
INTERNATIONAL STUDIESINTERDISCIPLINARY POLITICAL AND CULTURAL JOURNAL No. 1/2007

Ryszard M. Machnikowski**EURO-ATLANTIC RELATIONS
AFTER THE ENLARGEMENT OF THE EU****1. INTRODUCTION**

It seems obvious that any attempt to forecast the future state of the Euro-Atlantic relations should be based on the reminder of the past. It is also crucial to stress that they have undergone a series of significant changes since the end of the Cold War. During this period, as Ian Davidson observes: “[...] no European country can have an independent defence policy if the potential adversary is the Soviet Union; for fighting the Argentines in the South Atlantic, perhaps, or the Libyans in Chad, but not for keeping out the Russians. The independence of any European country is contingent on the independence of its neighbours. Therefore the starting point for any European defence policy is the concept of alliance.” (Davidson 1988: 151). That implied the need for a strong political and military presence of the U.S.A. on this continent, as all European armed forces combined were not a match for the Soviet Army, if not supported by the U.S. military. That caused the situation when any popular anti-American resentment (e.g. visible during so called “Easter marches” against the dislocation of American *Pershing II* and *Cruise* missiles in Europe in the 80s) had to be disregarded by the governments of the Western European states to keep Euro-Atlantic alliance valid and working.

During the Cold War any French attempts to diminish the role of America in Europe would have been largely futile, as they were firmly rejected by Bonn as not in tune with FRG interests. It was precisely Washington’s leadership and supremacy in Europe, which made France withdraw from the military structure of NATO in 1966 for almost 30 years: “It was deemed a contradiction of French sovereignty for the control of French capital weapons and conventional forces to be under the command and control of foreign generals and the influence of foreign governments. [...] Hence French sovereignty and national interests, as well as self-esteem required that French leaders control French national security policy. Where this required France working with NATO Allies it would so, but it would

not subordinate French interests to collective NATO command and control under the dominant direction of the United States, assisted by Britain.” (Wyllie 1998: 97). Since 1966, France remained a member of NATO, but withdrew from formal NATO’s institutions: Defence Planning Committee (DPC), the Military Committee (MC) and Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe (SHAPE). This country has never fully accepted American military and political dominance in Europe, treasuring much own sovereignty, independence and national interests. This position was enhanced by the possession of her own nuclear weapons perceived as the main warranty of inviolability. The national pride of the former world’s superpower and colonial state and self-perception of a unique country possessing civilizational mission to enlighten *the other* had probably something to do with this anti-American stance. (see de La Serre, F. 1996: 19–39; Howorth 1997: 23–48). Using a term that is currently quite fashionable, when she felt appropriate, France preferred to act *unilaterally* in order to show her independence and power. However, Paris could have been quite content seeing large U.S. military contingent in Western Germany, as a counterweight not *only* for the Russian troops, though perhaps the French were not willing to express that openly. It seems that, fortunately for Western Europe, a much needed and useful alliance – *keeping the Americans in, the Germans down, and the Russians out (Lord Ismay)* – was right in place, fulfilling its duties rather effectively. Global defence and security issues were essentially monopolised by NATO – all other defence initiatives were considered ineffective and secondary, including Western European Union, which was *defrosted* only after the end of the Cold War, apparently without a huge success. For almost half of the century this Euro-Atlantic alliance successfully prevented war and maintained the sense of security on the European continent.

The most important changes in the field of transatlantic cooperation are obviously associated with the demise of the Soviet Union – sudden and unpredicted outcome of Ronald Reagan’s strategy to exhaust the “Evil Empire” by a political pressure, forcible arms race (including (in)famous *Star Wars*) and proxy wars in Afghanistan, Nicaragua and Angola. The by-product of Reagan’s policies was the emergence of Mikhail Gorbachev’s *perestroika*, which ended the short and brutish existence of the Soviet Empire. That event shattered the whole international environment and transformed not only European, but also global politics. The disintegration of the communist system liberated Eastern and Central Europe from the Soviet oppression and paved the way for rapid, peaceful and somewhat unexpected reunification of Germany, followed by the much slower integration of the rest of Europe, to be partially completed only on May 1st, 2004. Global rivalry between capitalist and democratic West, under the

leadership of the U.S.A., and Soviet Russia and its satellites, lasting almost half a century, was finally over. The Soviet armoured divisions and tactical nuclear missiles no longer effectively threatened Western European countries, what essentially put into question the need for the strong transatlantic military alliance (NATO) in general, and American presence in Europe in particular. As Andrew Cottey notes: “In short, the end of the Cold War posed fundamental questions not only about NATO’s future direction but also about its very existence. As one observer put it, not only whither NATO but also whether NATO.” (Cottey 1998: 44).

