World War I, that is Great Britain, France, the United States, Japan and Italy. This was to be a representation of the balance of power in the international order of the time. During the almost twenty-year period of the League's activity, its composition changed all the time, a fact which we will examine, while the Council's only two permanent members were two European powers – France and Great Britain. Moreover, like any organisation, the League had an international secretariat, headquartered in stable and stately Geneva.

From a normative point of view, the League's greatest value besides its sheer existence was the acceptance of a set of core rules which were to govern international relations, ensuring peace and security to its members. From this perspective, member states' undertaking to "respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all Members of the League" (Article 10). This was unprecedented in the history of diplomacy and international relations. What is more, "in case of any such aggression or in case of any threat or danger of such aggression" the Council would "advise upon the means by which this obligation shall be fulfilled". This is, of course, the core of the League's collective security system, and any other such subsequent system. Further, Article 11 states that "any war or threat of war […] is hereby declared a matter of concern to the whole League […]". Breaking, by any member of the League, of the ban on war "in disregard of its covenants […]" would be understood as "an act of war against all other Members of the League" (Article 16). The same article then states what sanctions would be levied against an offending state: severance of relations, possibility of military action by the League, possible removal from the League.

Implementation of obligations stemming from Article 10 was to be assisted by the dispositions of Articles 12–16, which set down a broad spectrum of peaceful means of settlement of disputes. Member states undertook not to resort to war until such peaceful means were exhausted. These included arbitration, an international court and political settlement with the help of the Council. The Covenant foresaw the establishment of the League's judiciary arm, the Permanent Tribunal of International Justice. This was created, with its seat in The Hague. Article 20 of the Covenant established the primacy of obligations (rules, law) of the League over all other international obligations of member states.

The mandate system created by the League of Nations was primarily a means of stripping of colonies away from countries which had lost a war – mainly Germany – and turning them over for management by other colonial powers. This was therefore, in a sense, acquisition of foreign bounty. Despite this, the aim was to improve the situation of peoples who resided in those territories and offer them a path towards independence. Article 22 refers to "peoples not yet able to stand by themselves under the strenuous conditions of the modern world […]" and that "[…] the well-being and development of such peoples form a sacred trust [read: obligation] of civilisation […]". No international document today could include this wording because of political correctness, but at the time it denoted the universalism of the League's rules and practices, and the desire to extend those standards to peoples who did not yet have their own states. A special permanent commission of the League was to supervise the enactment of a mandate, that is the treatment by the mandatory ("developed nation") of the people in its care. Such rules had not existed before and would influence the standards of conduct of the European powers towards their colonies.[74]

The acceptance of the Covenant and the establishment of the League of Nations attested to the most radical transition of how international order was thought of, from *si vis pacem para bellum* (*ius ad bellum* which was a sovereign's "God-given" right) to *pax per iustitiam* (peace through law). The League of Nations was also the first expression of the existence of the "international community". From then on, this phrase would enter the parlance of commentary and publications concerned with international relations. Europe would be seen by the rest of the World through the prism of not only colonial conquest and imperial politics but also universal institutions and laws which it was creating for the benefit of the rest of the World. In the times of the League, Europe became the

74 Text of the Covenant of the League of Nations: http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/leagcov.asp. Polish edition: K. Kocot, K. Wolfke (eds.), *op. cit*., pp. 47–58.

international centre of diplomatic activity, with its capital in elegant Geneva. As Great Britain had been considered "the World's factory" during the XIX century, so during the times of the League, Europe was the "factory" which turned out international norms and mechanisms which regulated international relations. Her role vis-à-vis the Rest of the World was not to change – remaining a collective colonial metropolis.

The establishment of the League of Nations with all of its functions activated a mighty diplomatic machinery aimed at consolidating the letter of the Pact in the form of more detailed agreements, setting down more concrete regulations based on its sometimes general and declarative wording. At this stage, therefore, I will point only to three large areas of the League's norm-producing activity.

The first is anti-war law. Europe's experience, including the most recent events of World War I, as well as the potential for conflict following the cessation of hostilities, gave this issue highest priority. Most important here was, of course, the Kellogg–Briand Pact (an anti-war treaty), initiated by the French minister Aristide Briand and proposed also by the Head of US diplomacy Frank B. Kellogg. It was signed on 27 August 1928 and the parties to it (including Germany) renounced "war as an instrument of national policy".[75] There had never been such a treaty. *Ius ad bellum* was delegalised! In addition, within the framework of the League many other agreements were signed, further developing a regime of peaceful resolution of conflicts. Of particular importance was the 1928 General Act concerning the peaceful settlement of disputes. The Act significantly enlarged the scope of possible conciliatory procedures, including arbitrage and legal argument before a court. We can include in this category the 1931 Convention on improving the means of prevention of war, developed by a special commission for investigation of disputes and conflicts.

Disarmament and arms control were a second area. In this realm, the wording of the Pact of the League of Nations turned out to be most idealistic. In its lengthy Article 8, the League's members agreed that "the maintenance of peace requires the reduction of national armaments". In addition, the Council was to "formulate plans for such reduction" for each state. Thirdly, members of the League undertook to "interchange full and frank information as to the scale

75 Text of the Pact: http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/kbpact.asp. Aristide Briand wanted to include the United States in issues of Europe's balance of power and security through a bilateral treaty. This could not be accomplished at the time. Instead, the treaty banning the use of force was signed in Paris – a historic achievement in the context of international relations. Fifteen states comprised the initial signatories; by 1939 that number had reached sixty-three.

of their armaments", as well as their plans for arms development and the state of their arms industry. These ideas were initially implemented only in Europe (within the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe [CSCE] and the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe [OSCE]), and only in the 1990s, that is following the end of the Cold War. To be sure, 1927 saw the establishment of the League's Expert Committee which was charged with formulating lists of expenditures required for defence – different for each state, while the rest of the expenditures were to be struck off. It is easy to see how the effectiveness of this Committee was nil. The largest and most unprecedented undertaking was the World Disarmament Conference which took place in 1932–1934 after several years of preparations. The United States and the Soviet Union, neither of which was a member of the League at the time, also took part in this Conference. The Conference worked on the definition of aggression (an even narrower one emerged),[76] the means to control the implementation of obligations and the development of common security – although the term was not used at the time. Following Hitler's rise to power and the German armament programme, the Conference was soon suspended and postponed *sine die*. Naturally, it was a failure for other reasons as well and the other powers did not have completely pure intentions. The carefully prepared disarmament conference, its order of proceedings, or selection of issues to be solved would eventually become a point of reference for other similar undertakings in the future, as part of the UN and beyond.

Human rights were another area of activity of the League. The phrase was not in use at the time, but the beginnings of protection of human rights did emerge within the League, as evidenced by the League's European genesis and its idealistic, normative profile. Article 23 of the Pact makes this clear, by referring to the rights of (native) populations of earmarked territories. It talks about securing for them humane working conditions, of generally just treatment and of the duty which the League had to address the issue of trade in women and children. In Article 25, members of the League supported the activities of the Red Cross. The League of Nations system also included the International Labour Organization (ILO) (Chapter 13 of the Versailles Treaty) which would be the inception of another mighty branch of human rights – international labour law. Even within the times of the League, the ILO drew up many tens of conventions from that field. Finally, the League of Nations system gained fame with one more area of human

76 The USSR initiated the 1933 creation of an agreement on the definition of aggression. This covered more than ten of the Soviet Union's neighbours and was something of a repeat of Litvinov's protocol, who had extended the decisions of the Kellogg–Briand Pact over those countries.

rights, established through national minority treaties. These treaties were signed between the League and new states (of Central and Southern Europe) formed from the former Austro-Hungarian Empire and also in part on the territory formerly belonging to imperial Germany. The issue here was the protection of rights of national minorities, whether they be minorities of race, language or religion. The unilateral practice of those treaties got a bad name (favouring Berlin's revisionist policies) but even the mere identification of these issues and the establishment of grievance procedures would have major, unprecedented influence on the general development of human rights and individual regional systems after World War II. We ought to mention that non-governmental steps towards introducing "classic" human rights through a suitable document, a kind of declaration of human rights, were attempted, but due to the worsening international climate of the 1930s, these steps never reached the level of intergovernmental discussion.

3 The fall of the system of the League

This wonderful, innovative, breakthrough project that aimed to civilise the international order fell apart less than twenty years after its inception.[77] It was destroyed by states which deemed themselves victims of the Versailles system, and the destruction of the League was completed thoughtlessly, though consciously, by the powers that had created that system – Great Britain, France and the United States. The United States, as we know, never became a member of the League as, in the autumn of 1919, the US Senate had rejected ratification of the Pact. The United States had refused in particular to be limited in its actions (the "right to intervene") in Latin America, as per the Monroe Doctrine. The US also wanted to avoid having to submit to the rigours of the League in terms of arming itself. The diversionary tactics employed against President Wilson during the time of the Paris conference and the commission to establish the League are very well described by Elmer Bendiner in the well-known work *A Time of Angels*.[78]

77 The most highly regarded Polish work on the state of diplomacy in international relations during the era of the League of Nations is H. Batowski, *Między dwiema wojnami 1919–1939. Zarys historii dyplomatycznej* [*Between Two Wars 1919–1939. A Sketch of Diplomatic History*], Wydawnictwo Literackie, Kraków, 1988.

78 A Democratic senator, in criticism of the Covenant, stated that America would "never renounce its rights" and "the Sermon on the Mount, the Decalogue and the Monroe Doctrine are absolutely sufficient". Senator Henry Cabot Lodge (R, Conn.), as the main opponent of the League of Nations, said that, "under this draft of the constitution of the league of nations American questions and European questions and Asia and African questions are all alike put within the control and jurisdiction of the league. Europe

Germany and the Soviet Union had felt themselves the victims of the Versailles system. They did, after all, have to agree to a loss of some of their pre-war territories to the benefit of states which had been reborn in Central and Eastern Europe. Further, Moscow and Berlin did not wish to be bound by the League's rules and the demands of multilateral diplomacy, depending as it did on dialogue and compromise. Due to geopolitical or ideological reasons, they openly strove towards a revision of the system or its annulment. Following Locarno, Germany entered the League as a tactical measure for a few years (1926–1933) but left it as soon as Hitler came to power, beginning preparations for the destruction of the European order and imposition of its own, murderous hegemony. Soviet Russia entered the League "for a moment" (1934–1939) when it seemed that it had come to terms with Versailles (that, too, was a tactical measure) but ceased to be a member after the invasion of Finland in 1939. Italy, with its theatrical Fascism, had little to say within the League, and left following the invasion of Ethiopia in 1935. Japan's story was similar – due to the distance it had not made its presence in the League felt particularly strongly, and finally left in 1933, to enact its aggressive plans in East Asia, joining the Anti-Comintern Pact.[79]

So, of the five powers that were permanent members of the Council of the League (or seven, counting the long-term membership of Germany and Soviet Russia), only two had continuous membership, France and Great Britain. And they were the two states, France in particular, that understood the sense of the League as a project of an international order. They, too, however, began to treat the League as either an instrument, or a barrier to the realisation of their own national or imperial interests. Pre-war thinking and practice quickly took over in Europe, with political and diplomatic manoeuvres contrary to the spirit and the letter of the League of Nations. The Locarno Pact (1925) was the beginning of this end, with Western states and global powers guaranteeing that Germany would respect the integrity of their borders. The Pact did not include Germany's

---

will have the right to take part in the settlement of all American questions… We are asked, therefore, in a large and important degree to substitute internationalism for nationalism and an international state for pure Americanism…". Henry Cabot Lodge, Constitution of the League of Nations, February 28, 1919, https://www.senate.gov/artandhistory/history/resources/pdf/LodgeLeagueofNations.pdf. See also E. Bendiner, *A Time for Angels: The Tragicomic History of the League of Nation*s, Littlehampton Book Service, Worthing, 1975.

79 This was an agreement between Nazi Germany, Fascist Italy and Japan, which was readying itself for military expansion. It was formally directed against the Comintern, the Communist International, formed by Moscow in 1919.

neighbours to the East, offering them arbitration conventions instead. This was, of course, against the logic of the Pact of the League of Nations, and its underlying system of collective security. The path from Locarno to Munich turned out to be a short one – a mere thirteen years in fact. The steps which followed, kept in the general logic of Locarno, saw the European powers adopt unilateral actions which were as myopic as they were selfish: the Pact of the Four, the Stresa Front and the Munich Conference – perhaps the most heinous diplomatic event of the time. An exception to this trend was the project of an Eastern Pact, an attempt by Paris to right the wrongs of Locarno, though that one also ended before it began. The openly expansionistic policies of Nazi Germany were greeted with an astonishingly lax attitude. Its 1936 annexation of Rhineland, until then a buffer for France, precipitated an arms race but, at the same time, the Western powers, in particular Great Britain, did everything to direct Germany's attention eastwards. The infamous term "appeasement", which comes from British politics of the time, would forever enter the vocabulary of – not just European – diplomacy.[80] The evaporation of the spirit of self-preservation from the democratic powers of Europe, from France and Britain – be it out of convenience, fear or selfishness – returned only a short time before German's attack on Poland.[81] Which was, alas, too late. The war which in 1934 could have been averted through concerted action, was inevitable by the late summer of 1939.[82] Europe had allowed itself to be set on fire. The League of Nations was destroyed by a central European power which in a short time had become the mighty, destructive antithesis of European civilisation.

The fall of the first normative international order, created in Europe by Europe, came about not so much through it being contested but through geopolitical actions of big powers, whose nationalist ambitions led to the outbreak of another great war. The international order of the League of Nations was destroyed by two totalitarian systems of Europe, "Europe" being taken in the sense of geography, not of civilisation: Fascism and Communism. It has to be said that, although culturally the enemies of Europe, both of those were nourished at their inception by entirely European and, initially, innocent ideas. The democratic West attempted to halt Communism, that is the expansion of the Soviet Union,

---

80 This process of Europe's slide towards war through myopic manoeuvring by the European powers is eloquently described in: B. Simms, *op. cit.*, pp. 362–404.

81 J. Karski, *Wielkie mocarstwa wobec Polski 1919–1945. Od Wersalu do Jałty* [*Great Powers and Poland 1919–1945. From Versailles to Yalta*], Wydawnictwo Poznańskie, Poznań, 2014.

82 For example, Józef Piłsudski suggested that France ought to take preventative measures in arming herself following Hitler's rise to power. Paris rejected that idea.

and actually succeeded. The Soviet leaders decided that they would have to wait for their next opportunity, for instance the one described by Lenin – the next intra-imperialist war. The Third Reich did not obscure its intentions from the beginning, but those intentions were initially ignored, perhaps precisely because Hitler was so open about them. The belief existed that it may be enough to offer him the "East-European sacrificial lambs". The genocidal traits of this project were also ignored for a long time. Characteristically, two powers (Germany and Soviet Russia), although ideologically opposed, cooperated for a long time to destroy the Versailles order in its geopolitical dimension. European democracies, which ought to have been interested in retaining the League of Nations, tolerated the growing threats for a long time while – as in Munich – betraying the fundamental rules and ideals which had led to the League's formation.

The punishment for not coming to the defence of the order of the League of Nations and the basic values of their own civilisation, for cowardice and deals with Hitler, for the degeneration of European politics was monstrous. Europe allowed itself to be set on fire. Writers called this European suicide, a European *auto da fé*, and the defeat was twofold – both in real terms and in terms of ideals. Europe ceased to be the centre of the World, the political and economic hub, the place where the fates of the geopolitical shaping of the World and its balance of powers were decided. Europe also ceased to establish the normative dimension of geopolitics. Highly symbolically, the headquarters of global normative authority moved from Geneva (the League of Nations' headquarters) to New York (UN).

Still, the normative patterns of an international order would survive the fall of Europe and of the League of Nations itself, which finally dissolved in January of 1946. Although the League was subsequently mainly discussed in political pamphlets, the international community did not come up with anything new or different, only a modified and improved version of the League – the UN – forged in the experiences of the inter-war period. So, although Europe could not defend its own normative international order, she gave the World a certain paradigm, towards the end of her reign as the "centre of the World" (according to Wallerstein). This paradigm was accepted by the World, and since 1945 has been protected more effectively than the European League of Nations ever was in Europe. That, however, is a separate issue. Characteristically, Norman Davies, the author of a monumental history of Europe, titled the chapter dealing with the period 1914–1945 "Tenebrae: Europe in Eclipse".[83] We could take that to mean that this exceptional historian wished to comment on the eclipse of the minds

83 N. Davies, *op. cit.*

of European politicians. The inter-war period was the time of the culmination of Europe's position in the World, in imperial terms as well as normative and cultural ones. The eclipse, the "invisibility", of Europe in the international order occurred after 1945.

4 Europe's Absence from the Cold War Order

Europe's inability to defend the League of Nations' system had numerous far-reaching consequences. To begin with, the human, biological and moral costs were immense: 40–45 million dead (the exact number remains an estimate), most of them civilians. A part of this death toll was taken by the holocaust, a system of concentration camps, an attempt at the industrial-scale extermination of the Jews who, after all, had been living in Europe before the Germans ever did. Carpet bombing had laid a number of cities to waste. The war had been apocalyptic as none before. The Old Continent and its nations had bled themselves dry, been brought to their knees, morally devastated, economically blighted, socially destabilised. The term "hecatomb", used to define World War I, took on its full meaning only in the light of World War II.

The punishment for Europe consisted not just of the unprecedented drama of the war itself; Europe had been taken off its pedestal. It had ceased to be the centre of the World system, the leader of the rest of the world and the avant-garde for the development of humanity. Worse yet, Europe was denied any agency in the new, bi-polar international order. Without her former might and greatness, she moved from conqueror to an object of the confrontation between two superpowers which were established in the void left by Europe's downfall. The international order "had to manage" without Europe while it was left to watch, full of bitterness and frustration, as others took on the roles of conqueror and leader. Europe had to accept their primacy and – in the case of the nations of the eastern part of the continent – the imposition of their brutal power. Nothing of this kind had been seen in Europe since her very beginnings, the time of Charles the Great.

1 A new *cuius regio, eius religio* (400 years later)

The disenfranchisement of Europe stemmed primarily from her division, which both strategically and ideologically impacted the entire world. In this global confrontation, "The main battlefield remained Europe" (B. Simms).[84] At any time the metaphorical battlefield could become a real battlefield, as both sides possessed gigantic military potential whose purpose was to prevent even slight shifts in

84 B. Simms, *Europe. The Struggle for Supremacy, from 1453 to the Present*, Basic Books, New York, 2013, p. 456.

international borders and any change in the balance of power, and anxiety, set over the few years which followed the end of World War II. The demarcation line itself was set by the moment of the capitulation of the Third Reich. Towards the end of the war, the Allied forces in the West and the Red Army were effectively racing each other to take far-reaching positions since both sides were very conscious of the fact that every scrap of territory liberated from the Nazis would become a highly valuable strategic and ideological possession, a bargaining piece in the coming confrontation with the then ally. The West (the Americans) realised this relatively late, delaying the opening of the Western Front thereby allowing the Soviets to settle as far as the Elbe. There, the soldiers and commanders of the Western and Eastern Fronts greeted each other somewhat less effusively than the soldiers of the Wehrmacht and the Red Army had done in Brest on the River Bug – after invading Poland in September of 1939.

The division *manu militari* had been, as it were, accepted in advance at the political and diplomatic levels. Its symbol became the Yalta Conference which took place in Crimea in February 1945. This event has a terrible reputation in the political discourse as well as within the academic community, although its essential decisions did not bear on the division of Europe, decided *after* the war. *It is true* that Germany had been divided into various occupation zones, and the Soviet Union received one of those; it is true that none of the territorial gains made by the Soviet Union at the expense of its Eastern European neighbours was questioned; it is true that power in liberated Poland was, *de facto*, to be held by the Communists installed there by Stalin (the temporary government). Nevertheless, it was made plain in several places that political changes in the liberated countries were to take place in a democratic way, that is respecting the will of those nations and by means of secret and open elections. This was especially stressed in the Declaration of Liberated Europe, an integral part of the Yalta documents signed by the "great three", that is the leaders of the USSR, the United States and Great Britain – Joseph Stalin, Franklin D. Roosevelt and Winston Churchill. The Declaration, which is full of phrases like "democratic institutions", "sovereign rights of nations" and "free elections", was also an undertaking to coordinate and commonly agree actions of the "three" in respect of the liberated lands as well as the victims, and allies, of the Third Reich. At the Potsdam Conference attended by the "great three" in July and August of 1945, following the close of World War II of that year, the leaders confirmed those general rules of conduct and the need for the "three" to cooperate in solving political and economic problems of those states.

After some years, when – as it turned out – Stalin had not adhered to the Yalta undertakings, and when the reality of Soviet rule in Moscow's sphere of influence became clear, questions were raised whether the Western leaders could have

foreseen this a turn of events. To a degree, certainly – especially in the case of Churchill who held no illusions as to the true nature of Russian Communism. In such circumstances, it was more convenient for them to pretend that they trusted their ally's, Stalin's, signature, for two reasons. Firstly, they needed him to bring the war in Europe to a final, victorious end, while the Americans needed him to lessen the cost of victory over Japan (they did not have atomic weapons just yet). The price for this was a series of territorial and political concessions, at the expense of smaller states, which had already been the victims of either Germany or the Soviet Union. Secondly, the Anglo-Saxons had no intention of fighting for freedom or democracy in nations of Central Eastern or Southern Europe. They did not think it would be effective, nor that it would suit their interests. Already before the war, London had excluded the possibility of actual fighting in defence of Poland, though the enemy was a common one. Any military action against the Soviets, who had been their allies since 1941, was all the more unlikely.

The division of Europe began with the division of Germany. The "fight for the soul of Europe" was primarily a fight for the soul and the shape of that particular country.[85] The Western Allies had agreed their policies in the three occupation zones. They aided their economic development with a free market model, installed a democratic regime, in which the Germans found themselves remarkably comfortable, and unified the three zones to form one entity. A Germany that stood on its own two feet while remaining under Allied control was necessary due to the growing tension in relations with the Soviet Union. Germany's importance to Stalin's politics was underscored by a blockade of Berlin's Western sectors (1948–1949) in response, in part, to the West's policies in the Western occupation zones. Soviet policies in the largest, eastern zone resulted in economic ruin for the area (looting and terror being commonplace). There, Moscow was ruthless in implementing their rule, and receiving payback for their role in the victory. Russia exited the committee of the four powers whose role was to coordinate common policies towards Germany. In these circumstances, the Western Allies decided to announce the formation of the Federal Republic of Germany out of their three occupation zones (May 1949). In response, the Soviets formed the entirely communist German Democratic Republic (GDR). The division of Germany, into two separate states belonging to opposing camps, became a fact.[86] This turn of events gave Russia (in its Soviet form), a civilisationally non-

85 B. Simms, *op. cit*., p. 459.

86 For a more detailed discussion, see: J. Holzer, *Europa zimnej wojny* [*Europe in the Cold War*], Znak, Kraków, 2012, pp. 173–196.

European superpower, a chance to extend its power to the Elbe as never before in history (apart from a short episode during the Napoleonic era). All this, thanks to the "internal" war which Old Europe had been incapable of preventing.

The GDR was merely the westernmost flank of Soviet power in Europe. Its victims included countries from across the central and southern parts of the continent. The Soviets worked hard to assimilate their war booty – territory from the GDR to the USSR, from the Baltic to the Adriatic. The former Central Europe might also be referred to as "Intermarium" (in Polish: "Międzymorze"), to use Piłsudzki's conception of a union of central-European countries in resistance to Russia. Central Europe had been an integral part of Europe for over a thousand years, yet it relatively quickly became a part of the Soviet Empire – a force which rejected European heritage and announced its desire to extend its power universally. With its regional position, its geo-strategic location, and a history of relations with both White and Red Russia, Poland was a key acquisition in this context. The "Polish issue" was therefore one of the most difficult questions addressed by the "Big Three" at the end of the war. The Yalta and Potsdam decisions, along with Stalin's iron-fisted politics of *fait accompli*, decided the fate of Poland's inclusion in the Soviet sphere of influence. As it had been the first victim of the war, with aggression against it beginning the hostilities, it became also the first victim of the victory. The pattern was the same in Poland as in other countries that fell to the Soviets. The physical presence of the Red Army and the Narodnyy Komissariat Vnutrennikh Del (NKVD) made it possible to install communist regimes supported, or even delivered, by Moscow. Physical elimination of forces of democracy opposed to the regime ensued simultaneously, through murder, imprisonment or flight to the West. Within two to three years a new system, complete in all detail would be formed: ideology, government (primacy of the party over the state), nationalised economy ("reform"), internal security apparatus, all would be subject to Moscow's control and directives.

The introduction of this new order resembled the implementation of the 1555 Augsburg rule – *cuius regio, eius religio*. The many long and bloody wars throughout Europe's history had never managed to break ordinary interpersonal – as well as economic, cultural or scientific – contacts between people. Following World War II, however, things were rather different. The regions under Soviet control became subject to the imposition of the new "religion" through most brutal, odious, far-reaching means ever. In 1555 the issue was only religion. After World War II, the "faith" imposed by one of the sides was totalitarian and equipped with numerous instruments of imposing its decisions and enforcing obedience, from the torture chamber to a monopoly over information and propaganda. The revolution and defence of its "achievements" required terror, and terror was

employed liberally.[87] In order for any of this to have effect, imposition of impermeable boundaries was necessary. This was accomplished at such a knock-out speed that only ten months after the end of World War II, and only eight months after the "great three" conference in Potsdam, on 5 March 1946, Churchill was able to give his famous Fulton (Missouri) speech: "From Stettin in the Baltic to Trieste in the Adriatic, an iron curtain has descended across the Continent. […] The Communist parties […] are seeking everywhere to obtain totalitarian control. Police governments are prevailing in nearly every case […] this is certainly not the Liberated Europe we fought to build up"[88] (referring to the Yalta declaration).

2 The institutionalisation of the division of Europe and its consequences

The division of Europe, and the division of the World as a parallel process, had many dimensions and was presented in many ways. It had multidimensional consequences, not limited to economic, diplomatic or military formulae such as the entente, Locarno or the Anti-Comintern Pact – as had been the case in the past. The new division was spoken of in such terms as "West-East" (blocs), "bipolar" (antagonism of two opposed superpowers), "Cold War" (confrontation without the use of military force). This division manifested itself in the following spheres:

- Political (a fight for influence in individual states, the propagation of different models of government)
- Strategic (balance of power in Europe and the World, and the accompanying arms race)
- Economic (the clash of two opposing models of development)
- Ideological and social (the clash of two opposing visions of social order, in individual states as well as globally)

This division had one more feature. Not only was it all-embracing, it was also universalist – stretching as it did across the entire World – and binary: success

87 P. Courtois et al., *Czarna księga komunizmu. Zbrodnie, terror, prześladowania*, Prószyński i S-ka, Warsaw, 1999. The chapter concerned with Poland was written by Prof. A. Paczkowski.

88 W. Churchill, *This Is Certainly Not the Liberated Europe We Sought to Build Up*, "International Herald Tribune", 12 March 1999.

for one side meant loss for the other. This context defined the sharpness of the conflict and the constant threat of the Cold War turning hot.

Nothing worse could have happened to Europe. Not only was it thrown off the pedestal of the "Ruler of the World", standing Athena-like over the globe and its peoples, but her destiny was also decided by powers beyond her borders. This disenfranchisement was all the more painful because of the United States's European roots and Russia's perceived civilisational inferiority. The two foreign superpowers competed in Europe, within her territory, but their competition had a global character. On the one hand, Europe was one of the theatres of this competition, while her potential was subjugated to the global interests of those powers, on the other. Pax Americana and Pax Sovietica took the place of Pax Europaea (and Pax Britannica and others) in territories where the two extended their control and influence. Both declared their universal ambitions, but their main potential was concentrated in Europe whose division was therefore so rigid and complete. Both sides were convinced that the situation in Europe would decide the global balance of power, which is why no geopolitical shifts were allowed once the new order was set. Each superpower attempted to pull its part of Europe closest to itself and to shape it in its own image, in the sense of spreading its developmental model.

As for the train of events which were the results of the World War II and of decisions taken by the "Big Three" in 1945, well, those are well known and the scope of this work does not require that they be recounted in detail. In the name of chronology, only the main events will be mentioned here. The US Army brought liberation to Western Europe and, with the exception of Germany, was relatively quickly recalled back home, across the Atlantic. It could not, however, bring economic, and certainly not social, restoration. The ruin of Europe's economies was not limited to the physical destruction of factories but also included the results of production being shifted to serve the war effort, severing of connections and a lack of workers, alongside unemployment. The drop in gross national product reached 50% or more for some countries and regions. This meant poverty, social unrest, instability and resultant attractiveness of populist and leftist, including communist, ideologies. The model of the victorious Soviet Union appeared to be an attractive alternative, especially as the human cost of "Soviet progress" was never seen up close. Communist parties in the West were in fact gaining in popularity. There were reasons to believe that, at the right moment, Moscow might use them as a fifth column. Therefore, in June of 1947, the Marshall Plan was announced. The plan of the Secretary of State, and of Washington, was to use massive financial aid to enable Western Europe, and Germany in particular, to rebuild its economies. "The Plan" could have included the countries of

Eastern Europe, but Stalin would have none of it. The need for substantial financial assistance to revitalise its economies, minimise poverty and prevent its societies from sliding into social instability and political radicalism showed how far Europe had fallen, from having been the richest part of the world only a few years before, and how deep the war's consequences had been.[89] The Plan worked very well and bound the economies of Western Europe closer to economy of the United States (previously those relations had been relatively limited). To implement the Marshall Plan, the Organisation for European Economic Cooperation (OEEC) was set up. The assistance was feasible not only for strategic reasons but also because the United States had become, for a short time at least, an economic mega-superpower; its share in global production was almost 50% – an unprecedented situation.[90]

The binding of the United States and Western Europe in the political and strategic sphere followed very easily. The Europeans quickly realised that in their condition – and faced with the geo-strategic superiority of the USSR – they would not be able to withstand an offensive by the Red Army. The blockade of West Berlin confirmed Moscow's determination in the heart of Europe and its readiness to use force to achieve its aims. The Brussels Pact of five countries signed in March 1948 was not sufficiently credible in this respect.[91] At the common request of London and Paris, therefore, the Americans decided to enter into a broader treaty with a larger number of European countries, signing the Washington treaty in April of 1949. This provided the groundwork for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization – to be established within a few years. The western part of Europe – which not a half century earlier had been conquering the World and extending its empires – became a US protectorate in terms of its security. The Atlantic Treaty became the main instrument in the strategy of halting the Soviet Union and a nuclear deterrent.[92]

The political, strategic and economic planes were most important, in terms of absorbing the western part of the Continent into post-war Pax Americana. The United States's primacy among Western nations was felt in other areas too. For

89 The Plan meant some 13 billion dollars for Europe, although the full extent of America's assistance was almost twice of that. Further discussion in: J. Holzer, *op. cit*., Chapter 5: *Odbudowa gospodarcza na Zachodzie* [*Economic Revitalisation in the West*].

90 In the following years the share dropped slowly to around 25%, where it remained for the subsequent decades.

91 A London initiative which bound Great Britain, France, Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg in a military alliance.

92 R. Kuźniar, *Polityka i siła*…, *op. cit*., p. 207 and subsequent pages.

example, in finance, where the US dollar replaced European currencies in the international financial system and became a true world currency (though the British pound retained a substantial role, due to City of London and the remaining British colonies). The 1944 Bretton Woods system, consisting of two financial institutions – the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund[93] – was entirely in American hands, due to their share in the global product and the role of the dollar. America took over from Europe in terms of scientific development and technological innovation. In the two decades following World War II, the great majority (over 50%) of Nobel Prize laureates in physics, chemistry as well as physiology and medicine were American. Finally, America took over from Europe in terms of ideology. The "American way of life" had no equal in terms of the attractiveness of its lifestyle and its social order. Popular culture enforced the vision of, sometimes rebellious, freedom and the ability for anyone to reach success through courage and hard work, in a place where everybody got a chance. The leading figures of Hollywood's dream factory from John Wayne to Glenn Ford or singers from Elvis Presley to Bob Dylan were heroes to the imaginations of people from Los Angeles through Warsaw to Tokyo.

In the discourse describing the World, Europe was replaced not just by the United States ("America") but also by the West. In a geopolitical sense, this phrase, like the Atlantic Alliance, became common only after World War II. After all, there had not been a geopolitical "West" before. Europe's place in the international order was taken by "the Free World" (in an affirmative version) or Pax Americana (in a version for those with some scepticism). Western European countries remaining within the American sphere of influence had the distinct advantage of continuation of civilisation. Western Europe did not need to leave its civilisation. To the contrary, she could safely continue developing it. Meanwhile, the nations of Eastern Europe, under Soviet power, faced the threat of sudden civilisational uprooting.

The Soviet plan for the nations which had fallen under their sphere of influence included tearing them away from Europe not just in political and economic terms, but in civilisational terms too. Hence the widespread attempts at cutting their Christian heritage away at its roots. This was an attempt to control their identity which was to fail, due to the depth of that identity in those nations and people. "Breaking away from Europe" and connecting to Moscow centre

93 The establishment of the International Trade Organization (ITO), the third of the planned institutions, did not eventuate. In its place, 1947 saw the creation of GATT, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

included all areas of life – in keeping with the consciously totalitarian character of Soviet Communism – and was executed at several levels.[94] The first of those were the bilateral relations between each state and the USSR, giving the countries satellite status. Appropriate agreements shaped their inferiority in legal terms (limited sovereignty), as well as in terms of the party ideology, economy and military affairs. Altogether, these agreements made Moscow the sun in its solar system, radiating its influence to all the other states. The second plane of implementation consisted of individual agreements between all of the satellite capitals (Warsaw and Sofia, e.g., or Bucharest and East Berlin), also governing all matters regarding relations between them, from party ideology to the military. The third plane of this structure were multilateral agreements. These began with the "Cominform" (a mutation of the Comintern, which had been dissolved in 1943), or the Information Bureau of the Communist Parties, created in March 1947 and tasked with party-ideological supervision over the newly-minted "allies" and "satellites".[95] In 1949, in response to the Marshall Plan and the creation of OEEC, the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance was formed. Its main objective was the permanent establishment of the communist economic model in the member countries (eight of them to begin with) and autarchy in the face of the West (breaking of earlier connections to avoid "the threat" of interdependency). Finally, in response to the Paris treaties signed by the Western countries in 1954,[96] the Warsaw Pact was created. It stood not just as a political and military alliance but also as a powerful instrument through which Moscow could discipline its "allies", as confirmed by the 1968 invasion of Czechoslovakia by Warsaw Pact forces, once it became clear that there was a probability of substantial reform of the socialist system in that country, and the introduction of "socialism with a human face". Not surprisingly, Moscow took this, quite rightly, as an attempt to depart from socialism altogether.

---

94 See also: W. Roszkowski, *Półwiecze. Historia polityczna świata po 1945 roku* [*A Half-Century. The Political History of the World after 1945*], Wyd. Naukowe PWN, Warsaw, 1997, Chapter: *W bloku komunistycznym* [*In the Communist Bloc*]; and J. Holzer, *op. cit*., Chapter: *Tworzenie bloku wschodniego i żelazna kurtyna* [*Creating the Eastern Bloc and the Iron Curtain*].

95 It was dissolved quickly, in 1956, following the "renewal" after the twentieth assembly of the Communist Party of the USSR, and due to the permanent establishment of "real socialism" in the satellite countries and their connection to Moscow.

96 They led to the creation of the Western European Union and the Brussels Pact, and to the inclusion of the Federal Republic of Germany in North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO).

Thus, there emerged a tightly bound, monolithic block of countries excluded from Europe in all aspects except for geography, heralding an impending "historic victory" over Europe, or at least her political systems and her civilisation as these were practised by the countries of Western Europe. This victory was to be reached either through "inevitable war" (Moscow gave up on the "inevitability of war" in 1956) or through peaceful competition, in which "the forces of peace, progress and socialism" (as defined by many party declarations) would prove their superiority over the opponents. Without getting into too many details of this construct and its evolution after 1956, including the time of detente, Moscow wished to create its own "anti-Europe" through its sphere of influence. This only serves to underscore the situation in which Europe found herself as a result of World War II and the divisions which had followed.

3 The birth of the "Little Europe" in the shadow of its protector from across the Atlantic

The disasters and ruin of World War II, Europe's division and the transfer of influence to external powers – these are not the only pieces of bad luck that befell the continent at that time. Shortly afterwards, many nations and territories of Africa and Asia began to free themselves from under Europe's colonial domination. Undoubtedly, that was one of the reasons why countries of Western Europe, of whom many had been colonial powers, would take a keener interest in Europe herself. The process of decolonisation outside of Europe hastened and supported the process of European integration.

Decolonisation had begun just after World War II. Within the subsequent fifteen years, the Europeans would part with possessions which they had been gradually gathering through the previous three centuries or more. There were several reasons for the sudden implosion of this global, if diverse, system, starting with the consequences of World War II. Soldiers conscripted from the colonies had served in European armies and assisted "their overlords" in regaining… independence and freedom. That experience could not be taken away from them. The earlier failure of those "overlords" and their subsequent misery meant that much of their legitimacy was already lost. This was compounded by the blighting of their military and financial powers, a process which crippled their ability to enforce obedience in the colonies. The other reason was, of course, support for the process of decolonisation from the side of the superpowers which took the opportunity to replace the Europeans and extend their global influence, in line with their universalist message which they preached. This was true in particular in the case of the Soviet Union which, in addition to supporting the

process itself, offered a model of development which appeared to be a shortcut to making up lost ground in terms of civilisational and economic development. The Americans also supported decolonisation as it fit very well into their "freedom mission". An apt demonstration of anti-colonial cooperation of the superpowers was their action against the intervention of Europe's colonial powers – Great Britain and France – following the nationalisation of the Suez Canal in 1956. Thirdly, keeping colonies ceased to be profitable in every sense – financial, political and moral. Drawn-out conflicts impacted the finances of the colonial powers and angered public opinion. It would be more profitable to grant independence to the colonies while keeping political and, especially, economic influence, along the lines of the US influence in Latin America.

The process began already in 1945, with the dismantling of British imperial acquisitions in South Asia and the Middle East. India, the jewel in the imperial crown, gained independence in 1947, with independent Pakistan being carved out of the territory at the same time. Indonesia (East Indies) gained independence from Holland in the 1940s. At the same time, the nations of Indochina began their fight to free themselves from France. The humbling defeat of the French at Dien Bien Phu in 1954 became a psychological turning point in the process: it was easier to divest of the colonies quickly, and without a fight. The Americans did not draw any conclusions from the defeat of the French and mired themselves in a bloody conflict which would last till 1973. Decolonisation of Africa began in earnest only in the second half of the 1950s. At the beginning of that decade only three countries were independent – Ethiopia, Liberia and what would later become the Republic of South Africa, where power was held by the whites. Later decolonisation ran its course quite easily, with the exception of the Kenyan uprising violently put down by the British and the drawn-out conflict in Algeria (seen by Paris as an overseas department of France herself). The process of dismantling the French empire in West and Equatorial Africa was hastened by President de Gaulle who preferred to concentrate on healing France than on fighting lost causes.[97] The year 1960 was therefore made "the Year of Africa". The United Nation (UN) proclaimed the famous Declaration on granting independence to colonised states and peoples. A year later, the non-aligned states movement was formally launched. Moscow was quick to seek to extend

97 It was precisely the costs and crises related to keeping a hold on the colonies (Indochina and Algeria) which were the nail in the coffin for the IV Republic. The creator of the V Republic, General Charles de Gaulle, was committed to independence for African states.

its influence there, while the so-called Third World became an arena for rivalry between the West and the East.[98]

And so, in under twenty years following the war, an important attribute of Europe's greatness and her place in the international order was taken away. Empires fell like houses of cards, as Great Britain, France, Holland, Belgium, Italy, Spain and Portugal lost their former possessions. In the case of Portugal, the last of its colonies were lost in the mid-1970s. London and Paris attempted to retain relationships and influence in their former colonies through various formulas, under the common banner of a Commonwealth. This, undoubtedly, allowed them to keep some of their imperial prestige (a common language, a type of monetary community in the Pound zone or the Franc zone) as well as the influence of Europe as a civilisation.

The experience of two world wars, the division of Europe and protectorate of the United States and the loss of colonies encouraged the Europeans to take care of themselves, or to lay down such conditions for peaceful international relations as to give everyone a chance for economic and civilisational development. The overriding motive was peace. "The contribution which an organised and living Europe can bring to civilisation is indispensable to the maintenance of peaceful relations. In taking upon herself for more than 20 years the role of champion of a united Europe, France has always had as her essential aim the service of peace. A united Europe was not achieved and we had war". Thus spoke the French foreign minister Robert Schuman in Paris on 9 May 1950. His speech contained a plan[99] proposed by Jean Monnet, another French politician deeply engaged in the creation of European unity. The core of the plan was the establishment of the European Coal and Steel Community, in effect turning over these industries, crucial to building of armaments, to common, pan-national manage-

98 The concept of the "Third World" was used in the Cold War period of East-West confrontation to describe countries, mainly former colonies, exhibiting a lower level of economic development and where their model of development was not a combination of democracy and free market, nor was it "real socialism". A large number of these countries, mainly in Asia and Africa, founded – at the conference of Cairo and Belgrade in 1961 – the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM), a loose coalition of countries avoiding identification with one of the main camps. See also: W. Roszkowski, *op. cit.*, pp. 138–154.

99 The text of Schuman's Declaration (in Polish and French) in: P. Parzymies (ed.), *Integracja europejska w dokumentach* [*European Integration in Documents*], Polski Instytut Spraw Międzynarodowych, Warsaw, 2008, p. 100 and subsequent pages. Full English text: https://europa.eu/european-union/about-eu/symbols/europe-day/schuman-declaration_en.

ment. And so, on 18 April 1951 six countries signed the treaty – France, West Germany, Italy and the Benelux nations. The Kellogg–Briand Pact forbade war; the Schuman–Monnet plan made it impossible. This was a Copernican breakthrough in the history of Europe, following many centuries of wars great and small which only served to weaken the Continent from the inside.

The movement for European unity had begun a few years earlier. Winston Churchill's September 1946 speech provided some important impetus, as the former, and future, British Prime Minister referred to the "United States of Europe".[100] A lot of political activity by numerous, diverse political and ideological groupings culminated in the European Congress at The Hague in May 1948. The fruit it bore, along with the formalisation of the movement itself, was the creation of the Council of Europe in May of 1949. Its founders intended it to be a unifying organisation for the free, western part of the Old Continent. It was given broad-ranging powers, reaching into important domains of international affairs, with the exception of issues of security which had already been assigned to the Atlantic Alliance. The Council had one significant weakness, however – it was a loose, coordinating forum. It had no integrative powers – which suited the British approach to European unity ("don't let our freedom to manoeuvre be limited in the slightest"). London was still betting on the "special relationship" with the United States and on imperial interests.

The countries of the Continent, whose experience of World War II was incomparably more painful than Britain's, harboured traditions of thinking about European federalism. They decided not to wait for Britain with its "splendid isolation". Therefore, as soon as the Coal and Steel Community was in place, two more integrative projects appeared – European Defence Community (EDC) and European Political Community (EPC) (1952–1954). The project moved along but the French, unilaterally, rejected the EDC in 1954 and the EPC automatically fell. At that time, incredibly, proponents of a united Europe, instead of giving up, proposed an even more ambitious project. A year after the rejection of the EDC treaty, work began on full integration along a common market model, allowing for free trade of goods, services, capital and labour (the four freedoms). The common market would have technocratic agencies (Commission), political mechanisms (Council, Assembly) and a judiciary (Tribunal). It would also have a number of other mechanisms, serving the purpose of opening the member

100 The idea of the United States of Europe had appeared in France in mid-XIX century, then returned in the late 1920s and early 1930s as the Pan-European Movement was gaining popularity.

states and their nations to each other. The plan for this model was not only to prevent any hostile undertakings but also, importantly, to hasten the development of European nations and return to them some faith in their own civilisation through the synergies and expansion of freedom which would follow. The British again refused to take part in European unification. The treaty creating the European Economic Community (EEC) was signed in Rome on 25 March 1957. A great day in the history of modern Europe.[101]

For a little over ten years, the Community was composed of the same six states, resulting in the EEC being referred to as "the six", in addition to the "common market" and "little Europe". Indeed, it had been "little" to begin with, but as it grew in strength, "little Europe" expanded its integration within the group and moved beyond it. From the beginning of the 1970s, it developed in three main directions: acquisition of new member states, political cooperation and development of trade relations with the outside world, including aid to less well-developed nations. These are well-known matters, with extensive literature, so at this stage we will have only a few paragraphs, for the sake of gaining a proper perspective.[102] The British quickly realised that they had underestimated the potential of the integrative model initiated by "the six" and applied for membership at the beginning of the 1960s. President de Gaulle blocked it, believing the UK to be an American "Trojan horse". He did not trust London's intentions. Several years later, the UK applied again, and again de Gaulle slammed the door in their face. He did not wish to allow for any "diversionary tactics" employed against the accepted model of integration before it had had a chance to properly establish itself. The UK finally entered the EEC with Denmark and Ireland in 1973, following de Gaulle's departure. In the 1980s, Greece, Holland and Portugal joined the organisation, following, in each case, the collapse of an internal autocratic regime. The number of members of "little Europe" thus doubled but would remain at twelve until 1995.

---

101 The roots of this project, and the biographies of the founding fathers, are exceptionally well presented in: J. Łukaszewski, *Cel: Europa. Dziewięć esejów o budowniczych jedności europejskiej* [*Goal: Europe. Nine Essays on Building European Unity*], Noir sur Blanc, Warsaw, 2002.

102 More detailed discussion to be found, for example, in: Z.M. Doliwa-Klepacki, *Integracja europejska* [*European Integration*], Temida 2, Białystok, 2003; K. Łastawski, *Historia integracji europejskiej* [*History of European Integration*], Adam Marszałek, Toruń, 2006; *Integracja europejska w dokumentach* [*European Integration in Documents*], in: P. Parzymies (ed.), PISM, Warsaw, 2008.

In an effort not to remain closed off in a strictly technocratic or economic formula of integration, the late 1960s saw the emergence of efforts to give the Community political agency too. In October 1970, the foreign ministers of "the six" gathered in Luxembourg and announced the need for closer political cooperation. They saw such cooperation as necessary in the light of "a need to prepare Europe for her duty towards the World, such as will inevitably arise out of her increased integrity and growing international role". The ministerial declaration demonstrated Europe's yearning for a greater international role, which had been taken away by the war. The heads of diplomacy of those countries began to meet regularly and, starting in 1974 and at the instigation of the French, so did government leaders. Those meetings became a new institution of the European Community – the Council of Europe, signalling Europe's readiness to enter international affairs. There were many ideas which suggested that the process ought to go further (for instance the famous Tindemans Report of 1975)[103] but by the end of the Cold War only one uniform European Act was created, in 1986, setting down a more solid base for European political cooperation. In it, the members undertook to act as a "unified force in international relations or international organisations".[104]

Europe was "little" but already in the 1960s and 1970s began to regain her former shine, due in large part to her economic success, a renewal and return to vitality following the destruction of World War II, an advantageous social model, stable democracy and development of human rights. Her culture also radiated outwards – Italian and French cinema, The Beatles, Edith Piaf and Charles Aznavour conquered the hearts of audiences in many parts of the World. European literature was still favourite with the book reading public. Admiration for the graceful elegance of Vienna or Paris went hand in hand with recognition for

103 The Belgian Prime Minister's report, commissioned by the European Community summit in 1974, saw the EEC being transformed into EU. Section B, Point 1 states that, "European Union implies that we present a united front to the outside world. We must tend to act in common in all the main fields of our external relations whether in foreign policy, security, economic relations or development aid". The report itself was not put in practice, in part due to strong opposition by London, by then an European Commission (EC) member. Its constituent parts would be, however, gradually integrated into EEC and EU treaties. Polish text of the report in: P. Parzymies (ed.), *op. cit*. English original at: https://www.cvce.eu/en/education/unit-content/-/unit/02bb76df-d066-4c08-a58a-d4686a3e68ff/63f5fca7-54ec-4792-8723-1e626324f9e3/Resources#284c9784-9bd2-472b-b704-ba4bb1f3122d_en&overlay.

104 Text of the Act, *ibid*.

European cuisines and the unequalled quality of wine from many of her regions. High culture was similarly esteemed. The World would have gladly welcomed Europe to the spheres of grand politics, but that would need to wait.

External relations of the EEC at the time were limited to preferential trade agreements with former colonies, mainly in Africa. Initially that had been a series of agreements signed at Yaoundé and later, from the mid-1970s, the Lomé conventions, renewed every five years, which included also countries of the Caribbean and the Pacific. This category was to facilitate ongoing development of those nations on the one hand, and to keep them within Europe's sphere of influence. Interestingly, Eastern Europe did not figure at all in the EEC's external relations. When the region did appear, it was only in the context of ministerial conferences, sittings of the Council of Europe, mentioned somewhere between the issue of East Timor and the problems of Latin America. A "United Europe" was not envisaged, nor was any possibility of future membership for Central European states. The identity of Europe at the time covered only Western Europe. Official documents do not betray even a shade of hope that the Iron Curtain would ever fall.

4 Attempts at dialogue between "East" and "West" and the sudden fall of the Iron Curtain

In the seventies, there was a break in the Cold War. It was a time of reconciliation and initiating contacts between nations who had been divided by the Iron Curtain. The overall division itself seemed stable so there was no fear of a risk of disturbing the strategic equilibrium. Without much resistance, both sides participated in negotiations in 1972 leading up to the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe in 1973. Soon the entirety of these talks and agreements came to be known as CSCE also called in the West the Helsinki Process – after the location of the talks. On 1 August 1975, thirty-five countries of the East and West – from NATO and the Warsaw Pact, but also including neutral countries – signed the Helsinki Final Act. The document defined the principles of mutual relations and created the framework for cooperation in many areas, from the economy, through energy policy and transport to science and sport, as well as interpersonal relations. Moscow wished to thereby obtain ultimate recognition for what had been called in the party–government documents of the communist bloc the "Yalta-Potsdam territorial and political order". In the West, the perception was rather the opposite – it was considered that with its articles concerning the respect for human rights and the openness of the communist countries to economic or interpersonal relations, the CSCE would serve the liberalisation of

the regimes in the East and their increased independence from Moscow. However, the implementation of the provisions of the Final Act did not seem to be overcoming the divisions of Europe.[105] In the second half of the seventies, an anti-communist opposition developed behind the Iron Curtain – though illegal it was nonetheless already becoming publicly visible. The leading role in these opposition movements was played by the Polish opposition. Every few years in Poland there was an anti-systemic event culminating in its brutal pacification by the authorities. Ever since the signing of the Final Act, the democratic opposition, though anti-systemic, enjoyed international legitimation which it was able to invoke. And Western countries acquired a means of exerting pressure on the East. The culmination of this new tendency was the revolution of Solidarity (1980–1981) which could be held in check only by the introduction of martial law. But the ideological failure of communism was complete: the army stood against a workers' movement, born in the "Lenin" Shipyard.

After that it was downhill all the way. Though in the first half of the eighties there was a short-lived return to the atmosphere of the Cold War with dialogue and cooperation broken off, sanctions and militarisation. The Soviet Union was only temporarily able to take up the challenge. It was not able to substitute its – however powerful – military might for its deficit in legitimation. The deepening economic crisis in the Eastern Bloc made it impossible to sustain the basic material needs of its societies. Communism lost in its competition with democratic and free-market countries across the board. Ultimately the system burnt out from the inside. No one could be in any doubt as to which model was the better one, which provided better for the material and spiritual needs of individuals and nations.

The fall of the communist bloc surprised everyone. At the end of the eighties, the outlawed Polish "Solidarity" regained some space for action, as the communist government felt they would be unable to bring the country out of the deep economic and social crisis without their help. The striving for freedom was also apparent in other countries. In Central Europe the most symbolic figures,

105 It is no coincidence that the chapter on the situation in Europe in 1979–1985 in: J. Kukułka *Historii współczesnej stosunków międzynarodowych 1945–2000* [*A History of Contemporary International Relations 1945–2000*], Warsaw, 2001, is called *Utrwalanie podziału Europy* [*Sustaining the Division of Europe*]. The next chapter is: *Nowe napięcia w stosunkach ogólnoeuropejskich (1980–1985)* [*New Tensions in General European Relations (1980–1985)*]. However, the author identifies the sources of these negative phenomena exclusively in the "policies of NATO countries" which is a historical distortion (pp. 271–298).

besides the Polish electrician Lech Wałęsa, was the Czech intellectual Václav Havel. And the fomentation in Central Europe found its counterpart in the deeds of the young Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev who undertook to lead the USSR out of crisis and save communism by deeply reforming it. But it was too late for that – even assuming that it would have been possible to reform communism. The United States, under Ronald Reagan's leadership, saw the opportunity to hasten the demise of the communist bloc – in what was essentially an ideological battle – and remove once for all a dangerous contender for global leadership. Hence, the comprehensive programme of the administration intended to accelerate the collapse of communism (a more proactive version of keeping communism in check).[106] At the end of the eighties, during the rise of a revolutionary spirit in Central Europe, the leaders and observers of Western Europe (those in the EEC) failed to notice that one of the main factors in the dramatic changes was the desire to return to a Europe of *nations*, to no longer be a region subject to a civilisationally foreign Soviet domination.

106 R. Kuźniar, *Polityka i siła*…, *op. cit*., pp. 134–145.

Part II Attempted Return

5 European Breakthrough

1 The end of the European division – the fall of the communist bloc

The end of the division of Europe came about thanks to Solidarity. This was not the solidarity of the countries of the European Community with the nations of "younger Europe" (to use the phrase of Professor Jerzy Kłoczowski), but the "Solidarity" which was born in Gdańsk out of opposition to non-European standards of social and public life and out of a Polish longing to reunite with Europe. Poland was also, in the eyes of the most important Europeans of the XX century, Charles de Gaulle, a "historical nation" of Europe, therefore one unable to accept communism or Soviet domination.[107] In Poland, opposition to both was intense. Regardless of civilisational identity, there were historical roots in the myth of the country as the *Antemurale Christianitatis*, that is the last bastion of Europe. This mythology was further strengthened after World War I with the successful Polish–Soviet war.

The 1989 "Springtime of Nations". At the end of the eighties, thanks to the remembrance of the revolution of the first "Solidarity" and the subsequent period of martial law, there was widespread pressure for a change of political system. Symptoms of the death throes of communism were perceptible in 1988, even if the authorities continued to put on a show of strength in the domains of propaganda and state violence. General Jaruzelski and his circle were conscious of the fact that without engaging the opposition in public life, they would be unable to break through the deepening stagnation which threatened to lead to a further uncontrolled eruption of discontent. The authorities tested the readiness of the opposition, including Lech Wałęsa, to enter into some kind of pact with them. Evidence of these attempts was a television conversation between the leader of "Solidarity" and the head of the official trade unions, where Wałęsa's arguments demolished his communist opponents in front of an audience of millions. There was no way back for the authorities, indeed they were forced to accelerate towards more comprehensive talks and compromises. The effect of this shift, together

107 General de Gaulle headed the French government in 1944–1945 and had opposed the anticipated Yalta division of Europe, which was why he was not to be invited. The future President of France had the opportunity to become acquainted with Poland fighting alongside Poles against the Bolsheviks in 1919–1921.

with the cool calculation of the democratic opposition, was the "Round Table" talks from February to April 1989. The agreement reached at the end of the talks assumed the legalisation of "Solidarity" (i.e. the opposition), compromises in the area of freedom of speech (freedom of the media) and the announcement of even bolder systemic reforms – concerning politics and the economy. The Polish Round Table soon became a symbol of the end of communism. The emotional course it took, its resolutions and consequences were the beginning of a second Springtime (in Polish: "Autumn") of Nations in this part of Europe.[108]

On the 4th June 1989, as agreed at the Round Table, were the first (almost) free parliamentary elections since the World War II. "Solidarity" trounced the communist parties in the elections,[109] to the surprise of the opposition, the authorities and indeed the whole of Europe, in fact, everyone living between San Francisco and Vladivostok. The changes began to accelerate, setting in motion a geopolitical domino effect in Eastern Europe. For a start, the first non-communist prime minister after World War II was Tadeusz Mazowiecki – taking office on the 12th September 1989. The dominant message of his foreign policy was "Back to Europe".[110]

In Hungary, the situation had already begun to change, but in an evolutionary rather than a radical manner. The opposition there was not as determined, nor did the situation in the country seem as dramatically bad as Poland's. In the spring of 1989, there was held a peaceful round table, but under the influence of events in Poland there was also an intensification in Budapest. In October, the communist party dissolved itself and the opposition successively took power. In Czechoslovakia, there was political and ideological stagnation following the military pacification by the Warsaw Pact in 1986. There was an interesting democratic opposition whose activity nonetheless failed to provoke wider social impact (the main effect being Charter 77). This changed under the influence of events in Poland and Hungary. In the summer there was an increase in

108 The first had taken place in 1848. M. Howard, *The Springtime of Nations*, "Foreign Affairs", 1990, vol. 69, no. 1. Polish historians and commentators more often use the term "Autumn of Peoples", which nevertheless ignores the original, metaphorical meaning of this phrase, instead connecting it literally with the season in question.

109 Out of the 161 places to the Sejm (the lower house) made available for free electoral competition, Solidarity candidates won all the seats and out of the 100 places available in the Senate (the upper house), they won 99.

110 "Return to Europe" was the motto of Tadeusz Mazowiecki's speech to the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe in January 1990. See also: T. Mazowiecki, *Rok 1989 i lata następne. Teksty wybrane i nowe* [*The Year 1989 and the Following Years. Selected and New Texts*], Prószyński Media, Warsaw, 2012.

opposition activity and in November large-scale demonstrations began. Heading the opposition was the charismatic intellectual Václav Havel, who, having been released from prison and following the "abdication" of the communist party, was elected president at the end of December 1989. In November political unrest had also appeared in Bulgaria and in December the first changes in the system of wielding power had begun. The process of the removal of communists and the takeover by new, democratic forces lasted in Bulgaria until the summer of 1990. The initiator of change in Romania was the Hungarian minority there. The fall of Nicolae Ceaușescu's regime was dramatic. The despot couple were shot during mass street demonstrations in Bucharest at the end of December 1989.[111]

It is true that post-communists remained in power in Romania for some time, but the system did ultimately fall definitively. In Albania, the dilapidated communist architectonic (modelled on the early People's Republic of China) started to fall apart. There too change was to have a brutal character.[112]

The scenario for transformation everywhere was quite similar. Opposition organisations or movements exert pressure for change. People abandon their fears and participate in mass demonstrations, sometimes accompanied by strikes. The demands for change become more and more precise and radical. The authorities struggle to offer the first, cautious compromises, but they quickly turn out to be inadequate. After further compromises there comes the moment of capitulation where power is handed over (by means of elections) and there is a change of political system. Of particular importance at this moment was Moscow's passivity. Moscow more or less officially declared that the transformations were the internal concerns of individual countries. In the West, there has been a visible tendency to ascribe considerable merit to Mikhail Gorbachev, no doubt as a result of the "Gorbymania" which spread through the media there. Norman Davies writes in a more sober vein on this point: "Gorbachev's role, though honourable, has been exaggerated. He was not the architect of East Europe's freedom; he was the lock-keeper who, seeing the dam about to burst, decided to open the floodgate and let the water flow. The dam burst in any case, but it did so without the threat of violent catastrophe".[113] The new rulers in the now post-communist countries immediately declared their intent to "return" their countries to Europe.

---

111 Only two months before, Ceaușescu had called for armed intervention from the Warsaw Pact forces against Poland.

112 The course of these events, related to the fall of communism in Central and Eastern Europe, has found its best account in: J. Holzer, *op. cit*., pp. 800–817; W. Roszkowski, *op. cit*., pp. 367–424.

113 N. Davies, *op. cit*., p. 1253.

German reunification. The fall of the Berlin wall and the reunification of Germany was of major significance for the subsequent geopolitical consequences of the collapse of communism in Eastern Europe. Events in Poland which had taken place a month before, could hardly go unnoticed just across the border, that is in the German Democratic Republic (GDR). Yet it was only in September 1989 that movements for change appeared there – but quickly thenceforth gathered speed – with the subtext of uniting with West Germany. Demonstrations intensified. The catalyst turned out to the Budapest's decision in May 1989 to open the Hungarian border with Austria to citizens of the GDR – that is providing a gateway to the free world. Tens of thousands immediately took advantage of the chance to leave. Warsaw and Prague were also routes to the West, visas being obtained in the embassies of West Germany. Once the floodgates had been opened, it became impossible to hold back the flow. Changes quickly followed in the upper echelons of the GDR. No one as yet spoke of reunification, but Moscow once again let it be known that it would not intervene militarily. On 9 November, a high-ranking East German official, Günter Schabowski, spoke about opening the border with West Germany. Immediately crowds of people from GDR moved on the wall that had been erected by the communists in 1961 to divide the two parts of Berlin. Hundreds had died attempting to cross the wall. And now they drank champagne, danced on the wall and began to demolish it. The slogan "We are a nation" turned into "We are one nation".

This dynamic development took not only Germans but also Soviet and Western leaders by surprise. At first Moscow ruled out the possibility of unification, as did the French president François Mitterrand.[114] Most sceptical of all was Margaret Thatcher, the British prime minister – here in opposition to the more open Americans. This was the context where the initially cautious Chancellor Helmut Kohl was to become shortly the "Chancellor of Unification". By 28 November 1989, he had already announced his famous ten points defining the process of the unification of both parts of Germany. Despite various fears, also in Germany, the train of unification had departed and could no longer be stopped. Stations along the way were the negotiations in the form of "2 + 4" (both German states and the four powers who had formerly been occupiers). Gorbachev acted as a break on the process – but not very effectively. Moscow was aware that it could not block this process, but, as was its habit, tried to sell its "agreement" for the highest price possible. The catastrophic economic situation of the Soviet Union,

114 It was on the banks of the Seine that the saying (attributed to F. Mauriac) appeared: "I so love the Germans, that I rejoice at there being two Germanies".

however, had the effect that Moscow was rather open to compromise and it agreed to unification in return for enormous material support provided in various forms by the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG).[115]

From June to August 1990, under the patronage of four global powers, a series of agreements between the GDR and the FRG were reached on the incorporation of East Germany into West Germany. By 3 October, the unified Germany was a reality and the German problem for Europe was over. This was a circumstance of great historical meaning. Ever since Germany's prior unification of 1870, German foreign policy had been destructive for Europe, sometimes being Europe's main enemy (in the interwar period and after World War II Germany was the reason for Europe's divisions). As of 1990, German was the most pro-European country of the Community and then of the Union. As Jerzy Holzer wrote, in the forty-five years after the end of the war, Germany also became "one of the European powers, indeed the most powerful European power, in virtue of its central location, its population and economic potential".[116] Which is why, with the growth of their capabilities and strengthened position, a new chapter in the history of Europe was to be characterised by the tension between "European Germans and a German Europe".

The fall of the USSR. At the end of the eighties, the Soviet Union found itself in an open and deep crisis. The last leader of the USSR's communist party, Mikhail Gorbachev, desperately sought a way out of the situation. He started out as the reformer of the system, but ended up being its undertaker. Almost until the end, he held onto the belief that both communism and the USSR could be saved. The terminal crisis of the Soviet Union was of a threefold nature: economic, political and national-cultural. The society of the USSR and the nations that comprised it were conscious of the ubiquitous inefficiencies and the advancing anachronism of the system. Attempts at reform only served to further reveal these inadequacies. The bankruptcy of the official ideology deprived the system of its legitimacy and its capacity to mobilise the population, and the directions of reforms ruled out the possibility of a return to state terror as an instrument of oppression. In this situation there appeared internal movements within soviet republics to free

115 More on this best found in: J. Holzer, *op. cit*., pp. 818–833. See also: H. Kohl, *Pragnąłem jedności Niemiec*, Politeja, Warsaw, 1999; German original: *Ich wollte Deutschlands Einheit*, Propyläen, Berlin, 1996. This account provides an unparalleled insight into the efforts to unite Germany and the solution of various interim challenges along the way, for instance – the military status of a united Germany.

116 *Ibidem*, p. 833.

themselves from the omnipotence of the centre – actually this was the desire of *nations* to achieve freedom and self-determination.

The first to go were the Baltic nations, which, like Poland, had fallen victim to the Hitler–Stalin pact. At the turn of 1988 and 1989, their soviet parliaments declared their sovereignty, though still within the framework of the USSR. A few other republics followed suit. Grassroots pressure and the lack of any reaction from the "centre" encouraged further steps, especially following the impulse of the Springtime of Nations from Central Europe. Declarations of independence were already announced in 1990. This provoked a nervous reaction from Moscow and the threat of sanctions. An unexpected ally to the nations seeking liberation from under the Soviet yoke (and the Russian yoke) was the rebellious leader of the fraction of the communist party who had lost their faith in the possibility of successful reform of communism and the preservation of the unity of the USSR – a Russian through and through by the name of Borys Jelcyn. He sought to lead Russia itself (!) out of the Soviet Union. And it was he and not "Gorby", the darling of the West, who was right and victorious.

A somewhat melodramatic "August Coup", intended by hardliners to overthrow Gorbachev and block the collapse of the Soviet Union, was openly opposed by Yeltsin's civil resistance. This attempt ended in fiasco and signalled the end of the USSR. Regardless of the attempted coup, by August the Baltic countries were already outside of the USSR. As in Central Europe, here too the snowball effect was proving unstoppable. Independence, though at first only very formally, was declared by further republics, each with its own specific circumstances. In the Caucasus, ethnic conflict returned; in Central Asia, party secretaries became local despots in keeping with the tradition of "Asian despotism". The *coup de grâce* was provided by Russia itself, in the person of Jelcyn. It was his initiative that in Białowieża Forest (Belarusian: Белавежская пушча), near to the Polish border, the effective dissolution of the Soviet Union took place. On the 8th December 1991, the leaders of Russia, Ukraine and Belarus decided to form the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) to replace the USSR. The Commonwealth was founded on the 21st December 1991, and a few days later, on the 25th December, the Soviet Union definitively ceased to exist. Alongside fascism it had been the other mortal threat to Europe as a historical political and cultural formation and had indeed been conceived as an alternative to Europe. Now it had fallen. However, neither this nor the defeat of fascism was Europe's doing. Europe had been unable to prevent the appearance of this threat which grew on its own soil. Communism and fascism were defeated by powers and factors different from those Europe was able to muster. In the case at hand, it was a combination of the activities of the United States, national movements in Central

European countries who had been subjugated by the Soviet Union, as well as the "genetic" defects of communism itself.

The emerging independence of the countries of Central Europe and the advancing disintegration of the USSR made the collapse of the Warsaw Pact and the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (COMECON or CMEA) a formality. After none too burdensome negotiations, it was decided that both organisations – key as they had been to the unity of the bloc and its subordination to Moscow – would be dissolved on the 1st July 1991. The process of the withdrawal of the Red Army from Central Europe would prove to be somewhat more complicated, but it too was completed in 1993. However, the end of Europe's divide did not mean the automatic beginning of its unity. That turned out to be a separate challenge.

2 The framework for a new international order

An important context for understanding the opportunity for Europe represented by the end of its divide was the shape of a new international order. Certainly, the Cold War had ended, an end had come to the polarisation and division of East and West (in the sense of a geopolitical–strategic divide). The concept of the "Third World" had also lost its raison d'etre, together with its separate political representation in the form of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM). The steel corset that was an all-encompassing polarisation of the world which had limited international relations for several decades since World War II suddenly fell apart. Still, there was no clarity as to what structure would come next. This lack of perspicuity was a side effect of the lack of a founding act which in the past had formed the basis of subsequent changes to the international order – at least for some time after the treaty in question. That had been the case in 1648, 1815, 1920 and 1945, but after the sudden collapse of the East-West layout no clear geopolitical–institutional framework appeared for the new order.

The only thing that was relatively clear was the lead role of the United States, "inherited" in some sense following the implosion of its main rival for global hegemony – the Soviet Union. This situation has been aptly named by Charles Krauthammer as a *unipolar moment*.[117] But even in this choice of words lay the suggestion of the fleeting, of the temporary – it was after all a "moment". There was no doubt that the United States, however multifaceted its power and influence, was not capable of becoming the foundation, the stability of the new organisation of powers. At most it was capable of playing the role of a "regent",

117 C. Krauthammer, *The Unipolar Moment*, "Foreign Affairs: America and the World", 1990/1991.

influencing the shape of the main structure of the order to come.[118] As the conviction in Washington strengthened as to the unique and essential nature of American leadership (from the second half of the nineties), opposition to this leadership grew in the world.

Without a doubt, alongside the obvious role of the United States, it appeared equally obvious that *the West* was to dominate in international relations. The course for a still united West was determined by: the role of the United States, the rapid growth of the role of the European Union (EU), the strategic ties between the United States and Europe (including non-EU Europe) and the spectacular transformation of North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) from a purely defence alliance into an instrument of security with global capabilities and ambitions. The new role of the Atlantic Alliance was apparent in the initiation of cooperation with former Warsaw Pact countries, including Russia, as well as in operations going beyond Article 5 of the Washington Treaty, that is military operations aimed at maintaining peace and security beyond the boundaries of NATO. All of the aforementioned combined with cultural and economic might (globalisation!) made the West the centre of the world, though in a qualitatively different form than a century earlier. Freed from the barriers and limitations of the preceding order, the process of globalisation according to the pattern defined by what was to become the Washington Consensus[119] seemed to have confirmed the new role of the West for many years to come.

The Rest of the World seemed to be absent from or at best playing an assistant role in the transformation "from an old to a new order". It may be said that the formerly centralised international order based on the twin poles of the United States and the USSR fell apart. They not only had previously taken care of discipline in their respective spheres of influence, but had also been concerned with the security and basic stability of regions over which they competed. The former Third World decentralised and regionalised, and one might have assumed that it would then return to its role as the periphery of the "centre" which would once again be the West (according to the pure model of I. Wallerstein). Things did not

118 Z. Brzeziński envisaged a role for the United States along these lines, especially in: *Out of Control: Global Turmoil on the Eve of the 21st Century*, Touchstone, New York, 1995; *The Grand Chessboard. American Primacy and Its Geostrategic Imperatives*, Basic Books, New York, 2016.

119 The Washington Consensus developed at the turn of the eighties and the nineties and subsequently became the dominant version of the neo-liberal economic doctrine, taken to be the theoretical basis for the globalisation processes imposed by the United States.

turn out that way, but for a good many years after the end of the Cold War, the future of the majority (still the "Rest") of the world was to remain unclear.

Shortly after the end of the Cold War, the idea of a "new world order" gained some currency; George H.W. Bush presented this conception several times, most extensively at the United Nations General Assembly of 1990. Simply put, it amounted to a strengthening of the role of the United Nations (UN) thanks to the existing harmonious cooperation of big powers, including the use of regional organisations for security, prosperity and democracy. Bush was seconded by Mikhail Gorbachev. An implementation of this conception was the US-led coalition's intervention in 1991 against Iraq, who had earlier invaded Kuwait. Later, however, diverging interests became more and more apparent and Washington ultimately preferred to act alone.[120] The "New Order" was disturbed by the phenomena predicted in the then much discussed works of Francis Fukuyama and Samuel Huntington. While it is true that Fukuyama wrote about the "end of history", he nevertheless assumed that before the fulfilment of his vision there would be a period in the world of ethnic and religious conflict, of terrorism and manifestations of the ambitions of world powers. Huntington postulated that a period of ideology would be followed by a return of the significance of cultural and civilisational differences – differences which would impact the shape and dynamic of international relations.[121]

The ensuing changes meant that Europe had the opportunity to regain an international position and to build – by means of earlier achievements and the new possibilities afforded by shared institutions – its place and role in the emerging international order. In the new circumstances, not only was emancipation from US guardianship and independent international identity, Europe could also move beyond its boundaries to shape the international landscape.

3 New political–institutional foundations of Europe

A shift towards deepening integration within the bounds of the European Community and a strengthening of its political dimension had been visible at least

120 On the subject of this stage, moving from bipolarity to the new order, see, for example: R. Kuźniar, *Pozimnowojenne dwudziestolecie 1989–2010. Stosunki międzywojenne na przełomie XX i XXI wieku* [*The First Two Post-Cold-War Decades, 1989–2010. International Relations at the Turn of the XX and XXI centuries*] Scholar, Warsaw, 2011, pp. 71–88.

121 F. Fukuyama, *The End of History?*, "The National Interest", Summer 1989; S. Huntington, *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*, Simon & Schuster, New York, 1996. He had already presented the core idea of his conception in 1993 in his *The Clash of Civilizations?*, in "Foreign Affairs", Summer 1993, vol. 72, no. 3.

since the mid-seventies. It is true there were more ideas and plans here than practical steps, but a significant manifestation was the acceptance in 1986 of the Single European Act. This alarmed Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher. Speaking in Bruges at the College of Europe in September of 1988, she determined to send a clear message of opposition to a strong, consolidated Community, one that would become an independent actor in international relations. The "Iron Lady" emphasised that the place of the Community was at the side of the United States and within the framework of a larger trans-Atlantic community. A short time later, there was, to use the language of international law, "a substantial change of circumstances" – the British Prime Minister was replaced.

Once again it was the French who took up the lead. To their mind, in view of events in Eastern Europe, a stronger Community and deeper integration were required. This could mean raising the entrance bar for candidate countries from Eastern Europe, until recently members of the communist bloc. Indeed, President Mitterrand was not a committed supporter of enlargement to include those countries. Already in December of 1990, the Intergovernmental Conference (IGC) of the European Commission (EC) took place, which surprisingly quickly drafted a new treaty – a turning point in the process of European integration and following the pattern initiated by the Schuman–Monnet plan and developed in the Rome Treaty. By 1991, the new treaty – the most important since 1957 and later to be known as the "Maastricht Treaty" – was ready and was signed in February 1992. This was the beginning of the Community's "decade of the treaty" and Maastricht was to become and remain a foundation stone of the new Community, or more precisely – the EU and the closer integration which had been sought for years in Europe.

The Maastricht Treaty distinguished two main pillars for the EU. The first was the already common market which now was to be complemented by economic currency unity. The successive implementation of this pillar was to lead to monetary union. The Economic and Monetary Union (EMU) was based on convergence criteria, that is the convergence of macroeconomic policies (reflected in basic indicators).[122] The second pillar envisaged by Maastricht was a common foreign and security policy, which was also to serve the shaping the international identity of the EU (more on this below).[123] Furthermore the consolidation of the

122 The requirements were to sustain a low level of inflation, stable currency exchange rates in the period up to the adoption of common currency, a low level of budget deficit (below 3%) and public debt maintained within limits (low 60%).

123 On the question of the treaty's treatment of the functioning of the I and II pillars of the EU, see for example: Z.M. Doliwa-Klepacki, *op. cit.*, pp. 55–113.

institutional architecture of the EU was advanced, by which the five main bodies of the EU were distinguished and their competencies defined: The European Council (comprised of heads of state or governments) as the political–strategic organ, Councils (comprising ministers from specific areas, managing the corresponding policies of the EU), the EC (as hitherto managing community policy, especially concerning the common market), the European Parliament (directly elected since 1979) and the Court of Justice.[124]

As a result of the Amsterdam Treaty of 1997, a third pillar appeared in the EU – the domain of freedom, security and justice. At stake was the creation of legal and organisational foundations for the free movement of people and their settlement in any country of the EU, that is in practice, strict coordination and cooperation in the area of internal policies. On the occasion of the signing of the Treaty of Nice in December 2000, the Charter of Fundamental Rights was proclaimed. This began the process of the creation of an EU system of protection of human rights (independent of, though related to, the Council of Europe). In the nineties, further decisions on the character of European integration were taken – integration was to be more all-encompassing. At the same time, midway through the decade, powerful machinery was initiated to handle the enlargement of the EU in phases. A large step was taken at the beginning of the XXI century, yet already in 1995 the "twelve" member states had become "fifteen".[125] Changes on this scale did not satisfy the appetite for integration, but only fed it. At the end of the nineties, there was an intensification of discussion on the final shape of the project for European unity (*finalité*), in particular the possibilities for giving the EU a federal structure.[126]

At the same time, the Community's development through treaties in the nineties, independently of its transformation into the EU, gave it something without which it could not have played a key international role – a mandate and instruments based on treaties to participate actively in international life. Europe's great potential and unique historical experience with relations with the external world could be turned into action, making the EU (and Europe) one of the pillars of the new international order, in accordance with the EU's collective interests and values. Let us recall that the "twelve" was the first commercial powerhouse in the

124 Formally the Court of Auditors also became a body of the European Union; however its role is strictly technical (as a kind of auditor).

125 Austria, Finland and Sweden joined the EU on 1 January 1995.

126 On the subject of the development of the EU in the nineties, see also: K. Łastawski, *op. cit.*, pp. 259–299.

world and was the second, following the United States, economic power in terms of gross domestic product (GDP).

Title I, Article B, Paragraph 2, of the Maastricht Treaty is of basic importance here. It states that the goal of the EU is "to assert its identity on the international scene, in particular through the implementation of a common foreign and security policy including the eventual framing of a common defence policy, which might in time lead to a common defence". A key term appears here: "international identity" – separation, autonomy and particular character, to be expressed through the active influence by the EU on the international scene. The scope of the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP), concerning all areas of foreign policy and security policy, is defined by Article 11 of the Treaty. As the text of the Treaty states, the goals of the CFSP are:

— to safeguard the common values, fundamental interests, independence and integrity of the Union in conformity with the principles of the United Nations Charter;
— to strengthen the security of the Union in all ways;
— to preserve peace and strengthen international security, in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter, as well as the principles of the Helsinki Final Act and the objectives of the Paris Charter, including those on external borders;
— to promote international cooperation;
— to develop and consolidate democracy and the rule of law, and respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms.

In the second point of Article 11, members states committed themselves to supporting this common EU policy "actively and unreservedly in a spirit of loyalty and mutual solidarity". They were also to "refrain from any action which is contrary to the interests of the Union or likely to impair its effectiveness as a cohesive force in international relations". The following article, Article 12, details the means of realising the goals of Article 11. These means are:

— defining the principles of and general guidelines for the common foreign and security policy;
— deciding on common strategies;
— adopting joint actions;
— adopting common positions;
— strengthening systematic cooperation between Member States in the conduct of policy.[127]

127 Z.M. Doliwa-Klepacki, *op. cit*., pp. 93–95, 323–324, 495–499. The text of the Treaty is online at: https://www.cvce.eu/content/publication/1997/10/13/5a6bfc79-757f-4d53-9379-ad23cc2cc911/publishable_en.pdf.

This all amounted to a turning point in the position of the Community and its relations with the external world – of course, on condition that the Union, meaning its members states, would want to make use of the spirit and the letter of the provisions of the treaties.

It was also important that the rotating leadership of the EU – the Council of Europe and the Councils those who represented the EU in matters of security and international policy – received key executive apparatus in the form of a fixed office – the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy (HR). Doubts as to the EU's seriousness in conducting the security and foreign policy envisaged in the treaty may have been exacerbated by the delays by the member states in appointing the said HR. The nomination finally took place in October 1999 when the position was taken up by the experienced Spanish politician Javier Solana (former General Secretary of NATO). An unfortunate false start was made by the CFSP: within the framework of the first practical "exercise" of the joint policy, the subject was the French Balladur plan which led to a failed attempt to develop a useful pact for stability and security (in Central and Southern Europe).[128] A major addition to the resources for a common foreign and security policy was the "inheritance" from the previous Western European Union (WEU) of additional instruments and specific elements of that organisation's mandate. On the basis of the Amsterdam Treaty, the process of integrating the WEU to the EU was initiated. At the beginning, the EU took over from the WEU the so-called Petersburg Tasks agreed in 1992, that is the "right" to carry out activities in the scope of humanitarian aid, crisis management, peacekeeping and emergency ("enforced") peacekeeping. The last element most of looked "serious" because it assumed implicitly the possibility of the use of military force.[129] From the material resources taken over, there was also the Western European Institute for Security Studies and a centre for satellite reconnaissance and a centre for threat evaluation.

It is worth recalling that relations external to the Community were maintained and developed all the while, regardless of the new international possibilities

128 Balladur's Plan – and later Pact – attempted to force potential member states to normalise their relations with their neighbours, especially with regard to borders and the rights of ethnic minorities. To a great extent, it was erected on the lack of knowledge of its authors and their desire to "raise the entrance bar" for candidate states. Negotiated according to rather anachronistic rules, it was signed in 1995 as a Pact on Stability and Security – and then was promptly forgotten.

129 In accepting this as an element of its mandate in June 1992, the WEU went beyond the Atlantic Alliance in terms of readiness for intervention out of its area.

afforded by the Maastricht Treaty – in particular in the scope of a common foreign and security policy. These ongoing external relations were maintained as before, by the EC in which for a long time there had been a separate commissioner responsible for this area. These relations focussed on economic and trade matters, often in reference to a rich system of association agreements with less developed countries (usually former colonies) – part of the cycle of Yaoundé/Lomé conventions. The Community also established several special arrangements (with the United States or Russia), preferential and standard trade agreements and in other areas as well. The EC and the European Commissioner for External Relations were still responsible for the work of EC missions in other countries (i.e. the diplomatic representatives of the Community) and in international organisations.[130] The combination of the potential lying in both these sectors of the Union (external relations and foreign policy) made the Union into a potential "player" on the international stage.[131]

4 Enlargement, that is to say: unification

The EU – even after the strengthening of its institutional foundations and after giving the integration process a comprehensive character (not merely the common market) – still did not have the right to act in the name of the whole of Europe, even if it could represent the countries of "Old Europe" including the European powers and the most highly developed countries. The right of the countries of Central Europe, among them Poland, to join the Union did not issue from the fact they had been part of Europe for a millennium, nor because of their wealth or military potential. Their right was more morally grounded: they had been cut off from a unifying Europe as a result of an unjust "judgement of history", they unceasingly desired to "return to Europe" and in the end led to the abolition of the division of the continent. For all this these countries paid a heavy price.

The decision to extend integration, taken almost at the same time as the fall of the "Iron Curtain", was not only the fulfilment of the dreams of many western Europeans, but also an instinctive flight forward from the poor cousins of "younger Europe". The countries of Central Europe were in a state of poverty and

130 More on this may be found in: Z.M. Doliwa-Klepacki, *op. cit*., pp. 160–185.

131 S. Parzymies, *Unia Europejska jako uczestnik stosunków międzynarodowych* [*The European Union as a Participant in International Relations*], in: S. Parzymies (ed.), *Dyplomacja czy siła? Unia Europejska w stosunkach międzynarodowych* [*Diplomacy or Power? The European Union in International Relations*], Scholar, Warsaw, 2009.

economic underdevelopment as well as exhibiting a different political culture, whereas western Europeans had with the struggle of decades developed "their identity" together with the idea of integration, so their resistance and fear of derailing their own process of integration seemed justified. This is why in the "old Union" there pervaded a strong scepticism towards the potential enlargement in a foreseeable time frame. This scepticism was most evident in the attitude of France during Mitterrand's presidency. His rather unclear idea of a European conference as something that would take the place of rapid integration was categorically rejected by the capitals of Central Europe. European countries represented at that time the avant-garde in terms of transformation and the pursuit of Union membership.

In spite of the scepticism they encountered, association agreements were negotiated quickly and signed in 1991. In the understanding of those agreements, the proposed programme of bringing countries closer to the EU was in fact the path to membership. "The old countries" of the Union had to quickly adjust their assumptions about the aspirations of Central Europe. The phrase a "return to Europe", far from being an empty slogan, reflected the great European potential of those countries, manifested in the systemic changes, both political and market, which were surprisingly rapid and well grounded. Here was confirmation for Huntington's intuitive idea that countries tend to form relationships on the basis of shared civilisational identity. Central Europe belonged to Western civilisation (Latin Christianity) and so it was easier to carry out the necessary shifts essential for EU membership. Indeed, the entire Community had emerged precisely on this cultural foundation. This was its strength and it was also to be the driving force of the nations who, after the collapse of the communist bloc, wished to be counted among the creators of the Community.

The pressure from "younger Europe" was so great that Western Europe had to quickly cast off the illusion that it might put off the enlargement process for "decades and decades", as Mitterrand wanted. The shift in thinking on this matter unexpectedly led to the rapid formulation of a positive strategy. The first stage of this strategy to be presented were the so-called Copenhagen criteria announced by EU leaders in the Danish capital in June 1993. There were five such criteria: a market economy, the capacity to cope with market forces, agreement to the rule of law established by the Community, a stable democracy and the protection of human rights, and adherence by a future member to the integrity of the Union, that is respecting the logic of the ongoing process of integration. This degree of transparency on the part of the Union gave candidate countries, as well as the existing Union, an understanding of the steps to be followed. The relationship was analogous to that between the control tower (in this case the EC) and an

aircraft (candidate country). And their cooperation was to result in a successful landing at the airport … in Brussels. A key friend to the candidate countries in this stage was the distinguished chair of the Commission Jacques Delors (a French socialist and a practicing Catholic) who had the same vision of the Community as its founders. He was also responsible for the smooth handling of the "jump" in integration – that is the Maastricht Treaty. And there were other allies too, as more and more people came to believe in the success of this great operation – expanding the Union to the East. A key report was prepared in 1995 by the EU's Reflection Group chaired by Carlos Westendorp y Cabezy. It concluded: we have to do with the most ambitious challenge for the EU for many years to come – the unification of Europe. German politicians played a great role in this process, Chancellor Helmut Kohl and European Commissioner for Enlargement Günter Verheugen, as did the new French president, the neo-Gaullist Jacques Chirac. One should not forget to mention the many officials of the Commission who may have been tough negotiators on the one hand, yet they were sympathetic advisors to the governments of countries seeking membership. Their counterparts in the future member states were also often wonderful, to mention only a few Polish (and European!) names: Mazowiecki, Skubiszewski, Geremek, Kułakowski… The success aimed for was to be a joint success. Though these emotional and sometimes frustrating times saw the continued division into "we–they", somewhere deep down everyone knew that we are all "we" and that this process of enlargement needed to be carried out without unnecessary delay but without that haste which might damage the delicate construction called the unity of Europe.

After necessary checks ("screening") on progress being made and the general condition of the state, the economy and the society of the candidate country, negotiations proper began in 1998. They included ten countries altogether: eight of the former "bloc" (Poland, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Hungary and Slovenia) and two "southern" European countries (Cyprus and Malta). When the negotiations moved forward, it was clear that enlargement was a forgone conclusion. The EU would not permit a project of such historical note to end in fiasco. And both sides faced challenges in preparation for accession. The EU had to prepare itself for enlargement, a process that quickly became known as the *big bang enlargement*. This preparation was begun by the IGC in Turin in 1996 and further advanced by the useful Amsterdam Treaty which nevertheless still required the subsequent Treaty of Nice to complete the process. On the basis of a plan prepared by the Commission, another IGC took place, finishing with the Treaty of Nice (December 2000). Above all it

regulated decision-making in the enlarged Union (division of votes into countries, the division of matters into those requiring unanimity and those requiring only a majority of votes). At the same time the programme Agenda 2000 agreed the budget for enlargement. It was acknowledged that there would be costs, and considerable costs at that, since several poor countries (especially Poland) with revenues much lower than the EU average were to accede. As per the principles of solidarity, these countries were to receive large-scale financial support from various community funds. After all these decisions had been taken, the path to enlargement was clear though challenging. There only remained the last negotiation issues on the conditions of membership, which were not always easy negotiations (for instance in the case of Poland).

The difficult negotiations, the most difficult in the modern history of each country entering the Community, were completed with success on 13 December 2002 (the anniversary of the introduction of martial law in Poland, ending the revolution of the first "Solidarity"). The signing of the Treaties of Accession was wonderfully organised at the feet of the Acropolis in Athens on 16 April 2003 – the signing fell during Greece's presidency. The ratification process in the twenty-five countries (fifteen plus ten) went according to plan and from 1 May 2004 on, the EU counted twenty-four member states in its ranks. Three years later, together with the acceptance of large loans, Bulgaria and Romania, the number reached twenty-seven. Already at the negotiation stage, future members were allowed to participate in various forms within the framework of the EU. Candidate countries participated on equal terms in the work of the European Convention which drafted the Constitution for Europe. Enlargement was deemed by all to amount to the unification of Europe, an event unprecedented in the continent's 1200 years of history (taking its birth to be marked by the year 800, the coronation of Charlemagne as emperor). From this point on, the EU not only had potential and instruments, but it had also a *legitimate right* to appear before the world as *Europe*.

6 The EU's Impact on Its Neighbours: Influence by Osmosis

As the Community was developing, its neighbours seemed to wake up from a slumber. They quickly became lively in a variety of ways. Both the physical proximity and the gravity of its interests gave the Community or Union the opportunity to test itself in the role of an international power – as a collective subject aspiring to shape the international order. In fact, the self-definition of the EU's international identity contained in the Maastricht Treaty required this. This challenging international role was all the more difficult in view of the fact that the EU's neighbours were so diverse, including among others northern Africa, Turkey, the Balkans and the post-Soviet region. Each of these regions not only represented a separate geographical character, but also hid within itself its own history, a history that was full of potential traps and which included the history of its relations with Europe. The logic of the influence of the European Union (EU) on its surrounding regions will by assumption – an assumption not expressed directly – recall the process of osmosis. By the development of structured, all-encompassing relations with countries in the proximity of the EU, by reaching into their "interiors" – their societies, markets, cultures and politics – the EU hoped to spread its own values to those countries, to spread its models of social and political life, and, in a certain sense, make them more similar to the EU. If as a result they at least became more democratic and market oriented, the development, stability and security of Europe's (the EU's) "neighbourhood" would be served.

1 The EU and the Mediterranean region

The exceptional status of this region for the EU policy was clear to all. Here Europe feels "at home". Key members of the Community have for many centuries been symbiotically linked to the southern and eastern coasts of the Mediterranean – to Northern Africa, the Near East and Asia Minor. For the Italian peninsula, this cultural contact reaches back to ancient times – at least since Hannibal, Carthage and the Punic Wars. It was after all in this region that Europe "began" with Ancient Greece, Christianity and the Roman Empire which ultimately brought the genotype of Europe to Gaul. After the birth of Islam, the relationship between the two coasts of the Mediterranean was almost constantly in conflict (the plundering expeditions of the Saracens, the Ottoman expansion),

conflict which nevertheless did not impede trade and mutual cultural exchange. In modern times, Europe has imposed on the majority of its southern neighbours colonial dependence, thought this imposed dependence had a much more gentle character than for sub-Saharan Africa. The Mediterranean region is also the soft underbelly of Europe in terms of security. After the Cold War, this came to mean not security in the traditional meaning, but about issues such as terrorism (related to the Middle East conflict) or illegal migration. The presence of authoritarian regimes, with their long-term fragility and the risk of a sudden middle-eastern conflict shifting from a "cold" to a "hot" war led to a heightened awareness and a readiness to act – either to prevent conflict or alleviate it. For some EU countries, this was an important region in economic terms (whether for trade or investment), and for almost all EU countries, it was an important source of oil supplies. The challenges were significant. In this region, the EU encountered Arabic and Islamic countries, non-states (like the Palestinian Autonomy), Israel, dictatorships and near-democracies, countries needing EU support and wealthy countries.

For all these and other reasons the Community (the European Economic Community [EEC]) rather early on turned its attention to the Mediterranean region which had already in the past included countries that for historical reasons had found themselves on the periphery of Europe. In the sixties, the EEC had concluded a series of association agreements: with Greece (1961), Turkey (1963), Morocco and Tunisia (1969), and Malta (1970), as well as mature trade agreements with Israel and Lebanon. Some of these agreements anticipated significant financial support from the Community and preferential trade terms for her partners. A new stage in the Community's approach to the region started at the beginning of the nineties. On the one hand, this resulted from the appearance of the European *Union* and the international ambitions that were built into its new mandate. On the other hand, an impulse was provided by the growing commitment of the EU to Central and Eastern Europe following the fall of the Iron Curtain. The countries of the region did not wish to lose their previously established positions in relation to the EU's external policy. This situation affected in particular the southernmost countries of the EU – France, Italy or Spain who at this point increased rapidly the number of initiatives addressed to their southern neighbours.[132]

---

132 For more on this point, see: P.J. Borkowski, *Polityka Unii Europejskiej w regionie Morza Śródziemnego* [*The Policies of the European Union in the Mediterranean Region*], in: S. Parzymies (ed.), *Dyplomacja czy siła…* [*Diplomacy or Power…*], *op. cit*., p. 303 and the following pages.