2. SECURITY DILEMMA AFTER THE END OF THE COLD WAR

This caused the emergence of the two important problems: first – whether the U.S. was still much interested in European security issues; second – whether the EU was able to develop independent and coherent security policies and build capable military force apart from NATO. James H. Wyllie had no doubts making his comment: “**Today, as the threat in Europe has steeply declined, greater threats and real competitive interests have grown in other regions. America’s closest allies may still be in West Europe, but the greater dangers challenging American strategic interests are in the Middle East and East Asia [...].** A declining profile and presence in West Europe does not indicate an American retreat from world politics at the historic moment when it finds itself the world’s only superpower, but other regions have overtaken Europe in the hierarchy of American strategic interests. Official pronouncements have made this change of perspective clear. Since 1993 American defence planning has been predicated on the priority to deter and fight two major regional conflicts almost simultaneously and unilaterally if needs be. **The regions of concern do not include Europe.** (emphasis added – RMM)” (Wyllie 1998: 80–81). This effect was pretty obvious – in a foreseeable future Russia, or any other European state alone, could not pose a *serious* threat to American interests. At the same time, in East Asia such a threat could appear: China, a stable and rapidly developing country was patiently building up its military and political potential, and perhaps one day would be able to challenge American dominance over this region (the test ground is, certainly, Taiwan). Japan, despite its serious economic crisis, still was an economic superpower, which had to be reckoned with. In the Middle East at least three countries – Libya, Iran and Iraq – were pursuing anti-American policies after the end of the Cold War. Though all were relatively weak, they were at least annoying American policy-planners. In other regions, there were numerous “rogue

states”, which still did not want to acknowledge American hegemony and were the centers of instability there. Their actions have included nuclear proliferation (North Korea, Pakistan) which currently is perceived as the greatest danger for U.S. security, when transnational terrorist groups like *Al Qaeda* finally manage to get WMD. Hence, the position of a relatively stable, prosperous and secure Europe simply had to slide down on the American priority list. Immediately after the end of the Cold War the nature of present threats for the security of this continent was unclear, so newly created European Union could focus attention on internal reforms, common economic projects, like establishing Single European Market and the Economic and Monetary Union, as well as rather slow enlargement to the East and South. Almost all Central and Eastern European states perceived the European Union as a source of economic support, and NATO as a military warrant – they used to think that these organisations were complementary, not *contradictory*, and actively sought membership in both of them. Hardly anyone there could imagine the situation that one day they might face a tough alternative – **either** to support European *core* **or** to support the U.S.A.

Unfortunately, terrible bloodshed in the former Yugoslavia proved that not the whole of a European continent was violence-free and forced the decision-makers to consider new security policies. By 1995 the Euro-Atlantic record on the Balkan Wars was fairly unimpressive. Western Europe was unable to react, partially due to the lack of resources, partially due to the divergent interests of particular states, and the U.S. administration was initially not interested in any major intervention. Western reluctance allowed gross human rights violation in this region, including mass killings and ethnic cleansing. Finally in 1995, when the U.S. administration decided to act, NATO started “Operation Deliberate Force”, which was aimed at destroying a military infrastructure of Bosnian Serbs during the three weeks of intensive air strikes. This military action forced the Serbs to sit at the negotiation table and sign the “Dayton Agreement” (*the General Framework Agreement for Peace*) in November 1995. Afterwards, 60,000 NATO-led peacekeeping troops called “Implementation Force” (IFOR) entered the region and monitored the fulfilment of the peace agreement’s obligations. After successful implementation of the peace process, IFOR was replaced subsequently by the SFOR – Stabilisation Force. Endangered NATO’s credibility was therefore saved, and the unity of the West maintained for some time. As Cottey rightly observes: “NATO’s experience in the conflict suggested several important lessons for the Alliance’s future role in peace-keeping and peace-enforcement: that attempts at peace – keeping are unlikely to succeed (and may even be counterproductive) in circumstances where there is no peace to keep; that indirect forms of pressure, such as “no fly

– zones’’, have only limited effects in the absence of supporting ground forces; that the Europeans lack the military resources to undertake peace-enforcement operations without US support; that divisions can seriously undermine the Alliance’s ability to respond effectively. (Cottey 1998: 51–52). Americans draw a conclusion that if they want to carry out military mission in a fast and effective manner, they should not wait till European governments define the lowest *common denominator* of their interests. These Yugoslavian ‘‘lessons’’ revealed also another obvious thing – that European states were unable to resolve even internal European problems without the significant American military help, so Europe largely depended on Washington’s political will. So, if the U.S. refuses, Western Europe does not have enough capabilities to perform peace-enforcing missions. As a result, the most active European states decided to build such capabilities. However, this process has met some very serious limits. As far as the economic co-operation was concerned, member states agreed to give up the important functions of their national sovereignty to the supranational institutions of the European Union. But when close political cooperation was considered, EU countries jealously kept their powers, so the whole process remained strictly intergovernmental, making the *second Pillar* of the EU – the Common Foreign and Security Policy – rather weak. This situation has been accurately described by Christopher Hill as *the capability – expectations gap – CEG*. (Hill 1993). On the one hand, there was a wide demand for a more active role of the EU in the world affairs, on the other, the EU did not have capabilities to fulfil these expectations smoothly. In 1998 the ‘‘inventor’’ of the CEG, presented an article *Closing the capabilities – expectations gap* trying to sum up important changes which took place since 1993 on the CFSP field. He has noticed that: ‘‘[...] the conclusions is irresistible that while there has been some amelioration of resources, instruments and cohesiveness, and some foundations have been laid for further improvements, the fundamental insufficiency remains. **Indeed, with future enlargement, bringing more budgetary pressures and complications of decision – making, and the IGC not having initiated radical change, the available capabilities for foreign policy may well diminish. The EU continues to impress more in potential than in action.**’’ (Hill 1998: 29). And he concludes: ‘‘**The CEG has not gone away; it will probably never do so** (emphasis added – RMM), even if it is highly desirable that European foreign policy – makers should realise the dangers of hubris and scale down their ambitions to remake international relations – the besetting and tragic flow of American policy, after all.’’ (Hill 1998: 37–38).