The above circumstances meant that the European Council adopted an ambitious programme in June 1994[133] for just such a development of relations with countries of the southern and eastern coasts of the Mediterranean. (It was no accident that the 1994 Summit took place on the Greek island of Corfu, or "Kerkyra" in ancient times.) In effect, this was to lead to a sphere of peace, security, stability and economic prosperity. Initially it was to be called the Mediterranean Partnership. In the political sphere, there was to be dialogue concerning, among other matters, human rights, democracy, the rule of law, means of developing trust and security. In the end, the form for this was given by the Barcelona Declaration, a document adopted at the end of the founders' conference made up of foreign ministers from the "fifteen" together with eleven countries from the Mediterranean region, including the Palestinian Autonomy. (The location of the meeting – Barcelona – in November 1995 was also decided by the fact of Spain holding the presidency at that time.) The Declaration established the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership, which quickly became known as the Barcelona process. Like the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE), the Barcelona process was given a tripartite structure. The first part dealt with political and security issues both on the level of international relations and concerning the internal situation of individual countries, with reference to standards of democracy and respect for human rights. The second part included economic–financial matters, the basis for modernisation and economic growth in partner countries to the EU in the region, as well as the growth in employment (also a means of reducing internal tensions and the influence of radical forces in those countries). The third part of the tripartite division concerned social, cultural and humanitarian issues. The EU representatives make no secret of the fact that a key goal of development of this region was the reduction of migratory pressures from the south.[134]

The realisation of this ambitious programme from the start met with serious problems. The countries included in the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership were resistant to EU arguments in issues related to democracy and human rights which seemed unreconcilable with the social dimension of Islam. The governments of Arabic states exhibited a lack of willingness to implement recommended structural reforms which were intended to give economic growth a chance.

---

133 At the summit in Essen half a year later, the EU adopted the strategy of enlargement to the east.

134 S. Parzymies, *Zachód – dylematy otwarcia na Wschód* [*The West – Dilemmas of Opening to the East*], "Rocznik Strategiczny" ["The Strategic Yearbook"], 1995/1996, pp. 81–82.

The same governments took no notice of the fact that, for example, the gross domestic product (GDP) of Finland with its population of 5 million was higher than the GDP of the 70 million strong Egypt, but these comparisons had considerable resonance with their respective societies. The EU partners of course eagerly accepted financial help – amounting to 5 billion ECU for the period until 1999. In security matters, a priority for Arabic countries was the containment of conflicts in the Middle East. The outbreak of the Second Intifada, in no small part the doing of Ariel Sharon, and the victory of Benjamin Netanyahu dashed hopes of a rapid peace agreement between Israel and Palestine. The impasse in this conflict provided the Arabic countries with a good pretext to become entrenched in their demands, without any wish to make compromises in other matters as well. Ultimately, in the EU's approach to Arabic countries, stability took precedence over democracy and human rights. Nevertheless, it was the EU that began the process of organising international relations in the region according to a definite project.[135]

The realisation of the great strategy of EU enlargement (negotiations completed in December 2002), which concerned two countries in the Mediterranean region – Cyprus and Malta – led the EU to seek a new formula for impacting its direct international environment. And it found one rather quickly. In the first half of 2003, the Commission presented a report entitled *Wider Europe – Neighbourhood: A New Framework for Relations with Our Eastern and Southern Neighbourhood*. The programme sketched there covered sixteen countries, from Morocco to Belarus, but without Russia who did not feel well in that company. From the point of view of structure, this was a continuation of the tripartite structure from the Barcelona process: political, economic and social. However, the programmes now were profiled, dedicated to individual countries, adapted to their needs, capacities and expectations, and dealt with specific issues in trade, the growth of the market economy, migration, culture, human rights, transport, energy, telecommunication, investment and development support. This "neighbourhood programme" did not include the prospects of membership.

Before this programme could get off the ground, Paris, and more particularly her hyper-ambitious foreign minister Nicolas Sarkozy, expressed the desire to go further and in February 2007 proposed the creation of a Mediterranean Union, which would only include countries in that region and not the whole EU. France was seconded in this proposal by Italy and Spain. Because Berlin – and not only Berlin – did not wish to allow the fragmentation of the EU along the

135 P.J. Borkowski, *op. cit.*, pp. 316–325.

lines of external "specialisation", the representative of Europe in these initiatives remained the entire EU. After some modification, this initiative was inaugurated with pomp and ceremony at the Paris summit in July 2008, the host being (by then) *President* Sarkozy. The leaders of forty-three countries took part in the meeting from Europe, Africa and the Near East (including Egypt – Hosni Mubarak, Israel – Ehud Olmert and Syria – Baszar Al-Asad), as well as the heads of key international organisations, led by Secretary General Ban Ki-Moon. Form exceeded content, however, the increased institutionalisation of the new entity (biannual summits, annual meetings of ministers, a secretariat, joint presidency) gave the impression of a new level in the approach of the EU towards its southern neighbours. In essence, the issue was one of the intensification of the existing programme of the European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP) to the EU's south, in all key aspects. The hidden logic of this policy remained unchanged: in exchange for economic and financial support, partner countries would make progress towards democracy and respect for human rights. Despite the higher status of this political programme it was doomed to failure. The governments of the south and east of the Mediterranean did not share European values and had no intention of adopting political, economic or social patterns of behaviour from EU countries.[136] Subsequent stages of the Middle East conflict were to subvert the project. Before it had the chance to achieve some success, the "Arab Spring" broke out, which was surely the result of the impact of Europe as a model, but not of EU policy. The course of events and the consequences of the "Arab Spring" ultimately destroyed the EU's neighbourhood policy in this area.

As long as the Community means a mere "common market", whether of the "six" or of the "nine", it could not make greater claims to be in a position to influence the Israeli–Arabic conflict. Of course, many efforts were made – after all the Community's immediate neighbourhood was concerned, as well as its security and economic interests – but it retained only a supporting role here. The EC's position on this conflict was sketched in the Venice Declaration of 1980, which was the European response to the Camp David Accords of 1979, which laid to rest the period of war and enmity between Egypt and Israel. The Venice Declaration recognised the right of the Palestinians to their own state, confirmed by the recognition of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) as the sole representative of Palestine, and it supported a comprehensive solution to the near-east

136 *Ibidem*, pp. 334–335; S. Parzymies, *Wyzwania dla Unii Europejskiej* [*Challenges for the European Union*], "Rocznik Strategiczny" ["The Strategic Yearbook"], 2008/2009, pp. 139–140.

conflict. Perhaps for this reason Israel was strongly opposed to the participation of the Community (and more broadly: Europe) in the conflict resolution, as it perceived the European states as pro-Arab and anti-Israel. This was said to be due to the goal of securing stable oil supplies and the historical relations of some EC countries with the Arabic world, including the fact of their being a large number of Islamic inhabitants of Europe. The United States was also not interested in the EC's participation, preferring to play the role of *honest broker* alone, leaving them with more room for manoeuvre. In any case, divisions internal to the EC (countries being divided into pro-Israel and more neutral) complicated the more active participation of the Community.

It was only with the initiation of the Middle East peace process at the beginning of the nineties that the EU had the opportunity to be an actor in conflict resolution. Witness for instance the Madrid Conference of 1991 which was intended to increase the tempo of the peace process. However, subsequent rounds of negotiations took place in the United States where understandings were concluded, their patron being Washington. It is true that the EU even entered into the Quartet on the Middle East (the United States, Russia, the UN, the EU), but its role was limited to its general support for the overall process. The only significant input from the EU was in providing a degree of stabilisation of the situation in the Middle East by supporting the Palestinian Autonomy (the budget of the Autonomy came mainly from EU donations) and financial–technical help for the Autonomy in fighting terrorism in its land. The general position of the EU on the conflict did not in essence change. The EU remained attached to the main Security Council resolutions concerning the Middle East conflict, especially items number 242, 338 and 425, which proclaimed the right of the Palestinians to self-determination and the principle of "land for peace". The actual role of the EU in this process was more declarative, though for a certain time it even had a special envoy representing its security and foreign policy. In a sense, it was even good that the EU was not "at the table" for the negotiations and was not a party to the subsequent detailed accords, since from the end of the nineties this process stalled.[137] Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, who had been leading Israel for several years, is not an enthusiast of the peace process, and furthermore is a clear opponent of Europe's participation. He and other Israeli politicians have not spared the EU and Europe bitter accusations, aimed at keeping

137 J. Zając, *Role Unii Europejskiej w regionie Afryki Północnej i Bliskiego Wschodu* [*The Role of the European Union in the Region of North Africa and the Middle East*], Warsaw University Publishers, Warsaw, 2010.

Brussels far from the Israel–Palestine conflict. Thus far they have been successful in this endeavour.

2 Turkey – geopolitics, identity and Europe's borders

The EU's relations with Turkey took on a particular significance when Ankara raised the question of their membership in the EU. Turkey, it is true, had already concluded with the Community an Association Agreement in 1963, but the association agreements of the Community from that period – and there were many – did not hold out the promise of membership. In the eighties, more and more declarations appeared supporting the commencement of accession talks. The end of Europe's division into East and West naturally gave priority to central and southern European countries, which had been blocked by their incorporation in the Soviet Bloc from participating in European integration from its beginnings. With the completion of the *big bang enlargement*, the issue of the Turkey's membership returned inevitably to the table. Turkey's accession had many supporters, who were even more convinced than in the case of enlargement to the East. Great Britain had a favourable attitude – suiting, as it did, its vision of the EU as a politically rather loose formation, more of a free market than a community – but Mediterranean countries were also on the same page, including Italy, Spain and Portugal. France and Germany were internally divided on this issue. The United States also supported Turkey's membership (particularly strongly during the administration of George Bush) and it exerted influence on the countries of the "new Union" who were closely related to the United States, especially Poland. Under the influence of this favourable atmosphere in several of its key capitals, the EU decided at the end of 2004 to begin membership negotiations with Turkey, and they began a year later, during the presidency of the pro-Turkish British.

Turkey's membership in the EU cast clear light on the issues of the Community's borders and its identity. While this had seemed a Turkish problem, it suddenly came across as a problem of the whole Union. A Turkey that was, formally or informally, ruled by the military could not be considered as a candidate for membership. All the more impossible was consideration of a Turkey where standards of human rights, especially those concerning women, drastically departed from European standards. The removal of military personnel from positions of authority, sustaining the secular nature of government, improvements in the sphere of human rights and sustainable economic development – all these improvements put Turkish membership back on the table. There remained, however, other more serious matters raising doubts about Turkey's accession. For instance, is it geopolitically a part of Europe? The answer is negative since 97% of

the Turkish territory lies in Asia. The remaining 3% is a "leftover" from Ottoman conquests in the XV and XVI centuries. Turkey's admission would amount to the exit of the EU from Europe and sharing borders with such "difficult" neighbours as Iran, Iraq or Syria – that is direct and automatic involvement in security problems outside Europe. The argument that, thanks to Turkey, the EU would gain the capacity to have geopolitical influence on the countries of Asia Minor is valueless, ignoring, as it does, geographical and cultural factors.

However, it was civilisational issues that provoked the greatest controversy from the start. Turkey does not belong to European civilisation; what is more it has for centuries been in conflict with Europe. It even managed to remove "Europe" from its border areas with Asia Minor (Byzantium had after all begun in the Roman Empire, at a time when the Turkish tribes remained deeper in inland Asia) and almost permanently took over the southern-eastern part of Europe. Turkey's further ambitions were ultimately frustrated at the end of the XVII century in the well-known battle of Vienna. It is said that Europe is more of a cultural concept than a geographical one. It is clear that creations such as the Community could only arise on the basis of a civilisational foundation like Europe. The founding fathers did not hide their strong affiliations with Christianity (the majority were practicing Catholics). Paradoxically, the main argument in favour of Turkey's acceptance was the statement that the EU cannot merely be a club of Christian countries. This claim was unjustified, in fact just before deciding about membership talks with Turkey, there was a discussion of the Preamble to the Treaty establishing a constitution for Europe, a discussion which failed to agree on a reference to Christianity as one of the civilisational elements of Europe's identity. Opinions were voiced in Turkey as well as elsewhere that refusing membership would amount to religious discrimination. But this is moral blackmail, regardless of other membership criteria and the cultural foundation of European integration. There was a related doubt about Turkey, not often expressed publicly – its demographics in relation to other large countries in Europe. Turkey's population is greater than Germany's, which means that it would have the biggest say (in the mechanisms of decision-making) – a country which neither geographically nor in terms of civilisation belongs to Europe.[138]

On 3 October 2005, accession negotiations with Turkey were started. At the same time, Angela Merkel and President Sarkozy spoke against their membership,

138 S. Parzymies, *Unia Europejska 25 państw – supermocarstwo czy superpaństwo?* [*The European Union of 25 States – Superpower or Super-state?*], "Rocznik Strategiczny" ["The Strategic Yearbook"], 2005/2006, pp. 132–135.

in place of which they offered "privileged partner" status. The process of negotiation itself was supposed to last at least until 2014 and it was besieged by so many reservations that it was practically doomed from the start. Negotiations began quickly, but equally rapidly, after only a few of the thirty-five points for negotiation had been settled, reached an impasse. The matter deserves a "Study in Intentional Fiasco" (the truth of which no one will admit to in public). In the following years, this fiasco would provoke much emotion, but these emotions are really the result of political correctness and the "blackmail" of the claim that "The EU is not a club of Christian countries". It had been a taboo before 2005 to say that Turkey cannot become a member of the EU because of cultural and political factors. Straightforward communication would have avoided frustrated negotiations. Despite the above, Turkey remains a close partner, indeed exhibiting model relations with the EU in many areas.

3 The post-Yugoslavian laboratory: from conflict to EU neighbours to EU members

The outbreak of war in Yugoslavia took the European Community by complete surprise. (We say mere "Community" because the EU still had no policy for security and defence.) The first exchange of fire, in connection with the announcement of the secession of Slovenia and Croatia, took place in mid-1991, while the decision to found the Union was reached in Maastricht in *December* 1991. Several years passed before the Union developed the institutions and forms of action required by the framework of the Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP). Before that, the EU did not have the capacity to respond to a war which broke out on its very doorstep. The unilateral decision of Germany to recognise the independence of the two new Yugoslavian republics forced a similar position from the entire Community, at the same time not giving any chance for a negotiated dissolution of Yugoslavia. However, it turned out that the problem was not so much the breakaway of the ethnically coherent Slovenia and Croatia, but the fact that the ethnically and religiously diverse Bosnia and Herzegovina had the same intention. In the latter republic, the Bosnian Serbs were outnumbered two to one and so were set to lose in their opposition with the Bosnian Croats and Bosniaks (the latter being predominantly Sunni Muslim, the descendants of the long Turkish domination of the Balkans) who both wished to break away. The Bosnian Serbs did not take part in the referendum of winter 1992, but this did not affect the result as the other two groups were anyway in the majority. The EC recognised the independence of Bosnia and Herzegovina adopted in the referendum. The mistake of the Community was to recognise the right of self-determination

of Croatians and Bosnians while refusing the same right for Serbs (they were not allowed to leave the rather artificial Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina and, for example join with Serbians from Serbia). War started. Its course was shocking: mass rape and murder, ethnic cleansing, over 100 000 fatalities. The diplomatic manoeuvres, with the participation of EU representatives, did not bring any results. At the same time, the EU did not possess any instruments by means of which to impose its will – for example the use of military threats towards the parties to the conflict. In their actions and crimes committed, the Serbs led the way, thanks to the support from the central government in Belgrade. It was only after a long delay that the French and English managed to convince President Bill Clinton to bring in North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) to impose a truce and force some kind of peaceful settlement. In 1995, NATO received the green light from the Security Council for the use of force and in the summer US air force began bombing, leading to a ceasefire after which peace talks became possible (the Dayton Accords, November 1995). NATO forces were to guarantee the peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina, so America turned out to be an essential element in the peace process.

During the "Kosovo War" (spring 1999), once again the EU had nothing to say. While it is true that the Contact Group that negotiated the cessation of the conflict did contain representatives of the EU and its leading members, but when the government in Belgrade rejected the draft of a peace agreement, NATO carried out the military operation, once again led by the Americans. The EU supported this operation but had no influence on the course it took and it was precisely because of the unfortunate manner of its execution that this operation laid to rest the doctrine of humanitarian intervention.

However, the implementation of peace after the drawn-out and bloody conflict in the former Yugoslavia fell to the EU. And it should be admitted that the EU demonstrated here unusual initiative and expended considerable energy and means, in returning peace and stability to the region and in giving the nations there the prospect of a better future. The great opening of the EU's engagement in the comprehensive stabilisation of the territory of the former Yugoslavia was the Stability Pact for South-Eastern Europe. It was first agreed in June 1999 in Cologne, at a meeting of EU foreign ministers and ministers of other interested countries (including the United States, Russia and Japan), and subsequently adopted in a festive manner at a great international conference in Sarajevo in July 1999, with the participation of forty countries and the most important organisations from the United Nations (UN), the OSCE, NATO, the World Bank, among others. The Pact was a comprehensive programme covering issues of security, the economy, systemic–political issues, humanitarian issues and human rights,

infrastructure and regional cooperation. While it is true that the Sarajevo conference was impressive in terms of its attendance list and commitments undertaken, the creation of the programme adopted then fell to the EU, both financially and operationally.[139]

The comprehensiveness, the scale and courage of the EU's approach to peace in the Balkans, all turned on the combination of a few elements that are crucial for the success of this kind of project: a stabilising mission after the conflict, agreements and activities for political stability and economic revival, and association agreements opening the prospect of accession and preparing candidates for accession. It was precisely in the countries of the former Yugoslavia (Western Balkans to use the accepted EU terminology) that the EU acquired experience in the CSDP that began in 1999. In the first decade after the conflict ended, the EU placed there a few missions of a military, law enforcement or civilian nature (often mixed in nature). Among the most important missions were the military mission EUFOR Althea deployed in Bosnia and Herzegovina (the handover from NATO of responsibility for security in this country), Concordia (stabilisation in Macedonia) and EULEX in Kosovo (in the NATO protectorate run by the mafia, the development from the ground up of administration, the justice system, infrastructure for institutions and principles of democracy and respect for human rights, etc.). Each of these operations has been costly – for instance the costs of EULEX reached around 165 million euro annually.[140]

A second pillar of the EU involvement was the financial–technical support aimed at political and economic stability and which was granted on the basis of bilateral understandings between the EU and individual countries formed out of the collapse of Yugoslavia. Recipient countries had to fulfil the terms of cooperation, including their readiness to adopt internal reform and, in some cases, to cooperate with the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia in The Hague. Alongside bilateral understandings for stabilisation and association, the EU launched several multiparty programmes and encouraged regional cooperation with the participation of other international organisations. The programmes in the main aimed at the democratisation of the systems of

139 S. Parzymies, *Reformy instytucjonalne, rozszerzenie, wspólna obrona – trudne wyzwania dla Unii Europejskiej* [*Institutional Reform, Enlargement, Common Defence – Difficult Challenges for the European Union*], "Rocznik Strategiczny" ["The Strategic Yearbook"], 1999/2000, pp. 130–132.

140 M. Mizerska-Wrotkowska, *Polityka Unii Europejskiej wobec Bałkanów Zachodnich* [*EU Policy towards the Western Balkans*], in: S. Parzymies (ed.), *Dyplomacja czy siła…* [*Diplomacy or Power…*], *op. cit*., p. 299.

these countries and structural reform which was to give independent economic growth a chance. This was also a costly undertaking. The flagship programme CARDS, which was only one of many, provided support in reconstruction, development and stabilisation. Its budget for 2000–2006 alone was 5.4 billion euros. The progress achieved thanks to these programmes allowed for the passage to a third form and stage of EU involvement – for peace and systemic transformation in the Balkans. We should recall that the entire operation was not an easy one, as these countries were coming out of both communism and their past and were located on the periphery of Europe – economically and socially as well as geographically.

In Brussels and the capital cities of the Community members, it quickly became clear that the most effective means of reaching stability and ensuring that democratic and market reforms were irreversible was the prospect of EU membership. Nothing would mobilise the governments and societies to reform as well as a promise of EU accession, which for those countries appeared to represent the adoption of the ideal social and security order for nations from a continent tired of wars. Painful memories of World War II in the former Yugoslavia, the dehumanisation and destruction, came back. Which is why, after a series of understandings on stabilisation and association (and their implementation) there came the time for consideration of the prospects of membership for those ready to work for it and fulfil the criteria (yes, the Copenhagen criteria) and additional expectations of the EU related to the events of the war and its consequences. Naturally, first in line would be Croatia, after Slovenia the most developed republic of the former Yugoslavia. Fate had determined that Croatia would be on the "right side" of the conflict (unofficial opinions say that Croatia's leader Franjo Tuđman and army equalled the Serbs in terms of both political instinct and their behaviour on the fronts, including atrocities committed). Thanks to Western support, Croatian was quickly able to carry out the necessary reforms and already in 2005 began accession negotiations. From mid-2013, Croatia became the twenty-eighth member state of the EU. The "bait" of membership – especially when it became a real possibility as in the case of Croatia – brought about deep reform and the abandonment of nationalist ideas in Serbia. The case of Serbia was, however, more difficult. Serbia had lost the war and suffered severe consequences as a result but was deemed by European public opinion to have been the sole author of the atrocities. Overthrowing the "bad guy" of the war, President Slobodan Milošević, in 2000, only took away some of the "odour" of Serbian misdeeds. For a long time, Serbia's refusal to accept the military separation of the province of Kosovo from her territory (the NATO operation of 1999) remained a problem, as well as her inadequate cooperation with the Hague Tribunal – except

for the speedy appearance there of Milošević himself. Nevertheless, thanks to internal transformations supported by the EU, there opened up before Serbia the possibility of EU membership. In the middle of 2013, Brussels agreed to begin membership negotiations which were launched the following year. The remaining three countries formed out of the collapse of Yugoslavia – Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro and Macedonia – could not count on the possibility of membership, though each for a different reason. But still, EU support prevented their decline into internal conflict or serious regress.[141]

The only failure of the EU – which was also the failure of the entire international community (the UN, the OSCE, NATO) – was Kosovo. Perhaps this was because this "country's" founding myth had been falsified. It had emerged as an international protectorate (of the West), as a result of a NATO military intervention which took place without a mandate from the Security Council. It was thought that the Albanian majority (Islamic) in Kosovo – a minority in the cut-up Federal Republic of Yugoslavia of that time, dominated by Serbia – as the victims of the nationalist–expansionist Serbs, would be able to count on a right to revenge, huge financial support, tolerance for those in power accused of war crimes, tolerance for a system of corruption, a mafia-style system of rule and for the organised crime dealing in human trafficking and narcotics. Enormous financial support and countless technical missions brought no significant effect, yet the EU as a whole in 2008 recognised the declaration of independence of Kosovo, after which the support continued (and without which the country would immediately become a failed state). Being in practice an EU (and NATO) protectorate, the situation in Kosovo was similar to certain African states in the middle of the XX century. The permanent exodus of Kosovo inhabitants to EU countries confirmed the fiasco of this political experiment. It is an example, encountered more frequently for some time now in the EU, of a predominance of ideology (dogma) over a sober assessment of the realities of the situation, as well as an incapability of correcting errors, even when the costs of these mistakes are high.[142]

141 For more details: *ibidem*.

142 In view of the way Kosovo was created, there is no chance for general international recognition nor for membership in international organisations – beginning with the UN. Despite the small population (less than 2 million), enormous external support did not lead, for example, to a reduction of unemployment below 40% or the proportion of those in poverty below 33%. More on the circumstances of Kosovo's emergence may be found in "Rocznik Strategiczny" ["The Strategic Yearbook"], 1999/2000. See also: M. Mizerska-Wrotkowska, *op. cit*., pp. 294–300.

4 The EU and its attitude to Eastern Europe

The first stage and form of the post-Cold-War return of the European Community towards its eastern neighbours was the "great enlargement", which occupied its attention and resources after 2004. The 2004 enlargement covered ten countries of the region with Romania and Bulgaria joining a little later in 2007. However, in the nineties, the EU did not ignore "farther flung" neighbours, countries of the former Soviet Union and offered them support programmes for systemic transformation and the development of bilateral relations based on Partnership and Cooperation Agreements (PCAs). The huge TACIS (Technical Assistance to the Commonwealth of Independent States) programme, realised in connection with countries of the former Soviet Union in 1991–2006, cost around 7.5 billion euro. The PCAs lasted many years, one being with Russia, and aimed to achieve an individual approach to the needs and the expectations of partner countries, though the diversification of their content was not always much in evidence. Though these PCAs did not envisage EU membership, what was understandable from a European perspective, they did include issues related to pro-democratic reform and respect for human rights. The latter was also a reason why post-Soviet "partners" did not greet this kind of cooperation with enthusiasm and in some cases the (more) authoritarian character of their governments made it impossible to implement the provisions of agreements – either in theory or in practice (this relates particularly to Belarus and the countries of Central Asia). Even with the support of these agreements, the EU was not able to achieve much in the face of the baggage from the Soviet-Russian pas, particularly where this influence had been greatest.[143]

A neighbourhood of hope and frustration. A key step forward after the completion of enlargement was the adoption by the EU of the ENP. This policy abandoned the illusion that the same approach would work both for Eastern Europe and for Central Asia, for instance for Ukraine and for Tajikistan.[144] The ENP was launched in 2004 and was dedicated only to six countries: Ukraine, Belarus, Moldavia, Georgia, Armenia and Azerbaijan. The ENP programme took into

143 A. Szeptycki, S. Kardaś, *Polityka UE wobec Europy Wschodniej, Kaukazu Południowego i Azji Środkowej* [*EU Policy Towards Eastern Europe, the Southern Caucas and Central Asia*], in: S. Parzymies (ed.), *Dyplomacja czy siła…* [*Diplomacy or Power…*], *op. cit*., pp. 237–243.

144 A mistake of this sort was made at the beginning of the nineties by NATO in its initiation of the same program of cooperation with all countries of the former communist bloc (including those of the former USSR). The principle of non-differentiation means for example, the same approach to Hungary and to Uzbekistan.

consideration the need to diversify the approaches to particular countries. Nevertheless, each cooperation plan included issues related to democratic institutions, human rights, the rules of law, the opportunities for investment, economic cooperation, trade, energy, illegal migration, combatting terrorism and cross-border cooperation. The six partners of the EU in the ENP, with few exceptions, remained sluggish in these domains – and they did not show much interest at first in changing. Nevertheless, the EU did manage to awaken some semblance of civil society in those countries and facilitating visa formalities and strengthening interpersonal relationship did lead to a growth in the inhabitants' interest (e.g. in the case of Ukraine and Moldavia), especially among younger citizens (stipends for students!) in achieving closer ties with "Europe".

The prescription for awakening these six countries from their general lethargy was the proposal by the EU of a new and more developed form of cooperation: the Eastern Partnership (EaP). The Polish–Swedish proposal (R. Sikorski, C. Bildt) appeared in the spring of 2008 (in response to the French Mediterranean Union) and after some hesitation, especially in Berlin, gained the approval of the entire EU in June of that year. The war of Russia and Georgia in August 2008 helped somewhat to convince those who had previously been indifferent that the EU's project made some sense. The European Commission prepared a detailed programme and in May 2009 achieved the formal inauguration of EaP. The goal was clear – to separate off Eastern Europe from the blur of the previous neighbourhood policy by significantly strengthening bilateral relations. This meant making EU countries aware that with Eastern Europe we are still dealing with *Europe*, assuredly a part of the same geo-political space – albeit in a somewhat different cultural–political form and painfully burdened by its past. This awareness created other prospects for the development of relations with the EU than in the case of Algeria or Lebanon, which would never be part of Europe. With the EaP the principle of differentiation was underscored even more, and in return for reforms and opening up to the EU, programme participants could count on even greater generosity. In terms of issues, the EaP included similar areas to the ENP, though not all were implemented. The programme could not offer the prospect of membership (there were light years between the internal systems of these countries and EU standards), but association agreements and deepening trade zones could be offered. These understandings meant long-term relations with the EU and the opportunity for deeper and deeper entry into integration.[145]

145 A. Szeptycki, Sz. Kardaś, *op. cit*., pp. 243–251; S. Parzymies, *Partnerstwo Wschodnie – nowy instrument Europejskiej Polityki Sąsiedztwa* [*Eastern Partnership – A*

In the EU, deprived as it is of geopolitical instinct, no one realised that what from the perspective of Brussels might look like promotion of European standards – setting the foundations for sustainable economic growth or humane societies – for Moscow looked like geopolitical game-playing and an incursion into its sphere of influence, the former Soviet Union. This became spectacularly evident in the case of Ukraine. Acquiring its formal independence after the fall of the USSR, it remained a country and a society entirely dependent on Russia. At the same time Ukraine's internal system became an example of a post-colonial/oligarchical system, very much on the periphery of an empire, an example of what is termed "peripheral development". The level of oligarchy in the state and economy was even higher than in Russia – the interests of oligarchs clearly take precedent over the interests of the state. This was accompanied by a low level of political class and an underdeveloped state instinct at all levels of organisation. The social awareness of being European was also at a low level – Ukrainians to a lesser extent identified with Europe. At the same time those governing Ukraine were rather eager to declare their intention of connecting with Europe, yet there were no reforms accompanying these intentions that might give them conviction and make them more realistic. The declarations were merely a form of public tender-offerings, typical for the mentality of the authorities in Kiev: whoever gives more – Brussels or Moscow – will gain our sympathy.[146] This is why the EU's efforts regarding Ukraine – at least for the first decade – recalled the toils of Sisyphus.

The year 2004 witnessed an unexpected turn of events when the authorities together with Moscow decided to tamper with the second round of the presidential elections. The first round had been won by Victor Juszczenko, perceived as pro-European, against Victor Yanukowych – considered to be the representative of Moscow and the oligarchs. The reaction to this culminated in the so-called Orange Revolution (several weeks of demonstrations on the main square in Kiev and in other cities). With the strong support of Europe (Brussels, Strasbourg and certain other countries, in particular Poland), following negotiations there was agreed a third round of elections which Juszczenko won. In Kiev, promises of reform appeared and Brussels offered encouragement, including a resolution of the European Parliament recognising the aspirations of Ukraine and summoning

New Instrument of European Neighbourhood Policy], "Rocznik Strategiczny" ["The Strategic Yearbook"], 2009/2010, pp. 149–52; see also: "Rocznik Strategiczny" 2008/2009, pp. 140–143.

146 For more details, see the excellent study of A. Szeptycki, *Ukraina wobec Rosji. Studium zależności* [*Ukraine's Attitude to Russia. A Study of Dependence*], Warsaw University Publishers, Warsaw, 2013.

the EU's bodies to act in this direction. However, Ukraine was enveloped by an internal political struggle so radical that reforms and Europe were forgotten. This suited Moscow which torpedoed Brussel's efforts and the rickety, inconsequent efforts of Kiev to carry out reforms establishing standards close to European standards in various areas of life.[147] Despite Kiev's poor progress, the EU decided to offer further incentives in the form of an offer to conclude an agreement for association and closer trade zone. This was announced at the EU–Ukraine summit in Paris in September 2008 (a month after the Russian–Georgian War). The agreement did not mention the prospect of membership, what was to be expected in view of the internal situation of Ukraine. Surprisingly, the pro-Russian President Yanukovych (who had come to power following the failure of the leaders of the "Orange Revolution" in 2010) somewhat accelerated reforms enabling the conclusion of the agreement. Soon, however, under pressure from Moscow – with Putin returning to the presidency and ensuring that nothing would change in the mafia–gangster manner of rule – reforms came to a halt. This was despite mounting efforts from the EU (which also turned a blind eye to a series of abuses of Yanukovych, the autocrat from the land of the Dnieper). Georgia and Moldavia also expressed a desire to come closer to Europe by means of similar association agreements. The remaining three countries of the EaP – Belarus, Armenia and Azerbaijan – remained indifferent to the opportunity represented by the new form of cooperation with the EU.

Russia: from cooperation to confrontation. To capture in a few paragraphs the problem of the relations of the EU with Russia – bearing in mind their gravity, complexity and dramaturgy – requires simplification which is hard to accept, also for the author. However, the format of this work does not permit more at this point. It takes no effort of imagination to appreciate the multidimensional meaning of Russia for Europe and the EU including the latter's international role. The history of this country demands attention, its enormous space, its potential in terms of natural resources and military resources, the variously interpreted fatalism of its destiny (failed attempts at modernisation according to the Western model) and the Soviet heritage. Today, when ordinary Russians (not only politicians) think of the Soviet Union, there is a sense of gloom together with – what is hard for western Europeans to understand – nostalgia. This is confusing as it was precisely regular Russians who made up the mass victims of that totalitarian

147 A. Sarna, *Ukraina bez Kuczmy* [*Ukraine without Kuczma*], "Rocznik Strategiczny" ["The Strategic Yearbook"], 2004/2005; *idem*: *Ukraina: "eksperymentu" ciąg dalszy* [*Ukraine: "Experiment" Continued*], "Rocznik Strategiczny" 2005/2006.

regime. All this and more represented a great challenge for the EU. All the more so since Russia is a direct neighbour, well known for her caprice, special demands, arrogance-perceived-as-a-virtue, being the bullying neighbour, being trigger-happy, the lack of respect for law and her own obligations and at the same time in possession of a certain facility with propaganda. On the other hand, it also came easy to Europe to accept Russia's "special privileges", revealing a willingness to make concessions out of fear and admiration at the same time, no small number of "useful idiots" facilitated being either straightforwardly corrupt (operating in big business) or uncritically accepting Russia's history-based narrative. A recurring motif in this narrative was Russia's alleged "humiliation" – whether referring to the collapse of the Soviet Union as a superpower, or to the West ignoring her interests after the Cold War (her declining sphere of influence, her status as a superpower).

So, Russia represented for the EU an exceptional challenge and it is worth adding that both entities appeared on the international stage at the same time – the EU as the continuation of the Community and Russia as the legal and actual successor to the Soviet Union (the latter indeed inheriting the poor legal and political tradition of the Bolshevik state). Both sides in their first few years of existence had to find their place on the world's political map (first of all in the Euro-Atlantic sphere), whereas Moscow was still stuck in the illusion of her Soviet past, whereby her only partner in global discussions was Washington. The EU's approach to Russia was from the start characterised by a certain ambiguity, the more so in view of the simultaneous relations developing directly between Russia and individual EU members – sometimes those members were highly committed politically and economically (e.g. Germany or Italy). This of necessity impacted the EU's position towards Russia. The ambivalence was based on there being two different goals: on the one hand, Moscow was supposed to engage in "civilised" foreign policy and deliver improvements in systemic standards in the direction of greater openness, democracy and human rights; on the other hand, Russia was an opportunity for a "good deal", especially in the area of energy resources and the opening of an enormous market not only to products but also to investment, especially infrastructure investment. In the EU there was the conviction that Europe was an attractive partner for Russia – both as a partner and a model of development. Sometimes the ambiguity in EU–Russian relations led to reality checks, for instance in the case of the two wars Russia conducted in Chechnya, that is within the area of the Russian federation (1994/1995, 1999). In both wars, Russia had no scruples about committing numerous crimes, with the victims numbering in the tens of thousands. Both in foreign policy and in Russia's internal politics, there were frequent cases of behaviour contrary to EU

expectations. Russia tried to avoid criticism or pressure from the EU, frequently adopting the position of an auctioneer – a global power who is able to choose its "friends" as those making the best offers – Europe can easily be exchanged for the United States or China. Depending on the circumstances, Moscow tried to select its privileged partners from among the powers of Western Europe – be it Germany, France or Great Britain. (When Paris and Berlin criticised Russia for the Chechnyan War, Moscow's favourite became London and Prime Minister Blair.) Until the end of the time of Jelcyn, the EU could hold out hope for a future of healthy relations with Moscow and Moscow's good faith in its approach to the EU (at least in accordance with the PCA of 1994.) At that time the "Opponent" of Russia was the "bad" NATO, which decided to enlarge by three countries of Central Europe, former satellite states of Moscow – so in response Moscow tried to preserve good relations with Europe.

In this spirit, the EU adopted a so-called strategic partnership in 1999 (still during Jelcyn's rule), a programme which extended the formula of the earlier PCAs. At the same time, the EU condemned in quite strong terms Russian operations in Chechnya, nevertheless recognising Russia's right to combat terrorism, which, as is known, Russia did in its own rather specific manner. From that time on, EU–Russia summits were to take place systematically, twice a year. The Partnership covered four large areas: the economy; issues related to freedom, security and justice; international security; and scientific research, education and culture. Within the framework of these four areas there were around twenty specific – though still rather large – subjects, from energy to terrorism to the question of Russia's membership in the World Trade Organization. The realisation of the programme was supposed to bring the two sides closer together in terms of standards in the various domains of politics, economy and law thereby changing Russia according to EU expectations, its norms and values. In Europe, faith in Russia's transformation was so great that many experts and commentators claimed that in the more distant future Russia might join the EU.

The atmosphere and course of partnership between the EU and Russia started to slowly change after the transfer of power in Russia to Putin (president since 2000). In internal politics, Putin's rule from the very beginning was marked by an increase in authoritarianism[148] whereas in foreign policy – a growth in assertiveness and a willingness to enter into confrontation, aided by the simultaneous

148 M. Menkiszak, *Rosja: zmierzch demokracji?* [*Russia: Twilight of Democracy?*], "Rocznik Strategiczny" ["The Strategic Yearbook"], 1999/2000 (especially the point "Era Putina" ["The Age of Putin"], from p. 155).

rise in oil prices in world markets (during the first decade of the XXI century, the price of oil grew by almost five times). Putin had the goal of regaining for Russia the role of a superpower, at the same time questioning the position of the West.[149] The EU–Russia dialogue quickly became a dialogue between two hard of hearing interlocutors. Statements were characterised by their being "for show" and the "agreements" reached were merely declarative. In the opinion of experts, the EU conception of strategic partnership with Russia quickly became mere wishful thinking.[150] Instead of coming closer to Europe (becoming her "continuation" to the East), Putin's Russia chose a path of creating an alternative union-community. This is Eurasian integration. Which is why Moscow reacted with hostility to the ENP and the Colour Revolution taking place in the territory of the former Soviet Union (Georgia 2003, Ukraine 2004) was perceived as the West's conspiracy to besiege Moscow in her own territory. Putin also decided to reverse the earlier asymmetry in mutual dependence – from this point on, Russia was to have much greater significance to Europe (EU), because of the politicisation by Moscow of the supply of energy resources and an increase in military capacity. The only country Russia wanted to preserve close ties with was Germany.[151] Putin's Russia also began to present a vision of an international order that was contrary to the European vision. In Putin's vision, power overrides the rule of law.[152] Osmosis, as part of the logic of the EU's approach to Russia, turned out to be ineffective.

---

149 The West handed Moscow pretexts to be offended who in turn justified their opposition to western domination by citing among other things the NATO intervention against Yugoslavia (Kosovo 19999) or the war against Iraq of 2003 (both lacked the authorisation of the Security Council).

150 More on this in: S. Bieleń, *Stosunki Unia Europejska–Rosja* [*Relations between the European Union and Russia*], in: S. Parzymies (ed.), *Dyplomacja czy siła…* [*Diplomacy or Power…*], *op. cit*.

151 Helmut Kohl had been in the past the favourite western partner of Jelcyn, and later Gerhard Schröder was Putin's, which might have been a conscious strategy on Moscow's part to draw out Germany from the rest of the West by offering them special relations and material benefits (conditions for making advantageous deals). In part, this coincided with the interests of Germany (regarding their international role, greater room for manoeuvre and economic growth).

152 See especially M. Menkiszak, *Rosja: czas próby* [*Russia: Testing Time*], "Rocznik Strategiczny" ["The Strategic Yearbook"], 2008/2009 (above all the point "Rosja jako agresywne mocarstwo rewizjonistyczne" ["Russia as an aggressive, revisionist power"], from p. 202).

7 The EU on the Global Stage

After the end of the Cold War, Europe regained the opportunity to enter the world stage, especially in connection with the great enlargement of the European Union (EU) undertaken in 1993–1994. Europe's programme of global activity resulted both from the past – the role Europe had played until World War II – and from the ambition written into the Maastricht Treaty, as well as from an awareness of the potential and the collective interests of this group of countries. The global activity of the EU developed along two lines: the geopolitical axis, that is in relation to states (powers) and regions of other parts of the world; and the normative-institutional axis, that is via the creation of universal norms and activity in international organisations with a universal character.

1 The EU and the "Rest of the World"

It is hard to find a clear common denominator to the relationships of the EU to the "Rest of the World"; there is such diversity in these relations. However, of greater importance are the *motives* for the EU's activity here and the direction of development of its relationships with various regions in other continents. The motives have been and continue to be rather obvious. The first motive has been the colonial past of a group of important EU countries, that is the continuation today of that presence of Europe in the world, though now in a new form, not having much to do with colonialism. The old colonial powers played something of the role of guide for the other countries of the EU and for the EU as a whole. The second motive is economic interest. This had always been a factor, but now is being realised in a different way – via the development of trade, via efforts to sustain traditional markets, via investment and especially via the search for natural resources and other products. The third motive is security. While it is true that overseas regions have not generally posed a direct threat to EU countries, economic interests themselves require stability, including the neutralisation or counteracting of threats in various spheres. This has also been required by the role to which the EU aspired from its inception. The fourth motive is the pursuit of a better international order. In the EU, it has been felt that the spread of European values embodied in slogans and standards of human rights, tolerance, democratic institutions or the rule of law would improve the situation of non-European countries and provide them with better prospects for development. The exact proportion of these various motives and their practical expression has varied depending on the region or group of countries in question, on their real situation and needs.

To a certain degree, the EU's policy towards the "Rest of the World" has been a continuation of external relations or other contacts from the time of the European Economic Community (EEC), as they involved trade and development support above all. From the founding of the Union, this policy was conducted within the framework of a common security and foreign policy (later adding common security and *defence* policy), with the key participation of European Commission (EC) in conducting external relations. The EU developed in this area an unusually broad range of programmes and contacts in the form of joint positions and strategies, understandings, missions of various kinds, strategic partnerships, political dialogue, associations of varying rank, trade agreements, support of various kinds and sometimes also sanctions. No other country or rather power (or group of countries) has been as active in relation to the "Rest of the World" as Europe. No one else devoted such large material and financial resources to this end. This fact completely contradicted the complaints or criticisms of the media, commentators or even "experts" that "Europe doesn't do anything" in this or that matter or place. And this was activity *à tous azimuts* [= all-out or wide-ranging], to use the phrase from French security strategy at the time of de Gaulle. In this way the intention was to create the international identity of the EU in terms of treaties.

The EU's Sisyphean labour in Africa. The foreign policy of the EU towards sub-Saharan Africa, historically so-called "black Africa", was the most difficult part of its relations with the world. The reasons for this difficulty were the cultural specificity of Africa, its ethnic–tribal variation which when combined with a certain type of culture, on the one hand, hindered the development of state organs that were normal in other parts of the world and, on the other hand, increased the tendency for outbreaks of destructive conflict. Furthermore, African governments used the undeniable consequences of colonialism as a pretext to demand constant support from the "white man" and to sustain an ongoing explanation for African incapacity and lack of effort. On top of that were Europe's economic and security interests, the pursuit of which was also facilitated by the existence of stable, predictable and responsible authorities, those that respect human rights and elementary principles of democracy and the rule of law – all in the interest of local populations. The actions of the EU and certain individual EU countries (especially former colonial metropolises) were characterised by a low level of effectiveness, as their frequently positive results turned out to be highly fragile. Which is why from a European perspective this was a Sisyphean labour. The accounts below of this "work" will be limited to covering the EU in an institutional sense, that is excluding the activities of individual (former) colonial powers.

Before the appearance of the EU, relations with African countries had been reactivated and the EEC carried out policy, which was also the "merit" of the as-yet not entirely *former* colonies, especially France. "Not entirely former colonies" – the writing of these relations into the Rome Treaty at the beginning of 1957 took place a few years before the "Year of Africa" (1960) when a large number of colonies gained their independence. The formula used in the treaty was one of association with overseas countries and territories, with the implicit responsibility of the EEC to engage in cooperation and broad-based support. To this end was created the European Development Fund. This was not founded out of altruism, though it was indeed beneficial for its recipients as well. EEC countries, and not only France, had economic interests in Africa. These connections also meant for EEC countries a certain prestige and international influence, as well as containing a non-trivial strategic imperative – the Soviet Union had begun its offensive in the Third World, and resistance to this was needed. At that time, the core of these relations was preferential trade for African countries, but with preferential treatment also for EEC countries. The overall result, which would have favoured the EEC due to its competitive advantage, was made more even by means of non-returnable aid granted to African countries. When the overwhelming majority of African countries gained their independence, the new form these relations took were two conventions in Yaoundé (1963, 1969), whose point was similar: mutually preferential trade complemented by development support. At that moment the bilateral relations between the already former colonial capitals and the former colonies were still stronger than the relations with the EEC as a whole. In any case, the Community did not at that time have larger international ambitions. The addition of Great Britain markedly increased the number of countries, former colonies and other dependent territories with which the EEC wanted to sustain special relations. First of all, in 1972, there was created a Generalised System of Preferences (GSP) for underdeveloped countries from various parts of the world and then, in 1975, there was introduced a new system of relations in the form of four subsequent conventions from Lomé, one concluded every five years. The same logic of relations was continued – reduced trade tariffs, development support and non-returnable financial support. However, from the end of the Cold War on (in view of the lack of competition from the communist bloc), these conventions and relations came to emphasise respect for human rights, including the rights of women and the promotion of democratic principles, institutions and good governance. The Community also declared its respect for the sovereignty of its partners from the Lomé system and their freedom in marking out their path of development. In trade relations, a mechanism was built in to ensure the stability of the revenues for underdeveloped countries and

their exports which were sometimes based on natural resources or agricultural monoculture.[153]

The end of the strategic division of the world into East and West modified the Community's approach to Africa. On the other hand, it worsened the situation on the continent where internal conflicts continued and spread to neighbouring countries leading to the collapse of state structures which had emerged after the end of the colonial period and which for some time functioned well. Without limiting its support, the Community and its member states formulated expectations in the domain of governance (i.e. "elements of democracy"), respect of human rights and security measures to be taken. This was the result of the passage from the EEC, an economic and trade group, to the EU with its stated ambition of shaping a better international order. Furthermore, the founding of the World Trade Organization (WTO) limited the options for applying selective trade preferences that would discriminate against other external countries. The EU's new approach, not only towards Africa but also towards a much broader group of underdeveloped countries was captured in the formula ACP (Africa, the Caribbean and the Pacific region), as presented in the Cotonou Agreement of June 2000. With the help of this agreement, the EU wished to respond to the marked stagnation in development in this group of countries in comparison with other regions where, thanks to internal reform, self-determination and the possibilities created by the globalisation of the nineties, significant progress was achieved in terms of growth and joining the global economic system.

The Cotonou Agreement had the ambition of combining into one whole the issues related to security (including various means of preventing armed conflict and uncontrolled migration), human rights and democracy, development aid aimed at combatting poverty (the EU signed up to the Millennium Development Goals of the United Nations [UN]), economic and trade cooperation aimed at the improve integration of those countries with the global economy and financial support in the event of sudden or cyclical drops in export revenues. The Programme from Cotonou, negotiated with the countries it was aimed at, was also intended to incline – or perhaps *force* – the countries of Africa to achieve greater independence, to greater independent effort (e.g. reduction in tariffs to reduce protectionism, a reduction in easy, demoralising incomes for corrupt, local and nepotistic ruling groups). In this way, it was hoped that the competitiveness of goods produced locally would increase, as happened in the Asian emerging economies. It was also

153 K. Kołodziejczyk, *Polityka Unii Europejskiej wobec krajów grupy AKP* [*EU Policy towards ACP Countries*], in: S. Parzymies (ed.), *Dyplomacja czy siła…*, *op. cit.*, pp. 383–387.

expected that compliance with WTO regulations would increase. In 2005, the EU adopted its first Strategy for Africa, grouping the elements above into four categories: 1) peace and security, 2) economic growth, 3) social development (with a particular emphasis on education and health) and 4) respect for human rights.[154] In keeping with this strategy and influenced by their experiences with the implementation of the Cotonou Agreement, the EU decided to move on to a new form of cooperation with the countries of this region, cooperation on the basis of *economic partnership agreements*. These were an individualised and more demanding version of the Cotonou programme. At the EU–Africa summit in Lisbon in December 2008, the majority of African countries rejected this new formula as disadvantageous or risky (due to the potential loss of revenue from tariffs, the too low level of competitiveness – in practice trade benefits would accrue to the EU alone). Only a part of the ACP countries, including Caribbean countries, decided to conclude these Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) agreements.[155]

The failure of this formula did not influence the EU's interest in Africa. The European Development Fund was still in operation providing non-returnable development aid (only in the period 2008–2013 – i.e. during the economic crisis in the EU – this support amounted to around 23 billion euro). The beneficiaries thought this was too little, but the EU complained about the slight results, that is the inability of the beneficiaries to make good use of these funds. Not only did the EU demonstrate its interest in Africa's situation, its security and development by means of development support, including technical support, and stabilising missions carried out within the framework of the European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP), but it also participated in regular EU–AU (African Union) summits, organised since 2000 (the first being in Cairo; in 2014 in Brussels the leaders of around sixty African and European countries took part, as well as the Secretary General of the UN) and on the whole focus on matters of security, economics and migration. However, the EU cannot count its Africa policy among its overall successes. The failures on this "front" had an endogenous character, their sources being the specific nature of African culture, its low capability

154 The adoption of this strategy towards Africa coincided with the resolutions of the G-8 summit in Gleneagles (Scotland) in 2005, where the G-7/8 countries considered African issues for the first time in history. The decisions of the summit envisaged significant debt reduction and increase in development aid, among other things. Four of the countries – France, Germany, the UK and Italy – out of the seven entitled to vote in financial–economic issues (i.e. without Russia) are EU members. In addition, the President of the European Commission participates in G-8 summits.

155 K. Kołodziejczyk, *op. cit.*, pp. 389–404.

of mobilising its own mechanisms for growth and numerous, sustained armed conflicts that devastated previously stable countries leading them to fail as states. These states have undone their previous achievements and blocked chances of support not only form the EU but also form other organisations and countries. A particularly hopeless period in this respect was the nineties and the beginning of the new millennium (conflict in the Great Lakes region, in the Congo, Somalia, Sudan, Chad and other areas.[156] Only recent years have brought a reverse tendency which nevertheless remains fragile.

Latin America. For the international position of the EU, relations with Latin America have had, above all, the character of sentimental public relations. In these relations the EU was able to try out its own *soft power*. Security matters were of little consequence here and economic matters, though significant, were not of the greatest urgency. The EU's interest in Latin America was mainly of a historical and cultural nature. Any political goals were connected with the sheer ambition of playing a global role, thereby shaping the EU's international identity. While it is true that contemporary Latin America was "created" by the old European powers – thereby sharing a cultural kinship – the early colonisation was followed by early decolonisation and the Latin America quickly came under US "protection". Cultural relations with the countries of southern Europe – Spain, Portugal or Italy – have been preserved.

But until the end of the Cold War, Latin America remained under the custody of the United States. This happened because of US economic and strategic interests (counteracting the (perceived) USSR goals of provoking social and political revolutions to weaken the position of the United States "on their own doorstep"). After the relaxing of the Cold War corset, this changed. Opportunities appeared for a stronger presence of "Old Europe" as well as other overseas regions. The newly founded EU was able to test its capabilities to play the role of a "global player" in a low-cost and low-risk context. There were several background assumptions here. The countries of Latin America, while not very wealthy, were much more developed and stable than the countries of Africa – they were not in need of development or humanitarian aid. They also began to seek more room

156 See J. Milewski, *Afryka – półwiecze niepodległości. Czas wielkich wydarzeń i bilansu* [*Africa – A Half-Century of Independence. A Time of Great Events and a Summing Up*], "Rocznik Strategiczny" ["The Strategic Yearbook"], 2009/2010; and R. Kuźniar, *Pozimnowojenne dwudziestolecie…* [*The Two Decades Following the Cold-War…*], *op. cit*., subchapter "Afrykańska kronika kryminalna" ["An African Criminal Chronicle"], pp. 282–287.

for manoeuvre, freedom from the US monopoly of influence in the region. There was much resentment in the region towards the Americans who had indulged in many dirty practices, from economic exploitation to support of bloody dictatorships. The EU was able to showcase its merits and try out its ability to attract other countries, to tighten relations and expand influences beyond its immediate vicinity and in confrontation with the traditional power in the region (the United States) as well as powers from Asia who had also headed off to "conquer" Latin America (both China and Japan). It was also an opportunity to check the new set of instruments available in the common security and foreign policy. The weakness of the EU's approach to Latin America was the aforementioned lack of natural urgency in these relations – normally issuing from geographical proximity or security issues. From the start this was a hindrance to the EU in building up a more serious strategy towards Latin America.

Initially, in the nineties, the EU was able to nurture the hope that the mere intensification of contacts would be enough for Latin America to notice the EU's charm and foster closer long-term ties. For many reasons, the model of integration from the EU could have become a road map for the countries and societies of Lain America, and the EU could thereby have become a privileged partner. The cultural similarity combined with mutual curiosity could have neutralised the distance represented by the ocean between the continents. Nevertheless, the EU as a whole did not have much more to offer its potential junior partner, certainly not enough to represent a credible alternative to the United States or to weaken the power of Chinese expansion. In view of the WTO regulations, the development of trade relations proceeded without preferential treatment for particular relations, as the countries of Latin America did not belong to the poorest or most underdeveloped countries. There were others more deserving of development support or aid. It is true that in the political domain, in 1999, a "strategic partnership" was launched and EU–Latin American summits were organised, but in view of the growing number of such "partnerships" and the lack of a clear idea of their particular content, they tended to remain a pleasant but merely diplomatic ritual. And this was the case here as well. The EU as a whole did not bring any important "added value" to the usual bilateral relations between the two regions.

At first there seemed to be more hope in the cooperation between the EU and sub-regional organisations who demonstrated a definite tendency to enter into economic integration, in particular Mercosur[157] and the Andean Community

157 Mercosur – the Common Southern Market was founded in 1991 by four countries: Argentina, Brasil, Paraguay and Uruguay. Its structure looked uncannily similar to the EEC, but in reality the level of internal integration fell way behind that of the EC.

(Comunidad Andina/CAN). Cooperation with Mercosur, which consciously imitated the EEC, came quickly, at the beginning of Mecosur's existence, that is in 1992. Both groups began adopting common programme documents, and at the EU summit in Essen, a decision was taken to create a joint free-trade zone. Later talks in this matter ran aground on the issue of the export of agricultural goods. A free-trade zone of this kind would not be possible without changes in the common agricultural policy of the EC. Talks were postponed until the next round of trade negotiations with the WTO (called the Doha Development Round), and these talks, as is well known, foundered – above all because of discrepancies in positions on trade in agricultural and food products. The EU signed a cooperation agreement with the older Andean Community[158] in 1993. Common issues were trade and combatting the narcotics business. The remoteness of the two continents and the specific nature of the issues facing the Andean states, as well as issues between those states themselves, meant that there was a gradual weakening in contacts between the Andean Community and the EU.

Asia, that is China. Historically speaking, Europe has been strongly present in Asia since colonial times as we have mentioned in earlier chapters. This was above all not only true of the colonial powers such as Great Britain and France, but was also true of Holland or Germany. The historical presence of Europe covered almost all of Asia (only Japan reserved independence), though China was much less affected in virtue of its huge area and population and also because of its civilisational uniqueness. When the European powers of Great Britain and France were victorious in the Opium Wars in the middle of the XIX century, this opened the Chinese market to trade with Europe,[159] yet this did not amount to European domination over the Qing Empire. What the Chinese saw as their humiliation in the Opium Wars in a subtle way came to burden European–Chinese relations in later times.

For the EU's international identity, its policy towards China and developing relations with them was in a sense more important than relations with the rest of Asia (everywhere east of the Persian Gulf). Of course, in 1996 the Asia-Europe

158 The Andean Community was founded in (as the Andean Group) in 1969 and its mission was to become a common market group. However, in view of the difference between the member states, from Venezuela to Chile, their cooperation did not progress much.

159 *Nota bene*, the cause of the Opium Wars was the rigorous mercantilism of the Chinese authorities, which amounted to blocking European products from their market and insisting on payment for Chinese exports in gold or silver. Europeans had difficulties preserve a balance of trade, as would be the case in the XXI century.

Meeting (ASEM) formula was initiated, that is the Asia–Europe Meeting, as a vehicle to develop cooperation between the EU and East Asia. At that time ASEM included twenty-five countries. The cooperation focussed on three main areas – political, economic and sociocultural. Every two years there were meetings at a summit, and, independently of those meetings, meetings at a ministerial level. The formula seemed so attractive that there was pressure to extend its scope, and the twenty-five countries increased to fifty-one, including Russia, Kazakhstan and Mongolia. This was the same as the number of countries in the UN at its inception, but in the case of the UN the fifty-one represented the entire world. With ASEM's meagre institutional structure, the formula must have lost its focus, ending up being yet another diplomatic ritual devoid of real political meaning. At the same time, China began with the Deng Xiaoping reforms at the end of the seventies and then from the beginning of the nineties headed towards its global destiny. The consequences of this new destiny – different from Mao Zedong's "long march" – quickly became clear to the West including Europe. At the beginning, however, the illusion was cherished that China could be fitted into the West's international order. It seemed that the EU wished to undertake just that – the growing power of China seemed to be an ideal candidate for the constitutional goals of the EU's international identity: peace and security in accordance with the UN Charter, international cooperation and the spread of democracy and improvements in human rights.

In the EU's approach to China after the Cold War, we may distinguish three phases: the nineties, a period leading up to the financial market crisis in the EU and today. Unfortunately, with the case of China it is most evident that international role of the EU follows the pattern "take-off–culmination–decline". Even the beginning was not good in this case, due to the dramatic event taking place shortly before the birth of the EU: the massacre at Tiananmen Square on 4 June 1989 and the further repressions that ensued. Events in Beijing were in sharp contrast to the hope expressed by the changes in the communist bloc, further awoken that very day by the victory of the Polish "Solidarity". Somewhat earlier, it is true, the EEC and China had begun regular trade relations as a result of Deng's reforms, but the final period of the Cold War was not conducive to expanding these relations to other areas. In view of the values the Community had espoused, it could not avoid strongly condemning the massacre in Tiananmen. The Community began expressing its critical attitude to the events in China and more broadly on the human rights situation there in the well-known "Chinese Resolution" presented at the beginning of the nineties in the Human Rights Commission of the UNO (United Nations Organisation). Beijing considered this an unacceptable interference in its internal matters and an assault on

its prestige.[160] At the same time, however, the EU – and particularly individual member states – tried to develop relations with China motivated by economic interest and the steady opening up of China to the world. Which is why the EU adopted an Asian strategy in 1994 and in the following years endorsed further documents which reflected greater EU interest in China and the increased political significance of China and the external relations of the Community in general. Before the decade had come to a close, both sides were the second or third economic trading partner for the other, and the level of investments from EU countries in China was second only to the United States.[161]

From the start of the new decade (and new century) EU–Chinese relations entered a new phase, not only as a result of the successes of both sides, but also in view of a new institution in the form of annual summits according to the formula of a "mature partnership" (document from 2003), thanks to which the EU and China were able to act to define areas of common interest and jointly face challenges. Indeed, the bilateral relations quickly gained tempo and developed thanks to the ongoing dialogue covering as many as twenty-four areas, from human rights to finance, transport, energy, science, culture, environmental protection. In this dialogue and attempts at cooperation, there was no lack of difficult issues such as atomic non-proliferation (the problem of North Korea), combatting terrorism and organised crime. From the beginning of the more intensive phase of EU–China relations, there appeared the issue of the economic and trade interests of individual leading EU countries (Germany, France, Great Britain). These separate relations weakened the EU's overall position and ability to take a strong position towards Beijing when the need arose (e.g. when it came to the possibility of placing large orders for Airbus aircraft, the "Chinese Resolution" from the United Nations Commission on Human Rights was dumped and only (little) Denmark formulated a mild resolution on political freedom in China in its place. Denmark was principled but had little to lose). We may say that from the nineties on, there began a race between EU countries for pole position in the Chinese market where things were of course mainly decided at a political level. Somewhat akin to "gold fever" there appeared "China fever", a fight not for land with gold, but for contracts for export to China and investments there. European

160 The campaign surrounding the resolution was accompanied by considerable media attention and diplomatic manoeuvres at the UN forum. We may note that the resolution – in the face of opposition from non-western countries – was never adopted.

161 See J. Rowiński's excellent chapter: *Stosunki Unii Europejskiej z Chinami* [*EU Relations with China*], in: S. Parzymies (ed.), *Dyplomacja czy siła…* [*Diplomacy or Power…*], *op. cit*.

concerns and some individual governments seemed even to act contrary to the interests of their own markets and employees. The strongly mercantilist policy of China meant that the EU states started noting massive trade deficits with China, exceeding 150 billion euro annually with turnover exceeding 300 billion euro (e.g. in 2007, export from China to the EU was over 230 billion euro, whereas in the other direction – a little under 70 billion).[162] Independently of the issue of trade deficits, the development of contacts in other areas was important – the EU hoped to influence the evolution of the system in China in culture, tourism, science and education (including a huge level of student exchange and inter-university relations). Until 2008 more or less, both sides were able to count their cooperation a "success story". This success was aided by the lack of geopolitical problems which were manifest in Chinese–US relations – for example the issue of Taiwan – or in Chinese–Japanese relations. Both sides supported a multi-polar international order (with differences of emphasis); both avoided the "unipolar" American approach. This difference in approach was particularly in evidence in the administration of George Bush and its pursuit of global hegemony, though here too the EU was not fully consistent (note the pro-American position of Great Britain). The EU in any case claimed the role of a "global actor", and at that time both sides favoured the model of the triad of poles (together with the United States) as the foundation of the new international order.[163]

The 2008 crisis represented an important turning point for the international position of the West and it also meant a strengthening of China's position and a sudden weakening of EU power.[164] (More on the consequences of this crisis for EU–China relations in the last part of this work.) As a result of China's rising position and the internal issues and lower credibility of the EU, issues came to the fore which had previously been hidden: issues of human rights (though China no longer wished to discuss human rights and was increasingly in a position to avoid doing so); an embargo on weapons and military equipment, criticised by

162 Despite considerable efforts on the part of the EU (and its member states) and the promises of China to balance this deficit, little had changed by 2014 when export from China to the EU reached a little over 300 billion euro whereas in the other direction the figure was 165 billion euro, out of which Germany represented 45%.

163 B. Góralczyk, *Unia Europejska – Chiny: najważniejsze stosunki na globie?* [*The European Union – China: The Most Important Relations in the World?*], "Studia Europejskie" ["European Studies"] 2009, no. 2.

164 For more on this see: R. Kuźniar (ed.), *Kryzys 2008 a pozycja międzynarodowa Zachodu* [*The 2008 Crisis and the International Position of the West*], Scholar, Warsaw, 2011 (especially the essays by E. Haliżak and J. Rowiński).

Beijing as a hangover from the Cold War; the lack of recognition by the EU of the Chinese economy as a market economy (China's infringement of WTO regulations); large trade deficits, provoking the accusation against China of systematic mass dumping (tolerated at least if not inspired by the government in Beijing); the infringement of intellectual property rights; illegal emigration from China (also to Europe), to which the Beijing government turned a blind eye; Europe's worries over Chinese expansion in Africa. All these problems increased as the crisis went on and with the divisions within the EU following 2008.

2 The EU on the global stage – the normative aspect

From the moment of its emergence, the EU had the ambition of being a normative power and in this capacity of creating a better international order. This is a recurring motif of the speeches of EU representatives and high-ranking officials of member states on various occasion. This is grounded in Europe's experience, in its unusual passage from a continent of wars to a continent of peace, precisely thanks to the appearance of the first Community after World War II (in 1951). This ambition is also written into the Maastricht Treaty on the EU, in Articles 2 and 11 which included statements, we recall, on the EU's activity for the preservation of peace and international security in accordance with the UN Charter and the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) documents (Helsinki, Paris) on the development of international cooperation and the support for the rule of law, democracy and respect for human rights. In this way the EU built up its international identity through a common security and foreign policy. And it really was the case that after the Cold War the EU was that force – sometimes the only one – improving the international order, with great effort and considerable cost. As has been written, as a regional "post-historical" international order, the EU took it upon itself the role of signposting the way for the Rest of the World's development. "Post-historical" – that is developing peace and prosperity without great ideological confrontations, without wars, following a simple pattern: a combination of a more-or-less liberal democracy and an open market economy (see, e.g. F. Fukuyama and R. Cooper).[165] It is easy to point

165 In his famous 1989 essay *The End of History?*, Francis Fukuyama predicted that after the Cold War, following the model of the EEC, there would be a "common marketisation" of international life (F. Fukuyama, *The End of History?*, "The National Interest", 1989, no. 16, pp. 3–18). The well-known British diplomat Robert Cooper wrote that Europe (the EU) is a postmodern system of international relations, no longer having the use of force at its disposal – a fact which will affect its surroundings according to

out the four main areas of EU activity in the character of a normative power: economy–trade–finance, human rights, international security, environmental protection and climate.

Trade and the economy. In this area the EU felt at ease – after all it had been formed and operated with great success as the EEC – a common *market*. While still the EEC, it had become the world's leading trade power, and since the time when ten more countries were added in 2004, it had also become the leading power in terms of size of gross domestic product (GDP) (exceeding the United States by 1–2%). The Union in its basic version – as a Community – had the international-legal capacity to represent member states in the sphere of international relations. It was after all the EC that represented the EU in world trade, in negotiating and concluding contracts in the WTO system and in bilateral relations. The goals of the EU in this area may be summarised in the following triad:

- The improvement of conditions for one's own economic growth and expansion;
- Establishing the rules for this area, making it stable, predictable, based on a contractual foundation, ideally multilateral;
- Development support for the most underdeveloped countries in the world.

The EU has been an unusually active, collective member of the WTO since the latter's founding. Indeed, it has played a key role, together with the United States, in transforming the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) into the WTO and in further liberalisation of trade within the framework of the WTO. The EU's approach to this sphere had two tracks: firstly, liberalisation of trade in accordance with the provisions of the Uruguay Round (their realisation being in stages), and secondly the enforcement of rules by the mechanism of dispute resolution in the WTO. Within the framework of the WTO, the EU took part in the elimination of the majority of non-tariff limitations, especially in the area of agriculture, textiles and garments. It also participated in the liberalisation of the service sector, though simultaneously defending its own market with tariff instruments. At the same time, it attempted to monitor the respect for intellectual property in the context of international trade (the Trade Related Intellectual Property Rights [TRIPS] understanding), which was of course connected

---

the logic of liberal internationalism (spreading democracy and human rights). See: R. Cooper, *The Breaking of Nations: Order and Chaos in the Twenty-First Century*, Atlantic Press, London, 2003. At the same time Cooper worried that the rest of the world would live according to the realist paradigm of the international order (the primacy of power politics).

to concerns about sustaining competitive advantage in relation to other world markets.[166]

The EU has within the WTO the opinion of an "effective player", which is the result of its experience and size (combined GDP and value of trade). The EC, which represents EU states in the WTO, is keen to resort to the mechanism of *dispute settlement*, especially against the United States (often in the matter of food safety or environmental protection in production processes). This was also apparent in the course of the round of negotiations begun in 2001 concerning trade liberations – the Doha Round. This was supposed to be a development round, that is the provisions were supposed to be conducive to the development of poorer and less developed countries. G-20, in representing less developed countries (LDC), demanded significant liberalisation in the trading of agricultural items. The EU did not greet this proposal with enthusiasm and this time, together with the United States, required the same treatment for trade in industrial goods. After a few years (in 2006), negotiations reached a stalemate and multiple attempts to revive them came to nothing. In general terms, the balance of the reduction in subsidies and tariffs after all stages of the negotiation: the triad EU–US–G-20 (around 130 countries) did not satisfy everyone to a sufficient degree.[167]

The EU was also an active participant in international trade and in discussions beyond the WTO system. Its capacity outside the WTO was above all thanks to bilateral and multilateral agreements with the majority of countries in the world as well as numerous sub-regional groups. These were, as mentioned above, various agreements on association, trade, cooperation and support for ACP countries, often with a preferential character. Facilitating access to EU markets and aid was directly tied to expected improvements in the situation of those countries in terms of human rights, good governance or specific democratic standards. In this way, there was an attempt to "civilise" other countries in the world in sense of adopting certain systemic patterns which, it was felt, would serve their development. There were also talks, without significant progress, on joint free-trade zones with Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), Mercosur, the countries of the Persian Gulf and others. All the time the GSP

166 K. Kołodziejczyk, *Ekonomiczne aspekty polityki zewnętrznej Unii Europejskiej* [*Economic Aspects of the External Policy of the European Union*], w: S. Parzymies (ed.), *Dyplomacja czy siła…*, *op. cit*.

167 E. Haliżak, *Niepewna przyszłość międzynarodowego systemu handlowego* [*The Uncertain Future of the International System of Trade*], "Rocznik Strategiczny" ["The Strategic Yearbook"], 2003/2004; *idem*, *Tendencje w handlu międzynarodowym* [*Tendencies in International Trade*], "Rocznik Strategiczny" 2005/2006.

was in operation for underdeveloped countries with a lack of diversity in export. Financially, the EU was (and remains) the world's greatest source of development aid (around 60% of the world's total). Support is granted via the European Development Fund, as well as through the UN, OECD, WTO and HIPC (Heavily Indebted Poor Countries), that is a mechanism for debt reduction for the poorest countries, agreed within the framework of the International Monetary Fund (IMF), World Bank and G-7.

EU efforts to improve the situation of all the poorest states in the world, what was called the "international division of labour", did not have a merely moral motivation. The aim was also to return to the world a certain multi-polar balance in the context of the challenge of the near-hegemonic position of the United States at that time. An example of this effort was the Lisbon strategy adopted by the EU in March 2000. This was the EU's response to globalisation which opened it to stronger competition, not only from the United States but also from new centres of growth, especially in Asia. Without an effective response, job losses might have followed, leading to poverty and social disturbance as well as the ultimate threat to the stability of democracy in EU countries. The Lisbon strategy assumed that the EU's social model could be defended by preserving competitiveness through innovation due in turn to increased investment in R&D, focussed especially on the acquisition of competitive advantage in the so-called knowledge economy. The appropriate investments, reforms and educational programmes were to help sustain economic growth, employment and society cohesion. There was an official declaration that the EU would surpass the United States in the above respects within a decade. Ultimately this goal was not achieved but the effort was not wasted. There was a similar intention behind the creation in 1999 of a common currency – the euro. Of course, as mentioned above, this was above all a political project serving tighter integration within the Community, but we should not ignore its external significance. The euro was to be the EU's "coat of arms" for external relations ensuring a better place in the global economy, trade and finance. It was to bring serious changes in global finance, that is to bring an end to the near monopoly of the dollar in global financial markets. Until the financial crisis beginning in 2008, these efforts were very successful – it was precisely then that the euro became the first currency of international transactions and the second for reserves. The crisis weakened the position of the euro and the trust placed in it, a topic we shall return to.

European speciality – human rights. If there was an area where the EU became for a moment a global power, it was human rights. This aspect of EU international identity was recorded in Paragraph 5, Article 11 of the Maastricht Treaty on a common security and foreign policy (intended precisely to serve the support for

democracy, the rule of law, respect for human rights and basic freedoms). The fall of communism and the end of the Cold War, taken as a victory for the idea of freedom and human rights, created in the nineties (sometimes called the "decade of human rights") an opportune moment for the EU's offensive in this area.[168] Its activity for human rights moved in many directions and had many aspects. Firstly, let us recall the significance accorded by the EU to these issues in the process of enlargement to post-communist countries – human rights were one of the five Copenhagen criteria for membership. Secondly, the question of human rights was a key point in the programme of European Neighbourhood Policy, though in view of the cultural circumstances of the EU's neighbourhood, the EU's efforts were rather ineffective (sometimes not effective at all). Thirdly, EU postulates on human rights and democracy were present in relations with much more remote countries, in the new generation of partnership and cooperation agreements (for trade and aid) with LDC, particularly at the beginning of the nineties.

The global stage *par excellence* for the EU's activity for human rights was of course the United Nations. This engagement and the capabilities of the EU in this area became evident during the World Conference on Human Rights in Vienna in June 1993. The ambitious programme adopted there – to a great extent the result of the efforts of the EU and her member states – became the bible of human rights for the period following the Cold War. The achievements of the Conference included establishing the office of UN High Commissioner for Human Rights and the principle that the level of respect for human rights in any country (especially when those rights are infringed) is a legitimate concern of the entire international community. (This principle does not contradict the principle of non-intervention in the internal affairs of sovereign states.[169]) From that moment on, the EU was seen to be unusually active at the UN Human Rights Commission. In the nineties, the EU represented the driving force of the Commission, often acting as an icebreaker towards the indifference or resistance of groups of countries towards individual human rights' issues. The work of the EU was dynamically coordinated by the rotating presidency. The EU also had the task of seeking allies for various positions and initiatives which were to become the subject of negotiation and finally resolutions of the Commission. The EU drafted the majority of its resolutions concerning the human rights' situation in specific countries where serious infringements had taken place – politically most chal-

168 For more on this: R. Kuźniar, *Pozimnowojenne dwudziestolecie…*, *op. cit.*, pp. 202–221.

169 Z. Kędzia, *The Vienna World Conference on Human Rights: Failure or Milestone in Human History?*, "International Geneva Yearbook", 1994.

lenging was the case of China. The EU's strong suit was also subject-based resolutions concerning among other things the death penalty, women's rights, political rights and some social rights.[170] It was active in using special procedures, above all concerning complaints (Procedure 1503). The vast majority of rapporteurs (on specific topics or countries) were also working at the initiative of the EU or its members states; the EU not only initiated their appointment but also ensured them adequate funding. Since the EU is a bloc of countries with a large combined economy, it could take steps safely because any countries who felt "affected" by EU resolutions would be reluctant to resort to retaliatory measures.

The EU's engagement was to have key significance for the creation of the International Criminal Court (ICC) in The Hague. Without the EU, the Court would not have been established, since it had powerful opponents hindering (directly or indirectly) the negotiations leading to its establishment – opponents that included the United States, Russia and China. In the end, thanks to the persistence of the EU, the statute of the ICC was adopted at the close of the Rome conference in 1998 (with the United States, China, Iraq, Israel – an unlikely quartet – among the seven countries voting against). In the treaty establishing the Court, a high bar of ratification was envisaged – sixty ratifications. Once again, thanks to the exceptional diplomatic efforts of the EU (persuading many countries in the world), obstacles were overcome quickly. The ICC began its activity. Other UN treaties which face a much lower threshold of ratifications sometimes wait a much longer period to come into effect.[171]

The doctrine of humanitarian intervention had its strong supporters in the EU, even if not unanimous support was often from leading countries. Alongside the United States and Canada, EU countries were the driving force for accepting this doctrine as a principle of international relations. The colonial roots of these practices hindered acceptance of this principle, as well as controversies surrounding the intentions and means of application and scepticism or opposition from many non-Western countries. The post-Cold-War laboratory for formulating and implementing the doctrine of humanitarian intervention was the conflict in Yugoslavia, with successful intervention in Bosnia and Herzegovina (1995) and a failed intervention in Kosovo (1999). The North Atlantic Treaty Organization

170 J. Starzyk-Sulejewska, *Stosunki Unii Europejskiej z Organizacją Narodów Zjednoczonych. Podstawy prawne i instytucjonalne oraz wybrane dziedziny współpracy* [*EU Relations with the UN. Legal and Institutional Bases and Selected Areas of Cooperation*], Scholar, Warsaw, 2015, pp. 217–224.

171 For example, the International Covenants on Human Rights required ten years to gather thirty-five ratifications.

(NATO), with the sturdy support of Great Britain, France and Germany – that is the EU powers –, took the responsibility for the operational–military dimension of the doctrine, whereas the EU as a whole began specialising in the "civilian aspect" or in something which was called "humanitarian support" (support without the use of force). This role was much emphasised not only in the Balkans but also in other regions in the world. The critical reception received by the so-called humanitarian intervention conducted by NATO in Kosovo inclined sections of the international community to look for another formula for political–legal reactions to dramatic humanitarian situations or long-term abuses of human rights. Once again, though the initiative came from the Canadian government, we owe the further steps and the successful conclusion to the decisive actions of the entire EU and its main member states. As we know, the final shape for the principle of intervention is the principle of responsibility for defence, accepted at the UN Summit of 2005.[172]

International security. At this point we should mention a caveat: by international security we are not concerned with the role of the EU in the domain of international security, in general, but only with reference to selected normative aspects in a global context. The EU is a valuable system of security for its members and plays an important role regarding its regional neighbours, but these basic aspects of its activity for security have already been discussed and will be again in subsequent parts of this work. As we recall, the Maastricht Treaty granted the newly formed EU competencies in this area. These competencies were detailed in Article 11 on the goals of a common security and foreign policy, which included not only "to strengthen the security of the Union in all ways", but also "to preserve peace and strengthen international security, in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter" and the documents of the OSCE. In the end, however, international security *sensu largo* did not turn out to be the EU's "element"; the EU emphasised interest only with respect to a few selected issues, taking a comprehensive approach only to the security of its own region and the immediate international vicinity. The leading role in security matters

172 The Canadian government initiated the establishment of a special international Commission to deal with humanitarian intervention following the universally criticised NATO intervention in the former Yugoslavia, in response to the Kosovo situation, in 1999. The Commission prepared a report on the matter (September 2001), which became the starting point for a full reform project by the UN Secretary General Kofi Annan (2005). Further work was done at the General Assembly of the UN and the essence of the Commission's work was adopted in a document at the UN 60th Anniversary Summit (September 2005), becoming thereby a principle of the UN.

belonged to the world powers (including two EU members) and organisations established explicitly for this purpose (the UN, NATO, the O/CSCE, etc.).

Among the few normative and global security issues of interest to the EU was the ban on the use of force, with two exceptions envisaged in UN Charter (self-defence and authorisation by the Security Council). The EU as a whole was in this matter categorical and unambiguous – any international operation aimed at security must have a Security Council mandate. So it has been for all EU missions, though only a few have included the probable use of force. The principal position of the EU in this matter was most evident in the time of the dramatic dispute with the United States about the "means of solving the Iraq problem" in 2002–2003. The EU as a whole supported respecting Security Council Resolution 1441 of November 2002, including the primacy of the UN and its principles over any unilateral pursuit of military "solutions" (meeting of the foreign ministers of the EU in January 2003). Unfortunately, just a short time later, a few countries of the EU broke ranks and supported the military operation of the United States.

The EU has not had the opportunity to participate in disarmament negotiations. Before the EU had no competencies in this area, and then there was no opportunity because for many years there were no serious disarmament negotiations or arms control negotiations (besides START in US–Russia relations). The EU, not as a side or a "front" but as a group of countries, did however make its mark in the context of two headline issues and understandings which did have relate to disarmament. We refer to the Mine Ban Treaty of 1997 and to the 2007–2008 Convention on Cluster Munitions. In both cases, a large group of member states played a significant role in bringing these initiatives to a successful finish. Without EU support – as in the case of the ICC – success might have been impossible due to the resistance of world powers (including Russia, China, the United States) and other states not enjoying the highest opinion in the world. The EU *was*, however, formally present – alongside France, Germany and Great Britain – in negotiations concerning the limits to Iran's nuclear programme. The EU foreign ministers addressed this matter and presented a compromise proposal to solve this problem (by way of diplomacy, in contrast to Washington which constantly repeated that "all options are on the table", meaning the readiness to resort to military force). The High Representative for Common Foreign and Security Policy Javier Solana was particularly active, frequently representing the EU in meetings in this area and sometimes putting forward proposals on behalf of the Security Council.[173]

173 See, for example: "Rocznik Strategiczny" ["The Strategic Yearbook"], 2006/2007, p. 132.

The EU's engagement in the so-called *global war on terror* was characterised by an emphasis on international law, above all when considering the use of force and the manner of its use, as well as banning torture (in both matters there were ongoing disputes with the United States). However, regardless of this dispute, the EU was an active participant in international efforts to combat terrorism. Numerous bi- and multilateral understandings and agreements, many under the auspices of the UN, covered the practical cooperation of secret services and police, blocking the financing of terrorist activity or counteracting their attitudes or ideas.

In the middle of the last decade, the EU was occupied with the problem of the reform of the UN, above all the Security Council, for around two years. Every so often the UN goes back to this issue in view of the drastic underrepresentation of new powers or regions in this main organ of the UN responsible for peace and international security (in the case of Africa we are talking about the entire continent of over fifty states). The reform of the Security Council would have to begin with its enlargement to include new permanent members. Almost everyone in the UN agrees that this is the right step. The EU as a whole has not taken up a clear position in this matter, but the matter does affect the EU directly in two ways, the first of which being Germany's possible permanent membership of the Security Council. Germany's aspirations are generally met with understanding both inside and outside Europe, in the context of the possible reform of the Security Council to include a greater number of states. It might have seemed that a good moment was the general reform of the UN prepared by the Secretary General before the Jubilee Summit of 2005. Germany was considered for permanent membership of the Security Council along with four to six other countries which had also sought membership. The German candidacy was supported by two other permanent Council members from the EU – France and the UK. However, an opposed coalition was set up by … Italy, the coalition being mainly comprised of non-EU states. Italy was concerned that its position would be weakened in the event of German membership of the Security Council. Italy's behaviour was that of the proverbial "dog in a manger", and though unpleasant for Germany (both countries being members of the EU and NATO and the countries had been World War II allies), it was not a decisive factor in the final fiasco. The enlargement plans were scuppered by US opposition.[174] The

174 In the event of Security Council expansion, Germany was a certainty – alongside Brazil, India and Japan – for permanent-member status. This quartet was to be joined by one or more members from Africa.

second aspect of the Security Council reform which directly affected the EU was the idea – appearing in various expert or political circles in the EU – that the EU itself might become a permanent member of the Security Council. This odd idea actually acquired a measure of support and recognition, including the support of the European Parliament. It was a strange and misguided idea for at least three reasons. Firstly, it would require a deep revision of the UN Charter to allow for membership of non-states such as international organisations – and such a revision was practically impossible. Secondly, it was tied to the idea that France and the UK would give up their seats for the EU. Thirdly, it would be hard to imagine the EU formulating a position at the Security Council, since there are already such deep divisions in the EU, exhibited for example by the Iraq War (2003) or Russia's aggression against Ukraine (2014). In the end, the initiative fell away for the same reason as the question of German membership – the opposition of the United States to the reform.[175]

However, the EU did achieve success in its efforts to create an organ within the UN responsible for failed states. The phenomenon of failed states appeared after the Cold War and by the end of the nineties represented a serious international security problem.[176] Kofi Annan decided to address the issue in the aforementioned reform programme of the UN. The EU, taking into consideration its international ambitions and the colonial past of its largest members, was a natural choice in the area of failed states within the framework of the UN. In the final negotiations, the EU strongly supported the idea of setting up a new Peacebuilding Commission as the UN's antidote to the problem of failed states. When this idea came to be realised, on the basis of the final summit document of 2005 and later Security Council decisions, the EU took care of the Commission and its operations as its main supporter and sponsor; the EU took part in all the sittings of the Commission.[177] Once the Commission began its work, it appeared that the EU was the most involved participant in its tasks, especially in its peace

175 More detailed discussion may be found in: J. Starzyk-Sulejewska, *op. cit*., pp. 262–274; J. Symonides, *Organizacja Narodów Zjednoczonych: geneza, podstawa, cele i zasady funkcjonowania* [*The United Nations: its Genesis, Foundations, Goals and Operating Principles*], in: J. Symonides (ed.), *Organizacja Narodów Zjednoczonych. Bilans i perspektywy* [*The United Nations. A Summing Up and Perspectives for the Future*], Scholar, Warsaw 2006, pp. 47–51.

176 More on this in: S. Bieleń, *Państwa upadłe* [*Failed States*], in: J. Symonides (ed.), Organizacja…, *op. cit*.

177 Formal membership of the Peacebuilding Commission was limited to specific groups of UN member states.

missions in several countries (above all in Africa).[178] The Commission in some sense replaced the earlier United Nations Trusteeship Council and the functions of the two organs were very similar so the combined experience of the Trusteeship Council and the EU was extremely valuable.

In the European Security Strategy adopted in December 2003, the EU took on the task of creating "An international order based on effective multilateralism". This was to mean the strengthening of international institutions and legal principles as well as global and regional international organisations, especially the UN. When the Strategy was adopted, the EU took seriously the resulting responsibilities.

Climate change. The protection of the earth's climate was the next key area of EU involvement on the global stage, an area affecting the entire international community, if not, to put it with more pathos, the whole of humanity. At the same time, it was in this area that the EU was quickly to learn that the "balance of power" in the world had changed and not in the way the classical understanding of that phrase would have envisaged. The seventies witnessed a rise in global awareness of climate change. This was partly due to globalisation processes in themselves which led to economic growth in large and hitherto weak countries such as China, India or Brazil. These countries – but not only they – entered into a stage of industrialisation (paradoxically in parallel to the West's *de*-industrialisation). This growth led to increased CO_2 emissions. On the other hand, thanks to the efforts of a more aware section of world public opinion and the activities of various non-governmental organisations (NGOs) – quickly followed by the UN – the problem of global warming became a subject of international discussions and conferences. The year 1997 was announced to have been the warmest year in the recorded history of the earth. And subsequent years were to see new records. In the international community, there was quickly achieved a consensus that the global warming is increasing and it has a human-made character (human activity is at least a contributing factor). Consensus was also reached on the consequences: agriculture will be affected, as will access to water and food all leading to mass migration. The melting of the glaciers and the polar ice-caps will cause rising sea-levels which may render populated areas uninhabitable – certain islands being particularly under threat, their populations facing relocation to the mainland.[179]

178 J. Starzyk-Sulejewska, *op. cit*., pp. 303–325.

179 D. Brodawka, *Zmiany klimatu jako nowe zagrożenie bezpieczeństwa* [*Climate Change as a New Security Threat*], Fundacja Studiów Międzynarodowych, Warsaw, 2009.

The EU's more intensive activity in this area commenced with the 1997 Kyoto Protocol (complementing the framework convention of 1992). The Protocol contained certain obligations in the area of CO_2 emissions, which were nevertheless assessed as inadequate to stop observable climate change. It was estimated that the emission limits would be exceeded by around 2030 (representing an average rise of 2 degrees Celsius in the earth's temperature from the 1990 level). Since 1997, the EU has been the main driving force for the adoption of more far-reaching commitments. Besides limits for EU states, global limits are of course also at issue. The basic arena for the ongoing battle has become the annual climate conference organised by the UN. Similarly to the case of the WTO, a triangle has been established: the first "corner" consisting of the EU, the UN's IPCC (the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change) and a large army of experts and NGOs; the second corner is made up of a group of large countries acting as "brakes" on the process – the United States, China, India and others; the third corner is a group of less-developed "complainers" hiding behind the backs of the second group, but who might agree even to significant new limits if they were provided with some form of financial incentive for their countries and local elites. The Kyoto Protocol was to elapse in 2012, so first of all the EU sought to ratify an ongoing version of the Protocol and then to extend the commitments of signatories. The EU's efforts were sometimes described as a cunning effort to hit the competitiveness of emerging and rival markets. Some legitimation of the EU's efforts was given by the Nobel Peace Prize awarded in 2007 to the Climate Panel.[180]

The determination of the EU and certain other participants of international relations, coinciding as they have with a broadly favourable international public opinion, made success seem likely. It was assumed that further conferences would bring the global community closer to the necessary decisions. However, the process suddenly fell apart at what was to be the culminating phase in Copenhagen, in December 2009. The conflict surrounding the size of emission reductions and the corresponding timetable turned out to be insurmountable. From the perspective of the EU's international standing the problem was even more serious. Here was the EU's great project (the reduction of emissions from their 1990 levels by 30% by 2020 and by 50% by 2050), and it had fallen apart because of a secret deal struck between the United States and China (the two main polluters of the earth) without the knowledge of the EU. Chinese nationalism

180 The Climate Panel shared the prize with the former vice president of the United States, Al. Gore, also an active personality for many years in this domain. A. Giddens, *Polityka zmiany klimatu* [*The Politics of Climate Change*], "Dziennik. Gazeta Prawna", 9 November 2009.

and American egoism combined to conquer Europe's defence of the world's interests (the plan of reduction was accompanied by financial support for underdeveloped countries to develop their technological readiness to achieve the commitments).[181] Washington and Beijing's rather ostentatious disregard of the EU and its material and diplomatic efforts was a clear signal as to where the limits of the EU's international role lay.

181 S. Parzymies, *Unia Europejska wobec kryzysu finansowego i groźby zmian klimatycznych* [*The European Union Responds to the Financial Crisis and the Threat of Climate Change*], in: "Rocznik Strategiczny" ["Strategic Yearbook"], 2009/2010, pp. 154–156; K. Niklewicz, *Psują klimat* [*They are messing up the climate*], "Gazeta Wyborcza", 19–20 December 2009.

8 The EU as a Global Actor? A Lost Opportunity

The description of the European Union (EU) as a global actor might only have appeared explicitly in the EU narrative at the end of the nineties, but all its actions from the Maastricht declaration on were moving in this direction. The attainment of the critical mass necessary to make the European dream of greatness – the vision of a global power – a reality became discernible at the end of the last decade of the XX century. At that time, the EU's development and its successes, as well as changes in the international situation, seemed to indicate this as a possibility or even an unavoidable necessity. Aside from the internal integration that the EU underwent during the nineties (in terms of international relations and security, economic and monetary union including the introduction of the euro, the area of freedoms, security and justice),[182] the start of the next decade provided three strong arguments for considering the Union to be a power. The first was the successful expansion of the EU to include ten new member states, which had been thought of as the main challenge facing the EU and whose success was rightly considered to constitute the "unification" of Europe. The second was provided by a new form of integration: the European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP) – the EU's answer to the war in the Balkans. The third was the endeavour to place the EU on a firmer institutional footing by signing a treaty that would consolidate it, also an expression of its ambitions in terms of international relations.

From the end of the nineties, the EU began to explicitly define itself as a global power (and to be considered as such by others), and as one of the three pillars supporting the new, global international order. Countless texts on the topic have been published and the very term has come to be part of the EU narrative. Tony Blair, the British prime minister and one of the most eloquent and interesting European leaders of that era, said in Warsaw on 6th October 2000 that Europe remains "a unique combination of that which is intergovernmental and which is transnational" and "thanks to its economic and political strength can be a superpower – a superpower, but not a superstate".[183] While the EU was getting ready to put on the "heavy armour", resistance came from an unexpected quarter. Its

182 Z. Czachór, *Zmiany i rozwój w systemie Unii Europejskiej po Traktacie z Maastricht* [*Changes and Development in the European Union System after the Maastricht Treaty*], Atla 2, Wrocław, 2004.

183 S. Parzymies (ed.), *Integracja europejska…*, *op. cit.*, Warsaw, 2008, pp. 430–431.

attempt to become a global player was opposed by its closest partner – who had previously played the role of the protector and leader of the West – the United States.