The discussions over this issue instantly brought the question of limiting American dominance and diminishing NATO’s role in the European security issues. This became a subject of controversies both within the EU and between the EU and the U.S. – close American allies (United Kingdom, the

Netherlands) intended to keep American leadership in NATO, some other countries (predominantly France) tried to diminish it. At the same time the U.S. administration attempted to play a sensitive game – to enhance European military capability in the region and not being superseded by the EU on this field, what could lead to losing its dominant position. Conflict in the former Yugoslavia sparked some visible tensions both inside Europe and between the European states and America over the use of force. These tensions and rows could have also been observed during NATO intervention in Kosovo in 1999, but transatlantic alliance managed then to limit the repercussions. However, the overall result of NATO's operation in Kosovo is not very convincing. Though this foreign intervention effectively stopped numerous atrocities committed there, this region seems to remain in a dead-lock – still it is not clear what will be the future of this region and who ultimately will rule this land, as it is rather hard to expect that current Western protectorate will last for ever.

3. 9/11 ATTACK AND ITS CONSEQUENCES

Another huge catalyst for growing transatlantic rifts emerged after September 11, 2001 attack and American response to it. This “punch in the face of the American hegemon” (as it was frequently called, especially through the Middle East) has been noticed with shock and awe by the American nation, and with declared sympathy towards the victims by the large part of the world. However, there were some places in the world, where these attacks were met with open joy and support, and European solidarity with America somewhat vanished and was superseded by the feeling of *shadenfreude*. “Why do they hate us?” and “what went wrong?” were the most frequent questions in the USA, as ordinary Americans seemed not to know the answers. They finally encountered the fact that even after the end of the Cold War America had an enemy clever and resourceful enough to make a significant harm. However, a large sector of the world's public opinion (as well as some notorious American authors like Noam Chomsky (2001, 2003), Gore Vidal (2002) or Michael Moore (2003) did have some hints on the *root causes* of the resentments leading to this savage, anti-American attack. It was the U.S. government itself to be blamed for what happened on 9/11. It was U.S. power, arrogance, annoying unilateralism, ruthless exploitation of the world's resources (most notably, Middle Eastern oil) and, last but not least, support of Israel against the Palestinians, which had caused resentments leading to this outrageous act of barbaric atrocity. In the eyes of the radical (and sometimes even not *so* radical)

intellectuals and large sector of the *World's public opinion* (especially in the Muslim countries, but also in Western Europe and even America), the perpetrators of these cruel attacks were at least partially validated by the presumed atrocities committed by the *Imperialist U.S.A.* to the rest of the world. (see: Scraton 2002; *Letter from United States Citizens to Friends in Europe*) America's greatest current sin was hidden under the banner of *globalization*, which apparently concealed the enormous (and evil) influence exerted by the American civilization. "Globalization" was frequently presented as the aggressive spread of essentially American values and ways of life, trade and government over the globe, as if it was a "natural" and inevitable process, excluding any coercion. A critical approach to that concept and its *deconstruction* presumably revealed cultural, economic and political *neocolonialism* and *imperialism* standing behind it, as well as a coercive nature of this process – it was perceived as a forceful *Americanization* of the world – forcing the rest to accept Western – alien to them values.

Therefore, it should not come as a surprise that soon after 9/11, the U.S. government received advice from engaged intellectuals to turn the other cheek to the masters of the terrorist attacks, and meet their demands based on *legitimate grievances* (do not attack the Taliban, stop supporting Israel, withdraw from the Middle East, spare Saddam, halt globalization etc.). Sometimes it seemed that nothing short of total and final self-rejection of any political and cultural influence exerted by the U.S.A. on the world, could win the hearts and minds of the pacifist European public opinion, French and German leaders and columnists included¹. Though immediately after 9/11 many governments of Western European countries hurried up to declare verbal support, at least some of them did it apparently in order to have a minimal control of the superpower prospective actions, and possibly to curb them. All in vain, as contrary to these voices, the Bush administration, led by the *neocon* desire to change the world rather than to understand it, invaded Afghanistan and quickly ousted the Taliban regime, what left *Al Qaeda* without a base. The U.S. government soon declared, with outrageous sincerity, that this country no longer be a *benign hegemon* and would actively pursue its harsh security policies. The Americans started to perceive a whole world as a battleground for their fight with the terrorist groups hidden under the banner of *Al Qaeda*. Bush jr, was clearly following Ronald Reagan, who after a decade of rather uncertain foreign policy, successfully achieved the democratic transformation in Central and Eastern Europe, surprising many experts (so called *sovietologists*), who used to

¹ Jean-Marie Colombani, the author of the famous article *Nous Sommes Tous Américains* published in *Le Monde* next day after 9/11, has soon written a book showing a little bit different attitude towards the USA: *Tous Américains? Le monde après le 11 septembre 2001*, Fayard, Paris 2002.