1 The younger brother does not abandon his elder sister

The United States had become Europe's protector unexpectedly, despite their earlier doctrinal attitude to the Old Continent. *Ideologia Americana* meant a wide-ranging isolation of "New World" politics from Europe's rotten ways, left behind by the generations that built America's greatness.[184] This was the way things stood for the whole of the XIX century and it continued to hold between the world wars. After all, America declined to join the League of Nations using the excuse of not wanting to get involved with the internal affairs of Europe – affairs that were so full of intrigue, nationalist squabbles and vying for primacy. In truth, Washington did not want to limit its options by accepting the restriction contained in the League's Covenant. It should also be noted that America entered the two world wars in Europe not in the name of the righteousness or security of one of the parties but because it was attacked.[185] That it took on the leadership role in the West as a result of World War II was quite natural and happened under the banner of the Atlantic Alliance that was born at that time and whose foundation became the Atlantic Charter signed by Roosevelt and Churchill, the leaders of the main English-speaking Allies, on the 14th of August 1941. Even if the reason why Western Europe became an American protectorate during the Cold War was far from "normal" (i.e. the threat of communism), it led to the formation of quite natural and comprehensive links between these two branches of that civilisation. On the basis of a shared model of economic, social and political development, as well as of the values that justified it, there arose an objective interdependence which both parties wanted to strengthen and which had no analogue in any other part of the world. Its strength extended to all areas of life: economy and trade, policy and strategy as well as culture. The Atlantic Alliance became the share space in which they existed.

The end of the Cold War appeared to presage a simple continuation of this harmonious cooperation – with victory over the shared threat a confirmation of its logic. It was to be expected that the Europeans would recover some freedom of movement on the international scene, given that the immanent threat was gone. Both parties, the Americans and the western Europeans, worked together

184 T. Żyro, *Ideologia Americana*, Łośgraf, Warsaw, 2002.

185 By Germany in World War I and by Japan, an ally of Germany, in World War II.

to "finish up" issues connected to the end of the Cold War: including German unification (most importantly), support for change in political systems in Central European countries and assistance with the fall of the Soviet Union. Cooperation between Western Europe and America was also mostly trouble free when it came to the war in Yugoslavia. In 1990, at the end of the Cold War, the parties signed the Transatlantic Declaration that announced the development of close relations in security, trade and the support for democracy. In Washington, it was understood that relying on Europe and having her as a junior partner helped to strengthen America's global position. This belief was well expressed by Richard Holbrooke – the number three in the State Department – in an article published at the time in "Foreign Affairs", entitled *America: A European Power*.[186] America was to watch over European integration, the spread of stability and democracy to the former communist bloc, and to stabilise relations with a post-Soviet Russia. This suited the Europeans even in the mid-1990s. The New Transatlantic Agenda signed in December 1995 reflected the widely shared interests of both the parties, with an attempt to draw the EU into increasing its contribution to the Western leadership of the world. In short: an America supported by Europe. This was also the case for security issues, where both sides were looking for a convenient formula allowing greater autonomy and increased efforts from Europe. At that time, this kind of formula was provided by the idea of the European Security and Defence Identity within North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), which was to find its practical expression in the form of the Combined Joint Task Force – to be used by the Western European Union with the permission of the Atlantic Alliance in situations in which the United States did not wish to participate in a military operation.

Throughout the nineties, EU confidence rose as did its sense of self thanks to cooperation in foreign affairs and security while the United States saw a growth in triumphalist tendencies which wanted to make permanent the "unipolar moment" that was symbolic of the decade. The growing strength of the EU caused disquiet in the United States both in terms of its implications for America's unquestioned leadership and for the unity of NATO. A discrepancy was revealed in views of the transatlantic community and its role in the international order. In the months before the new strategic plan for the Alliance was signed in April 1999, the Americans became openly confrontational, wanting to put as much focus as possible in the new document on the idea of a global alliance whose main instrument would be *out of area operations* (i.e. outside of Article 5 of the Washington Treaty) – an idea of an alliance that could intervene anywhere in the

186 *America: A European Power*, "Foreign Affairs", March/April 1995.

world and without necessarily having support from the United Nations (UN) Security Council.[187] Europe was split on this idea. Many of the allies were opposed to the idea as an instrument of Pax Americana – an expression of American unilateralism that came to the fore towards the end of Bill Clinton's second term. The calls for a *benign sheriff* or the *indispensable nation* (M. Albright) coming out the United States sounded ominously like *hyperpuissance* (H. Védrine) in Paris. France was not alone in feeling troubled. The sense of anxiety grew with the arrival in the White House of George W. Bush's Republican team, who saw NATO as a tool box from which one could pick and choose what was needed at any given moment. With Washington doing the choosing of course. At this time the EU was advocating a world which, although maybe not quite multipolar, would be balanced and based on institutional multilateralism so that the use of direct military force would become gradually less necessary. G.W. Bush and his associates saw things totally differently.[188]

2 Security disputes

War with Iraq. Already in the nineties, during the time of Bill Clinton's presidency, there were conflicts between the EU and Washington regarding security agreements of worldwide scope. The EU nations which took part in negotiating the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty supported due diligence in determining the details of the agreement while Americans were putting on the pressure and loudly rebuking those they saw as slowly down work on the agreement (i.e. France). In the end, all the EU states signed and ratified the Treaty while in Washington it failed to pass through the ratification stage due to the lack of support from the administration and until today has not come into force.[189] The creation of the International Criminal Court ended similarly. Both the Europeans and the Americans were quite active in the negotiating process but, while the former actually wanted it to be created, the latter wanted to ensure that it was created but in such a way as to be largely ineffective. In the end, the Court was created (Rome 1998) but G.W. Bush withdrew from the agreement that his predecessor

187 R. Kupiecki, *NATO u progu XXI wieku* [*NATO at the Turn of the XXI Century*], ASKON, Warsaw, 2000, pp. 87–116.

188 R. Kuźniar, *Pozimnowojenne dwudziestolecie…*, *op. cit*., pp. 118–123.

189 Independently of that, the hastiness of the United States and technical support for China in terms of computerised methods for maintenance of nuclear capability led to India's "rebellion" which resulted in it acquiring nuclear weapons, followed by Pakistan.

had delayed signing. Washington wanted to make sure that the American military or political leaders responsible for the use of force abroad could never be sent to The Hague. Both these examples show the growing discord between the United States and EU regarding significant international security issues. These differences became most visible in practical terms in relation to the fight against terrorism. What was for the United States a global war on terror that called for the use of the military and the abrogation of international law, including the UN Charter and the Geneva conventions (in the case of Guantanamo, for example), was thought of by the Europeans in terms of tackling terrorism with the use of specialised services and within the framework of national and international law. The Europeans accused Washington of a "simplistic view of the war on global terrorism" (Védrine, again).

Equally significant differences driven by the vital security interests of America's European allies appeared even within the EU in relation to the American Ballistic Missile Defence project. They concerned the early version of the project from the late nineties and the period of the G.W. Bush administration. The essence of the project was to provide a missile shield for US territory as well as for large military US bases abroad and the military operations carried out there. This would mean, however, establishing distinct security standards within the territory of the Atlantic Alliance and would threaten the Alliance's internal unity. The security of the United States, hidden behind the shield, would have become detached from that of Europe. In addition, the Europeans feared that steps taken by the United States in this direction, including its withdrawal from the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty[190] would lead to a breakdown of the system of arms control agreements which could provoke Russia to increase spending on weapons with deleterious effects for the security of neighbouring Europe.

The security conflict between Europe and America came to a head because of the Iraq war. As became quickly apparent, the purpose of the war was to ensure America's position of global hegemony, with Europe in the inferior position of a vassal in transatlantic relations. When G.W. Bush declared in the first half of 2002 that the United States intended to intervene militarily in Iraq, it seemed at first that this was a continuation of the war against terrorism, responding to the September 11, 2001, attacks and whose first stage had been the intervention in Afghanistan aimed at the headquarters of the organisation responsible for the attacks. The Europeans were united in declaring "We are all Americans"

190 The agreement signed by the United States and the USSR in the seventies limiting antimissile facilities to one for each of the superpowers.

(Le Monde title). Although the United States did not seek NATO support, due to their experience in Yugoslavia in 1999 and even though the 11th September attacks were considered to fall under Article 5, Europe gave strong diplomatic support for this intervention starting in October 2001. Shortly afterwards, however, in January 2002, Bush declared the existence of an Axis of Evil in which he included Iraq, Iran and North Korea. This move indicated Washington's warlike intentions for whom the Afghanistan campaign was too small to satisfy its ambition and capability of becoming a global hegemon.

From spring 2002, the US administration stopped was about its aim of a military solution to the Iraq problem. It accused Hussain's regime of hiding weapons of mass destruction and supporting terrorism (i.e. of sustaining relations with Al-Qaida, which carried out the 9/11 attacks). Washington tried to convince its European allies to join the war. The EU as a whole and most of the members states were opposed, as was the overwhelming majority of the international community. The Bush administration was surprised by that reaction and took the matter to the Security Council, counting on its support for the use of force. The UN Security Council, however, introduced a strict weapons control regime with an investigative mission, while preserving the right to determine how to resolve the issue. No one had the right to intervene without its consent. America made no secret of its intention to ignore the Council's decision. It became clear that for Washington, the war against Iraq was intended as a demonstration of hegemonic power to be witnessed by the rest of the world and not a continuation of the war against terrorism or an attempt to take control of supposed stores of weapons of mass destruction. The administration's intentions were clear if you considered who was there in the administration at the time – representatives of arms and petrol industries, advocates of the use of force unimpeded by law and neo-conservatives proclaiming the necessity of global military hegemony for the United States. Policy documents have only confirmed this interpretation. A particularly clear manifesto for military unilateralism and the pursuit of American hegemony was contained in the US National Security Strategy, announced in September 2002. This astonishing document marginalised Europe and relations with European allies.

The problems connected to the Iraq war started for Europe when the Americans, irritated by the doubts and objections voiced by many of the EU states, decided to use the "divide and conquer" strategy. The distinction between a New and an Old Europe was invented. New Europe was deemed to be made up of dynamic and brave "new democracies" – such as the very pro-American Poland – that were candidates for EU membership and about to join, with negotiations having closed in December 2002, as well as other states, primarily Great Britain – traditionally close to the United States – and Spain. It was they that supported the United States

in its pursuit of war, as expressed in the letter of the eight signed on 30th January 2003. In this letter, the leaders of eight nations, including Great Britain, Poland and Spain, expressed support for Bush's policy on Iraq.[191] The letter broke ranks with the EU even though just three days earlier, on 27th January, the foreign ministers of the EU and of the countries that had just completed accession negotiations adopted a declaration setting out the EU position on the matter. The declaration reiterated EU support for resolution 1441 RB which established that it was the UN Charter and Security Council that would have the main role in solving the Iraq problem. The Americans didn't just break EU unity; they decided to alter its internal balance of power by attacking the Paris–Berlin axis, both those capitals – along with Moscow – having opposed the Security Council resolution authorising the use of force in Iraq. As the then Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice colourfully summed it up, "Punish France, ignore Germany, forgive Russia". One could conclude that it was the United States that was the main beneficiary of EU enlargement – its new members' attitudes were strongly pro-American and disloyal towards Europe.

The position taken by the EU – the "Old Europe" – was mocked in *Of Paradise and Power: America and Europe in the New World Order*, a much cited and colourful essay by Robert Kagan, a neo-conservative spin doctor for the Bush administration. According to that essay, Europe was an island of illusionary happiness, made lethargic by peace and well-being, while the United States was the superpower full of civilising vitality that provided Europe with security and conditions for development. The Americans were the hunters who brought home the game – Iraq in this case – so they came from Mars, while the Venusian Europeans were content to be consumers and waiters. It would be a while before it became apparent how much of a poisoned trophy Iraq was. Until that time, these kinds of comparisons worked on the imaginations of many, especially in countries which feared Russia's geopolitical ambitions. European unity as a precondition for realising the EU's international ambitions did not stand the test that Iraq represented, with the short-term ambitions and interests of individual member states – mainly Great Britain, Spain and Poland – winning the day. And Europe was twice the loser. Firstly, it was unable to stop the United States from an act of aggression that led to disastrous results not just for them but for the whole Western world. Secondly, it became divided and the effects of these divisions were to

191 The letter was inspired by "Wall Street Journal's" editorial team and taken up by Spain's prime minister, J.M. Aznar, who convinced the other seven signatories to join him. For more see: "Financial Times", 26–30 May 2003.

last a long time. There was to be a lack of mutual trust and loss of faith in Europe's ability to unite in the face of adversity. The willingness to undertake unilateral action will become apparent more often.

3 European forces – a reality check

The moment the EU was formed – with the objective of defending its own security and the interests of its member states and the commitment to build its own identity in international affairs by influencing the international order – the need for it to be equipped with its own military capacity also arose. Credible joint foreign and security policy could not exist for long without military support. That the issue was taken up at the end of the nineties was, on the one hand, the natural consequence of endogenous efforts in this direction, with roots going back to the 1952–1954 project for a European Defence Community and the 1954 formation of the Western European Union that later became moribund. On the other hand, a strong argument for moving from talk to action was provided by the experiences in the former Yugoslavia in the nineties. It was because of what happened there that the Europeans were forced to listen to how helpless and incapable of reacting to these kinds of crises they were. In that conflict, Europe had to rely on the United States, whose position determined whether and how NATO forces would be used. In the first phase of the conflict, in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Washington long delayed with the decision to use force despite encouragement from London and Paris. Once used (in 1995), however, it led to a good result. In the final phase of the conflict, in Kosovo in 1999, the Clinton administration did not have to be convinced. It might even seem that the Americans enjoyed their earlier experience. The operation in Kosovo was carried out with European support but under the US rule and in a way that did not serve Europe's aims well, or the idea of humanitarian intervention in general. For the Europeans this was an argument for building up military capacities that were independent of the United States. They could serve not just to stabilise the situation or react in a crisis in the vicinity of the EU but also to demonstrate its independent role in international affairs.

After the failed effort to reactivate the Western European Union and the attempt to create a European security and defence identity within NATO – which anyway would not live up to EU ambitions – another solution was decided upon. As a result of a joint French and British initiative, taken up in December 1998,[192]

192 In particular the meeting in Saint-Malo between President Chirac and Prime Minister Blair, at which it was decided to put forward an initiative to create within the

the next few meetings of the European Council (starting with Cologne in June 1999) took steps to create the ESDP as an instrument for the pursuit of the Common Foreign and Security Policy. Initially it was decided to: 1) set aside military forces and provide them with the necessary equipment, 2) create the political and military bodies to serve ESDP and make decisions regarding potential use of the forces and 3) put together technical capabilities for analysis, intelligence, strategic studies and planning, among other things. The size of the forces was set at 60 000 soldiers who could be sent within sixty days to a crisis area in order to carry out a "Petersburg task", i.e. peacemaking or peacekeeping, stabilisation or humanitarian aid requiring military protection. In practice, many more would be required to maintain continuous operations. However, member states relatively quickly offered forces for the ESDP – a total of 100 000 soldiers, 100 ships and 400 planes. It should be noted, however, that the term "defence" in the name of this policy was misleading since it concerned out of area operations and non-traditional defence of EU countries from external aggression. The member states were not yet ready to give the EU the role of collective defence.

Even such small-scale pioneering moves met with resistance from the United States, starting with Bill Clinton's administration. Washington took very seriously the threat that Europe could become politically and strategically independent, leaving the United States without a follower. There was also the worry, shared by Washington and some of the new EU and NATO members that were previously in the communist bloc, that the developments in EU policy could threaten the unity of the Atlantic Alliance due to issues of split loyalty and differing preferences as which of the two security systems to make use of or rely upon in a given situation. The position of the United States was spelled out by the then Secretary of State Madeleine Albright in terms of "the three D's": no *delinking* ESDI from NATO, no *discrimination* and no *duplication*. This meant no diminution of NATO's role in Europe's defence, no discrimination during the creation of the ESDP against European NATO states that are not EU members and no duplication of NATO's capabilities and tasks. Of course, if these directives were followed literally, the creation of a European defence capacity would have been impossible

EU "the capacity for autonomous action, backed up by credible military forces, the means to decide to use them, and a readiness to do so, in order to respond to international crises". This was connected to the aim of the EU playing "its full role on the international stage".

from the start, particularly since the ESDP was also opposed by such candidate states as Poland.[193]

The creation of the ESDP went more smoothly in the institutional sphere and "on paper". There were more problems with real military capabilities despite developments that spoke in favour of their creation. This was because on September 11, 2001, an event occurred that was in a way foreseen by President de Gaulle in the sixties, which was the reason he had taken France out of the integrated military structures of the Atlantic Alliance in 1966. The issue was the threat that the whole Alliance could be drawn into a military conflict, a war, as a result of a US military intervention somewhere else in the world. Were it to possess independent military capacity, Europe would not be reliant upon the United States for its defence and would not be, as a result of that reliance, automatically drawn into "American wars". Substantial differences in opinion accompanied the first steps towards the ESDP, which when combined with the conflict between America and Europe regarding the war in Iraq, opposed by the societies of all of the EU states, even Great Britain. Of course, the issue was not just with the relation between ESDP and NATO or the United States, but also with the functions and size of the EU's military capabilities. Whether they were to serve as forces assisting humanitarian aid – a beefed-up Red Cross – or if they should be capable of rapid, effective military operations even in areas distant from Europe, as a kind of European Foreign Legion. The European morale in this respect was lifted for a short while by the first and highly successful ESDP operation carried out in the Congo in the spring of 2003 on the basis of a resolution of the UN Security Council, with even Washington surprised and appreciative. Operation Artemis undeniably stopped the crisis in that part of the country from developing into large-scale genocide. In the same year, the EU took over from NATO Operation Amber Fox whose function was to prevent conflict in Macedonia and stabilise the country.[194]

The relative success – in the face of some opposition – of the development of a European security and defence policy meant that the EU was ready to adopt a European security strategy, which should be seen as the first complete and authoritative expression of the idea of an international entity contained in the EU's founding treaty. Already telling is the very title of the document signed during the EU summit in December 2003 – *European Security Strategy: A Secure Europe*

193 For a discussion of the development of the ESDP at that time see, in particular, the texts by J. Barcz, J. Czaputowicz and K. Miszczak in the quarterly "Polska w Europie", 2003, no. 2. See also the text of Secretary Albright's remarks to the North Atlantic Council ministerial meeting, Brussels, December 8, 1998.

194 For more detail see: R. Kuźniar, *Polityka i siła…*, *op. cit*., pp. 223–238.

in a Better World. Equally telling is how the EU came to define itself within it: "As a union of 25 states with over 450 million people producing a quarter of the world's Gross National Product (GNP), the European Union is inevitably a global player… it should be ready to share in the responsibility for global security and in building a better world". That is a bold declaration, but at the time the EU had every reason to see itself in such a role. In practice, it intended to act in two areas: firstly, to improve stability and security in its immediate neighbourhood (with particular attention to ending conflict in the Middle East – in contrast to the unwillingness to consider engaging with crises in Eastern Europe that was already apparent at that time); secondly, to create an international order based upon effective multilateralism (which would include strengthening international institutions and the rule of law as fundamental to that order). Within the EU, it was understood that to fulfil that role it would have to be more active, more capable, more coherent. The document also talks about the development of a broad range of instruments that were political, diplomatic, military or based on trade and development aid, as well as of the need to create a strategic culture that would make it possible to carry out early, rapid and, if needed, robust interventions. From today's perspective, it is hard to imagine that the EU was so full of optimism and faith in its capabilities. For example, a "balanced partnership" with the United States was predicted, and among the powers that the EU intended to work with because they "share our values and aims" were China and Russia! Regardless of later developments, it should be noted that the document is a reflection of its times and of Javier Solana, who was at that time the EU's High Representative for the Common Foreign and Security Policy and had the right to claim that "European security strategy is a key point in Europe's development".[195] At that time, the EU could justifiably be considered one of the corners of the golden triad – the triangle constituted by North America, East Asia and Europe – the geopolitical structure that carried the whole international order.

4 Europe's constitutional fiasco

The nineties witnessed a series of EU successes that served to strengthen and widen European integration. This convinced some nations and groups whose aim was to strengthen EU institutions to take up the idea of consolidating EU agreements in the form of a grand, solemn treaty, which in the private dreams of some was to be the European Constitution. These dreams had a long tradition,

195 J. Solana, *Droga Europy do bezpieczeństwa* [*Europe's Road to Security*], "Rzeczpospolita", 12 December 2003.

and the author of perhaps the most ambitious constitutional project for Europe, going all the way back to 1831, was Wojciech Bogumił Jastrzębowski, a Polish naturalist scholar who participated in the November 1830 Uprising. The drive towards these kinds of ideas began during the first decade of the XXI century, not just with the intention of consolidating EU treaties but also with the broader desire to put Europe on a new, solid institutional footing and to demonstrate its self-assurance and aspirations on the international scene. For this reason, the meeting of the European Council in Laeken in December 2001 had no trouble to call another European convention – the previous one having put together the Charter of Fundamental Rights – whose job it would be to prepare such a grand treaty. The convention was to be headed by a politician not only of grand intellectual statue but also of significant organisational ability – France's former president, Valéry Giscard d'Estaing.

The make-up of the new European convention was particularly broad and democratic – apart from government representatives it included parliamentarians, with some selected from opposition parties, as well as members of the European Commission and Parliament. A powerful social forum that brought together non-governmental organisations, unions and business representative worked alongside the convention and cooperated with it. The convention openly listened to critiques, made diagnoses, selected problems and proposed approaches to solutions. The President and other participants used the term "constitution" from the beginning although it caused doubts among many as it was felt that the term only had application to states. After more than a year the document was ready. In July 2003, Giscard d'Estaing presented the fruit of the convention's labours to the leaders of the EU gathered in Thessaloniki – the final document bore the more widely acceptable title of a *Treaty Establishing a Constitution*, even though in Article I-1 it stated that it was the constitution establishing the EU. For a short time, the project became the subject of discussion at an intergovernmental conference and was to be accepted at the meeting of the European Council in December 2003. This did not happen because its approval was blocked by a country that was not even a member state at that time – Poland. Not long after, and in part because of this, the government in Poland fell and Warsaw changed its mind. In the end, the constitutional treaty was signed nearly a year later in October 2004.

The value of the treaty lay in how it strengthened the EU's institutional effectiveness and ability to coordinate economic initiatives, as well as in the way that it ensured continuity by introducing permanent leadership in the Council and the European Council in place of a six-monthly rotation. From our point of view, the most important element was a potential strengthening of common foreign and security policy by integrating it with the ESDP and creating the

post of European Foreign Affairs Minister. In addition, the European Defence Agency was created to oversee the development of the European military sector. Future developments in security and defence policy could, in accordance with the treaty, lead to the creation of a joint EU defence system – a traditional alliance – which would require a unanimous decision by all of the members, which even then looked like a remote possibility. The EU could, however, immediately undertake missions aimed at peacemaking and peacekeeping, conflict prevention, crisis management or stabilisation, as well as missions with humanitarian, disarmament or antiterrorist objectives. The solidarity clause was to play a role similar to that of the Atlantic Alliance's Article 5, which introduced the obligation to provide mutual assistance between member states in the event that one should suffer a terrorist attack, or a natural or humanitarian disaster.

Reading the articles of the European Constitution gives the impression that one is witnessing the birth of a global single actor which, akin to the United States or China, is not just capable of articulating and defending its interests but can also influence international affairs and the development of the world order. After all, this actor was to gain a solid institutional grounding, the ability to sign agreements, to carry out real foreign and security policy which would have its own diplomatic core and a "telephone number" – in response to Kissinger's famous question "Who do I call if I want to call Europe?" At the same time, to make things complete, the constitution formally gave the EU symbols that had previously been reserved for states: a flag, an anthem, a holiday, a currency and a motto.[196]

However, the constitutional treaty was not ratified and this was not due to the objections of Poland or any other nation suspected of a deficit in pro-Europe solidarity but due to it being rejected in a referendum by countries of the Old, or even very old, Europe – France and Holland in May and June of 2005. For Europe this was shocking, even though the main reasons why the constitution was rejected were not the contents of the constitution but the internal problems of those countries, particularly immigration. The shock was so great that a time to reflect was announced. The failure of the treaty came at a bad time for Europe in general, a time of disagreements on Iraq, difficulties with accommodating large-scale enlargement, significant differences on Turkey (with the subtext of the future of Islam within the EU) and weak leadership: Tony Blair compromised by the war in Iraq, Gerhard Schröder with business entanglements with Russia, the burnt-out political retiree Jacques Chirac and Silvio Berlusconi who seemed

196 In that order: twelve stars on a blue background, Beethoven's Ode to Joy, 9th May (the day the Schuman Plan was presented), the euro, "United in Diversity".

to have permanently just walked off the cabaret stage. Angela Merkel was just beginning her career. The dire description and prognosis made by the respected Irish former EU Commissioner, Peter Sutherland, was accurate – "Since the disastrous referendum in France […] the EU has been directionless and politically damaged in a fundamental sense".[197]

It turned out to be possible to pick up the pieces of the broken crockery and put the vase back together – in the form of the Lisbon Treaty. A change of leadership helped, especially the Merkel–Sarkozy duet. The Paris-Berlin Axis was revived for a moment with good results. It also helped that in March 2007 the fiftieth anniversary of the Treaty of Rome was celebrated in Berlin, during which time agreement was reached on the "small treaty" (as opposed to the constitutional one). After difficult negotiations, the project was accepted in Brussels in June and, after another intergovernmental conference, it was signed in Lisbon in October 2007. The Lisbon Treaty consisted of two parts (the EU treaty and the treaty concerning how it was to function); it was a slimmed-down, simplified version of the constitutional treaty. All signs of the EU's "constitutional turn" were removed including relevant symbols[198]; the minister of foreign affairs was renamed "the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy"; and the role of the national parliaments was strengthened in the context of the principle of subsidiarity (that social and political issues be resolved at the most local level practicable). It also included a green light for a multi-speed Europe, the option for increased cooperation strengthening the integration of a smaller group of more committed countries, including matters of foreign and security policy.[199] The vase was almost broken again, this time by the Irish referendum in June 2008. However, once the financial crisis of 2008 came to affect some EU countries, the problems with the Emerald Isle's bloated banking system came to light, the Irish quickly changed their tune and the treaty was accepted in a second referendum. The example of Ireland showed how fragile the structure of the union was. It also revealed that a mere half a percent of the EU population

197 P. Sutherland, *A Direction for Europe*, International Herald Tribune, October 21st 2005; also P. Hassner, *Polityka frustracji* [*The Politics of Frustration*], "Reczpospolita", 5 August 2005.

198 Almost twenty countries decided to maintain the symbols as a sign of their support for European unity. Poland was not among them, unfortunately.

199 J. Barcz, *Unia Europejska na rozstajach. Traktat z Lizbony: Dynamika i główne kierunki reformy ustrojowej* [*The European Union's Parting of Ways. The Lisbon Treaty: Dynamics and Main Directions of Systemic Reform*], Instytut Wydawniczy EuroPrawo, Warsaw, 2010.

could reverse difficult reforms necessary for the EU's effective functioning, so that the more democratic the EU became the less capable it was of making important decisions regarding its internal affairs and its relations to the rest of the world. The vase, although made of precious materials, was not as strong as in the beginning, when made from a single mass. In the case of the EU, the basic problem became the weakness of its political "glue".

Part III The Twilight of Europe as an International Actor

9 The 2008 Crisis and the Beginnings of a Post-Western International Order

"Every political system which takes its principles to the extreme destroys itself."[200]
Gonzague de Reynold

The height of Europe's power in the world and its ability to shape the international order was in the beginning of the XX century. This was true whether we consider the extent of its colonial or imperial sovereignty or its position in the League of Nations. From World War II to the end of the Cold War in 1989–1990, a divided Europe under the protection or domination of the two external superpowers was not playing an independent role in the bipolar international order. It was an order defined by East-West antagonism and the rivalry between the United States and USSR, in which the West and the United States might have had the upper hand but the divisions, including those within Europe, were immovable. After the end of the Cold War, we had an almost-two-decade-long period of Pax Americana, during which America played the role of a regent – a mighty regent but a regent nonetheless – during the process of the passage from a period of Western domination including the rebirth of Europe, to a period where the international order was more balanced. This new order, thus far undefined in terms of name or main characteristics, will certainly feature the full inclusion of "the Rest of the World", with the emerging powers that represent it coming first.

This change was foreseen by Fareed Zakaria, the well-known Indian-American political theorist and publicist, in his book *The Post-American World*, published in May 2008, only a few months before the turning point.[201] The author did not surmise that in only a short time the world would change even more, to become "post-Western". The rise of the "Rest of the World" out of the shadows of the West has come not just at a time of crisis in the United States and in its global role, but during a profound, chronic crisis in Europe. Since 2008, the whole of the West has been on the defensive, pushed back by other states who are strong enough to force their points of view regarding the world order. This is just the beginning of this process and it is hard to predict in every detail how it will develop, but one thing is sure – we have entered a post-Western world order.

---

200 The quotation was translated from its Polish language version, cited by J. Woźniakowski, *Góry niewzruszone*, Znak, Kraków, 1995.

201 F. Zakaria, *The Post-American World*, W.W. Norton & Company, New York, 2008.

1 Crisis of the West, crisis of Europe

Oswald Spengler's 1917 book, *The Decline of the West*, has been the object of much criticism, and not just because of its frequently cloudy arguments and hermetic language. Nevertheless, the view of the development and decline of civilisations, particularly Western civilisation, deserves to be treated seriously. Neither Spengler's contemporaries nor later critics of his interpretation of the story of the West are strengthened in their criticisms by the "tiny fact" that he managed to fairly accurately predict the end of the second and final phase of the West's greatness on the world stage – around the year 2000. Spengler claims that every great culture at some point enters the "civilisational phase" of development characterised by its size and its expansion into its surrounding territory, which then leads to the downfall of that culture and the geopolitical formation within which it formed, and which carried the culture. The "cultural phase" is, according to Spengler, a phase of spiritual and metaphysical development that confers upon it internal strength. The "civilisational phase" consists of the material externalisation and expansion of that culture. However, during the civilisational phase, the culture burns out and declines.[202] In the ancient era (which included for Spengler both Greece and Rome), Greece was the cultural phase and Rome the civilisational. The fall of Rome after a period of material greatness and expansion meant the end of the ancient era that preceded the West. Spengler does not use the concept of European civilisation but of "Western civilisation" which, according to him, is the combination of Western-European and American cultures. According to his interpretation, the West's cultural phase was Europe up to the end of the Enlightenment in the XVIII century – the time of the growth of the West's spiritual strength. "Chaeronea and Leipzig were the last battles fought about an idea", Spengler writes. Afterwards came the civilisational phase, the period of Western material expansion and imperial conquest. During that period, the United States came to the forefront of the West. The imperialist expansion of the West is the omen of its downfall. Of course, such expansion is also the

202 There are of course many more conceptions of civilisational cycles that lead from birth to disintegration. They are ably compared by Niall Ferguson in his opus *Civilization: The West and the Rest*, Penguin, London, 2011. He begins his comparison by proposing Thomas Cole's series of five paintings, together called "the Course of Empire", as illustrative of the life cycle of civilisation. The individual painting, in order they appear in the cycle, are called: *The Savage State*; *The Arcadian or Pastoral State*; *The Consummation of Empire*; *Destruction*; and *Desolation*. N. Ferguson, *op. cit.*, pp. 295–296.

realisation of the developmental capabilities of each mature civilisation – its destiny and fate, it might be said. Such was the West's fate and the finale of its upward struggle. Spengler wrote about "the metaphysically exhausted soil of the West" in 1917. The phase of expansion can last a long time but is inevitably followed by decline. What is interesting is that the West's expansionary phase runs from year 1800, the time of the Napoleonic wars, till the year 2000, that is contemporary for us but distant from the year 1917.[203]

It is a coincidence, of course, that it was in 2001 that the terrorist attack occurred which led America into the war which turned out to be a trap. It is a coincidence that it was in 2008 that the great financial crash occurred which sent the West into a profound economic crisis presaging its global downfall. What is more, the financial crash in the United States and Europe is not the only event that justifies the choice of that year. We can disagree with Spengler completely or just in details, but the West came to the limits of its expansion at the end of the XX century. From there, one may ask what the meaning of this fact is, the meaning for the West's role in the international order.

I consider the year 2008 as a quasi-Spenglerian end-date for the West's and Europe's position in the international order for two reasons.

Firstly, for political and strategic reasons. In 2008 the West, in the form of the United States, suffered a significant loss of face over its rivalry with Russia in Georgia. In previous years, Georgia witnessed political changes which were meant to lead it to membership in North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the European Union (EU). Both those organisations indicated that this membership could commence in the foreseeable future. Special relations between the United States and Georgia developed, with many US military advisors present in Georgia, training Georgian troops. But in August 2008, the president of that country allowed himself to be provoked by Russia into taking military steps against the separatist province of South Ossetia, which was supported by Russia, thereby giving Russia an excuse to respond with overwhelming military power. The United States decided against providing any military support to a country that seemed, and desired, to be an American protectorate. The 2008 Caucasus war showed the limits of the West's strategic capabilities, even though the truculent G.W. Bush was US president at the time. In the end, it was the EU that gave Georgia some succour. It came at the same time as another important "signal". The year 2008 was the bloodiest year in Afghanistan since the beginning of the West's intervention in that country (in late 2001), leading to discussion of

203 O. Spengler, *The Decline of the West*, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1926, pp. 1–50.

the need to change strategy in favour of withdrawal despite not having achieved the stated goals. Furthermore, in 2008, the Republican Party lost the presidential elections, which meant the United States would not continue military operations in Iraq. The Americans, themselves, decided that it was wrong to have got into that war both because it was so expensive economically and in terms of international standing and because it was a failure in terms of ethics and image. The Shock and Awe that was aimed at Saddam Hussein's Iraq ended up with shock and shame for the United States.

Secondly, 2008 was even worse for the West in economic and cultural terms. It started with the financial and mortgage crisis whose early signs were already visible in 2007 and which was precipitated by subprime loans granted to low-credit-standing borrowers as well as the toxic financial instruments of indeterminate content that were sold as securities by Wall Street illusionists. The day 15th of September 2008 is considered the dramatic start of the crisis as this was the day that Lehman Brothers, one of the oldest and most prestigious financial firms in America, went bankrupt. After that more bankruptcies followed, the governments responding with exceedingly expensive programmes to save the banks, investment funds and manufacturers who had collapsed. Soon after that, the crisis spread to Europe, where it had a different cause – excessive government and private debt, the result of funding private and social spending on credit and the issuing of bonds that proved too expensive to buy back or pay off. This revealed a basic problem with the banking system – a deliberate lack of care in approving loans – as well as a problem shared by many governments – a deliberately reckless approach to public spending financed by loans to be paid back by future generations. The financial systems of EU member states were not able to support a lifestyle modelled on the United States. Financial markets profited by speculating wildly and thereby increasing chaos and uncertainty. Some of the EU states faced the prospect of bankruptcy (Greece should have declared bankruptcy immediately) and nearly all faced years of crisis, recession and stagnation. The steps taken in Europe consisted mostly in belt-tightening budget costs that led to increased economic recession as well as in issuing new bonds that increased debt, which would now be much more expensive to buy back in the future.

Experts were agreed that this was the biggest financial crisis in the Western world since the Great Depression at the end of the 1920s.[204] The earlier crash led

204 W.M. Orłowski, *Kryzys finasowy a pozycja Zachodu* [*The Financial Crisis and the Position of the West*], in: R. Kuźniar (ed.), *Kryzys 2008 a pozycja międzynarodowa Zachodu* [*The 2008 Crisis and the International Position of the West*], Scholar, Warsaw, 2011.

to a worldwide crisis while the 2008 crisis was limited to the West, which was indicative of the changing role of the West in the world's economy. A growing failure to maintain responsibility on the part of citizens, governments, banks and investment funds served as the cultural context for the crisis, a response to the increased need for consumption that outpaced growth in efficiency and per capita production. Mass culture, reduced ever more to the function of advertising, came to promise the fulfilment of all expectations. Both governments and banks tried to meet those expectations.

The events of 2008 and their consequences were a crisis in the broadest sense – a transition between long-term cycles or great, historical economic systems. Bernard Rosier and Pierre Dockès call them "moments of paroxysm". According to their definition, these are "temporal nodes, multidimensional escapes and breakdowns" within which "the economic, social, ideological and political elements of our modern world intermingle".[205] The year 2008 would not be crisis in this sense or a particular end point for Europe's position in the world order were it not for secular tendencies that have for decades been eating away at Europe's position in the global arrangement of powers. Meinhard Miegel, a foremost German economist, said at the time, "The rich West has reach the limits of its capabilities when it comes to generating economic growth". According to him, this happened because of changes in three fundamental factors that had been the source of the West's success for the previous hundreds of years.

Firstly, Miegel claims that the West's access to cheap and easily obtained natural resources – that is those on its territory – had finished. It should be noted that today only 0.3% of the world's oil and just 0.8% of the world's natural gas is to be found in EU territory.[206] The problem facing the West, including Europe, is its profligate use of natural resources, water, energy and food as compared to other societies. Furthermore, and putting it bluntly – the West's (Europe's) ability to parasitise the rest of the world is coming to an end.[207] This will also have to change, and this change will put us back on the same level as other parts of the

205 B. Rosier, P. Dockès, *Cykle ekonomiczne, Kryzysy i przeminay społeczne – perspektywa historyczna*, PWE, Warsaw, 1987, p. 22. French original: B. Rosier, P. Dockès, *Rythmes économiques. Crises et changement social, une perspective historique*, La Découverte/Maspero, Paris, 1983.

206 R. Ulatowski, *Geoekonomia surowców energetycznych* [*The Geo-economics of Energy Resources*], Rambler, Warsaw, 2014, pp. 39–59.

207 Z. Bauman, *Panika wśród pasożytów, czyli komu bije dzwon* [*Panic among the Parasites, or: For Whom the Bell Tolls*], "Gazeta Wyborcza", 2–3 October 2010 (discussion concerning issues raised within H. Welzer, *Wojny Klimatyczne* [*Climate Wars*]).

world. Secondly, "we are getting older and there will be fewer of us". Thirdly, "we have changed mentally. Our grandfathers were willing to work harder for less. We are content". So the West must get ready for life without growth,[208] a reality that cannot fail to impinge on its global position. Miegel related all of these factors to the West as a whole but they all are even truer of Europe (and to a lesser extent, the United States). But they were not the only factors behind the amazing rise of the West and its world status since the middle of the previous millennium. Among them were also political institutions and creativity (inventions and basic scientific research).[209] And they too – political institutions especially – have ceased to ensure Europe's development and advantage over the rest of the world enjoyed during previous centuries.

Among the secular tendencies, Europe's demographic situation is particularly problematic. Europe now accounts for less than 7% of the world's population and that number is falling rapidly. The birth rate on the "Old Continent" (from now on the term will apply also to the inhabitants as well as the region) is much less than 2%, in many cases only 1.5%, which is less than that is necessary for maintaining the generations at a constant level. The shrinking population goes with an ageing one, especially among those from Europe. The term "Europe's demographic suicide" has come to be used to describe this situation.[210] This is caused by cultural trends (discouraging (large) families), legislative trends (limiting the number of births) and economic trends (women joining the workforce, which is an attractive alternative to motherhood but includes pressures, especially in corporations, not to have children). Migration has been the European solution for the lack of people at a working age. According to some estimates, by 2030 Europe may be short of more than 20 million workers.[211] Considering migration solely through an economic lens – as a solution to labour shortages – is a

208 M. Miegel, *Nikt nie chce płacić za obietnice sprzed kryzysu* [*No One Wants to Pay for Pre-crisis Promises*] (interview with R. Woś), "Dziennik – Gazeta Prawna", 3–5 September 2010.

209 N. Ferguson, *op. cit.*, pp. 244–245 (according to Ferguson, other factors included political rivalry, medicine and a consumer society).

210 G. Wiegel, *Katedra i sześcian. Europa, Stany Zjednoczone i polityka bez Boga* [*The Cathedral and the Cube. Europe, the United States and Politics without God*], Fronda, Warsaw, 2005.

211 To bring those 20 million workers from Europe it would be necessary to settle around 80 million people, given an average family of worker plus three dependents. This does not seem possible, but it does give some idea of the size of the cultural changes that Europe would undergo in order for migrant workers to replace the disappearing and ageing Europeans. See: "Gazeta Wyborcza", 7 December 2015.

serious mistake as it ignores the issue of social cohesion and cultural security, as can be seen in some countries of Western Europe. It also ignores the long-term consequences in terms of cultural changes on the continent which could affect Europe's identity, including in the international sphere.

Demography is strongly connected to issues of morality and ideology. As we have seen, it is commonly thought that one of the reasons for the rise of Europe and its international position is a specific ethos whose roots lie in Christianity, the achievements of Roman civilisation, the late Middle Ages, Renaissance and the Enlightenment, all enriched by the spirit and effort of industrial capitalism. We can repeat after Huntington – Culture does matter. The cultural preconditions for Europe's strength and position have undergone rapid change in the last few decades. Not just in terms of the erosion of the European ethos, decreasing respect for it or even declining familiarity with it. Primarily, the change has concerned the propagation of hedonistic consumerist attitudes in mass culture and mass social behaviour. European societies for the most part appear to demand that their expectation of such a way of life be met, no matter the consequences for themselves. Media of all sorts – including the Internet, the local press and television stations – play a role in this well-recognised transformation of citizens into consumers, with cheap entertainment that encourages unrestrained consumption and squeezes out informational and educational programmes.

The cultural process underway appears to be leading to the primacy of the individual, the group and the minority interests over common interests. For some time now, the evolution of human rights and basic freedoms in Europe appears to be heading in that direction too. It involves a complete rejection of natural law in favour of a contractual, transactional understanding of basic human dignity. The relationship between cultural foundation and human rights is lost to view, a situation which – when combined with the individualist interpretation of those rights – may lead to the erosion of the cultural foundation. The problem of the relationship between society and the individual, between common good and individual needs is examined well in the works of Jacques Maritain.[212] We are

212 As one of his commentators writes, the point is to "find an optimal balance" between the needs and common good necessary to maintain a particular community (its cohesion and development) and "the needs of the individual that seeks within society the conditions for its own development without sacrifices, assimilation and the favouring of one element over another". F. Compagnoni, *Prawa człowieka. Geneza, historia I zaangażowanie chrześcijańskie*, WAM, Kraków, 2000, p. 154, footnote. Italian original: F. Compagnoni, *I diritti dell'uomo Genesi, storia e impegno cristiano*, San Paolo Edizioni, Rome, 1995.

currently witnessing an imbalance between them, in favour of the unrestrained self-realisation of the individual. No one can deny the Europeans the right to this version of human rights and freedoms but it would be well to help them realise what the long-term consequences may be. Of relevance here is also the observation made by George Soros, that "the most perfect of markets may become a machine destroying social bonds, if it is not bound by a cultural and ethical corset".[213]

Soros is rightly thinking of the financial and market-based aspect of the West's crisis which, for various reasons, is affecting Europe more profoundly than other parts of the West. The unrelenting commercialisation of ever more sectors of social and individual life is leading to the primacy of money in both cases. Paul Dembiński, in his excellent analysis of the role of finance in Western society and economy, uses the term "financialisation" by which he means "the spread of a financial way of thinking in social life" or, to put it in other terms, "profound changes in social life under the influence of the rapid growth of financial markets". In his view, financial rationality is becoming the organising principle of the social system and interpersonal relationships are turning into financial or trade-like transactions – a sign of the totalising nature of financial markets. In Dembiński estimation, "financialisation" impinged on the essence of what it means to be human, penetrating all spheres of economic, social and also, with time, political life.[214] It thereby alters the traditional place of culture within those spheres. Dembiński's position is in harmony with Spengler's (views put forward a hundred years ago). As Spengler put it, "Through money, democracy becomes its own destroyer, after money has destroyed intellect". The dictatorship of money will deform economic life and its primacy conquer law, morality and politics. These are, according to Spengler, the signs of the decline of Western civilisation, similarly to the case of Ancient Rome.[215] The financial crisis that appeared in 2008 and its many consequences that affect, among other things, Europe's international standing, only confirm how right Spengler's intuitions were.

---

213 After P. Dembiński, who paraphrases George Soros in: *Finanse po zawale. Od euforii finansowej do gospodarczego ładu* [*Finance after a Heart Attack. From Financial Euphoria to Economc Order*], Studio Emka, Warsaw, 2011, p. 189.

214 *Ibidem*, pp. 13–23, 174–175, 184–191. However, the whole work is recommended.

215 O. Spengler, *op. cit.*, p. 463: "Here also money triumphs and forces the free spirits into its service. […] A more appalling caricature of freedom of thought cannot be imagined. Formerly a man did not dare to think freely. Now he dares, but cannot; his will to think is only a willingness to think to order, and this is what he feels as his liberty." O. Spengler, *op. cit.*, p. 464: "Through money, democracy becomes its own destroyer, after money has destroyed intellect".

Cultural factors may make it more and more difficult to make the necessary adjustments which are required to sustain the general vitality of European civilisation as a foundation of its international role. Examples of cultural factors include women's liberation versus the demographic decline of Europe and political correctness versus the freedom of speech required to tackle difficult questions. Necessary adjustments will be blocked in view of the interests of variously defined minorities and culturally imposed limitations on freedom of thought when we are in search for the optimal solutions to small crises, as well as a deep crisis. This situation is the effect of what was once called the culture of *connivance*, that is silent acquiescence in the face of dangers or the deliberate ignoring of threats, ultimately limiting one's capacity to undertake correctional action. This can be seen both in the internal life of European countries and in their external relations. The sum of cultural–civilisational changes in Europe in recent decades allow one to draw the conclusion that can be expressed in the English phrase: *too soft to survive*.

2 The return of the "Rest of the World"

Fareed Zakaria writes of a "Post-American World" in response to the evident rise of the rest of the world onto the global stage (and not as a result of the 2008 crisis, which erupted a few months *after* Zakaria coined the phrase). The use of the word "return" in this context is perhaps not ideal as the rest of the world had not in fact been an actor on the world stage before. The "international stage" was built by Europe and then taken over by Europe and the United States together – that is by the West. The Rest of the World was – with minor exceptions which did not impact the big picture – the mere object of western international activity. The Rest subsequently developed into the Third World, dependent on the West. This began to change, slowly but inexorably after the Cold War. The sources of this change lie in the same three tendencies which are currently working to Europe's disadvantage: demography, natural resources and culture – but of course there are other factors as well.