forecast a longstanding well-being of the USSR. Enormous economic, political and military pressure on the Soviet system led to its subversion and the collapse of the Soviet State. Surely, it is worth mentioning here that this transformation seemed to be much an easier task in comparison, as the large parts of the Eastern European public desperately awaited American liberation, which is definitely not the case when we consider the population of the Middle East. While huge sectors of Polish, Czech or Hungarian societies have felt they were actually oppressed by the Soviet domination, a lot of people in the Middle East believe that their real oppressor is the U.S.A. itself, so they do not need more American presence there. Hence, it is not yet clear whether American military and political pressure succeeds with the transformation of the *Greater Middle East*, a clear goal of current American foreign policy.

In Washington, Western European support was considered insignificant, what was a clear result not only of a current unilateral mood, so fashionable today in the D.C. corridors of power, but also of the Bosnia and Kosovo lessons. Former experience strengthened the disdain for asking “Europe” or “the World” for their permission for U.S. action in Iraq. The people standing behind the terrorist attacks were labelled *evil doers* and *mad fanatics*, deprived of any popular support, what made the impression that Bush administration was not interested at all in countering the presumed motives of terrorist actions, and limited itself to targeting the perpetrators and those who supported them. Some of the U.S. officials have even uttered that the war on terrorism could be finally and decisively won (by the simple extinction of terrorists and their base) – the clear result of an approach chosen by them to “explain” terrorists’ actions. (Frum and Perle 2003). Unfortunately, this vision of an isolated enemy of America, lacking any wider support or sympathy is far from being true. The sheer scale of anti-American resentments, so much visible today on every continent, has indicated that many governments and/or societies are willing to reject, or at least limit, the influence exerted by this country. Even if they did not openly support violent attacks against America, they felt no constraint to justify these attacks, and at least partially exculpate the perpetrators.

Interestingly, large parts of Western Europe, most notably France and Germany, have formed “moderate” anti-American camp in the UN Security Council, widening Euro-Atlantic gulf already existing there since the end of the Cold War. Many European intellectuals claimed that it was the U.S.A. and its imperial zeal, not *Al Qaeda*, which posed the greatest and real danger for the world’s stability and security. German governing elites cleverly utilised pacifism and growing anti-Americanism of its population to prevail in the upcoming parliamentary elections, and actively supported French policy to constrain Washington’s violent actions. In these two countries (as

well as in the U.S.A.) articles predicting the inevitable fall of the “American Empire” were hugely popular. (Todd 2002). Some other books, which became bestsellers, were suggesting that the *CIA* (and surely Israeli *Mosad*) were the true, deeply hidden puppet masters of these attacks, crafted to justify the future acts of U.S. aggression (or even that the whole “9/11 affair” had been fabricated – see Meyssan 2002, Wisniewski 2003). Franco-German efforts to stop American war against Saddam were soon joined by Russia, dreaming about the “multipolar” world, where the influence of the sole superpower was effectively curbed by the coalition of the local powers and, albeit with some reluctance, by China. This cannot come as a surprise – those states even previously hinted the need to limit U.S. influence. As Michael Glennon interestingly observes: **“Reactions to the United States’ gradual ascent to towering preeminence have been predictable: coalitions of competitors have emerged. Since the end of the Cold War, the French, the Chinese, and the Russians have sought to return the world to a more balanced system.”** (emphasis added – RMM) France’s former foreign minister Hubert Vedrine openly confessed this goal in 1998: “We cannot accept... a politically unipolar world,” he said, and “that is why we are fighting for a multipolar” one. French President Jacques Chirac has battled tirelessly to achieve this end. According to Pierre Lellouche, who was Chirac’s foreign policy adviser in the early 1990s, his boss wants “a multipolar world in which Europe is the counterweight to American political and military power.” Explained Chirac himself, “any community with only one dominant power is always a dangerous one and provokes reactions.” In recent years, Russia and China have displayed a similar preoccupation; indeed, this objective was formalized in a treaty the two countries signed in July 2001, explicitly confirming their commitment to “a multipolar world.” President Vladimir Putin has declared that Russia will not tolerate a unipolar system, and China’s former president Jiang Zemin has said the same. Germany, although it joined the cause late, has recently become a highly visible partner in the effort to confront American hegemony. Foreign Minister Joschka Fischer said in 2000 that the “core concept of Europe after 1945 was and still is a rejection of [...] the hegemonic ambitions of individual states.” Even Germany’s former chancellor Helmut Schmidt recently weighed in, opining that Germany and France “share a common interest in not delivering ourselves into the hegemony of our mighty ally, the United States.” (Glennon 2003).