As far as culture is concerned, it is worth heeding the words of the Singaporean professor Kishore Mahbubani, who is rightly credited with being the main theoretician of the Asian growth model (the "miraculous growth") which he perceives as being closely related to Asian values. Mahbubani has been saying for years that, "the XXI century will be the Age of Asia". In his main publication of 2008 and in several other statements, he has said that (Eastern) Asia has been developing faster than the West and the coming decades will see the surpassing of the West. This is not due to the discovery of a unique development model but

is because Asia has learned to successfully employ the Western model, while applying it to specific local cultures. Altogether this results in faster and more stable development than the West. Asian people have taken on elements of the Western model in a creative way, elements such as the free market, the rule of law, the basics of democracy (or rather meritocracy and representative government), technological progress, universal education and a culture of peace. They have rejected, however, western liberalism as it appears in the highly individualistic version of human rights and basic freedoms, especially personal and political freedoms. Of course, these changes have been accompanied by an exceptional work ethic, a kind of social discipline and respect for one's own culture.[216] In view of Chinese and other Far Eastern success stories of the last two decades, considering the use Eastern Asia has made of globalisation and the support from China to the United States during the 2008–2009 crisis, Asian people have no reason to consider the Western model of development as superior to their own. In many non-Western countries the term *Beijing consensus* has become popular (as an alternative to the *Washington consensus*), as a term better suited to their cultures and development requirements. The return of the Rest of the World has a solid basis in its cultural and economic foundations.

The culturally generated crisis of the Western development model, and the parallel successes enjoyed by its modified versions in non-Western countries, has led to the decline of the Western model. This is particularly so when modified models are combined with global demographic tendencies. There are three such global demographic tendencies that should be pointed out at this point. The first is the ageing populations not only of the "first world" – that is the West – but also, with a slight lag, of China and East Asia. The second is countries such as Turkey, Mexico, Brazil, Indonesia, Vietnam (and China until around 2030) will be dynamically growing both demographically and economically. The third, tendency will be represented by those countries growing demographically but poorly economically, those who are unstable politically where urban explosions are common (mainly Africa and Arabic countries). In the latter group of countries, inequality of earnings and of opportunity will grow and this represents a serious threat to Western countries in terms of terrorism and uncontrolled migration. These three tendencies when combined will force changes at the level of global governance to the advantage of non-Western countries and to the detriment of

216 K. Mahbubani, *The New Asian Hemisphere: The Irresistible Shift of Global Power to the East*, Public Affairs, New York, 2008; see also *idem*: *Azjatycka ekspansja* [*Asian Expansion*], "Dziennik" (Supplement: "Europa"), 28 April 2008.

Europe's position.[217] We may add to this the migratory "counter-attack" (in Toynbee's sense): during the West's expansion "white man" emigrated to conquer territories and spread his civilisation.[218] For some time now, the tendency has been the reverse – culminating in the exodus of 2015. The rising flow of people to Europe from non-Western countries, also for economic reasons (Europe having sustained its level of growth), will blur its civilisational identity and affect its international position and EU foreign policy, especially towards Arabic countries and the Islamic world.

Even if Europe can hold on to its assets and its absolute potential, the long-term global trends represent an unstoppable growth in the productivity and the financial, social and cultural potential of the rest of the world. Only in terms of military might will the rest of the world remain behind Europe (not to mention the United States). We may also anticipate that the aforementioned processes of growth, demographics and migration – unfavourable for Europe/the West and favourable for the rest of the world – will blur the differences between parts of the world, lessening the chance of a permanent alliance or anti-European coalition. Discrepancies of wealth will remain for some time and will have their bearing on international relations. Yet regardless of the dynamics of these processes and the form they take in various circumstances, Europe has moved onto the defensive, limiting its ambitions to the protection of its heritage. Indeed, this situation applies to the whole of the West which has lost power and initiative – there is no new *grand design*. The West has lost the capacity to impact the Rest of the World, to influence it in a creative manner. Invoking the universality of certain values and principles is in this context conservative; it does not result in any model or message which could be taken up by the rest of the world.

3 Signs of a new order

The signs of a new, post-Western international order are more and more numerous and evident from a geopolitical perspective. The normative–institutional

217 J.A. Goldstone, *The New Population Bomb: The Four Megatrends that Will Change the World*, "Foreign Affairs", January/February 2010.

218 A.J. Toynbee, *Civilisation on Trial*, OUP, New York, 1948, pp. 185–187. However, Toynbee considered the spiritual counter-attack (which threatens our cultural identity) to be much more powerful than the physical one. Russian communism was a case in point. It came from the West (from Marx). An earlier case was that of Islam (the expansion of the Ottoman Empire). He defined our civilisation as Greco-Roman, Western or Western-Christian.

dimension is always the last to appear, only doing so after a new balance of powers has been fully established. Of course, the current geopolitical changes can be felt in the context of the most universalist of the multilateral institutions: the United Nations (UN). We are witnesses to the weakening of the Security Council due to its not being representative, a fact which seriously undermines its legitimacy. In 2004–2005, there still took place in the UN a great discussion on how to reform itself and expand its composition with new permanent members. The European permanent members – France and the UK – had agreed to the introduction of a few new, non-Western members to the Security Council. As we saw above, there was even talk of replacing the European powers with a single collective member – the EU. Only the United States was strongly opposed to any expansion of the composition of the Security Council. On the occasion of the seventieth anniversary of the founding of the UN in 2015, there was no longer a word uttered about the reform of the Organisation – not only of the Security Council, but also of any UN structure or manner of functioning. It was especially the European nations that avoided reform – though as a rule it has been they that have been keen to "save the world" – since they were aware that opening the question of the UN Charter and subjecting it to an attempted revision might well end in disaster from a western point of view (the "West" being mainly European). It was the West's vision of an international order that had been embodied in the original UN Charter of 1945 when the "Rest of the World" still had little say in international relations.

The same goes for other aspects of the UN's activities, especially in the area of human rights. Although in 2005 the Human Rights Commission was renamed the Human Rights Council – following the motion of the European states – and the higher status implied, the issues surrounding human rights have ceased to be visible. There are of course several reasons for this downgrading of human rights, but the basic cause is the crisis of the EU and its weaker legitimation at the UN. From a cultural–civilisational perspective, that is from a values' perspective, Europe (the EU) has ceased to be the point of reference. We already have a situation of a plurality of values against a cross-cultural background and in the coming decades this will only increase. The position of human rights will weaken not only at the UN but in international relations in general. This is happening not only because of China which is against discussing human rights in bilateral or multilateral meetings, but also because of high-profile failures in this area (viz. the "Arab Spring") as well as the approaches taken to security matters, in particular the war on international terrorism.

More visible are the geopolitical aspects of global change happening before our very eyes, including the direct institutional consequences. The basic fact here

is the new and growing position of China. Let us recall first of all that in 1990 China was not among the top ten countries in terms of gross domestic product (GDP) and yet by 2011 it had achieved a strong second place. Economic forecasts indicate that more or less in the years 2025–2030 China will overtake the United States and from then on and "until the end of time" it will be the unquestioned Number One in the world economy. It is already the leading trade power (as an individual state) impacting export and import across the world and thereby influencing the world economy in general. As a result, China has acquired influence on the policies and politics of countries in their own region and also, step by step, in Europe.

Of course, China is lacking in too many key areas to be able to take on the role of global leader at present (and in any case it does not seem to be any hurry to do so). The best estimates are that China will only match the United States in military might by around the middle of the current century (around 2050). China is not in possession of much in the way of the capacity to form coalitions, especially in its own region where it inspires fear rather than willing cooperation. And besides trade relations, there is not much that connects China with countries *beyond* its own region. It is hard to imagine China standing at the head of something like NATO or Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO) in Latin America or in Africa. China lacks much in the domain of *soft power*. Despite its great history of civilisation, China has not been able to create either a mass culture or a high culture (in music, film or literature), one that might shape the sensitivities, imagination or aesthetic tastes of countries of other parts of the world. China is a place "to do business", not a place where great debates are initiated or where ideological or cultural trends find their beginnings.

Regardless of these shortcomings, China's demographic superiority, the scale of its economy, its gigantic financial reserves (also number one in the world), their trade and investment expansionism and their model of economic development for non-Western countries – all these factors have meant that the West has ceased to be the only point of reference in various regions of the world, especially in Latin America and Africa. Paradoxically this affects Europe more than the United States. Although Europe (the EU) began in the nineties to compete with the "American way of life", the 2008 crisis hurt Europe more deeply and Europe's light has dimmed. For the time being, its standard of living and level of development still retain a measure of attractiveness for hundreds of thousands of immigrants and refugees coming each year. Now, in 2015, China established an investment bank with fifty-seven (!) states as founding members, including the majority of Western states – even though the bank is perceived as a threat to the position of the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank (read:

"the USA").[219] China has begun work on a transport–communication axis to Europe known as the "New Silk Road" and it has strategically "taken over Russia" (taking advantage of the anti-western course of President Putin). These events all make one take very seriously the leadership aspirations of Beijing.[220]

In the global geopolitical configuration sketched above, China could play a variety of roles. It might, firstly, be perceived as an alternative to the United States, that is the global Number One. Somewhat more broadly, we might see China together with its sphere of influence in East Asia as an alternative to the West. The question then arises as to the nature of this potential leadership: from hegemony (*Pax Sinica*) to leader (like Germany at present in the EU). Secondly, China may, in the XXI century, become the advocate of the "Age of Asia", that is the replacement of the Atlantic (in its role from the XIX to the XX centuries) with the Pacific. The United States would become China's *junior partner*, as Europe had been for the United States. In this model, the Rest of the World, now including Europe, will find itself at the periphery of the global order. Thirdly, China might become a pole of a new axis organising the international order: China–United States, replacing the recent bipolar pairing of East-West. The phrases "Chimerica" or "G-2" have been in use for some time already; however the second expression is incorrect since the "G" stands for "group" and so should include several members, or at least three.

In each of these scenarios – and one or other or a combination is sure to come to pass – the Europe of the EU is pushed into the background. A global triangle including the EU, a quite credible possibility at the beginning of the XXI century, is no longer realistic. The disappearance of Europe (the EU) from the map of global power structures in the coming two or three decades is still so surprising because only a few years ago, at the beginning of the present decade (in 2011–2013), Europe's power was comparable to that of the United States and China. According to a research by Professor Mirosław Sułek, the overall power of these three global actors, measured on the basis of several factors (military power, GDP, population, area, military budget, number of soldiers), is as follows: United States – 5161, EU – 5436, China – 4642. Using so-called strategic matrices, one can measure a larger number of factors, including qualitative factors: governance, territory, natural resources, population, culture and religion, science and education, armed forces, foreign policy in a geopolitical context. And

219 The bank's official name is the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank (AIIB). Its founding capital is 100 billion USD (half the capital of the World Bank).

220 B. Góralczyk, *Przebudzenie smoka. Powrót Chin na scenę globalną* [*Waking up the Dragon. China's Return to the Global Stage*], Rambler, Warsaw, 2012.

in this model Professor Sułek's research gave the following results: the United States received 8.14 points, the EU – 7.67 and China – 7.32. In the short term, the power of the EU may even rise a little, but after 2030 it will give way to the growth of China's power (and other non-Western "rising powers").

Besides the unfavourable long-term development tendencies, some of which we have discussed above, the problem of Europe turns on the fact that it is not a country, so its power has a nominal character merely being the sum of the powers of its member states. The coherence of the EU cannot be compared to the coherence of individual countries (their level of internal integration), so its power cannot be utilised in politics and external relations in an analogous manner.[221] A collective's real power is even less than its nominal power, not only due to the lower level of internal coherence, but also because of differences or conflicts of interests which make fast and effective decision-making impossible. This limits the extent to which Europe may fulfil its potential. Difficulties in finding a common denominator for key decisions have been very evident in the EU especially with reference to external relations rather than in internal cooperation. This situation is a result of the history, geopolitics, experience, traditions and varying ideas and political programmes of individual members states whose number has dramatically increased since 2004 (from fifteen to twenty-eight).

Pushed out – or perhaps resigning – from the role of one of the poles of the global triad, the EU will have to find its place in a more complex geopolitical configuration which will form out of the present international order. This configuration includes BRICS (Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa), the group of states which was in fact initiated externally, it first of all being a unit in the reports of the American banking house Goldman Sachs, at the beginning of the XXI century. In the beginning it was "only" BRIC – Brazil, Russia, India and China. In 2010 the Republic of South Africa was added. In 2013 their collective share in the world's GDP was 21% while their share in the world's population was over 43%. They are also geographically large countries rich in natural resources. "Called up to the blackboard" by Goldman Sachs, the countries of BRICS began to meet at the level of their leaders, meetings which resembled somewhat the meetings of the wealthy North (or rather West) G-7/8. Much divides these countries from one another, but there is a clear desire among them to limit the position of the West (the United States and the EU) in international politics. In

221 For more details, see: M. Sułek, *USA, UE i Chiny – trzy bieguny w globalnym układzie sił* [*The USA, the EU and China – Three Poles in the Global Balance of Power*], "Rocznik Strategiczny" ["The Strategic Yearbook"], 2013/2014.

the end, BRICS will probably not become an anti-western coalition, even if that were Russia's intent. But it remains an indication of the fact that we are entering a post-Western international order.[222]

A similar role in this process is played by G-20, which since the 2008 crisis has been meeting at the level of heads of state and government. G-20 arose as the expansion of G-7/8 (though the latter continues to meet alone, since 2014 without Russia) – expanded by adding non-European countries. The idea was to include "emerging markets" into the mechanisms of global governance. Besides the obvious powers, countries such as Argentina, Indonesia, Turkey, Saudi Arabia and Mexico were also included. And among these 20, there is also place for the EU (alongside the countries already present in G-7: Germany, the UK, France, Italy), the EU representing all its members. As of now the effectiveness of G-20 is highly debatable, but everything suggests that this formula will take on an increasingly institutional structure and play an ever-greater role in global finance and the process of stabilising global economic growth.[223] The interpretation of the place of the EU among the group of twenty actors, among which four are also member states, is ambiguous, so we should leave this issue at this point. It is however evidence of the relativisation of the EU's place in the global balance of powers, especially considering that at the G-20 Summit in Evian, the host, President Sarkozy, tried to persuade the much less developed and poorer (per capita GDP) countries of G-20 to offer aid to the eurozone, threatened, as it was, with collapse.

So the evolution underway in the international order, regardless of the mistakes and the weakness of the EU itself, has lessened the opportunities for the EU to play the role anticipated for it only ten years before. Growing geopolitical pluralism, decentralisation and regionalisation in the context of this order will turn the EU – if it does not manage to make out of its "combined potential" the usefulness possessed by traditional geopolitical actors – into one of the scraps making up the global patchwork. The 2008 crisis and its extensive consequences have quickly and dramatically revealed the incapacity of the EU to take effective action influencing its immediate geopolitical neighbourhood which suffers the impulses and changes appearing in the entire global environment. This refers in

222 J. Zajączkowski, *BRIC dziesięć lat później, czyli Anty-Zachód w rozsypce* [*BRIC Ten Years on, or: Anti-West*], "Rocznik Strategiczny" ["The Strategic Yearbook"], 2013/2014.

223 S. Para, *Perspektywa G-20 jako instytucji sterującej gospodarką światową* [*The Prospects for G-20 as an Institution Steering the Global Economy*], "Rocznik Strategiczny" ["The Strategic Yearbook"], 2010/2011.

particular to North Africa (the "Arab Spring"), the conflict in the Middle East, Turkish politics and Eastern Europe, and above all, Russia which has rejected closer ties with Europe, preferring instead a more confrontational approach, developing instead an alternative "Union" – a Euro-Asiatic Union. At the same time, Russia has turned out to be quite effective in breaking up the EU's unity and incapacitating it from action in the area of foreign policy, security and defence. The irony is that the EU's impotence and the atrophy of her security and defence policy came at a time when the United States, following the election of President Obama, ceased its sabotage of the EU in the latter's pursuit of a key international role.

10 Crisis as an Ending

Any crisis may be approached in an optimistic spirit by perceiving it, in what is said to be a Chinese tradition, as an opportunity – a moment to repair or rebuild a fragment of social reality. Everyone who has been concerned with European integration has in their mind the words of Jean Monnet: "Europe will be forged in crises, and will be the sum of the solutions adopted for those crises". The course of the European Union (EU) crisis in the years from 2009 to 2016 suggests that Europe has not "passed the test" – it does not seem to have offered a response which represents an opportunity, a chance to repair faults, to revitalise the project of European unity as the founders intended at the turn of the forties and fifties of the last century – Monnet among them. This inadequate response is due to the fact that we are not really dealing with a crisis of the Union (one crisis) but with a Union (Europe) of many crises. There has not been a situation like this since the establishment of the first community in 1951. The status of the EU in this crisis is analogous to a serious illness in the body (e.g. a major heart attack). When an illness of this kind occurs, other illnesses or weaknesses in the body become manifest, though they had been hidden and unnoticed before. These secondary illnesses might not be dangerous in themselves, especially with an overall state of good health – a strong healthy system can keep them under control and fight them off naturally. But after a heart attack.

1 Struggle with the financial–economic crisis (i.e. the EU is busy with itself)

The distinguished economist Professor Witold Orłowski gave a pithy statement of the essence of the financial–economic crisis. (It directly affected the eurozone, but ultimately the entire EU was impacted, though only some of the countries in each group were deeply affected.) The first point of Orłowski's analysis was that a few countries in the eurozone stood on the verge of bankruptcy. Secondly, the crisis revealed the loss of competitiveness of those countries' markets and the fall in competitiveness of a few other markets as well. Thirdly, problems reached crisis point because of a lack of supervisory-preventative mechanisms (crisis management). Fourthly and finally – and perhaps the most challenging issue for the future of the eurozone – the crisis exposed the gulf in economic culture between the countries of the South and North of Europe, between traditions of doves and hawks in monetary policy. These traditions had not been united despite the

introduction of the common European currency.[224] The countries known by the unflattering acronym of PIGS – Portugal, Ireland, Greece and Spain – found themselves in a particularly difficult situation, with PIGS becoming PIIGS as Italy joined them. Strict austerity programmes quickly brought positive results in all the countries so named, with the exception of Greece. Greece had become a specialist in avoiding and abusing EU regulations, including in particular regulations governing monetary–economic union: budget limits, public expenditure limits, regulations on national insurance and taxation, in short: living beyond their means, at the cost of the remaining eurozone countries, especially the wealthiest. The level of demoralisation of the Greek political elite and Greek society was so great that Greece– seeing that the time of cheating is coming to an end – turned its anger against those who had been supporting them and who could still save them. The spectre of "Grexit" appeared – the exit of Greece from the eurozone. Greek citizens most of all protested against the idea of Grexit at the same time portraying Angela Merkel as a Nazi, even though it was she who was most involved in saving Greece. It needs to be added that this "help" was also in the interest of German private banks which financed the Greek "living beyond their means"; the bankruptcy of Greece meant loss of capital for those banks. In the European press, the nations of Southern Europe have been accused of being lazy and spendthrift, while the northern nations are tight workaholics. It is interesting that both have been accused of bringing about the crisis in the eurozone: one group has imposed monetary–economic discipline in a dictatorial fashion while the other group is lax.

In 2009, the gross domestic product (GDP) for the EU as a whole dropped by four percentage points (with Poland alone sustaining positive economic growth); escaping this crisis required many undertakings painful for countries in both the aforementioned groups. All the steps were negotiated with the participation of member states, the Commission, the European Central Bank (ECB) and the International Monetary Fund (IMF). Which is why the process of finding solutions and taking decisions took longer than public opinion expected. The ensuing tension gave the impression that not only the eurozone but the entire EU could collapse at any time.

There were three kinds of response deemed necessary. The first was the negotiation of the sharing of the costs of the crisis between debtors and creditors – that is between those who had taken out loans to cover public debt so as to sustain

224 W. Orłowski, *Jak podzielić ból* [*How to Share the Pain*], "Gazeta Wyborcza", 23 April 2012.

levels of public service beyond what the national income would permit and those who granted loans turning a blind eye to the creditworthiness of the borrowers. This was somewhat akin to the situation of subprime borrowers in the United States, only at the level of governments. Secondly, there was a need to create conditions for renewed growth for those countries who were mired in debt. This was achieved by a series of expensive bailouts, aid for the banking sector to preserve the liquidity of the finance system of those countries. The bailouts helped keep heads above water, but came at the cost of increased internal debt, a burden on future generations and a reduction in future growth potential. Thirdly, it was necessary to find a long-term solution to the malfunctioning eurozone to avoid future crises and crashes. All these elements were summed up as follows: firstly, save Greece from bankruptcy; secondly, bailout packets and mechanisms and thirdly, a "life jacket" for the eurozone.[225]

The discussions to reach agreement on all these solutions were carried out in a tense atmosphere, with the hysteria of the financial markets (including predatory-speculative trading on the value of securities), the games played by ratings agencies which had previously provided unreliable evaluations, often consciously, thereby contributing to a false economic picture which in turn contributed to the crisis. The climax of the Greek crisis in 2010 was a real thriller – it seemed just a question of time before the first country left the eurozone, presumably bringing others in their wake. And just such a scenario was anticipated by several experts.[226] There was a serious threat to the eurozone itself, which by saving itself had to take care not to break up the EU (or to introduce an institutional divide within the EU).[227]

The bailout went as follows, in keeping with the challenges facing the EU and the eurozone. Firstly, a temporary instrument called the *European Financial Stability Facility* (EFSF) was created. It was intended to protect threatened countries from bankruptcy, especially Greece, and it was active until the end of 2010. Next, the European Stability Mechanism was set up, which required the amendment of the Treaty on the European Union (TEU), in this embodiment

225 *Ibidem*. Foreign authorities were of a similar opinion – for example N. Ferguson or N. Roubini.

226 In Poland, for example S. Kawalec, E. Pytlarczyk, *Rozwiązać strefę euro* [*To Disband the Eurozone*], "Gazeta Wyborcza", 11 April 2012; see also: A. Słojewska, *Scenariusze rozpadu strefy euro* [*Scenarios of the Collapse of the Eurozone*], "Rzeczpospolita", 18 April 2012.

227 See for example: R. Kuźniar, *Euro uratowane – ale co z Unią* [*The Euro Is Saved – But What of the EU?*], "Rocznik Strategiczny" ["The Strategic Yearbook"], 2012/2013.

the mechanism was already an international organisation with its seat in Luxembourg. Its goal was to grant aid to countries threatened with loss of the stability of its public finances. The ESM was equipped with enormous capital for loans – around 700 billion euro (also due to its emissive power). Finally, in March 2012, there was signed the so-called fiscal pact, that is the *Treaty on Stability, Coordination and Governance in the Economic and Monetary Union* (TSCG). The treaty is intended to counteract at a structural level the debt and public finance deficits in member states. The treaty established norms which could not be violated, response procedures (and pre-emptive measures) as well as sanctions for infringing agreed precautionary barriers.[228]

The real "hit" in saving the eurozone was 2012s unconventional decisions of Mario Draghi and the ECB he headed. "Super Mario" first decided to guarantee for three years the possibility of obtaining unlimited loans by large and unstable commercial banks (to sustain their credit rating). His risky decision to buy an unlimited amount of government bonds on the secondary market was considered a breakthrough. It undermined large-scale speculation, calmed the hysterical "financial markets" and removed the spectre of bankruptcy from the weakest countries of the eurozone.[229] At the same time, work began on EU banking, that is the creation of joint supervision mechanisms for the largest banks of the eurozone (and not only supervision was envisaged, i.e. caution, but also mechanisms ensuring liquidity). These steps thankfully were effective, though the EU had to devote almost all its collective energy to them (there were countless meetings of heads of state and government and ministers of finance). This situation continued, with occasional breaks, practically until June 2015 when it was once again necessary to save Greece from bankruptcy and from its exiting the eurozone. "In the meantime", the EU also had to save the Cypriot banking system.[230]

228 P. Borkowski, *Kryzys – światełko w tunelu* [*Crisis – The Light at the End of the Tunnel*], "Rocznik Strategiczny" ["The Strategic Yearbook"], 2012/2013.

229 J. Almunia, *Gdyby nie ratować banków* [*If We Did Not Save the Banks*] (a conversation between the vice president of the European Commission and L. Baj), "Gazeta Wyborcza", 29–30 September 2012.

230 The Cypriot banking system was bloated out of all proportion because of the needs of servicing the local economy. It had been colonised by Russians (money-laundering and tax avoidance). It would have collapsed were it not for the EU's intervention. To avoid collapse, Cyprus agreed to adopt an austere bailout package prepared by the EU.

2 Political–institutional crisis

A financial–economic crisis as deep as this one had to provoke political problems and these quickly turned into a political–institutional crisis of the EU. Its manifestations included the legitimation problems of EU organs and their competencies and decisions, the return to the nation state in the EU's functioning, the prospect of deepening integration in the eurozone, that is the possibility of a multi-speed Europe. There also appeared the question of the federalisation of the EU, i.e. the optimal degree of its integration in terms of its capacity to solve the problems facing it (meaning the problems facing its members states), and not the problems which it created itself – as in the digs of some commentators, not entirely unfairly.

The fiscal pact was undoubtedly itself a step towards deeper integration, especially in the eurozone. It introduced a broader area of coordination in economic and social policy. The conviction strengthened that the eurozone would require more coordination in the long term, as well as adjustments in taxation, social benefits and – what was most challenging but within the realm of possibility – an increased redistribution of incomes between markets as diverse as Germany and Greece (diverse in terms of their competitiveness and economic culture). Such extensive solidarity would, it was felt, lead inevitably to a separate budget and quasi-government for the eurozone. In connection with these challenges, the president of the European Council Herman Van Rompuy prepared a 2012 report entitled *Towards a Genuine Economic and Monetary Union*. Formally, it included proposals for the entire EU but in practice was designed for the eurozone. Deeper cooperation was envisaged in four main areas: financial, budgetary, economic and political. The financial area included above all the banking sector, as mentioned above. The budgetary issues included assurances of healthy fiscal policy, including the element of joint handling of debts and financial support, in return for reforms. In the economic sphere, the intention was to ensure growth, employment and coherence, thanks in part to a thoroughgoing convergence of the eurozone's markets. The proposals for the political sphere were not only about decision-making capacity but also about creating for these decisions mechanisms of democratic legitimation, which might imply the creation of a separate (separate from the European Parliament) parliament for the eurozone countries.

Van Rompuy's plan did not emerge in a vacuum. The crisis had prepared the groundwork for the discussions on the further federalisation of the EU on the one hand, and on the lack of democratic legitimation on the other. For many politicians and experts, it was clear that effective responses to the problems facing the EU – from internal challenges to the stability of the euro in the context

of cultural–economic diversity in the eurozone – require deeper integration. At stake was a so-called federalist or community breakthrough or leap. Something akin to Rome 1957 or Maastricht 1992, that is the passing of another major portion of member-state powers to international organs, in the name of greater solidarity and the achievement of other EU goals. The practical consequences might be the increased redistribution of earnings, an energy union or joint border security for the EU (member states). It might have seemed that the route to such a breakthrough or to a true, tighter federation within the EU would be the fiscal pact perceived as the foundation for the new institutional architecture of the "core" of the EU, around which the European periphery would function, according to any logic chosen: whether of various speeds, diverse geometry or concentric circles.[231] Articles by French authors in the press encouraged these hopes, in "Le Monde" and "Financial Times" appeared texts with titles such as "The EU is dead – long live the eurozone!" or "Thank-you My General, Good morning Jean Monnet"[232] (de Gaulle was a supporter of the intergovernmental approach, Monnet – the community approach). These articles were insincere or at least premature since it was France that was to become at that moment the defender of the interests of individual states and their sovereignty in the process of integration. For the French, or at least a large portion of French society, this was in fact a means of getting rid of the UK from the leadership of the EU, and perhaps from the EU altogether, a goal which did not, however, suit Berlin.

On the other hand, some – such as the director of the European Council on Foreign Relations Marc Leonard – were aware that "what is necessary is not possible". He meant deeper integration as a condition of sustaining the vitality and coherence of the European project (and even its mere survival) for which there is currently no political understanding and support in the EU.[233] Federalists, such as vice president of the European Commission Viviane Reding, have even spoken of the historic opportunity to realise the vision of a United States of

231 J. Pawlicki, *Unia kilku prędkości* [*Multi-speed EU*], "Gazeta Wyborcza", 27 October 2011 r.; J.-C. Piris, *An EU Architect Writes: Time for a Two-Speed Union*, "Financial Times", 4 November 2011; J.-J. Mevel, *Le scénario d'une Europe à plusieurs vitesses*, "Le Figaro", 5 December 2011.

232 P. Ricard, *L'UE est morte, vive la zone euro*, "Le Monde", 15 October 2011; T. Klau, *Merci mon Général, bonjour Monsieur Monnet*, "Financial Times", 19 October 2012.

233 M. Leonard, *Il faut briser le cercle vicieux du déclin de l'Union européenne*, "Le Monde", 30 August 2011.

Europe.[234] However, careful observers such as Professor Andrew Moravcsik from Princeton have claimed that the process of European integration has achieved a natural plateau for the foreseeable future. The approach of *ever-closer union* must be held back, as there is no social mandate for an all-encompassing, European federal state. Despite this fact, Moravcsik believes that, "The EU will remain the most successful example of voluntary international cooperation in history".[235] He forgot to add that nothing can be given once and for all.

The heart of the matter is not the disputes between the supporters of various conceptions of European integration, disputes which have been carrying on since the turn of the forties and fifties when the European Council sufficed for some, but others wanted to go further and establish the European Coal and Steel Community. This dispute continued right up until the Lisbon Treaty with politicians and experts involved in the entire process. With few exceptions, the initiative has been taken by the supporters of the ever-closer union, invoking the logic of Walter Hallstein comparing European integration to riding a bike: if you do not wish to fall, you need to keep pedalling. Since the 2008 crisis, many maxims of this kind have been subjected to critical analysis. Since that time, progress in integration, the permanence and shape of the European project have ceased to be the exclusive domain of politicians, diplomats and thinkers. Deeper integration has evidently lost support from the nations and countries of the EU. Demonstrations and electoral decisions have made this clear. In times of crisis, there has been a return to the nation state as the most credible locus of institutions of rule in difficult circumstances. A significant section of public opinion has begun to perceive the EU not so much as ineffective as the very source of European problems or at the very least a barrier to their solution. Alongside eurosceptic parties and milieu, there has appeared, for the first time since the fifties, groups openly hostile the EU, groups demanding its liquidation. They were not yet able to command majorities in opinion polls, but they were able to rely on 5–20% support in some countries as well entering national parliaments and the European Parliament in some cases. This phenomenon affected both "old" and "new" EU countries (e.g. France, Holland, the UK, Greece, Poland and Hungary).

And then for the first time in the history of the Community, a member state has decided to leave – the UK. In times of crisis, the UK has decided to take advantage of a weak EU and reject its previously endorsed commitments which

234 V. Reding, *Stany Zjednoczone Europy* [*A United States of Europe*], "Rzeczpospolita", 13 December 2012.

235 A. Moravcsik, *Europe after the Crisis*, "International Herald Tribune", 22 April 2012.

had become uncomfortable. As one might have imagined, the British blackmail ("Either the agreement of all remaining members, or we are leaving…") only deepened the general crisis of the EU. The spectre of so-called Brexit – following the pattern set by "Grexit" – has started a chain reaction where other countries have begun demanding the same.

The socially hard-hitting austerity measures, also referred to as a "weight-loss programme" brought again to the fore the question of the democratic legitimation of the EU. The decisions to accept these measures in exchange for support from the EU were reached in the course of negotiations between the affected governments and the EU organs or eurozone organs. The nations in question were merely informed. "A divided Europe looks into a Greek mirror. This is the meaning of the drama: the less democracy, the better for the markets", wrote Jürgen Habermas commenting the violent demonstrations in Greece.[236] The EU countries from "the North" in 2011 imposed the rejection of a referendum by Athens on the acceptance of the drastic budget cuts – as a condition of further support. The referendum was a bad idea, a populist idea – after all, similar referenda could be organised in the supporting countries (e.g. in Germany or Holland), and Greece, which had previously driven its economy into the ground, would have been left alone with its troubles. As evidence of this situation, we may take the referendum that did come to pass in spring 2015 where Greeks rejected the terms of proposed aid and the populist government decided a moment later to adopt even stricter conditions to save Greece from otherwise inevitable bankruptcy and its exit from the eurozone.[237] Of course, in this case, not the EU but the democratically elected governments were to blame. It was they who, in the course of globalisation, not only allowed financial markets to break away from their economies, but also allowed for living beyond the society's means, including tax cuts which could not be sustained in tandem with costly social benefits and other elements of their welfare state. Low taxes were a point of neoliberal doctrine and the politics of individual states and not of the EU. The EU was perceived as a locus of wealth but now it could no longer afford to carry the promises inter alia implicit in the welfare states of its members. On the other

236 J. Habermas, *Nie o taką Europę szło* [*That Was Not the Europe We Wanted*], "Gazeta Wyborcza", 19–20 November 2011.

237 The spectacle of Greeks dancing after the "victory" in the referendum was a sorry sight. It recalled Zorba the Greek dancing after his "beautiful catastrophe" which he himself caused. Greece brought on itself its economic catastrophe. Slogans of a "proud nation" from the populist Prime Minister Alexis Tsipras were of no use in tough negotiations with Brussels. They only proved the infantilism of their approach.

hand, it was essentially the nation states which were in possession of the mandate for sometimes severe austerity measures. In hard times it is easier for (national) governments to gain the social support needed for tough decisions and reforms. The pro-European rhetoric and the competencies of the EU organs in Brussels were easier to digest in better times. This was aptly put by Olaf Osica who wrote in 2011 that, "the way the crisis is experienced by various states, tends more to increase national identity in a divided Europe than to lead to the beginning of a new sense of being European".[238]

The crisis revealed the European project to be like La Fontaine's fable "The Milkmaid and Her Pail" where the milkmaid's daydreams are spoiled by her spilling the milk she already has, while walking to the market. The EU has an ambitious vision for the future, but these dreams are easily broken by national identities which impact individual countries in their attitude to deeper integration, in their readiness for the federalisation of the EU. And it even turned out that some founding countries were not exhibiting enthusiasm to divest themselves of the attributes of sovereignty. Which is why with each passing year, the crisis came more and more to shake the balance between the competencies of community organs (transnational) and international organs – to the benefit of the latter. This came about under the influence of the big powers, especially Germany. The trend initiated by Berlin was noticed by experts and politicians and Piotr Buras, the director of the Warsaw Office of the European Foreign Affairs Council, called it a "silent revolution in the EU", that is a "new intergovernmentalism" in steering the EU's "nave".[239]

The deepest crisis in the history of the Community coincided with the terms in office of weak and often not even serious leaders. In France, the president was the hyperactive, capricious and egocentric Nicolas Sarkozy, while Italy was run by a character straight out of burlesque – Silvio Berlusconi. The man was known as "Bunga" after his private, obscene parties (the term's real meaning being known only to the invited). Then the colourless socialist Zapatero drove Spain into economic crisis. The conservative prime minister of Great Britain decided to gamble the membership of his country for special status in the Community. His whole behaviour was evidence that he did not attach great importance to the condition or even the continued existence of the EU. David Cameron's Great Britain seemed to coexist almost *alongside* the EU, and the reform of the eurozone – whose survival

238 O. Osica, *Unia stanu wyjątkowego* [*EU State of Emergency*], "Tygodnik Powszechny", 13 November 2011.

239 P. Buras, *The EU's Silent Revolution*, Policy Brief, ECFR, September 2013.

London seemed count on – was important to the English because and only because the City's interests were also at stake. In several other EU capitals, leaders were weak on the economy and weak from the social instability of their countries. To strengthen their position or preserve their power, they tried to consider their national interests, ignoring at the same time the interests of the EU as a whole.

The exception was Angela Merkel. Thanks to the health and power of the German economy, as well as the role Germany played in saving the eurozone, it quickly became the undisputed leader of the EU. Not always quick in action but stubborn and consistent Germany has gained authority and even the nickname the "Empress of Europe". The chancellor compares well with her rather bland colleagues from the other main countries from "Old Europe". Besides that, external powers (the United States, Russia, China) attest Germany's leadership – when they address a question to Germany, it is understood they are addressing the whole of Europe. This suited Berlin's growing tendency towards unilateralism, in any case a feature of other EU powers (e.g. France and the UK's actions against Libya without consideration of the position of other EU states). It was clear that in external relations the EU powers prefer to act independently without being straightjacketed by a strong EU position. The previous axis of Paris and Berlin became a distant memory and summits were more a matter of nostalgia and habit than meetings for the preparation of serious proposals. An extreme example of the crisis of EU leadership was the aforementioned and embarrassing spectacle of Sarkozy with his begging bowl at the 2001 G-20 summit in Evian, where he was chair. The EU's refusal of support was partly an expression of the conviction of the wealthier members that "Europe is rich enough to manage", but more significantly, it was a way of punishing France for their breaking ranks in their actions against Libya a few months prior to the summit. Paris' requests had a poor effect of the image of Europe which was no longer able to be the model nor the mentor. The joint effect of all these and other factors was the drift of the Community – both internally and in external relations – and a more evident weakness, lack of unity, powerlessness.

Researchers and experts are only too keen to extend (or change) the categories of crisis the EU has been experiencing since 2009. For example, Professor Bogdan Góralczyk writes about the crisis of *leadership* (or vision), the economic crisis, institutional crisis ("deficit of democracy"), the crisis of basic values and the security crisis – a total of five different crises.[240] Donald Tusk, the president

240 B.J. Góralczyk, *The Crises of 2008 and 2014 and the New Role of the European Union on the Global Scene*, in: B.J. Góralczyk (ed.), *European Union on the Global Scene: United or Irrelevant?*, Centre for Europe, Warsaw, 2014, pp. 233–246.

of the European Council, also spoke about five crises at the end of 2015: Russia, migration, terrorism, Greece and Brexit (it being clear that some of these are short- or medium-term challenges[241]). And there was no mention here of the demographic crisis which in the long term may have much more catastrophic effects than any of the other crises. Paweł Świeboda, a penetrating expert on integration, made a sharp observation in his report *Europa: plan przetrwania* [*Europe: Survival Plan*] where he claims that during the last fifty to sixty years, Europe has prepared itself mainly to repel external threats, where suddenly there has appeared an internal crisis threatening the EU's existence, one towards which the EU appears to be rather defenceless.[242]

241 D. Tusk, *Chrońmy granice Unii* [*Let's Protect the EU Borders*] (in conversation with T. Bielecki), "Gazeta Wyborcza", 3 December 2015.

242 P. Świeboda, Opening report during the session *Europa, przyszłość, solidarność* [*Europe, the Future, Solidarity*], organised within the framework of the European Forum for New Ideas in Sopot in 2011.

11 Crisis of the International Role of the EU

1 Foreign policy weakens, security and defence disappear

The comprehensive crisis – both financial and economic and political-institutional – could not fail to impact the international standing of the European Union (EU). Paradoxically this happened just when – as a result of the provisions of the Lisbon Treaty – the EU had decided to strengthen the tools at its disposal in security, defence and foreign policy. Most pertinent is of course the European External Action Service (EEAS) which was set up to support the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy (HR). Let us recall that the treaty nominally raised the status of the High Representative, as they are also the vice chair of the Commission and the chair of the Foreign Affairs Council (meetings of foreign ministers of the EU states). The European Service was conceived of as an EU foreign ministry. However, the idea that the head of foreign policy would be called a "Minister" did not gain acceptance (the assumption of the Constitutional Treaty), so the prestige attached to the Service was reduced. This can be seen in the title itself of the department – "External Action Service" – avoiding the phrase "foreign affairs", "international relations" or "external relations" – only "external action". This was an indirect way of reducing the status of the High Representative as well, and the foreign affairs' policy conducted by the High Representative also came down in prestige among EU policy matters. This nomenclature revealed the fact that the EU does not really conduct foreign policy, but only external "action". Indeed, this assessment has been confirmed by the subsequent functioning of the Service since its establishment in 2010. It is true that the Service's budget is rather impressive at around 1 billion euro in 2015, and it has a staff of around 5000 officials (diplomats) and foreign offices ("embassies") in almost all countries in the world. But it is precisely in the period following 2010 that any common foreign and security policy (and defence policy too) enjoyed a period of stagnation.

The weakening of EU policy in this area can already be seen in the nominations to the position of the High Representative. The first nomination following Lisbon was the British woman Catherine Ashton, she being followed by the Italian Federica Mogherini. In both cases, we were presented with figures who, not to put the matter more bluntly, were not very strong personalities in the EU and who did not represent significant experience or knowledge in the areas they had

been entrusted with.[243] In the period preceding every nomination to the position, on the "market" of possible names there would appear strong candidates, after which the opinion would prevail that the largest EU states would not permit this position to be occupied by a strong figure since this might lead to the EU having a clear foreign policy. The EU powers preferred to keep all options open in this area, including their ability to exert pressure on the High Representative. During the term of Catherine Ashton, it must be said that the external action service was developed, but her successor then did all she could to remain as invisible as possible. Yes, one is happy to make declarations about the rights of bisexual and transsexual individuals, which is more the responsibility of human rights organisations, but we do not see the High Representative getting involved on behalf of the EU in resolving the conflict in Eastern Europe or Syria. Without any qualms, the Union powers undertake unilateral actions whose consequences affect the whole of the EU. This is what happened in the case of the way Paris and London acted in Libya, how Paris acted in Syria, Berlin in Turkey, or the way Paris and Berlin acted towards Ukraine and Russia during the 2014/2015 conflict. Neither the first nor the second High Representative had anything like the recognition or influence that was enjoyed by their predecessor, Javier Solana (Spain's former foreign minister and former secretary general of North Atlantic Treaty Organization [NATO]) whose EU *position* was formally of considerably lower prestige and narrower scope. There is no lack of individuals (advisors and diplomats) with extensive knowledge and experience inside the EEAS, but the scope of its activity is determined by the Foreign Affairs Council, which does not want the High Representative to play a clear leadership role. The differences in the interests of the member states that have become visible during the last few years, the unilateralist approach taken by the most powerful and the primacy of the intergovernmental method (the quiet revolution) do not leave a lot of space for a strong EU foreign policy.

Its decreasing significance is particularly visible in terms of the EU's gradual abandonment of a joint security and defence policy that came to look promising – thanks to much effort and despite much opposition from the United States among others – several years after it was first established in 1999.[244] At that time,

243 In the corridors of Brussels, well-informed leaders made no secret of the fact that the criteria of selection had been gender and the "principle" that each large member state must receive some key position.

244 R. Kuźniar, *Wzlot i upadek Europejskiej Polityki Bezpieczeństwa i Obrony* [*The Ups and Downs of European Security and Defence Policy*], "Bezpieczeństwo Narodowe" ["National Security"] 2014, no. 4.

European leaders considered the European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP) as a vital, missing piece of the plan to allow the EU to become a global power or, indeed, a global superpower (T. Blair). Just a dozen years later, the ESDP had become a shadow of that promise and those aspirations. It is enough to point out that the EU first quickly gave up on forming its own army, that was to number 60 000 soldiers – a decision that should be considered rational – only to later create a series of battle groups (of about 1500 men each) that existed mostly on paper and which were never used, so that in the EU security narrative they became the proverbial Loch Ness monster. As the Polish analysts, Marek Madej and Marcin Terlikowski, wrote in 2013, the ESDP saw the entrenchment of "a previously observable trend towards a concentration upon technical missions that were limited in scale and scope and most often were purely civilian in character. It means that most of the CSDP have been auxiliary and subsidiary in form". [Polish original: "zauważalny już wcześniej trend ku koncentracji na misjach technicznych, ograniczonych w skali i zakresie zadań, przeważnie o charakterze czysto cywilnym […]. Nadaje to większości misji WPBiO status pomocniczy i uzupełniający".] The authors based their opinion on observations of the sixteen EU missions that occurred at that time, most in Africa. A proliferation of small missions (numbering no more than a few dozen people), which were civilian, advisory or teaching in character and politically insignificant, was considered by them as indicative of loss of faith within the EU that the ESDP could be of use in the context of the EU's more serious security concerns within Europe.[245] The EU's complete withdrawal from this sphere was apparent given its inability to even consider sending a battle group to Libya or Syria, as well as to set up a peacekeeping force in the Donbas region (as Kiev's requested in the spring of 2015).

European leaders were afraid to even start an internal discussion on the topic, similar to the discussion regarding European security and defence, which led to a delay in the work on a new EU security strategy. The previous, and thus far only, security strategy was adopted in 2003, with a review of its implementation having been carried out in 2008. Meetings of the Council of Europe regarding security and defence took place extremely rarely – no more than once every year and a half – with the December 2013 meeting deciding that a new strategy would be prepared by the end of 2015, which did not happen. Opposition by the Council's European leaders was hard to understand given that lively discussions

245 M. Madej, M. Terlikowski, *Wspólna Polityka Bezpieczeństwa i Obrony – czas strategicznego bezładu* [*A Common Security and Defence Policy – Time for Strategic Disorder*], "Rocznik Strategiczny" ["Strategic Yearbook"], 2012/2013, pp. 239–243.

were taking place and projects for such a strategy were being prepared in various analytical-research circles. Sven Biscop, who is a Belgian expert in the area, prepared several serious reports as well early versions of a new EU security strategy, without response.[246] From today's perspective (2016), the excellent *Future of Strategic Europe* published just four years earlier sounds like political fiction, even though it was written by Nicole Gnesotto – one of the top specialists in the field on the Old Continent. At one point, the frustrated author writes, "The EU's security and defence strategy remains a policy of managing others' crises".[247] The Polish translation of the word management ("zarządzanie") is inadequate in the Polish version but it may be unconsciously revealing the nature of the problem: it suggests the administration of the problems rather than taking control.

In practice, the EU's external relations with partners in distant corners of the world looked better, as they created the impression that the model of relations worked out earlier was being continued. Things looked much worse in terms of the EU's immediate surroundings, which turned out in recent years to be resistant to attempts to shaping it using a joint foreign and security policy. Developments indicated that the EU had lost the ability to effectively influence what was happening just outside its borders. At the same time, the 2012 High Representative's annual report states that the EU is expanding its international actions in two directions: 1) to develop democracy, stability and welfare in its neighbourhood; and 2) to maintain strategic partnerships with key actors outside Europe.