Any remaining sympathy towards America finally ended, when the Bush administration had decided to wage a war against Saddam Hussein and his oppressive regime, not only in order to capture rich oil fields there, but also to start a radical transformation of the whole region towards some form of a participatory political system, providing a minimum of freedom for its

inhabitants. Ironically, the idea that democracy may be brought to the Middle East on the American tanks, has been rejected by many European intellectuals as the *Neo-Bolshevism*; they eagerly used this opportunity to *de(con)struct* it and reveal the *real* motives of the American aggressors – primarily their greed for oil and the will to conquer the world. (see e.g. Todorov 2003). This war has provided a perfect opportunity for all *peace lovers* to justify the thesis that the real oppressors are usually the Americans, driven by their murky interests and ready to subject all other countries to their neo-colonial will. Objecting political elites received huge support from their citizens, taking part in many loud and widely broadcasted protest marches, organized along Western Europe. Ultimately, after a decade of hidden but growing tensions, the “Old” Europeans managed to detach themselves from an alliance with the country, which successfully guarded their territorial integrity against the Soviet Union since 1945 (through NATO), and supported the slow process of economic and political unification with money (Marshall’s Plan) and tacit political support. What was impossible during the Cold War, when the political leaders of the European societies firmly attached themselves to the leadership of America, is clearly possible now, when they tend to limit the American power. The clear result of this message, so widespread in the European media is that today, according to a recent EU opinion poll, European public deeply believes that only Israel outstrips the U.S.A. as a country posing the greatest threat to world’s stability.

It seems that both the majority of European political and intellectual elites, and the European public prefer to suggest that actions mounted by the *warriors of jihad* and their followers are now directed solely against America, its power and culture, and they try to forget French bloody experience with Islamic terrorism from the middle 90s. They want to believe that *Al Qaeda* is fighting not with the West, but with America and Israel. Even Madrid and London bombings were frequently interpreted as a punishment for the pro-American policies developed by the then Spanish and current British governments, which actively supported U.S. occupation of Iraq. That feeds the illusion that disengagement from America can win the hearts and minds of the Islamic terrorists and their sympathisers and, consequently, would secure these populations from the terrorist threat. They also seem to think that ideas and practices forwarded by America are significantly different from those originated from the Old Continent. This latter view received a powerful support from an American neoconservative, Robert Kagan who claimed that “*the Americans are from Mars and the Europeans are from Venus*” (Kagan 2002). Influential intellectuals on the both sides of the Atlantic have started to believe that growing transatlantic tensions over Iraq allow them to bury the concept of the “West”, traditional-

ly consisting of (Western) Europe and (Northern) America, based on social practices and institutions coming from a long and common, albeit frequently violent, history.

4. CLASHES OVER U.S. INTERVENTION IN IRAQ

So far, the most visible tensions were to be observed in the UN Security Council, where U.S. administration clashed not only with China and Russia, but primarily with France and Germany, over the UN resolution allowing America to use force to oust Saddam. As we know, ultimately U.S. officials failed to persuade their opponents to accept such a resolution. Surely, it does not mean that the whole Europe decided to oppose the U.S. administration. The governments of Great Britain, Italy, Spain, Poland and Portugal openly supported American actions in Iraq. It is worth mentioning, however, that the majority of the population of these states did not support their leaders – their attitude was much better expressed by President Chirac and Chancellor Schroeder. The result is that these pro-American leaders have already lost their offices (like Spanish Prime Minister Jose Maria Aznar and Polish PM Leszek Miller) or are about to lose them soon (Tony Blair).

M. J. Glennon interestingly describes these events: “[...] **in pursuing power, states use those institutional tools that are available to them. For France, Russia, and China, one of those tools is the Security Council and the veto that the charter affords them. It was therefore entirely predictable that these three countries would wield their veto to snub the United States and advance the project that they had undertaken: to return the world to a multipolar system.** During the Security Council debate on Iraq, the French were candid about their objective. The goal was never to disarm Iraq. Instead, “the main and constant objective for France throughout the negotiations,” according to its UN ambassador, was to “strengthen the role and authority of the Security Council” (and, he might have added, of France). France’s interest lay in forcing the United States to back down, thus appearing to capitulate in the face of French diplomacy. **The United States, similarly, could reasonably have been expected to use the council – or to ignore it – to advance Washington’s own project: the maintenance of a unipolar system.** “The course of this nation,” President Bush said in his 2003 State of the Union speech, “does not depend on the decisions of others.” The likelihood is that had France, Russia, or China found itself in the position of the United States during the Iraq crisis, each of these countries would have used the council – or threatened to ignore it – just as the United States did. Similarly, had Washington found itself in the position

of Paris, Moscow, or Beijing, it would likely have used its veto in the same way they did. States act to enhance their own power – not that of potential competitors. **That is no novel insight; it traces at least to Thucydides, who had his Athenian generals tell the hapless Melians, “You and everybody else, having the same power as we have, would do the same as we do.” This insight involves no normative judgement; it simply describes how nations behave.** (emphasis added – RMM)” (Glennon 2003).

Iraqi case is an interesting exercise of *realpolitik* in the post-Cold War world: an attempt to trammel the one and only remaining superpower (or even *hyperpower* in French parlance) by the *coalition of willing, though not mighty*. It was also pretty clear that these efforts were bound to fail – it was simple unrealistic to use the international law to block U.S. actions, as current Washington’s administration frequently proved it did not think that international organisations could subvert its sovereign right to act independently, when in need. Glennon presents an interesting prediction of the future events: “If the war is swift and successful, if the United States uncovers Iraqi WMD that supposedly did not exist, and if nation-building in Iraq goes well, there likely will be little impulse to revive the council. In that event, the council will have gone the way of the League of Nations. American decision-makers will thereafter react to the council much as they did to NATO following Kosovo: **Never again**. Ad hoc coalitions of the willing will effectively succeed it. If, on the other hand, the war is long and bloody, if the United States does not uncover Iraqi WMD, and if nation-building in Iraq falters, the war’s opponents will benefit, claiming that the United States would not have run aground if only it had abided by the charter. But the Security Council will not profit from America’s ill fortune. Coalitions of adversaries will emerge and harden, lying in wait in the council and making it, paradoxically, all the more difficult for the United States to participate dutifully in a forum in which an increasingly ready veto awaits it.” (Glennon 2003).

The result was that the Euro-Atlantic atmosphere was significantly spoiled, and many European states had to decide – **either they were with U.S. or with the Franco-German tandem supported by China and Russia**. Some governments decided to support the European *core* (Belgium, Luxembourg), some, mentioned earlier, decided to support America. The choice of their societies, however, was pretty obvious – the majority of them was against the invasion on Iraq and showed their attitude during loud and well-publicised protest marches in the streets of the numerous European capitals.

The recent enlargement of the European Union has increased the complexity of transatlantic relations in this respect that it enlarged the conflicting camps within the EU. Some states, most notably Poland and the Baltic

republics – Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia, consider active U.S. presence in Europe as a chief guarantor of their newly regained independence. Hence, from their perspective, NATO is the main vehicle for truly effective defence and security policies, valuable precisely *because* this organisation implies *close* relations with the U.S.A. The European Union is still perceived primarily as an economic organisation, providing financial assistance to the new members and having rather scarce defence and security assets. It seems that these states have treated ambitious plans for any closer and deeper political cooperation within EU (including truly *common* foreign and defence policy), with some scepticism and reluctance, *because* they are not sure whether it is aimed at the reduction of American presence in Europe. These states, observing clashes over Iraq in the UN Security Council, were confronted with an intriguing question – how could they trust that these European states, which were actively cooperating with Russia (former totalitarian Eastern Europe oppressor) and China (still an authoritarian state) to block American (still Western liberal democracy) action to subvert the tyrannical regime, ruthlessly harassing its own population, would **ever** act in their defence, if there was such a need (even if currently it seems to be highly unlikely). They believed that it was the U.S. which was willing to use the military force to forward its vital interests, so it would be better for them to support this country. They hope that the sphere of American interests includes their region and would shelter them against some external enemy, when this is the case. Their *perception* of possible security threats in Europe is significantly different than the perception of Western European states, which strongly believe that it is simply unrealistic to expect in the future any hostile attempt against any EU state. It cannot come as a surprise that the biggest of them – Poland – the country which stubbornly supported the U.S. actions in Iraq, earned a well-deserved nickname *American Trojan donkey* in the German press (apparently, slightly nobler animal – *a horse* – is reserved for the Brits), and annoyed the French President, Jacques Chirac to that extent that he could not help himself of giving them a valuable and pretty rude advice to be quiet when (the *mafia-styled*) “members of the family” were quarrelling.

Some other CEECs, during the diplomatic row over Iraq, decided to follow this advice of the French President and used this opportunity not to express their views. When, after the failure of the Brussels summit in December 2003 (due to the opposition of Spain and Poland), France and Germany mentioned their willingness to build *two speeds Europe* unless the constitutional treaty was to be accepted, they promptly declared their will to join *the European core*. They have probably assessed that cohesive and politically integrated United Europe will significantly transform the security dilemma on the continent. When Prague or Budapest is considered as

European as Paris or Berlin, none would ever plan to attack them. They probably expected the ultimate decline of the American influence over Europe and preferred to side themselves with the major decision-makers there. It seems that the “New” Europe is also pretty divided, as far as the transatlantic relations are concerned. Some states are going to support the “British” tradition of keeping America in, trying to build their own version of the *special relations*, some other are willing to join the old French plan to build the European Union as a counterweight to America in a new, truly multipolar world.

The rift between the two sides of the Atlantic seems to be an obvious and inevitable result of the end of the global rivalry between the U.S. and Soviet Union 15 years ago (due to the demise of the latter). Potential Soviet threat firmly kept both sides of the Atlantic united in their resistance, what gave them a ground for common political stance, when necessary. It cannot come as a surprise: lack of a common enemy is a frequent cause for disentanglement in human societies. Now, when this uniting threat has long been gone, both sides are prone to perceive each other as potential competitors in the global economic struggle, which superseded former ideological and military conflict, framing the globe during the Cold War. Integrational processes in Western Europe, which now include Central and Eastern Europe, are providing European Union with a unique opportunity to make itself independent of the American protection. Soviet Empire no longer endangers the security of Europe, so it does not need American military shelter anymore (though new, *assertive* Russia will try to exert as much influence as it is possible using its primary weapon – **gas**, this time not to *conquer* Western Europe, but to *control* this continent). This continent has to strive with its own *power* (economic) and *weakness* (demographic, political and military), particularly with the newly reunited Germany, this continent’s *colossus*, being in the past frequently a European troublemaker and, even more importantly, with the influx of immigrants, who instead of *adjusting themselves* to the European society intend to *adjust Europe* to their culture. Current U.S. administration is no longer willing to support the deeper integration of this continent as it may create a serious challenger to the project of a new American century. Hence it is trying to use some “Old” and some “New” European countries, known for their unconditional support for the U.S. actions, to slow this process and diminish the closeness of the economic and political bonds. On the other side of the Atlantic, there are those willing to build a new European identity on the anti-American fundament, following the vision of the two famous European philosophers: Jacques Derrida and Jurgen Habermas (accidentally being of the French and German origin). As Dominique Moisi interestingly observes: **“It is as if, divided over its institutional and geographic future, Europe**