In relations with the United States – following a period of struggles with America's hegemonic ambitions and its global war on terror as well as the EU's efforts to become a global actor – a friendly détente was reached. This did not mean, however, anything like the parity or partnership with Washington that the EU was hoping for. The causes, of course, were the EU's growing divisions and internal crisis. However, Obama's turn towards Asia was an important additional reason. President Obama spent the first two years in the White House focused on developing relations with the main Asian countries as well as on increasing America's presence in that part of the world. It was the frequency of his meetings with Chinese leaders at that time that led to talk of G-2, a new global axis. In relation to Europe, the analysts and commentators who were

246 S. Biscop, *Peace without Money, War without Americans – Can European Strategy Cope?*, Routledge, Aldershot, 2015.

247 N. Gnesotto, *L'Europe a-t-elle un avenir stratégique?*, Armand Colin, Paris, 2010. The author was the director of the EU's Security Institute in Paris.

paying attention – including C. Grand and R. Cohen – saw something like benign neglect,[248] an approach that was not affected by displays of pro-American feelings made by the new generation of European leaders such as Sarkozy and Merkel. Regardless of whether Obama really felt more global than Western, he and his government deemed the EU to have achieved maturity and independence in the international sphere, so it had to manage alone, especially given that there did not appear to be any major threats to American interests on the Old Continent. "Europe is no longer the major strategic concern of USA's foreign policy", declared C. Ashton in her first report. But then a number of European capitals began to show signs of feeling lonely and abandoned. The Europeans began to manifest how much America's presence was needed by them for a variety of reasons.[249] These displays of immaturity surprised even Europeans commentators, who began to talk about Europe's "retirement" (Ivan Krastev) or relegation to the second league: "the European spirit has failed, European passions are extinguished", argued Pierre Hassner nostalgically.[250] It is sometimes thought that Washington's patronising attitude towards Europe was due to its inability to cope with even such militarily insignificant operations as Libya in 2011.

The EU–US relations became emotional once more due to two completely different events. The first was Edward Snowden's revelations regarding the extent to which American services were listening in on, among other, the leaders of the EU countries – their closest allies. Berlin, and especially Merkel, objected strenuously. The PRISM programme seriously undermined confidence in relations between Europe and the United States, especially because the Obama administration was unable to behave the right way after the problem was revealed and Europe reacted to it. The second event is rather positive in character, but it is not certain whether it will come to pass. The matter concerns the negotiations begun in 2013 to create the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership. Upon the signing of the

248 R. Cohen, *Europe and Benign Neglect*, "International Herald Tribune", 6 September 2010; also D.J. Kramer, *Obama traci Europę* (in conversation with A. Leszczyński), "Gazeta Wyborcza", 19–20 June 2010.

249 This was felt most strongly in the countries of the "New Europe", many of whose past politicians (presidents, ministers etc.) sent a letter to Obama in July 2009 asking him not to turn away from this region, particularly given the potential threat from Russia. Text of the letter in: "Gazeta Wyborcza", 19 July 2009.

250 P. Hassner, *Europa spadła do II ligi* [*Europe Has Dropped to the Second League*] (a conversation with L. Włodek-Bernat), "Gazeta Wyborcza", 18–19 September 2010; I. Krastev, *Europa: mocarstwo na emeryturze* [*Europe: A Big Power on Retirement*] (speaking with D. Pszczółkowska), "Gazeta Wyborcza", 18–19 December 2010.

agreement – which was optimistically and inaccurately predicted for 2015 – not only would the relationship between two sides of the Atlantic become closer, but the position of the West in international trade would also become strengthened. Even in early 2016, it was not clear, however, whether the agreement would be finalised.[251] The war between Russia and Ukraine, as well as Western reactions to it, did not significantly help to bring together Europe and America apart from enlivening the Atlantic Alliance's stance towards the East. The president of the United States was still not keen on participating in US–EU meetings.

In terms of Asia, the period of crisis only seemingly failed to make much impact. Seemingly, because EU–Asia relations rarely included matters of global significance that would influence the international order or even matters of lesser significance that would raise emotions (unlike relations with the United States). But only seemingly because of the EU's most significant Asian partner – China. The partnership concerned economic matters of trade and investment. And both the parties were each other's largest or second-largest partners in terms of sales. Political relations served to maintain economic contacts. But Europe's financial and economic crisis as well as its lack of unity in foreign relations significantly lowered its status in China's eyes. China had been interested in a partnership, on its terms, with a unified Europe, but since the EU was not able to achieve that, China started to favour relationships with the main European powers, treating relations with the EU as a diplomatic ritual that involved biannual meetings between the parties. Beijing noticed that the EU powers were competing among each other for its favours and contracts. Germany and France were the first off the blocks in this competition, but they were soon joined by the UK, whose political stance towards China was close to America's. The EU's minor members followed this example.[252] A weak EU was unable to react decisively to trade practices that were dishonest and in conflict with the World Trade Organization (WTO) regulations.[253] In effect, the EU ceased to be treated as a particularly difficult or demanding partner. It gave up its prior, principled stance regarding human rights, was not interested in geopolitical or security matters within Eastern Asia and

251 A. Jarczewska, *Transatlantyckie Partnerstwo Handlowo-Inwestycyjne (TTIP) – szansa na nowe otwarcie w stosunkach USA–UE?* [*Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) – Opportunities for a New Opening in US–EU Relations?*], "Rocznik Strategiczny" ["The Strategic Yearbook"], 2013/2014.

252 See more in: J.M. Fiszer (ed.), *Unia Europejska – Chiny. Dziś i w przyszłości* [*European Union – China. Today and in the Future*], ISP PAN, Warsaw, 2014.

253 The main concerns were dumping, lack of access to its own markets and an artificially low yuan.

did not try to influence Beijing's policies regarding any issues apart from climate change: which suited the Chinese just fine – but also meant that they did not see the EU as a global actor intending to shape the international order. At the same time, China was not interested in Europe's problems in the Middle East or in its relationship with Russia following Moscow's aggression in Ukraine. A weak EU served the economic interests of China and its efforts to increase its own international standing. This was, of course, closely connected to the failure of the EU's common foreign and security policy as well as the abandonment of its ambitions in the sphere of security and defence.[254]

The EU tried to compensate for its weaker position in relation to China by developing multilateral relations with the nations of Eastern and Southern Asia. This was the aim of the dialogue concerning global economic and security matters that was carried out at the annual Asia–Europe Meeting (ASEM). The fact that around fifty countries were involved in these meetings meant they were purely deliberative in character, but even so it was of course better that they do take place.[255] More constructive perhaps were the meetings between the EU and the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) countries. Free trade zone agreements were signed with some of them, with the assumption that with time the zone would come to include all the member countries of both organisations. During these meetings, the EU showed greater interest in matters of security in Southeastern Asia, particularly given that the ASEAN countries created their own Regional Forum dealing with this very issue and it is a clear attempt to draw upon European (EU and Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe [OSCE]) experience in that area: indeed, the EU participates in the work of the Forum. The EU's problem in its relations with China, ASEM and ASEAN was that while those countries were taking a Realpolitik approach, the EU defined itself as a normative power. At that distance and without military (security and defence) potential it was hard to command respect and influence the countries of that region, especially given that at the same time the EU was losing it ability to influence its immediate neighbourhood.

---

254 K. Miszczak, *Unia Europejska i Chińska Republika Ludowa – partnerzy globalnego bezpieczeństwa?* [*The European Union and the People's Republic of China – partners in global security?*], "Bezpieczeństwo Narodowe" ["National Security"] 2014, no. 4.

255 However, the ASEM meeting in Milan in October 2014 was completely dominated by the meeting of Western European leaders with Putin regarding Ukraine that was organised on the sidelines.

2 Towards the Mediterranean – a good start to a bad thing

The region of the Mediterranean – its southern and eastern coasts – became in the 2010s the stage for a momentous EU failure, one which may yet culminate in disaster. Ironically, this happened in a region in which the EU and some of its member states, including all the major ones, were actively pursuing a security and development policy. One might have thought the aforementioned support programmes, carried out mainly as part of the Barcelona process and its various mutations, would bring about the desired outcomes: economic growth, increased social justice, political modernisation and protection of human rights and basic freedoms – all within the context of greater openness to the external world and the global developmental processes. Since Europe's long-term engagement was not bearing the expected fruit, the EU was often accused of hypocrisy and legitimation of authoritarian Arab regimes, which was unfair insofar as it would have been impossible to pursue any policies with regard to those countries without maintaining contacts with their governments. Of course, the policies of some EU countries, particularly those with a colonialist past in the region, could be thought of as providing support for local regimes: as in the case of France and Tunisia, or Italy and Libya – like the United States and Egypt.

Then, suddenly, a series of unpredictable events took place in Arab countries that seemed to be largely the result of European engagement in support of democratic reforms and human rights. The Arab Spring began with the downfall of the regime of President Ben Ali in January 2011, following protests that started in December 2010. The events in Tunisia ignited mass protests against the government of Mubarak in Egypt, and in February, his thirty-year rule was at an end. The flame of the Arab Spring jumped from country to country, particularly to Libya and Syria. In the case of Libya, a key role in the downfall of Gaddafi was played by NATO intervention and, following several months of fighting, power was taken over by rebels supported by Western powers and Gaddafi was killed in October. There was no direct Western intervention in Syria and the insurgents proved too weak to bring down Bashar al-Assad. The uprising turned into a prolonged, bloody and destructive civil war, indirectly engaged in by France, Saudi Arabia, Turkey, Iran and in later stages also Russia and the United States. Civil war also started in Yemen. In Bahrain, the Arab Spring was ended by a military intervention by Saudi Arabia, in much the way that Soviet forces intervened in Hungary in 1956. The other Arab countries also witnessed protests that were either less violent or quickly brought to an end.

Sadly, nowhere except Tunisia – which had certain democratic traditions and potential – did the Arab revolutions manage to meet the aspirations of those who

started them, and the EU watched on powerless as the hope of an Arab Spring turned into a dark and cold November autumn.[256] In Egypt, following a short period of Muslim democracy, power was taken using force by the military. Libya turned even more quickly into a failed state, similarly to Yemen, while Syrian territory not under government control saw a war of all against all, with jihadis of various stripes at centre stage. In the end, this led to the creation of a cancerous, rogue Islamic State that ruled large parts of Syria and Iraq (following the destruction of Iraq as a result of American aggression and occupation in 2003–2010). A certain positive role was played by the EU in stabilising democratic changes in Tunisia, even though the situation there remained quite uncertain. It was in Libya that the EU failed dramatically. The intervention of the Atlantic Alliance (or of several member nations acting under the NATO banner) turned out to be a mistake, including the abuse of the authority granted by United Nations Security Council Resolution 1973. The operation could have and indeed should have been taken on by the EU, which had the appropriate capabilities to fulfil the mandate of the resolution. However, the EU was unable to hold back France and the UK, who intervened with the clear intention of bringing down Gaddafi and whose approach was clearly motivated by neo-colonial motives – especially regaining access to Libya's nationalised oil. After Gaddafi's downfall, Libya did not just become a failed state – it was also a source for weapons and mercenaries that fed conflicts in various Central African countries, as well as being the open gates through which hundreds of thousands of refugees and immigrants travelled to Europe in the next few years.

Both the EU and most of its member states seemed to treat the growing refugee crisis as a short-term problem connected to the conflicts that were the result of the Arab Spring. Even the Italian Mare Nostrum operation in 2013 looked at first a bit like a game of cops and robbers. The aim was to discourage those who had made a profitable and comfortable business (for them, not the refugees) out of smuggling people from northern Africa and the Middle East. In the end, Italian ships took onboard people who had been smuggled across the Mediterranean in primitive boats. Many died due to the chaotic nature of the effort and due to bad weather conditions. In just one year, the Italians took onboard about a hundred thousand people. Several times as many reached the European continent, avoiding border patrols. In effect, the actions of the EU and its members were making it easier for those hundreds of thousands of refugees and migrants

256 S. Parzymies, *Arabska wiosna – dwa lata później* [*Arab Spring – Two Years On*], "Sprawy Międzynarodowe" ["International Affairs"] 2013, no. 1.

to reach Europe where their security and well-being would be taken care of. The EU intervention civilised what was initially an entirely spontaneous phenomenon akin to a rising wave. Information about the lack of a border and the good reception to be had in the EU probably served to encourage people in many countries of the Middle East and Africa, including those not in the throes of conflict.

But the tsunami came from a different direction. In mid-2015, a wave of refugees and migrants swept towards Europe from Syria and Iraq. This was the result of the civil war and the thuggish actions of the Islamic State which formed in 2014 across significant areas under jihadi control. In 2015, through Turkey and the Balkans, more than a million people reached Germany: with most of them arriving in the second half of the year and only a quarter of a million having arrived the previous year. Chancellor Merkel's August declaration that all who need it will be taken in, most definitely acted as a catalyst. In the face of the humanitarian crisis, the EU turned out to be divided, unable to adopt a common stance. Regardless of the degree to which it was prepared to provide shelter and the actual situation of the arrivals, the EU was unable to set out and defend its external border. Its defence was called for first by the leaders of the countries through which the exodus was taking place – with as many as 10 000 arrivals a day – and then by the president of the European Council, Donald Tusk and finally, in the last days of 2015, by the German Foreign Minister Frank-Walter Steinmeier. The defence of the EU's external border, sealing it to make it possible to know who was entering the EU, is not an easy task but it is not impossible. The problem is not with technical or organisational capabilities but with political will. This has been weakened by the effects of three factors: human rights, the Old European complex which could be called the "The White Man's Burden" and the existence of the Schengen zone. There was an additional, unique factor: Germany's guilt complex – their awareness of responsibility for World War II. Germany was still a hostage to their not so recent past. At first, Berlin tried to force its position upon the whole of the EU with a quota system which led to opposition from many countries and a confrontation that the EU had not previously witnessed. The EU's inability to react to the crisis included lack of agreement as to who were refugees, for whom assistance should be unconditional as a basic human right in accordance with the 1951 UN convention on refugees, and who were economic or social migrants who had joined the refugees in search of work and a better life in rich EU countries. Characteristically, nearly all who arrived in the EU since August 2015 wanted to reach Germany, Sweden or Norway where they would have the best conditions.

The problem with the reaction by the EU and its member states had many dimensions and contexts. It was not just a humanitarian problem but also an economic, social, cultural and security problem. In other words, it was very much a *political* problem. It brought out fundamental difference between member states in terms of their experience with contact with other cultures. What was natural for former colonial powers, was a reason for panic for countries without colonial experience; the latter reacted with fear and superstition to "the exotic". The crisis and the feelings it aroused fed nationalist, chauvinist parties and groups. At the same time, many of the opinion makers called for solidarity and tolerance understood in naïve, sentimental terms. The refugee crisis put in sharp relief the question of European identity – what it really means and whether there is any fundamental agreement about it in today's EU.

Somewhere in the background was the issue of the responsibility of the European countries which had played a role in causing the conflicts in Libya and Syria and therefore had responsibility for their consequences. In the second half of 2015, it came to be commonly thought that this crisis, coming as it did on the heels of the 2008 and 2009 crises, was the most serious since the formation of the Community and had the potential to cause its break-up. Comparisons were made to the late Roman Empire, which was not able in the end to defend its borders. The inflow of peoples across Rome's various borders was not just indicative of the Empire's weakness but also watered down its ability to defend its civilisational identity, a necessity for its survival.[257] The lifecycle of civilisations discussed in the previous chapter – for example the series of paintings by Thomas Cole dubbed *The Course of Empire*, discussed by Niall Ferguson – suddenly looked like realistic scenarios. It could happen to us too – as Paul Valéry said, civilisations are mortal, even ours.

The question of the implications of the inflow of refugees into the EU, unprecedented in its sudden onset and scale and made up almost entirely of Muslims, was raised dramatically by the two terrorist attacks in Paris in January and November 2015. While the first seemed to be aimed just at European freedom of expression – a vengeful reaction to the caricatures of Islamic figures published in Charlie Hebdo, a French satirical magazine – the second attack matched Huntington's vision of a clash of civilisations. In a coordinated series of attacks, 130 people were killed making it the French 9/11. It was carried out by Islamic

257 J. Borkowicz, *Imigranci pustoszą miasta* [*Immigrants Are Devasting Cities*], "Rzeczpospolita" (the "Plus Minus" supplement), 31 October–1 November 2015; M. Cichocki, *Gliniane skorupy Rzymu* [*Rome's Casing of Clay*], "Rzeczpospolita" (the "Plus Minus" supplement), 5–6 December 2015.

State jihadis in revenge for France's role in the Syrian conflict. The November 13, 2015, attack on France served as an alarm for the whole of Europe, as did the next bloody attack in Brussels in March 2016. The terrorists were European Muslims, second- and third-generation migrants from Arab countries. At the same time, several thousand of the jihadis fighting under Islamic State flags were Muslims born in Europe. Meanwhile, a wave of refugees and migrants from Arab countries was entering Europe. Would they become Europeans or, failing that, would their children and grandchildren? How many would join a jihad outside of Europe or even within it? The questions that arose in that situation were not unreasonable ones to ask.

It is quite wrong to equate Muslims with Islamist terrorists. But the second of those groups is not imaginary but a dramatic reality that has confronted many innocent victims in Europe, America, the Middle East and Africa and this experience should not be treated lightly. Should Europeans spend ever larger sums on internal security, limit the rights of citizens, give up on the freedom of movement afforded by Schengen, tolerate anti-Semitic excesses or accept areas where European law does not apply – just to avoid being called "Islamophobic"? There are no easy answers to these questions. But they must be asked given the rapidly rising number of people whom we are sheltering or allowing to stay, since they are coming here looking for work and a better life – which can also benefit us. During the long months of the refugee crisis and at a time of terrorist attacks, the EU as a whole including a large number of its national leaders preferred to stick their heads in the sand. It was only in December 2015, after several months had gone by, that the president of the European Council, Donald Tusk, dared to say that the EU's external borders must be protected since the wave of migrants "is too large not to hold it back".[258] The EU "strategy" taken up at the beginning of this phase of the crisis in June/July of 2015 remained only on paper. Of its three elements, only the first was put into action: assistance for refugees; counteracting the large-scale "industry" smuggling people and engagement aimed at ending the conflicts. It meant that the EU was reduced to the role of the Red Cross or, to put it in different terms, a *humanitarian power*. It took till the early spring of 2016 for a more sober attitude from Europe. And as for terrorism, not even the French President, F. Hollande, invoking Article 42.7 of the Treaty on EU right after the November 13 Paris attack (the Article regards assistance to a state under

258 D. Tusk, *Chrońmy granice Unii, op. cit*. He did this when the number of refugees and migrants to Germany in 2015 alone exceeded a million people.

military attack[259]), was able to achieve EU cooperation on fighting the Islamic State which stood behind the attacks. It should be recalled that after the September 11, 2001, attacks the whole Atlantic Alliance declared their readiness – the basis of Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty – to support the United States in Afghanistan where the Al-Qaeda headquarters were located.

Erdogan's Turkey decided to use the crisis for their own benefit, and the EU was ready to help. Most refugees from the Middle East (including Iraq and Afghanistan) reached Europe via Turkey, with significant and well-remunerated help from Turkish transporters, whose actions are tolerated by the authorities. Berlin, finally seeking to reduce the wave of refugees, proposed to provide Turkey with financial assistance – which is understandable – as well as to help in speeding up accession talks. This happened at a time when the policies of the Turkish government – well known and criticised within Europe – were actually decreasing that country's ability to fulfil membership criteria. (Turkey's policies included limiting the rights of its citizens, increased repression of Kurds seeking autonomy and the less than clear role played by Ankara in the Syrian conflict itself.) The promises made by Chancellor Merkel were confirmed a few weeks later by the European Council. This should be seen as an example of the dangerous way in which the EU was allowing itself to be blackmailed in strategic matters under the pressure of short-term problems of its own making.

3 Unresolved duel with Russia

During the preceding years, the only attractive symbol of the EU's effectiveness was the Balkans – the only region where EU enlargement was feasible in the foreseeable future. In July 2013, Croatia had become the twenty-eighth member of the EU. The 2012 agreement between Serbia and Kosovo, reached as a result of great efforts by Ashton and significant pressure from the whole EU, opened the way for Serbia too. And so in 2013, Serbia applied to begin accession negotiations but is not likely to join earlier than 2020. Two more countries with significant internal problems are waiting in the queue – Macedonia and Albania. The ongoing fragility and uncertainty of Bosnia and Herzegovina's situation excludes

259 It was widely assumed that the right response was to invoke Article 222, that is the solidarity clause from the Treaty on the Functioning of the EU. Independently of the fact that the situation did not satisfy the criteria of Article 42.7, the EU was not in possession of the appropriate structure to grant the support envisaged in that article. Which is why the EU defence ministers lined up to express their solidarity with France and that was an end to their response.

the possibility of talks. Insofar as the EU can talk of success in this region, it is because these are countries formed from the break-up of Yugoslavia. After all, Yugoslavia had been a fairly developed country with strong ties to the rest of Europe. Were it not for the war, it would have probably joined the EU during the large-scale 2002–2004 enlargement.

The last major opposition to the EU's international aspirations – opposition to its international identity and its ability to affect the international order – came from its immediate neighbourhood, from Eastern Europe. Paradoxically, this was, as a result of the success of the EU's activity in the region, carried out since 2009 in terms of the Eastern Partnership. Its formula included the possibility of associate status, including a free trade agreement. Three countries had decided to take advantage of the Partnership's opportunities and did so despite internal difficulties as well as discouraging signals and pressure from Russia: Ukraine (with significant assistance from Poland), Georgia and Moldavia. Developments regarding associate status were very slow due to the erratic behaviour of the governments of those countries, the legacy of the Soviet Union that still hung heavily upon them and the oligarchic structure that dominated their economies and politics. The EU made considerable efforts to help these countries deal with their problems, seeing the associate status as an opportunity to reform their political systems to ensure basic standards of democracy and the rule of law, as well as to modernise and open up their economies. Of course, associate status and the free trade zone were meant to tie these countries to the EU, in effect helping to free them from a one-sided dependence upon Russia. While Moscow displayed displeasure with these developments, it was also strengthening its ties with the EU at the same time – the EU had always treated Russia as a strategic partner. One symbol of the trust shown towards Russia was the building of the Nord Stream gas pipeline across the Baltic, even though there was plenty of evidence that Gazprom and deliveries of energy resources might be used by Moscow as a means of ensuring dependence and putting pressure on other countries, as well as a means of creating tensions within the EU. Furthermore, from the middle of the first decade of the XXI century, Russian civil liberties and democratic standards were demonstrably regressing. The government was evidently becoming authoritarian. At the same time, Moscow was beginning to put pressure upon the countries of the former USSR, treating them worse than satellite states had been treated under communism – the war with Georgia providing just one example of this. This led to a cooling of relations and undermined the idea of the "change through engagement" that played a role in the policies towards Russia of some countries, including Germany. This approach was intended to achieve

positive internal changes in Russia by sustaining relations, including economic relations, with Europe.

In the end, Russia challenged the EU openly. This happened right after Putin returned to the post of president in the middle of 2012. Moscow emphatically opposed Ukraine's growing links with the EU that were to be formalised by the signing of an association agreement during the Eastern Partnership's meeting in Vilnius in November 2013.[260] President Yanukovych, dependent upon Moscow's support and blackmailed by Putin, withdrew at the last minute. This step angered Ukrainians who saw association with the EU as a chance to civilise their country and decrease their colonial dependence upon Russia. The government tried to crush the Euromaidan mass protests that started in December 2014, with about a hundred people dying in the process. Holding EU flags and shouting "Europe is here", the Ukrainians did not give in and a frightened Yanukovych escaped in February 2015 to Russia. Moscow reacted by annexing Crimea a few days later and inspiring and equipping a separatist rebellion in March in the Donbas region.[261]

Russia's aggression against Ukraine meant the EU was faced with a particularly difficult geopolitical problem. In Western Europe relations with Russia were valued and there was no wish to spoil them. (And the same could be said for the entire EU in view it's acting as one.) But what Russia had done had not occurred in European international relations since 1945. It was not just a serious breach of the UN Charter but was an attack on the post-war European order that had been co-created by Russia and of which the EU felt itself to be a guardian. It was also a breach of the principles on which the EU–Russian relations, their mutual strategic partnership, were based. Finally, Russia had in effect attacked one of the EU's vital policies – the Eastern Partnership – thereby contradicting the logic of the entire European unification project, open, as it was, to all countries on the continent that wanted to participate. This could not be ignored, or so one might think. For several months the EU limited itself to sending Moscow warnings not to proceed any further. The first sanctions were less than serious: a travel ban within the EU for about thirty Russian notables and the freezing of their accounts in the West. Moscow must have been pleasantly surprised, particularly since it kept receiving assurances concerning the

260 To make sure that this happened, the EU gave up on a number of conditions that had earlier been given to Ukraine, including the freeing of J. Tymoshenko who had been put in prison in an act of political revenge, in the hope that the implementation of the agreement will gradually force Kiev to accept further political and economic reforms.

261 According to various reports, separatism was to be sparked in six regions but the efforts were successful only in two.

importance of relations with Russia from European capitals. And that would have probably been the end of it were it not that separatists (or the Russians who supported them) shot down a passenger liner flying from Amsterdam to Kuala Lumpur on July 17, 2014. Nearly 300 people, including 200 Dutch, died. The EU was forced to react more forcefully. At the end of July, the EU accepted stronger sanctions that affected Moscow in the longer term: 1) an export ban on weapons and dual-use technology, 2) an export ban on technology for the mining industry and 3) a ban on Russian access to Western stock markets. The effect of the sanctions was strengthened by sanctions imposed by the United States and other individual Western countries.[262]

A war in the immediate neighbourhood of the EU – punishment for a neighbouring state wanting to associate itself with the EU – was both geopolitical and axiological in character. It could be said that it presented the EU with the perfect opportunity to demonstrate its determination to play a significant international role. Brussels could prove its normative force and superiority over a brutal neighbour whose overall potential was, nonetheless, much less than the joint potential of all EU members together. It seemed all the more appropriate with the anti-European rhetoric Putin and his entourage were using to justify their aggression. For the EU this could have been its *hic Rhodus, hic salta*.[263]

Nothing of the sort happened. The EU did come to gradually conclude an association agreement with Ukraine and supported the new Kiev government financially and politically. However, the dialogue with Russia in the face of the conflict was carried out not by the EU but by Berlin and Paris. Two capitals, together with Moscow and Kiev, formed what came to be known as the Normandy Format, and the Minsk I and Minsk II agreements were signed on the basis of this framework, halting military action on the front between separatist Donbas and the remainder of Ukraine. Occupied Crimea was not discussed. The EU sanctions were to be called off once the conditions of the agreement were met, but the ceasefire was the only value it had – the EU did not even send a mission to ensure that it was being respected. Nothing more.

---

262 Apart from sanctions that were similar to those put in place by the EU, Russia's membership of the G-8 was suspended and Western leaders ceased to meet with Putin. The Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe suspended the right of the Russian delegation to participate in its work. Finally, NATO suspended the contacts with Russia it had as part of the NATO–Russia Founding Act and decided to strengthen its presence in the countries that formed the eastern flank of the Alliance.

263 R. Kuźniar, *Ukraine – Europe's hic Rhodus, hic salta*, in: B.J. Góralczyk (ed.), *European Union on the Global Scene: United or Irrelevant,* Aspra-JR, Warsaw, 2015.

Disputes regarding interpretation were discussed by the Normandy Four: Putin, Poroshenko, Merkel and Hollande. Putin constantly displayed bad faith and a disrespectful attitude towards the others. The EU's position was worsened not just by its absence at the negotiating table but, also, by the individual initiatives made by EU capitals towards Russia, which made it easier for Moscow to be intransigent in the face of Brussels' expectations. For example, the German vice chancellor – Merkel's number two – contacted Moscow regarding ways to sidestep the Commission's objections regarding a second Nord Stream pipeline which was potentially blocked by sanctions on all mining and extractive industries. The Italian government carried on business with Moscow as if nothing had happened and the prime minister of Hungary worked ceaselessly to develop economic links with Russia. By the end of 2015, the situation had not changed. Moscow was counting on the EU getting tired, while the EU itself had lost its best opportunity to use its foreign and security policy (including the defence component) to demonstrate its unity in the face of an act of aggression in its immediate neighbourhood. Once again, the aggression had been aimed at a country which could have been considered for membership in the long term, a prospect it had been deprived of as a result of that aggression. While holding the better cards, the EU was unable in Ukraine in 2014–2015 to win the geopolitical duel with Russia.[264]

The last few years have shown that on the one hand the EU remains attractive, as seen by the inflow of refugees and migrants, the stance taken by Serbia and the Ukrainian Euromaidan revolution of 2013/2014. On the other hand, its ability to influence and shape its surroundings has weakened. Recently, this has also included the sphere in which the EU considers itself a power – the normative sphere. In the long term, in more difficult international circumstances, normative power is ineffective unless it is supported by strategic potential and capabilities. It is a bit like for women – charm is not enough, it is also necessary to have the capacity to defend one's interests and enforce one's justified expectations. In these times of trouble, the EU might find solace in the Nobel Peace Prize which it received in 2012. The Nobel Prize was well deserved, though late in coming. For the EU made great contributions to maintaining peace on a continent that had been notorious for wars, as well as protecting peace around the world. The fact that most of the criticisms of the Nobel Committee's choice came

264 Camille Grand felt that "Putin must lose", because "while he may play better than the West, his cards are much worse". In conversation with J. Bielecki, interview for "Rzeczpospolita", 24 March 2014.

from within Europe just shows how mannered and self-destructive the European opinion-forming circles have become.[265] However, the Nobel Peace Prize for the EU in 2012 should rather be thought of, in Oscar style, as a "Lifetime Achievement Award" rather than a prize for "Best Film of 2012".

265 R. Kuźniar, *Nobel dla Unii Europejskiej? Jak najbardziej* [*Nobel Prize for the European Union? Well deserved*], "Sprawy Międzynarodowe" ["International Affairs"] 2013, no. 2; compare: A. Bebler, *Pokój w Europie a Pokojowa Nagroda Nobla* [*Peace in Europe and the Nobel Peace Prize*], ibid.

12 The Conditions of the EU's Survival as a World Power

Whatever else it may have been, the European Union (EU) has *been a European* attempt to regain position and influence in the international order, an influence that had been lost as a result of World War II. The end of the Cold War and the shift to a multipolar international order was not the "return of Europe", nor the recreation of the arrangement of centre (Europe) vis-à-vis periphery (the Rest of the World), but rather Europe's regaining its capacity to participate in the *shaping* of the international order. To achieve this, the Union had first of all to become representative of Europe, that is to enlarge significantly, as it indeed did – expanding from twelve countries in 1994 to twenty-eight in 2015. Secondly, the Union needed to develop instruments to influence its immediate and remote neighbours. This was attempted by means of a common security, defence and foreign policy, as well as a common currency and the eurozone. If the sum of the EU's efforts in this direction is far from satisfactory, we should consider why this was so and what lessons can be learned for the future. The author is aware that both the presentation of the material from which we draw conclusions and the conclusions drawn themselves depend on one's epistemological perspective and values. He nevertheless holds out hope that these considerations may serve in the process of creating a shared awareness of what the "international identity" of the EU is and what the place of our Europe should be in the international order. The predominance of criticism and the deficit of optimism in assessments of the EU's record may be useful as a warning and an inspiration to further action which might change the unfavourable course of events.

From the history of Europe in the international order, we can clearly conclude that it has marked itself out from the Rest of the World and has been perceived as a distinct culture. Polish researchers – led by Oskar Halecki, Bronisław Geremek and Krzysztof Pomian – were in no doubt: the borders and the identity of Europe were of a cultural nature. The foundation of this culture was Christianity, or more precisely Western, Roman Christianity – *Christianitas*. And on this foundation, a foundation shared by the nations of Europe, there have been various attempts at unification. These efforts finally succeeded with the European Community, freely entered into as it was. Its founding fathers were strongly inspired by Christian social thought, a Christian vision of social order. From the Middle Ages to modern times, Europe had been the bearer of a clear civilisational identity in its dealings with the Rest of the World, including its spiritual and

material achievements. It was the latter, and the resulting work and life ethic, which ensured Europe its exceptional general development and the growth of its potential. This growth, in turn, gave Europe a leading role with respect to the Rest of the World for several centuries. Europe's greatness, and in particular its international position, buried two threats to its civilisation which appeared on its own territory – fascism and communism. Both ideologies were extreme and powerful countercultures taking aim at the European tradition.

The projection of Europe onto the Rest of the World happened via the powers who had discovered that world, had familiarised themselves with it and then made it dependent on them in various ways (colonialism, imperialism etc.). The overseas expansion of the European powers was the vehicle, the form and the instrument by means of which European civilisation was transferred to various regions of the world. Each of the European powers "exported" Europe in a somewhat different version, in various colours (English, Spanish, French etc.), but the substance, European culture, was the same. This "export" was possible not only thanks to civilisational energy and attractiveness but also thanks to the definite military superiority of the European countries. The world experienced European conquest and exploitation, as well as European values and norms, including social organisation and human rights. In the last period of European "domination" over the world, Europe gave the world its normative model of international order (the League of Nations), the first order of this kind the world had seen.

After World War II and with the fall of the colonial system and the weakening of the European powers, the European Community attempted to take up Europe's former role towards the Rest of the World. There was a dualism in Europe's influence on overseas countries and regions. Later, after the end of the Cold War, the task of transferring Europe's values, norms and influence to the Rest of the World was to be taken up by the EU. This was felt necessary to satisfy Europe's interests in the new international order, particularly in the context of globalisation processes where it seemed that large players would be favoured on the international stage. So, the Union availed itself of the appropriate instruments which were to enable its role as a *global actor*. However, it quickly turned out that these EU procedures failed in consolidating the European powers (above all the UK, France and Germany) in their external relations. Indeed, the EU was pushed into the background as a representative of Europe before the world, thereby damaging Europe's position in the international order.

In the light of the aforementioned circumstances, the issue of Europe's place in the new international order emerging after 2008 – in the non-Western international order – is rightly addressed with some nervousness. There is a fear that Europe has really lost its capacity to influence the world, to (co)create the world

order, to bring its own values and models of development to the world – or just to make the world just a little "European". The question today is now less "How much Europe is there in the World?" and more "How much of the World is in Europe?" Perhaps from now on it will be the world that will be changing Europe, marginalising Europe, weakening her European character. Europe could lose its specific character, its charm and its attractiveness. It would cease to be different from the rest of the world in a negative sense – it would cease to be the world's "better" part (however politically incorrect that may sound). So, we may ask the question: What role will we be playing and how significant a role will it be? After all Europe is not going to disappear from the world immediately. The answer is ambivalent as there are proportions to take into consideration which are hard to quantify. Nevertheless, we must bear in mind that what had seemed unlikely for at least the last 500 years, is now conceivable: a world without Europe.

"A World without Europe?" – a publication bearing this title, prepared a few years ago by French researchers, must have seemed provocative at the time.[266] Today, there is much in the world suggesting the title has foresight. For it will become a reality if, as Europe, we cease to differ from the rest of the world, if Europe becomes a mere geographical designation without the capacity to influence the world. Which is why I would like at this point to draw attention to only two problems which are obstacles for Europe, unified as the EU, to playing a role in international life fitting to its illustrious past as well as its great potential today. Certainly, one might point out further problems, but the two discussed below are of particular significance, as I hope to show.

1 No entity without identity

The first issue is the problem of the identity of the EU, or rather the identity of the community of states which comprise the EU. Marcin Król begins his pessimistic *Europa w obliczu końca* [*Europe Facing Its Demise*] with the following, highly Spenglerian claim: "We are facing a moderate economic crisis, a serious political crisis, a dramatic civilizational crisis and perhaps a mortal spiritual crisis".[267] This is a crisis of cultural identity (ideological, spiritual) strongly connected, it would seem, to political identity. The cultural identity of any given group is made up of a set of ideas, beliefs, convictions, habits, values and norms they have created and with which members identify. A strong and rich cultural identity is important

266 P. Esper et al., *A World without Europe?*, Fayard, Paris, 2012.

267 M. Król, *Europa w obliczu końca* [*Europe Faces Its Demise*], Czerwone i Czarne, Warsaw, 2012, p. 8.

not only for the coherence of the group in question but also for its internal solidarity and for the dynamism of its subsequent development. Cultural identity emerges out of ethnicity, religion, history, place and sometimes language. In his much-discussed book *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*, Samuel Huntington wanted above all to say – as he himself emphasises – that "culture does matter". Culture – after almost two centuries of ideology – will now come to dominate the shaping of the world order. Leszek Kołakowski writes in a similar vein: "Niezaprzeczalnie przynależność do określonej wspólnoty kulturowej, historycznej i językowej jest naturalną ludzką potrzebą". ["It cannot be questioned that membership of a definite cultural, historical and linguistic community is a natural human need".] He takes it as obvious that "we first of all feel solidarity with our own cultural community, we perceive its intrinsic value, we seek its survival and flourishing".[268]

Researchers and thinkers are in doubt: "Europe has been formed by Christianity, anyone denying this gets an "F" in History",[269] says Professor Krzysztof Pomian, the historian of European culture and the academic director of the Museum of Europe in Brussels. Leszek Kołakowski also cannot imagine European civilisation without Christianity. In his *Jezus ośmieszony* [*Jesus Ridiculed*], he judges Christianity – the figure and message of Christ (the Gospel) to be a positive and fundamental element in European culture. And he considers the contrary tendency – the departure from this tradition, its removal from European consciousness – as a symptom of malaise in our civilisation.[270] Referring to Kołakowski's essay, the Dominican Friar Maciej Zięba presents Europe's situation as follows: "Dziejowy prąd oderwał ostatnimi czasy Europę od chrześcijańskiego kontynentu i jak gigantyczna kra rozpoczęła ona dryfowanie po bezkresnym oceanie historii świata". ["The main current of history has in recent times taken Europe away from its Christian continent and like a gigantic ice floe is drifting across the endless expanse of the history of the world".] And he adds that, "The ethos of Christianity has disappeared from contemporary Europe". [Original Polish: "Etosu chrześcijańskiego już nie ma we współczesnej Europie".] No "post-Christian ethos" or abstract "European post-values" will be appearing in the place of Christianity, as any such purported values are suspended in a vacuum.

---

268 L. Kołakowski, *Czy ludzkość może jeszcze ocalić swoje człowieczeństwo?* [*Can Mankind Still Preserve Its Humanity?*], "Gazeta Wyborcza", 4 April 2015.

269 K. Pomian, *Europa to nadal szansa* [*Europe Is Still an Opportunity*] (in conversation with W. Pięciak), "Tygodnik Powszechny", 18 December 2011.

270 L. Kołakowski, *Jezus ośmieszony. Esej apologetyczny i sceptyczny* [*Jesus Ridiculed. An Apologetic and Sceptical Essay*], Znak, Kraków, 2014.

This situation is a herald of storms ahead for Europe and its existential standing. This "ice-flow, which we can still continue our lives in a comfortable manner, is melting away". [Original: "kra, na której można sobie jeszcze ułożyć wygodne życie, nieustannie topnieje".][271]

In the work we have already cited, Marcin Król points out that it is Europe which has become "a particular spiritual realm where religion is withering and ceasing to play any role. In contrast to the rest of the world, including the USA". [Original: "szczególnym terenem duchowym, na którym religia więdnie i przestaje odgrywać rolę. Inaczej niż wszędzie indziej łącznie za Stanami Zjednoczonymi".] It is in Europe that "serious contemporary intellectuals can achieve success – not necessarily approval – thanks to their books which prove that God does not exist, and they do this with passion and commitment". [Original: "bardzo poważni współcześni intelektualiści zyskują powodzenie – niekoniecznie aprobatę – dzięki książkom, które dowodzą, że Bóg nie istnieje, i czynią to z zawzięciem i zaangażowaniem".][272] This process is going on under the influence of contemporary, postmodern and liberal cultural and ideological currents, especially as present in mass media but also supported by the decisions and documents of the EU organs. The most well-known case of this kind is the categorical opposition (especially from France)[273] towards the subtly expressed formulation for the Preamble of the EU Constitution – including reference to the Christian heritage of Europe. For a large group of members of the Convention on the future of Europe, this formulation was unacceptable. Though it was concerned with the spiritual heritage

271 M. Zięba, *Kłopot za kłopotem. Katolik w dryfującej Europie* [*One Problem after Another. A Catholic on a Europe That Is Adrift*], W drodze, Poznań, 2015, pp. 22–23.

272 "a zarazem bez najmniejszej wiedzy, że na temat istnienia lub nieistnienia Boga napisano w historii ludzkiej kultury tysiące ważnych prac". ["… without the faintest awareness that the history of human culture has given us thousands of works on the subject of the existence or the non-existence of God".] A little further on, Professor Król writes that, "equally distinguished commentators and scholars write books which are an expression of their surprise at the fact that so many people still experience religious sentiment and how much religious feelings may still be of help in shaping morality". [Original: "…że równie wybitni publicyści i uczeni piszą książki, które są wyrazem ich zaskoczenia tym, jak wielu ludzi wciąż żywi uczucia religijne, jak bardzo uczucia religijne mogą być pomocne w kształtowaniu moralności"], *op. cit*., pp. 50, 130–131.

273 Paradoxically, it was in France that the Treaty establishing a Constitution for Europe was rejected. But perhaps not that paradoxically in the history of Europe it is well known that opposition to Christianity is the prelude to opposition to Europe as a civilisation.

of Europe, the same Europe was referred to until the late Middle Ages as *Christianitas*. The same tendency had also been visible in the editing of the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights (in 2000), where no reference was made to natural rights conceived of as based on the dignity of man as a birth right (a conception with Christian roots). In this European document, there was no place for the basic and universal point of reference in the 1948 Declaration of Human Rights. However, in the "Convention on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence" (the so-called Istanbul Convention), it came as a surprise that the concept of gender was used, a concept which is rather in contrast to Europe's cultural heritage.[274] The ideological justification of the Convention, otherwise apparently unnecessary, shows how human rights, like other great ideas such as democracy or liberalism, are in practice vulnerable to partial distortion.

David Engels frequently draws attention to the more or less explicit resistance of EU organs to the Christian heritage of Europe in his magnificent work *Le déclin: la crise de l'Union européenne et la chute de la République romaine: quelques analogies historiques* [*Decline: The Crisis of the European Union and the Fall of the Roman Republic: Historical Analogies*]. The author focuses on the blurring of the identity of the Roman Empire and of Europe (the EU) as one of the main factors in the crisis of the one and the fall of the other political project. "Europe has almost completely abandoned its complex Christian heritage and national patriotism, treating every form of enthusiasm for non-universal values as potentially chauvinist". At the same time, he notes that the EU was not able to offer anything in place of this tradition, something that might strengthen a common European identity – something besides sterile norms and values, values defined as universal and so not necessarily European. A basic fault of these bureaucratic-normative manoeuvres ("dictatorship") is their emotional and spiritual (or metaphysical) emptiness. Europeans demonstrate in this way their incapacity to feel a spiritual or emotional bond with Europe as they are deprived of their connection with both their European and their respective national traditions. The EU, in attempting to sterilise Europeans, removes those emotions which are an essential component of any deeper identity, without offering anything instead.

274 The conception or theory of gender applied in practice aims to overcome all sociocultural aspects of certain roles for women, especially roles related to being a wife or a mother. The use of this conception in the Convention against violence was not justified, because in European culture (read: "Christian culture"), violence towards women does not come from the culture to which the conception of gender is opposed. Without doubt, the conception may be relevant in addressing the problem of discrimination of women.

What is worse, Christianity has faced discrimination in its own backyard, while other external religions, faiths and cultures have been privileged. This has been done in the name of "tolerance", by means of which Christianity is being removed while ensuring a friendly attitude to public manifestations of Islam.[275] That is why, for example, an ever-larger number of European cities avoid public celebrations of Christmas so as not to offend the religious sentiments of Islamic people, nevertheless permitting Islamic prayers in public places a few times per day. In the EU's programme of sterilising the European cultural and moral heritage, David Engels perceives the source of a threat to the traditional values which are essential to the survival of the family and native European peoples – however politically incorrect that might sound. If the current trends continue, Europeans may become a minority in Europe. Besides, it is precisely political correctness, according to Engels, that is responsible for many of Europe's identity problems, and if we do not treat these ailments, we will founder as a civilisation. Among these civilisational troubles, Engels includes the pursuit of a bureaucratic homogenisation of Europe (the ironing out of internal diversity), according to the conception imposed by the organs of Brussels.[276]

To some extent a symptom or symbol of this tendency as Engels analyses it, is the victory of Conchita Wurst in the Eurovision Song Contest of 2014. The point at issue is not so much the indefinite gender of the singer,[277] which inspired significant support from groups defining themselves as progressive, as much as the fact that the artistry – both the lyrics and the performance – were kitsch incarnate, especially considering the great European traditions (Piaf, Aznavour, The Beatles, Dalida etc.). The depth of this peculiar symbol lay elsewhere. In the well-made film *The Great European Disaster Movie* (2015), the narrator (a lecturer) flies to Berlin for a lecture on the no-longer-existent EU. On the way, he tells a young passenger that for him the victory of Conchita Wurst was proof of the greatness of the EU. But if the EU was indeed at its peak in 2014, then its collapse (in the film this takes place in 2021) could not come so quickly.[278] Perhaps

275 D. Engels, *Le déclin. La crise de l'Union européenne et la chute de la République romaine – quelques analogies historiques*, Toucan, Paris, 2013, pp. 22–24, 26–29, 130–131.

276 *Ibidem*, pp. 272, 284–287.

277 "Conchita Wurst" is the artistic pseudonym of the Austrian singer representing the LGBT community.

278 *The Great European Disaster* [The English title], directed by A. Piras. The narrator, in grotesque fashion, carried an imitation Conchita-Wurst bears – almost like a

the victory of Conchita Wurst should be interpreted as the harbinger of the end of the EU.