feels that it must exist as an alternative to the United States – a different and better West. European intellectuals, such as J. Habermas and Jacques Derrida, see in the recent antiwar demonstrations the emergence of a European civil society that chooses to define itself negatively against the United States. It is unfortunate that Europeans have not chosen to define themselves positively in the name of a clear project from Europe. **Unlike anti-American sentiments in the past, this breed of anti-Americanism is not so much a reaction to what the United States does as a reaction to what it represents. Although French President Jacques Chirac was clearly not speaking in the name of most European governments when he spectacularly opposed the United States over the war in Iraq, he was in tune with European public opinion.** (emphasis added – RMM)’’ (Moisi 2003).

5. THE END OF THE WEST?

It seems that as long as the European “core” is going to exploit this growing anti-Americanism of the large sector of the European public to forward futile plans to build the superpower to counterweight America, and the U.S. administration is going to treat the European Union as a challenger and, consequently, tries to sideline Europe, the Euro-Atlantic relations will remain where they currently are, or even deteriorate. Both attempts seem to be rather utopian and cannot be considered as the promising political projects – neither European Union will manage to be soon a serious contender to the almost-omnipotent power of the U.S.A., nor America will manage to ignore the position of Europe, whatever it is. But, as a result of these reckless actions of both sides, the transatlantic rift may grow even larger, and the division on the European “core” (led, obviously, by the Franco-German alliance joined by the coalition of willing to support their project) and “peripheral” states, consisted of those who are not happy with the aforementioned leadership in Europe (and less economically integrated) may finally consolidate. The revival of the concept of Europe of “concentric circles” or “two speeds”, immediately after the failure of the December 2003 EU summit in Brussels, is particularly significant. This summit showed that Europe was divided over the Franco-German leadership and its project for this continent’s prospective role and functions. Further rejection of the Constitutional treaty in the referenda in France and Holland even increased the mess, so the nearest future of the European Union is not clear – it does not know neither its own structure and legal basis nor its borders (enlargement – the case of Turkey) – current solutions are temporary, but no one

knows what kind of more permanent project will be accepted, if any. Moreover, this continent is doomed to face **demographic crisis** leading to the deep reconstruction of its population – it's hard to believe today that, first, the growing number of relatively young pensioners allow to keep economic growth in the long term and, second, the increasing pressure from the immigrant population, prevalently Muslim, is not going to lead to more social and cultural tensions, not only in the suburbs of European cities. It seems that within the next decade both Europe and the European Union will be facing a huge number of considerable challenges (structural, social, demographical, economic), seeking for a small number of reasonable solutions. This is not an easy task as quite a lot of these challenges are not even properly named and still their existence is denied by the politically correct leaders of European public opinion. Even though relations with the U.S.A. improved to some extent three years after Iraqi invasion, still there is a lot of hostility towards the American presence in Iraq and the *means* used by the American hegemon in its fight against Islamic transnational terrorist groups. Only recently both Council of Europe and European Commission highlighted clearly its contempt towards these European governments, which provided assistance and support to American security *apparatus* and let it capture suspected terrorists or transport them via European airports and airspace.

While these transatlantic and intereuropean divisions grow even wider, we can easily expect the decline of the Western civilization (if such has ever existed) and be witnesses to the reappearance of the (Western) European and American civilizations. (see also Hutton 2003; Glucksmann 2003; Kupchan 2002). What sort of contacts between them would eventually prevail – reluctant co-operation, open hostility or, not very likely, true friendship based on the common interests – today remains a mystery. D. Moisi presents “[t]he **worst-case scenario [...] for America's West to turn into an oversized Prussia – bullying, brooding, and obsessed with military might – and Europe's West into an oversized Switzerland – selfish and parochial, wrapped in neutrality.** (emphasis added – RMM). To avert this result, positive, rather than negative, definitions of transatlantic identity must be invoked by leaders on both continents. In constructing a new partnership, the unique legitimacy conferred by the international community will be key. To this end, both sides together must lead the way in reforming the UN, so that it becomes an institution with teeth, genuinely respected by the international community. Rather than competing for global influence or attempting to outdo one another in hard or soft power, the United States and Europe must accept a de facto division between their spheres of influence: a new Monroe Doctrine for a changed world. Finally, both sides must make a determined effort to transcend their natural prejudices, overcoming petty inferiority or superiority complexes. Europeans must