The EU's identity crisis made itself felt on the occasion of the exceptional wave of refugees and migrants to Europe in 2015. For the supporters of accepting refugees and migrants without limits, this was an opportunity to deepen the cultural diversity of Europe (i.e. to weaken its original identity); for others (from those with reservations to clear opponents), this wave represented a challenge to European identity. It is worth mentioning at this point an interesting remark of Leszek Kołakowski, who wrote in the essay we have already quoted from: "Cóż jest zatem oburzającego w tym, że ludzie bronią swej ojczyzny, ziemi ojców, że z lękiem reagują na masową imigrację stanowiącą zagrożenie dla ich tożsamości kulturowej, dla ich nie tylko fizycznej, lecz także duchowej przestrzeni, że nie chcą pozwolić na rozpłynięcie ich kulturowej tożsamości". ["And what is so shocking in the fact that people defend their homeland, the land of their forefathers, that they fear the mass migration threatening their cultural identity – for them it is not only a physical but also a spiritual space – that they do not wish their cultural identity to evaporate".][279] Marek Cichocki's text was extremely interesting both as interpretation and as prognosis, in reference to the problem of changes in identity under the influence of large, external migratory pressures. Recalling the assessments of historians and writers on the Roman Empire, Professor Cichocki claims that the fall of the empire was not so much due to the "impact" of a barbarian attack but was rather the result of the long-term development of connections between the Romans and the barbarians: in the end, "they became less Roman in form and in spirit". [Original: "stawali się coraz mniej rzymscy i w formie i z ducha".] Cichocki also writes about the total fiasco of the policy of resettlement and assimilation of migrants from outside of the Roman Empire and the advancing barbarity of those Romans who had weaker identity – also as a result of internal cultural changes.[280] In the stand-off between two identities, the stronger will win. The vulgar version of liberalism concentrates on comfort and pleasure and makes European identity weaker and weaker until it loses the will and capacity to survive. Christianity today, in its confrontation with the commercial-hedonistic version of liberalism, has no chance. The situation described by Michel Houellebecq in *Submission* is by no means as abstract as it might seem. There are cultural changes, negatively impacting Europe's de-

talisman. At one point, he holds this "beard" against the face of the young girl, commenting that it would suit her well.

279 L. Kołakowski, *Czy ludzkość może…*, *op. cit*.

280 M. Cichocki, *Gliniane skorupy Rzymu*, *op. cit*.

mographic potential and there is increased immigration ("someone has to stand behind future economic growth" as the economic-demographic mantra goes) – does all this mean Europeans are getting less European? What will become of Europe's (and the EU's) role in the international order?

Pope Francis, a well-intentioned "outside" observer of Europe's identity crisis had penetrating things to say on the subject. During his speech to the European Parliament in Strasbourg on November 25, 2014, he spoke of the "image of Europe as aged and subdued", giving the "impression of exhaustion and age – like a grandmother beyond the age of fertility and without zest for life". He identified the sources of this syndrome in the "lack of understanding of human rights and paradoxically in their overuse", the tendency to claim an ever-greater number of individual rights, devoid of social or anthropological context and without accompanying duties. He perceived this tendency in the egoism of European culture, exhibiting the sin of pride, closed off from the transcendental dimension of life, in the growing uniformity of politics, market, culture and even thought. He warned us against "the risk of living in the sphere of ideas alone, words alone, images, sophism… even to the point of mixing up democratic realities with political nominalism". He recalled that the "history of Europe for 2000 years is tied to Christianity". It is a history where "conflict and error have been present, but which has enlivened the desire to develop the Good". This is "our identity". Speaking the same day at the Council of Europe, the Pope said that, "achievements of thought, culture, scientific discovery are all only possible with a trunk to bear the branches and deep roots to sustain the tree. If the roots are destroyed, the trunk will slowly become hollow and die and the branches – once abundant and strong – will begin to droop towards the ground and fall". Leszek Kołakowski once expressed the same thought in similar words.[281]

We are not speaking here about a return to pre-enlightenment times or even turning the clock back to the first half of the XX century. That would be impossible and undesirable. Yet the speed with which Europe is being deprived of a great part of its cultural heritage (not only its Christianity), without anything appearing to take the cultural place of what is being lost, may lead to serious civilisational consequences. Some of which are already in evidence. This cannot but have an impact on the strength and vitality of Europe, its ability to defend its own interests and its role in the international order.

---

281 "Jeśli nasza cywilizacja dopuści do wyschnięcia swoich religijnych korzeni, obumrze wraz z nimi". ["If our civilisation allows its religious roots to wither, it will die out together with them."] L. Kołakowski, *Czy ludzkość może…*, *op. cit.*

2 The atrophy of the EU's will to power

The inability to formulate a real foreign policy is the second of the problems announced earlier – the second obstacle standing in the way of a significant presence of the EU on the international scene. In a text entitled *Can Europe Survive the Rise of the Rest?*, Timothy Garton Ash claims: "If Europeans are to preserve the remarkable combination of prosperity, peace, relative social security and quality of life that they have achieved over the last 60 years, they need the scale that only the European Union can provide. In a world of giants, you had better be a giant yourself…" So, we had better learn to look at the world as they do. Which is why "Today's Europeans" need to adapt Bismarck's wisdom, declaring "China, India and Russia are to the right, America and Brazil to the left — that's our map of Europe".[282]

The absence of a real security and foreign policy – contrary to the intentions of the nineties of the XX century – in the case of the EU issue from an underdeveloped geopolitical instinct. This situation was due to history and later due to the logic of the project of unification itself. World War II, at the roots of which lay the sick geopolitical conceptions of the Third Reich, devalued for Europe the very value of state thinking in geopolitical categories. It was completely natural that this (albeit erroneous) conclusion was drawn. The prophylactic against any return of geopolitics and its catastrophic consequences was to be the European Community. And in this regard, it worked very well: geopolitics was simply removed from thinking about relations between Community members. A side effect, however, was the complete absence of the geopolitical element from the "understanding" of the world by the Union and its organs. Geopolitical awareness was simply not conveyed from the level of state to the level of the Union.[283] The EU was supposed to be a normative power, charismatically using its *soft power*, granting development aid and supporting in humanitarian crises, but – God forbid! – it was not to behave like a traditional power. Let us make it clear: defined in the context of this conception of international order, represented by the creation of the EU, this kind of normative power would not have been a bad

282 T.G. Ash, *Can Europe Survive the Rise of the Rest?*, "New York Times", Sunday Review, 1 September 2012,

283 See P. Verluise, *Geopolityka granic Wspólnoty Europejskiej*, Adam Marszałek, Toruń, 2014. [English version by P. Verluise, The Geopolitics of the European Union Borders, ESKA, Paris, 2014.] The book is concerned with the borders and limits of possible enlargement of the EU, and not the perception of the surrounding global context of the EU and the actions of the EU in the logic of that global space.

thing. However, in the face of the "hardening" of the international environment surrounding the EU and the return of geopolitics, the EU stood helpless. This is clear if we look at the confrontation with Russia and its war against Ukraine, seeking membership of the EU. Russia's reaction nullified the normative intention of the EU's Eastern Partnership.[284]

Judy Dempsey is an excellent observer and commentator on the situation in our part of the world; in her opinion, the inability of the EU to take up an assertive position against Russia's behaviour in Eastern Europe and the collapse of the EU's unity is a consequence of the damage done by the Cold War to the mentality of Western Europeans. The Cold War not only made them subordinate to the United States, but also led to the appearance of a "European zone of comfort and complacency" which may ultimately lead to the squandering of the entire project of European unity.[285] There is a kind of lobotomy affecting Europe not only in the civilisational sphere but also in geopolitics and strategy. And again, this would not be such a threatening circumstance if Europe (the EU) were alone in the world. Whereas the situation is just the opposite: those with clear civilisational identity in the world are demonstrating their geopolitical and strategic assertiveness, especially China, the United States and Russia. The legal and normative dimension of the international order is extremely important. Yet, as the distinguished historian of war and theoretician of strategy Michael Howard writes: "To ignore the strategic aspect, as did Woodrow Wilson and his disciples is at best to forfeit the capacity to create an international order reflecting one's own value system; at worst, to see it destroyed altogether".[286]

In her passionate and informed work *L'Europe a-t-elle un avenir stratégique?* [*Does Europe Have a Strategic Future?*], Nicole Gnesotto writes about the EU as a "necessary force" for similar reasons to those pointed out by T.G. Ash: "Globalisation confronts Europeans essentially less with the risk of demise as with mathematical marginalisation". One of the conditions for developing a joint foreign policy, without which there will be no European influence on global governance,

284 Compare S. Biscop, G*eopolitics with European Characteristics. An Essay on Pragmatic Idealism, Equality, and Strategy*, "Egmont Paper" 82, March 2016.

285 J. Dempsey, *Samozadowolenie i europejska strefa komfortu* [*Complacency and the European Comfort Zone*] (a conversation with W. Przybylski), publica.pl, 2 June 2014. J. Dempsey was for many years the New York Times correspondent for Central and Eastern Europe, headquartered in Berlin, and subsequently editor-in-chief of "Strategic Europe".

286 M. Howard, *Foreword*, in: P. Bobbitt, *The Shield of Achilles: War, Peace, and the Course of History*, New York, 2002, pp. XVI–XVII.

is the explication of the basic principles of one's own model of management. By this, Gnesotto understands "collective solidarity, the search for common interests, introducing divided sovereignty into a certain number of policies. In other words, Europeans must accept the subordination of the particular interests of one's own state to the defence of the national European interest, something different from the sum of the interests of 27 national interests".[287] The problem posed by Gnesotto is essentially this: What level of integration is required for there to be an effective common EU security and foreign policy. The Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) is an intergovernmental policy, which one might think would doom it at the outset – in view of the lack of a unifying cultural foundation and shared geopolitical instinct (shared perception, will to react). Perhaps deeper integration is not enough for such a common policy to appear and that is why a "federational jump" is required, as Minister Radosław Sikorski and others put it (Sikorski when delivering a much commented speech in Berlin, in November 2011.)

The transformation of the EU into a full-blooded federation, if this is ever to happen, has been postponed for the foreseeable future. Indeed, even then it would be hard to imagine how foreign and security policy could be successfully carried out by the "community method". This approach, like the intergovernmental method, has its pluses and minuses. It can work, sometimes even too well, at a bureaucratic-administrative level, but sometimes causes harm to the very idea of integration. For the officials in Brussels have the tendency to uniformly overregulate various areas of life in Europe to an excessive and unauthorised extent, this harms the basic mandate of the EU – "unity in diversity". Overdeveloped procedures and instruments of defence, foreign and security policy – that is on that level which is generally the domain of the community method – have greatly exceeded the political capacity of the EU to take strong decisions and reach its full potential. (We recall that the EU still represents only a little above 20% of the world's gross domestic product [GDP] while being second in terms of military budget[288] – that is well ahead of Russia and China.) We might put it as follows:

---

287 N. Gnesotto, *op. cit*. It was twenty-seven and not twenty-eight countries because Croatia was not yet an EU member. It is interesting that the author uses the concept of European national interest, which seems to imply a "European nation", something which could not exist without a cultural and spiritual foundation. France has consistently denied just this – and the author is French.

288 More details in: P. Turczyński, *Potencjał wojskowy Unii Europejskiej na początku XXI wieku* [*The Military Potential of the European Union at the Beginning of the XXI Century*], Wyższa Szkoła Oficerska Wojsk Lądowych, Wrocław, 2012.

integration has gone far down the path but down the wrong path, down the bureaucratic path. What the EU really needs to achieve sound foreign policy and a serious role on the international stage is political union, a recurring theme but one lacking an implementation plan. It is symptomatic here that the same mistake is made in the report by Charles Grant from the Centre for European Reform in London, entitled *How to Build a Modern European Union*. While it is true that he writes that the "The European External Action Service (EEAS) has failed to fulfil expectations", but the solution is to be found in the same organisation (by means of better integration of EU policies, increased funding), and not at the level of the European politics that created the EEAS and uses it in this way.[289] The issue of the relationship between the degree of integration and the capacity to carry out a serious security and foreign policy requires deeper analysis. However, it is worth mentioning at this point that North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), which involves a much lower level of integration of its member states, is nevertheless capable of thinking geopolitically and taking key decisions concerning NATO's relations with its global environment. Perhaps this is merely the result of the American leadership of NATO, but then that would also suggest that the EU is doomed to failure.

Here we reach the third problem announced above – the third barrier to the EU occupying a significant role on the world stage. Paradoxically – or perhaps it is not that paradoxical – the weak link in the chain for the EU to have a "proper" foreign and security policy is actually the presence of the EU's big powers. This situation is paradoxical in the sense that since the Maastricht Treaty, and the subsequent launch of the Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP) in 1999, it has been those powers which have advocated a "strong Europe", a global actor; it is they who have sought the strengthening of foreign, security and defence policy. In the crisis surrounding Iraq, one could hear in Paris and Berlin laments that the divisions appearing in Europe are inhibiting its ability to be a strong voice on the world stage. And they were right. The enthusiasm of the EU powers to develop the EU into a big power in its own right began to cool with the signing of the Lisbon Treaty, though rather not as a direct result of the document itself. Evidence of a lack of "will power" were the appointments to the position of the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy (HR) – as we said above, this position was twice taken by persons without experience, charisma or broad support. The negative selection was made by the EU

289 C. Grant et al., *How to Build a Modern European Union*, Centre for European Reform, London, October, 2013, pp. 33–35, http://www.cer.eu/sites/default/files/rp_119.pdf.

powers concerned precisely to *avoid* having a person who might influence their individual foreign policies or might influence the overall foreign and security policy of the EU.

One might say we doth protest too much. Not so. As evidence for our criticism we may put forward examples of serious decisions in the domain of foreign and security policy. In the period of great effort to strengthen the CSDP (after the Lisbon Treaty), France and Great Britain surprised their partners by signing a separate bilateral cooperation agreement to tighten cooperation in this area (the so-called Lancaster House Treaties of November 2010).[290] This cooperation quickly took on a combative form in the joint operation of the two countries against Gaddafi's Libya in March 2011, thereby pre-empting any more concerted effort of the entire EU. Then Berlin and Paris – in an attempt to restore international security and order to Europe – formed an axis for the purposes of their negotiations with Russia regarding the latter's aggression towards Ukraine (the so-called *Normandy format*). Once again a common EU foreign and security policy was excluded (perhaps defence was thereby excluded as well). Occasionally, the EU's G-3 or Big Three involved itself in resolving significant international problems (such as the Iranian nuclear programme). But all these individual measures limited the capacity of the EU to perform as a *global actor*, that is coming to terms with its international environment as *the* EU.

In recent years, Germany has come to represent a separate case in this regard. German egoism in economic ties with the world had already been evident previously in its relations with China, for example. In recent years, however, German historical baggage has become a problem for the entire EU and has undermined German credentials as an EU leader in the area of security and defence. The first example of this sort is Germany's attitude to Russia, which has exhibited a kind of schizophrenia. On the one hand Chancellor Merkel has espoused a firm attitude to Moscow (in response to the war in Ukraine), on the other hand a large portion of Germany's political elite and various centres of economic power have expressed considerable "understanding for Russia" and have tried to do business with Russia, diluting the effects of sanctions. This generally soft attitude to Russia is a consequence of World War II (i.e. a guilt complex) as well as earlier German–Russian relations.

290 See also: J. Pawełek-Mendez, *Francusko-brytyjska współpraca w dziedzinie bezpieczeństwa i obrony według traktatów Lancaster House z 2010 r* [*Franco-British Cooperation on Security and Defence and the Lancaster House Treaties of 2010*], "Sprawy Międzynarodowe" ["International Affairs"] 2013, no. 1.

A second case is provided by the migration/refugee crisis from 2015. Here we have also witnessed the effects of historical guilt complexes and Germany's desire to repair its reputation. In this matter Berlin acted unilaterally, but then subsequently tried to share the costs of its initiative with the rest of the EU. This led to tensions both within Germany and in its relations with other states. The whole issue created a considerable sense of historical irony in the context of the EU's relations with Turkey – and a deep irony at that. After World War I, the European powers dictated terms of peace to Turkey (as Turkey had been an ally of Germany), including the independence of Kurdistan. Ankara at present has been taking advantage of the migration/refugee crisis – which Turkey itself exacerbated – to dictate terms to the EU on EU aid for Turkey, as well as obtaining assurances of accelerated accession negotiations. This is all happening while Turkey is openly becoming an authoritarian state that undermines European values and standards of human rights. All that was needed was an unceremonious about-face from Chancellor Merkel. Germany, the leading power of the EU, has begun to lose legitimacy in that role.[291] Germany has begun to look worryingly similar to the France of the interwar period. Both countries caused there to be gaps in the European security system of the time (France with regard to the League of Nations, Germany – to the EU).

In recent years, the situation has developed whereby the EU powers have become the weakest link instead of being the driving force of a common foreign and security policy. Indeed, they have sometimes been a barrier to achieving progress even in the form of treaties. The words of Donald Tusk, the current president of the European Council, bear witness to the abdication of the EU in the domain of a potentially active foreign and security policy. At the Strategic Forum in Bled, Slovenia, in August 2015, he expressed his opinion that the real challenge for the EU is not a better world outside of its borders. "The real challenge is to sustain and consolidate our imperfect order, which thus far we have enjoyed within the European Community". With the current conditions, one cannot deny the gravity of this challenge. Yet it would be historical shortsightedness not to understand that the defence of the European element in the international order lies in the interest of Europe itself.

291 J. Janning, *Germany – Europe's lonely leader*, ECFR, Berlin, January 2016.

3 The year 2016 – opportunity for a breakthrough?

The events of 2016 seem, on the one hand, to have prolonged the crisis of the EU. However, they may yet prove to be an opportunity for a breakthrough in the apathy and integration regress that has beset the Community since the end of the 2000s. The regress has weakened the EU's ability to act in external relations leading to the decline of its international role. In 2016, at least three things came to pass which might yet reverse the decline: Great Britain's decision to leave the EU; the option of a two-speed EU; and the adoption of a new security strategy and the implementation of its assumptions (in the background here is also the election of a new, openly anti-EU president in the United States). All three events represent challenges which might mobilise the Community to implement internal changes to strengthen the EU on the international stage. Will this happen? It is difficult to say, but if it cannot turn this challenge into an opportunity, another chance may not come along for a long time.

Brexit represents the shifting of tectonic plates, bringing with it the loss of a major, valuable part of the EU's overall potential: first of all, in demographic terms (the UK is the second largest population after Germany); secondly in economic terms (where the UK is also second only to Germany) and thirdly in military terms (where the UK is second to France). And British capacity is not only expressible in numerical terms. The UK also has great creative and cultural potential, scientific and technological capability and it is a world leader in finance. And we are not only losing quantitative and qualitative potential. The exit of the UK from the Union means a considerable loss of *influence* in the world for a united Europe. London brought connections to the Community by means of its special relationship with the United States and in virtue of its imperial, colonial heritage. British diplomacy is famed for its cunning and efficiency and this too was a resource available to the EU on the international stage. Further damage to the EU's international standing will be the loss of a permanent seat at the Security Council of the United Nations. And the Community will lose also in another manner, from within. It will lose the Anglo-Saxon spirit of competition and valour as well as its sober realism in assessing important political and ideological issues. This spirit has caused its share of discomfort in the past, but more often it was a positive stimulus in the internal relations of the Community.

Brexit may also bring the EU significant benefits. First, the so-called "brakes" on the EU's development may be removed – that force which had previously been slowing down deeper integration, especially in social, political and security matters. Secondly, there is greater chance of the EU developing as an autonomous strategic force – one independent of the United States. London has always

turned to the United States and NATO to block this direction of EU independence (represented by the CSDP). In this way, the Community may more quickly mature into an independent role in matter of international security, it having been held back in the past by the Cold War and problems with relations with Russia.

It is worth noting at this point that the exit of the UK from the EU, though a painful blow to the idea and potential of unification, should not come as a complete surprise. On the contrary, we should have seen this coming ever since… the first years of the UK's membership in the Community. We may recall, following one of the Polish experts here, that Great Britain was neither an original nor a "natural" member of the Community and later of the EU.[292] The point at issue here is the British tradition of foreign policy and its geographical situation. London decided to join the subsequent Communities only once it had turned out that – contrary to the UK's calculations – the Community had turned out to be a success which it was in the UK's interest to participate in. The political dimension of the integration process was continually ignored or rejected by London (viz. Thatcher's Bruges speech in 1988). When Churchill signed under the idea of a United States of Europe in 1947, he did not see a place for his own country there. What is more, he convinced the subsequent president of France, Charles de Gaulle, that whenever the British would have to choose, they would choose America over Europe. From the start the British had lacked full European credentials and a sense of solidarity with Europe. It was to be expected that when hard times came along, as they did in the second half of the 2010s, British egoism would take over – and not loyalty towards partners from a struggling continent (at that moment facing the great wave of immigration and frequent terrorist attacks). And yet both the above crises are the result of the ill-thought-out, neocolonial armed interventions of Great Britain against Iraq and Libya. It is easy to cause a catastrophe and then refuse to pick up the bill. It was nonetheless surprising how easily the British gave in to anti-European demagoguery driven in the UK by extreme politicians and a section of the tabloids. This was also the result of the superficiality of their belief in European integration.

The second element of a possible breakthrough helped by Brexit could be the shift to an EU of two speeds. As long as the UK was a member of the EU, it was hard to imagine it being left in the second group of countries. On the other hand,

---

292 P. Borkowski, *Pożegnanie z Brytanią i złudzeniami* [*Farewell to Britain and to Illusions*], "Rocznik Strategiczny" ["The Strategic Yearbook"], 2016/2017, p. 117 and following pages.

it was the UK that was holding back the "faster" countries. Without the UK, the creation of a group of countries to be "left behind" should be much easier. Especially because they are otherwise countries which signed up for this status as second category countries: they either are opposed to deeper integration or are openly against EU obligations or infringe community legal standards, above all in the area of the democratic rule of law – a basic criteria of membership.[293]

The referendum in the UK to leave the EU was to some extent part of a wider process which had appeared in Europe already a few years before that. There had begun a wave of populism which did not hide its enmity to the EU. These were not the eurosceptic or "euro-pessimist" political forces which had appeared in the past but were political groups demanding the complete dissolution of the EU, or at least its reduction to a common market or the departure of their own country from the EU. In the UK such a movement was successful, whereas in France not.[294] Elsewhere, whether in positions of power of simply enjoying a degree of support, these new political groups will oppose the participation of their respective countries in closer forms of EU integration. Some use the slogan "A Europe of sovereign nations", recalling the situation before World War II. However, "sovereignty" in the understanding of the populist groupings means the freedom to carry out authoritarian revolutions and freedom from any reaction from legitimate EU organs. They do not normally, however, bring their countries out of the EU because of the financial costs or because of anticipated opposition from the majority of their populations. In any case, these countries will not be invited to form the future core of the EU. The "core" may be formed soon, now that the parliamentary elections in Germany have been completed and where pro-EU parties predominate.

All indicators suggest that in an EU with a core of higher speed countries and without the UK, France and Germany will again be in the driving seat for further integration. The close cooperation of a duet of strongly pro-European

293 This refers to Hungary, but especially to Poland where the ruling party has, since the 2015 elections, carried out a parliamentary coup d'état and has violated the constitution, redirecting the country towards an authoritarian system. By 2016 this situation had drawn the attention of the European Commission which initiated procedures envisaged in EU treaties towards Poland regarding the respect for membership conditions for the EU.

294 The National Front candidate, Marine Le Pen, who announced her intention of organising a referendum on France's exit from the EU, suffered a decisive loss in the presidential elections of May 2017. Before that, the previously strong populist forces had lost elections in Austria and Holland.

politicians – Angela Merkel and Emmanuel Macron – may give Europe leadership which will be both accepted and supported by other core countries. If this leadership does indeed form, it may also strengthen the international position of the EU, insofar as it will cooperate with the proper EU organs and those heading them – as opposed to attempting to replace them. Tighter integration and strong leadership could enable a consistent and firm position of the EU on the key international problems.

Thirdly, after 2016, there has been a growing awareness in the EU that its own security needs to be taken seriously. Unfriendly behaviour and security threats to the EU, its member states and its citizens appeared from the east (Russia), from the south-east (Turkey, Islamic State, Syria among others) and from the south (North Africa, especially Libya) had to have a sobering effect on the European political elites. The EU's neighbours turned out to be ungrateful for the EU's involvement in various spheres: the economy, security, humanitarian work, democracy and human rights. The EU is not resigning from its involvement in these areas, but it does need to seriously rethink its strategy in relation to its own interests, especially in terms of its own security. Otherwise the EU's neighbours may first destabilise the EU from inside (through social, cultural and political changes) and then take its political and institutional structure apart.

The first indication that the EU is once again harbouring the ambition of becoming a group that could seriously look after the security of its members was the adoption in June 2016 of a new security strategy after a long delay (the previous strategy had been adopted in 2003). In view of the timing of the announcement – shortly after the UK referendum on Brexit – the title of the document might seem a little optimistic: "Shared Vision, Common Action: A Stronger Europe. A Global Strategy for the European Union's Foreign and Security Policy (EUGS)". However, its content reflected both the more realistic perception of the security situation of the EU and the new logic of its own foreign, security and defence policy. Probably the best expert on EU documents and practices, Professor Sven Biscop from Brussels confirms this interpretation. In his opinion, the new thinking within the EU about its security, represented by the EUGS, is an acceptance of Realpolitik, but not in the common, vulgar understanding of that term. This is a Realpolitik which is not so much a break with ideals or values, but a rejection of utopian thinking and wishful thinking in foreign policy. In sum, a realism about the means of achieving goals in accordance with EU core values. Sven Biscop sees in this realism a new Security Strategy for the EU, with new priorities: firstly, the security of the EU itself and its citizens; secondly, a reduced emphasis on the promotion of democracy when this is at the cost of destabilising regions near the EU; and thirdly, the necessity of developing military potential (hard power) in

view of the geopolitical challenges represented by the international context of the EU.[295] The remaining priorities contained in the EUGS – strengthening cooperative regional structures and global governance based on law and multilateral institutions – hardly provoke controversy. The development of an EU hard power should serve its strategic autonomy, as expressed in the maxim "We cooperate with the USA when possible; we act alone (without the USA) when necessary".

In this Strategy there are clearly defined conditions for the achievement of EU goals in foreign, security and defence policy. They are (above all) the credibility which is the result of the political unity and the potential of the Community; the capacity for rapid reactions, that is the EU's *responsiveness*; thirdly, there is the condition of being able to combine all the EU's resources into a whole for the purposes of achieving specific goals. The declarations of the EUGS do not disappoint. But EU institutions and those employed there are masters of verbal expression and the *bon mot*. Nevertheless, we should perhaps this time suspend our albeit justified scepticism. The year 2017 was characterised by further decisions confirming the determination of the EU to implement this Strategy. The EU Summit in June 2017 brought further key decisions. The first concerns the establishment of units for operational planning, with a function similar to that of the NATO Headquarters. The second decision concerns the settlement of the European defence budget, which will allow the undertaking of joint defence projects with the support of EU financing. Finally, an ongoing cooperation structure (PESCO) was given the go ahead to facilitate security and defence, i.e. tightening integration (in terms of increased effort and solidarity) for a smaller group of countries. Experts considered that the train called the CSDP could finally move ahead.[296]

No doubt, a catalyst for the awakening of the EU from years of slumber in its attitude towards its own security and global relations was the election of Donald Trump to the presidency of the United States. Trump's attitude to the EU from the start included three unpleasant elements. First of all, Trump made no secret of his low opinion of the EU as a political community (he encouraged the British to vote "leave"); he was the first president of the United States to deem the EU dispensable. Second of all, Trump took a businesslike, transactional approach to European security (as he did to the security of the West), resulting in his questioning the role of the United States in NATO. Thirdly, in his reactions to international

295 S. Biscop, *EU Global Strategy: Europe Holds Some Trump Cards Yet*, "Rocznik Strategiczny" ["The Strategic Yearbook"], 2016/2017.

296 A. Kellner, *Assessing the CSDP after the June 2017 EU Summit*, "ELN", 6 July 2017; I. Bet-El, *The Train Has Left the Station: European Security and Defence and the June European Council*, "ELN", 11 July 2017.

events, he has turned out to be an unstable and unpredictable president. Though Trump appears to remain broadly pro-NATO, there remain serious doubts as to his reliability when it comes to Europe (in his explicit statements he has been more pro-Russia than pro-European). European politicians (including Donald Tusk and Angela Merkel) have begun to openly state that Trump's USA represents a problem for Europe, that Europe can no longer rely on America. Which means that Europe should take its security into its own hands. This should have always been obvious, but for well-known reasons it has not been clear to all since World War II. As the brilliant French expert François Heisbourg expressed it, Europe is aware of the unique place of the United States regarding European defence, but since Europe has itself questioned the role of the United States, and this distance looks rather set to widen, Europe should now look to its own security. This shift represents not only additional costs but also additional opportunities.[297]

The growing awareness among European leaders of the necessity of deepening integration and rebuilding EU relations with the outside world is reflected in the common-sense attitude (finally!) expressed by ECFR director Mark Leonard in the middle of 2017. In a broad analysis of the EU's situation in a new international context, he writes of the need to focus above all on the defence of its own interests – the interests of member states and EU citizens, including economic issues and the previously unpopular geopolitical matters. In foreign policy, Leonard advances the idea that the EU should reduce its universalist mission (the leaders of China, India, Russia or the United States will not accept the EU's vision of the world here) and he recommends the increased capacity of the EU to defend itself, as well as a unique development model for Europe and the development of security for the EU in the context of its neighbours.[298] In other words, Europe should exhibit less of the Prometheism [Józef Piłsudzki's idea of impacting international relations by supporting national movements to weaken in particular Russia and subsequently the Soviet Union] appropriate more for NGOs and more of the features of a "good landowner" who takes care of his or her own property and preserves good relations with his or her neighbours. In view of the EU's situation and the disadvantageous changes in this part of the world, one cannot yet say whether 2016 will turn out to have been the "annus horribilis", when we hit the bottom and bounced back. The year 2017 has given some reason to hope so.

---

297 F. Heisbourg, *Bezpieczeństwo Europy zależy od niej samej* [*Europe's Security Depends on Europe*], "Gazeta Wyborcza", 2 August 2017.

298 M. Leonard, *L'Europe qui protège: Conceiving the Next European Union*, "ECFR", August 2017.

Closing Remarks

The answer to the question "How much Europe in the international order?" has become incredibly difficult. And Europeans have for some time been keen to avoid posing difficult questions. They are content with the efficiency and elegance of their politically correct speeches about the wondrousness of the European project. Rarely does one find among the army of well-educated and erudite analysts and observers of Europe someone willing to stand out and, risking the disapproval of their peers, say: If we do not halt the current course of events, the present time in the history of Europe will come to seem to posterity like a ball on the Titanic. Was the final of the 2015 Rugby World Cup not a sign of the times? Rugby, like several other sports, is a very European game; it combines valour, intelligence and a certain ethos. For decades, the French and national teams from the British Isles excelled. And now for the first time in history the four best teams meeting in the semi-finals did not include a single team from Europe (though it may be said that the four countries represented have some European roots – Australia, New Zealand, Republic of South Africa [RPA] and Argentina). What was lacking in the European teams? Valour, ethos…? Of course, it's easy to dismiss this symbolism as coincidence, but perhaps it is worth taking a moment to pause for thought.

There is no way to foretell the future of the European Union (EU) and the continent of Europe under its "care". The current situation is troubling, and the long-term trends are downwards. But in thinking about the future of the Old Continent, we should not fall into fatalism. Europe has come out of crises in the past, though the current one seems the deepest it has faced since the end of World War II. The right starting point should always be an accurate diagnosis. And it seems that Europeans have the greatest difficulties here. Trapped in the corsets of dogma and a culture of connivance, accustomed to the "politics of the ostrich", they eagerly hide from reality. The attitude of *carpe diem* (but without looking at the consequences for tomorrow) penetrates culture and social life as well as politics. If we cannot reverse this trend, it is at least worth considering what awaits us and try to make sure the least pessimistic scenario comes to pass. We should reflect and find a point of reference, a relevant historical experience or contemporary model which might serve in sketching a vision of Europe in the international order in fifty or hundred years' time.

This could be done by taking the starting point to be the current condition of the European project. For example, Bogdan Góralczyk presents three scenarios:

1) federation in spite of everything; 2) the appearance of a hard core and 3) the return of nation states and the decline of the role of the EU.[299] Instead of that, we may, as sometimes is done, imagine a future Europe through the prism of the fate or situation of one of its countries, which for some reason we deem representatives or illustrative of the whole of Europe. This procedure (in a certain sense *pars pro toto*), more literary than scientific, allows one to sketch the future place and role of Europe in the world. Four countries come to my mind in this respect: Greece, France, the I Rzeczpospolita and Switzerland. Their fate and place in the history of Europe may be indicative of Europe's future on the international stage.

Switzerland is a popular choice as a point of reference. It is, after all, a safe country; its wealth is legendary; it is a place where one lives in abundance and those who come from abroad are admitted according to the country's capacity to absorb new migrants. The national, ethnic, linguistic and religious diversity of Switzerland is also a reason to take it as a case study. Yet upon closer inspection, we see that Switzerland will not do. First of all, the country monitors its borders carefully. Secondly, it takes care of its cultural identity (*vide* the referendum banning minarets in 2009). Thirdly, in Switzerland (a federation, though in name a "confederation"), diversity is respected more than in the EU. The federal authorities do not, for example, attempt to remove religion from the public sphere in the various cantons. Switzerland's concern for its borders stands in sharp contrast to the EU's relaxed attitude. The esteemed German economist Hans-Werner Sinn is forthright on this subject: "Every country needs its borders to protect its natural resources, its infrastructure and public services. The property rights of a country are as important as the property rights of citizens".[300] The EU lacks the unity and the determination to protect its external borders. In the face of the pressure of external migration, this will inevitably lead to internal instability and tension and the subsequent erosion of its cohesion.

The example of the first Polish state, the Commonwealth of Many Nations (Polish: "Rzeczpospolitej wielu narodów") – the first period of which is called today the First Republic (Polish: "I Rzeczpospolita") and which includes the Union of Lublin, often compared today to the EU – is particularly disheartening. This country – at one moment rather wealthy and well developed – expanded its territory excessively and lost touch with advances being made in Europe as well

299 And he adds that there are currently three options facing the EU: survive and change, survive without changing and not survive. B.J. Góralczyk (ed.), *The Crises of 2008 and 2014…*, *op. cit*., pp. 246–252.

300 H.-W. Sinn, *Źle się dzieje w państwie europejskim* [*It's Not Going Well in the European State*] (interviewed by W. Gadomski), "Gazeta Wyborcza", 2–3 January 2016.

as losing its "geopolitical instinct". Its internal political system became more and more eccentric and its effective management became impossible – the system of the Royal elections in Poland (literally "free" elections) gradually eroded the power of the King. The First Republic might be taken as the archetype of the failed state. It collapsed with the acquiescence of its ruling class which put its purported freedom and democracy above the sheer survival of the state. (The democracy included distortions such as the *liberum veto*, which obstructed the convening of the Sejm (the lower house) and blocked important decisions.) In this situation, royal authority counted for less than the magnate-oligarchs whose private armies were larger than the Royal forces. Long before the actual collapse of the First Republic, the state had lost its ability to defend its borders (the similarities to the Roman Empire are clear, as well as to … the EU in 2015).[301]

Greece is often considered to be the origin of Europe and is certainly considered to be the origin of democracy. Europe is happy to recall the moments of Greek's greatness and its art, literature, philosophy or Olympic tradition – and it is right to do so. Yet the dark side of that period is forgotten or remains completely unknown, especially the degeneration of democracy that led to the deserved downfall of Ancient Greece. Greece might serve as the point of reference for the future fate of the EU, but then not only its ancient period but also its contemporary incarnation. With a collapsed economy after 2010, Greece was kept alive till 2016 on the life-support machine of the EU, a situation that will continue for some time to come. The cause of the contemporary collapse was a carefree attitude of living beyond one's means, being proud of one's past, joy in the present and a refusal to think about the future. It is notable that the chair of the European Council in his speech at the Strategic Forum in Bled, August 2015, invoked pride (in culture, wealth, the principle of solidarity) as the main emotion which should reinvigorate Europeans and bring them to the defence of their model of civilisation, their prosperity and their uniqueness. And he recalled at this point the pride the ancient Greeks felt in their relations with the "barbarians". The year 2015, in view of what was happening in Greece and in the EU, was not the best time to bring up that particular example.

Finally, our fourth point of reference is contemporary France. Perhaps the case of France most closely matches our need to find the right conception for Europe (the EU) and its place in the world in fifty to hundred years. France is a mature civilisation, a country with a great past and culture. At the same time,

301 See also: J. Topolski, *Rzeczpospolita Obojga Narodów 1501–1795* [*The Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth 1501–1795*], Wydawnictwo Poznańskie, Poznań, 2015.

France today is building its identity – and requiring the same from the whole of Europe – not on the basis of a spiritual heritage but on the basis of a sterile interpretation of the principles of republicanism. France opened her doors to immigration from the Islamic world and from Africa (from former colonies), permitting the civilisational "counterattack" (in Toynbee's conception) of a great impact. Gothic cathedrals stand empty (visited mostly by tourists from Japan and Central Europe), whereas Islamic sites are full of life. Displays of Christianity in public places are disapproved of. It is in France that the battle for the right conception of freedom will take place (especially the attack on the editors of "Charlie Hebdo"). It is no accident that the plot of the novel *Submission* takes place in France.[302] At the same time, France is the embodiment of European hedonism, the desire to dissolve in music and champagne, to delight in fine cuisine and wine. A world of fashion, refined entertainment, the artistically sublime. Sometimes France resembles an elderly, wealthy Lady. She is still able to afford the frolics of her younger years and has servants in attendance; she looks down from aristocratic heights at the world around her. Our Lady is able to use the force of her guard in defence of her palace and her estate (willingly engaging in military operations). When the time comes for revolution, she will no doubt behave as in the famous lines of Agnieszka Osiecka: "like chubby princesses proudly greeting the revolt when it came". Will Europe in the world become what France has become in Europe? Perhaps this is the most attractive vision when compared with the other aforementioned – and more unpleasant – options. But for how long…?

Of course, none of these scenarios will come to pass as described above. In imagining the future of Europe, we should look for something in between these various possibilities. Unless it happens that – for some reason unbeknownst to us or under the force of an impulse we cannot yet foresee – Europeans will reign in and reverse the current tendencies. As long as it is not too late.

302 M. Houellebecq, *Submission*, Picador, New York, 2016. The author describes in his book the seizure of power in 2022 France by the Muslim Brotherhood and the subsequent Islamification of the country. This development was aided by the attitude of the Socialist Party which decided to support the Islamic party solely for the purpose of opposing the rise to power of the National Front.

Bibliograpy

Biscop, S., Peace without Money. War without Americans – Can European Strategy Cope? Routledge, Aldershot 2015.

Braudel, F., Dynamika kapitalizmu, Aletheia, Warsaw 2013 (in French: *La dynamique du capitalism*, Arthaud, Paris, 1985).

Bull H., Watson A., The Expansion of International Society, OUP, New York 1984.

Cichocki, M.A., Problem politycznej jedności w Europie, PISM, Warsaw 2012.

Cooper, R., Breaking of Nations: Order and Chaos in the Twenty-First Century, Atlantic Press, London 2003.

Davies, N., Europe. A History, Pimlico, London 1996.

Delumeau, J., Cywilizacja odrodzenia, Alatheia, Warsaw 2015 (in French: *La Civilisation de la Renaissance*, Arthaud, Paris, 1993).

Duby, G., Czasy katedr. Sztuka i społeczeństwo 980–1420, Cyklady, Warszawa, 1986 (in French: *Les Temps des cathédrals: L'art et la société, 980–1420*, Gallimard, Paris, 1976).

Engels, D., Le déclin. La crise de l'Union européenne et la chute de la République romaine – quelques analogies historiques, Toucan, Paris 2013.

Esper, Ph., et al., A World Without Europe? Fayard, Paris 2012.

Ferguson, N., Civilization: The West and the Rest, Penguin, London, 2011.

Gnesotto, N., Przyszłość Europy strategicznej, PISM, Warsaw 2012 (in French: *L'Europe a-t-elle un avenir stratégique?*, Armand Colin, Paris, 2010).

Góralczyk, B.J. (ed.), European Union on the Global Scene: United or Irrelevant?, Centre for Europe, Warsaw 2014.

Halecki, O., Historia Europy – jej granice i podziały, IEŚW, Lublin 1994.

Holzer, J., Europa zimnej wojny, Znak, Kraków 2012.

Howard, M., Wojna w dziejach Europy, Ossolineum, Wrocław 1990 (in English: *War in European History*, OUP, Oxford, 2009).

Kant, I. (tr.) Ted Humphrey, *To Perpetual Peace. A Philosophical Sketch*, Hackett Publishing, Indianapolis, 2003.

Kieniewicz, J., Od ekspansji do dominacji. Próba teorii kolonializmu, Czytelnik, Warsaw 1986.

Kissinger, H.A., World Order, Penguin Press, New York 2014.

Kołakowski, L., Jezus ośmieszony. Esej apologetyczny i sceptyczny, Znak, Kraków 2014.

Koźmiński, M. (ed.), Cywilizacja europejska. Wykłady i eseje, Scholar, Warsaw 2004.

Kubiak, Z., Dzieje Greków i Rzymian, Świat Książki, Warsaw 2003.

Lubbe, A., Imperium europejskie? Ekspansja Europy a powstanie gospodarki światowej, PWN, Warsaw 1982.

Łukaszewski, J., Cel: Europa. Dziewięć esejów o budowniczych jedności europejskiej, Noir sur Blanc, Warsaw 2002.

Mączak, A. (ed.), Historia Europy, Ossolineum, Wrocław 1997.

McCormick, M., Narodziny Europy. Korzenie gospodarki europejskiej 300–900. PWN, Warsaw 2009.

Parzymies, S. (ed.), Dyplomacja czy siła? Unia Europejska w stosunkach międzynarodowych, Scholar, Warsaw 2009.

Polanyi, K., Wielka transformacja. Polityczne i ekonomiczne źródła naszych czasów, PWN, Warsaw 2010 (in English:, *The Great Transformation. The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time*, Beacon Press, Boston, 2001).

Pomian, K., Europa i jej narody, PIW, Warsaw 1992.

Rocznik Strategiczny (ed. R. Kuźniar, Scholar, Warsaw lata 1996–2016.

Simms, B., Taniec mocarstw. Walka o dominację w Europie od XV do XXI wieku, Wydawnictwo Poznańskie, Poznań 2015 (in English: *Europe. The Struggle for Supremacy, from 1453 to the Present*, Basic Books, New York, 2013).

Spengler, O., Zmierzch Zachodu: zarys morfologii uniwersalnej, Wydawnictwo KR, Warsaw 2001 (in English: *The Decline of the West*, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1926).

Toynbee, A.J., Cywilizacja w czasie próby, Przedświt, Warsaw 1991 (in English: *Civilisation on Trial*, OUP, New York, 1948).

Thucydides, tr. Hammond, Martin, *The Peloponnesian War*, Kindle Edition, OUP, Oxford, 2009.

Weigel, G., Katedra i sześcian. Europa, Stany Zjednoczone i polityka bez Boga, Fronda, Warsaw 2005 (in English: The Cube and the Cathedral: Europe, America, and Politics without God, Basic Books, New York, 2005).

Wells, H.G., Historia świata, Ossolineum, Wrocław–Kraków 1979 (in English: *A Short History of the World*, The Collected Works of H.G. Wells, Pergamon Media, 2015).

Zakaria, F., The Post-American World, W.W. Norton & Company, New York 2008.

Studies in Politics, Security and Society

Edited by Stanisław Sulowski

Vol. 1 Robert Wiszniowski (ed.): Challenges to Representative Democracy. A European Perspective. 2015.

Vol. 2 Jarosław Szymanek: Theory of Political Representation. 2015.

Vol. 3 Alojzy Z. Nowak (ed.): Global Financial Turbulence in the Euro Area. Polish Perspective. 2015.

Vol. 4 Jolanta Itrich-Drabarek: The Civil Service in Poland. Theory and Experience. 2015.

Vol. 5 Agnieszka Rothert: Power of Imagination. Education, Innovations and Democracy. 2016.

Vol. 6 Zbysław Dobrowolski: Combating Corruption and Other Organizational Pathologies. 2017.

Vol. 7 Vito Breda: The Objectivity of Judicial Decisions. A Comparative Analysis of Nine Jurisdictions. 2017.

Vol. 8 Anna Sroka: Accountability and democracy in Poland and Spain. 2017.

Vol. 9 Anna Sroka / Fanny Castro-Rial Garrone / Rubén Darío Torres Kumbrián (eds.): Radicalism and Terrorism in the 21st Century. Implications for Security. 2017.

Vol. 10 Filip Pierzchalski: Political Leadership in Morphogenetic Perspective. 2017.

Vol. 11 Alina Petra Marinescu: The Discursive Dimension of Employee Engagement and Disengagement. Accounts of keeping and leaving jobs in present-day Bucharest organizations. 2017.

Vol. 12 Jacek Giedrojć: Competition, Coordination, Social Order. Responsible Business, Civil Society, and Government in an Open Society. 2017.

Vol. 13 Filip Ilkowski: Capitalist Imperialism in Contemporary Theoretical Frameworks. 2017.

Vol. 14 Leszek Leszczyński / Adam Szot (eds.): Discretionary Power of Public Administration. Its Scope and Control. 2017.

Vol. 15 Tadeusz Klementewicz: Understanding Politics. Theory, Procedures, Narratives. 2017.

Vol. 16 Tomasz Bichta: Political Systems of the Former Yugoslavia. 2018

Vol. 17 Miroslav Palárik / Alena Mikulášová / Martin Hetényi / Róbert Arpáš: The City and Region Against the Backdrop of Totalitarianism. 2018

Vol. 18 Jolanta Itrich-Drabarek / Stanisław Mazur / Justyna Wiśniewska-Grzelak (eds.): Understanding Politics. Theory, Procedures, Narratives. 2017.

Vol. 19 Jerzy Juchnowski / R. Jan Sielezin / Ewa Maj: The Image of "White" and "Red" Russia in the Polish Political Thought of the 19th and 20th Century. Analogies and Parallels. 2017.

Vol. 20 Roman Kuźniar: Europe in the International Order. 2018.

www.peterlang.com