accept the United States' unique international status and Americans must rediscover the virtues of modesty and self-restraint." (Moisi 2003). Moreover, both will undergo significant *internal* changes, probably going in different directions (further secularization and dechristianization of Europe, making its culture even more *progressively postmodern* and fragile to the, sometimes violent, *incursions of the other*, and in case of America, *conservative revolution*, leading to the increase of religious influence over society). But let us hope that we have not reached a *point of no return* yet and all sides of this conflict reconsider their positions and will correct their shortsighted policies. I strongly believe that both Europe and America deeply need each other, and they can and should cooperate – the world also needs this firm transatlantic partnership. There are still a lot of common values and interests left, which provide a common ground for close cooperation. Only if this kind of a transatlantic unity is maintained, the world can hope for the resolution of so many conflicts and problems in so many places in the world (e.g. war on terrorism, WMD proliferation, conflict in Palestine/Israel, recent Russian *assertiveness*, conflict in Chechnya, the future of Kosovo, ethnic cleansing in Sudan, human rights violation, poverty and hunger etc.). If not, this serious conflict joins the long list of already existing ones, and certainly would not improve the state of world affairs. Let me finish with these resolute words of Dominique Moisi: "To future historians, November 9, 1989, will mark the end of the old West – and the beginning of a dissonance between European and American interests. **Let us hope that the bitter rivalry witnessed in the aftermath of September 11, 2001, will go down as a temporary emotional rupture, rather than as the end of a constructive transatlantic partnership.**" (emphasis added – RMM) (Moisi 2003). So far, however, the latter seems to be based on wishful thinking rather than down to the earth, realistic analysis of the transatlantic relations in the XXI century.

REFERENCES

- Chomsky, N. (2001). (an interview by David Barsamian), "The United States is a Leading Terrorist State", *The Monthly Review*, November.
- Chomsky, N. (2003). *Hegemony or Survival: America's Quest for Global Dominance (The American Empire Project)*. Metropolitan Books, New York.
- Colombani, J. M. (2002). *Tous Américains? Le monde après le 11 septembre 2001*. Fayard, Paris.
- Cottey, A. (1998). *NATO Transformed: the Atlantic Alliance in a New Era*. [in:] W. Park, G. Wyn Rees (eds), *Rethinking Security in post – Cold War Europe*. Longman, London.
- Davidson, I. (1988). *A New Step in Franco – British Co – operation*, [in:] Y. Boyer, P. Lelouche and J. Roper (eds), *Franco-British Defense Co-operation: a New Entente Cordiale*. Rotledge, London.

- Frum, D.** and **Perle, R.** (2003). *An End to Evil: How to Win the War on Terror*. Random House, New York.
- Glennon, M. J.** (2003). "Why the Security Council Failed", *Foreign Affairs*, May/June 2003; www.foreignaffairs.org/20030501faessay11217/michael-j-glennon/why-the-security-council-failed.html
- Glucksmann, A.** (2003). *Ouest contre Ouest*. Plon, Paris.
- Hill, Ch.** (1993). "The Capability – Expectations Gap, or Conceptualising Europe's International Role". *Journal of Common Market Studies* 31: 3.
- Hill, Ch.** (1998). *Closing the capabilities – expectations gap*, [in:] **J. Peterson, H. Sjursen** (eds), *A Common Foreign Policy for Europe? Competing Visions of the CFSP*. Routledge, London.
- Howorth, J.** (1997). *France*, [in:] **J. Howorth, A. Menon** (eds), *The European Union and National Defence Policy*. Routledge, London.
- Hutton, W.** (2003). *The World We're In*. Abacus, London.
- Kagan, R.** (2003). *Of Paradise and Power. America and Europe in the New World Order*. Random House, New York.
- Kagan, R.** (2002). "Power and Weakness", [in:] *Policy Review*, June/July 2002 at: http://www.policyreview.org/JUN02/kagan_print.html
- Kupchan, Ch.** (2002). *The End of the American Era: U.S. Foreign Policy and the Geopolitics of the Twenty-first Century*. Knopf, New York.
- Letter from United States Citizens to Friends in Europe*, at: [_letter_to_europeans.html](#)
- Meysan, T.** (2002). *La Terrible Impostura*, El Ateneo; (English ed. *9/11: The Big Lie*. Carnot USA Books, New York.
- Moisi, D.** (2003). "Reinventing the West". *Foreign Affairs*, November/December 2003 at: www.foreignaffairs.org/20031101faessay82607/dominique-moisi/reinventing-the-west.html
- Moore, M.** (2003) *Dude, Where's My Country?* Warner Books, Clayton.
- Scraton, P.** (ed.) (2002). *Beyond September 11. An Antology of Dissent*, Pluto Press, London.
- Serre de La, F.** (1996). [in:] **Ch. Hill**, (ed.), *The Actors in Europe's Foreign Policy*. Routledge, London.
- Todd, E.** (2002). *Après l'empire. Essai sur la decomposition du systeme americain*. Editions Gallimard, Paris.
- Todorov, T.** (2003). *Le nouveau desordre mondial. Reflexions d'un Europeen*. Robert Laffont, Paris.
- Vidal, G.** (2002). *Dreaming War: Blood for Oil and the Cheney-Bush Junta*. Thunder's Mouth Press.
- Wisnewski, G.** (2003). *Operation 9/11. Angriff auf den Globus*. Droemer/Knaur.
- Wyllie, J. H.** (1997). *European Security in the New Political Environment*. Longman, London.