

‘CFSP and ESDI: US-EU Aspects – The Necessary Fiction’

Paper Prepared for

1997 ECSA 5th Biennial International Conference
Seattle, Washington

Panel on

The EU’s Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) and
the European Security and Defence Identity (ESDI)

Dr Simon Duke
Head

International Relations & European Studies Programme
The Central European University
Nádor utca 9
H-1051 Budapest
HUNGARY

Ph: 36-1 327 3074
E-m: simond@ceu.hu

Draft Version. Please do not quote without permission of the author. Comments welcome.

CFSP and ESDI: US-EU Aspects – The Necessary Fiction?

Introduction

The end of the cold war saw a fundamental rethinking of the nature of security, with less emphasis being placed on military aspects of security, and more being given to non-military or 'soft' aspects of security. This marked a logical progression from the collapse of the bloc system marked with its vying nuclear-armed alliances. The immediate post-cold war years were also accompanied by speculation about the role of the U.S. which in the cold war years had been defined primarily in terms of active military assistance to its European (and other) allies. The ushering in of a more general definition of security appeared to diminish the compelling need for expensive U.S. military commitment to Europe and gave rise to European concerns of a latter day Wilsonian-type neo-isolationism, or the adoption of a more active U.S. role in the Pacific Rim, to the detriment of its relations with Europe.

The uncertainty surrounding the role of the U.S. generated many false hopes and expectations, amongst them was the idea that the European allies should strengthen European security structures, either to protect against possible neo-isolationist impulses in the U.S. or as a means of persuading Washington that the U.S. should continue to play an active -- even leading -- role in the security of the region. Such speculation, which inevitably accompanied this transition, has led to several myths about the role of the U.S. in post-cold war European security. Amongst these two stand out: that the U.S. is developing ties with Asia as an alternative to those with its European allies and; as a consequence, the U.S. has had no clear vision for post-cold war European security. It is argued here that the claims relating to the refocusing of American energies and interests towards the Pacific Rim have been exaggerated and that the Bush and Clinton administrations have actually had rather clear concepts of post-cold war European security and the U.S. interests in it. If anyone lacked vision regarding post-cold war European security, it was the major European powers themselves. The somewhat fuzzy ideas about 'Euro' security and the perceived need for European alternatives, in either the form of the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP), the European Security and Defence Initiative (ESDI), or the Eurocorps, has made a compromise necessary between the need for structures that *appear* to be European and those that reflect the continued importance of the Transatlantic element in European security – this idea I have termed the *necessary fiction* of post-cold war European security.

The CFSP and ESDI are the institutional embodiments of this necessary fiction for the U.S. and its European allies: on the one hand they allow France and Germany to pursue the general goal of European integration with a security element, without which integration would not be complete; on the other hand, these 'Euro' structures are in fact highly dependent upon U.S. good will, leadership and

resources. This fact has helped to retain U.S. interest in European security as well as securing support for an enhanced European security role on the part of the more staunch pro-Atlanticist allies. In addition, a number of flexible arrangements have served to keep NATO at the centre of European security organisations. These arrangements have focused on enhancing the political role of the Alliance, such as the formation of task-sharing arrangements with the Western European Union (WEU). Central to both the national and institutional adjustments is the Combined Joint Task Force (CJTF) concept which serves as the critical link between the 'Euro' options and the Atlantic pillar and which facilitates the accommodation of a variety of diverse approaches to European security, while avoiding the disruption and maybe dissolution of Europe's security institutions.

The idea of a necessary fiction is explored below in a number of interrelated segments. The first section considers the nature of America's self-appointed 'global leadership' role in the post-cold war system, concentrating on the declinist versus global dominance arguments. The second section attempts to consider the Euro-defence debate in the context of overall transatlantic relations. The third section considers the question of whether the U.S. is reorienting its interests away from Europe towards the Pacific Rim. This section concludes by arguing that although Asia presents attractive markets for the U.S. strong economic and cultural links to Europe remain that, on balance, ensure a central position for Europe in U.S. foreign affairs. The next section considers the issue of whether fractious trade relations between the U.S. and the EU pose a challenge to the formation or enhancement of security ties between the two. It is suggested that The New Transatlantic Agenda may provide a useful vehicle for adjunct to the security dialogue by addressing trade and non-security related concerns.

The fifth section examines the background and content of the two grand compromises (NATO's 1990 London Declaration and the January 1994 Brussels summit) that have shaped post-cold war European security. The most significant practical outcome of these compromises is the CJTF concept which, it is argued, has effectively consolidated U.S. leadership in both the NATO context but also, in a *de facto* manner in the exercise of 'Euro' options. As an interesting, but illustrative aside, the supply and dissemination of intelligence is considered as a significant example of this consolidation. The conclusion argues that the necessary fiction has established a workable *modus vivendi* where the main interests of the main actors are served and which may also constitute a stable platform for the development of other aspects of transatlantic relations.

America, = I still?

The few years since the end of the cold war have seen a series of attempts to make sense of the much changed international system – Francis Fukuyama's 'The End of History,' Samuel Huntington's 'Clash of Civilisations,' and Michael Doyle's observations on liberal states' propensity not to engage in conflict with each other – to name but a few.² Not unnaturally, theorising about the shape of the

international system has also focused attention on the role of the U.S. with the poles being marked by Paul Kennedy's and Joseph Nye. Kennedy pondered whether the U.S. would fall prey to modern variants of imperial overstretch, whereby "Great Powers in relative decline instinctively respond by spending more on "security" and thereby divert potential resources from "investment" and compound their long-term dilemma."³ While in *Bound to Lead* Nye argues that in the absence of firm hegemonic leadership, instability or even chaos could ensue. To Nye the "Twin dangers that Americans face are complacency about the domestic agenda and the unwillingness to invest in order to maintain confidence in their capacity for international leadership. Neither is warranted. The United States remains the largest and richest world power with the greatest capacity to shape the future."⁴ In the same year that Kennedy's book appeared, David Calleo's equally provocatively tome⁵ appeared and, together, they fuelled much of what became known as the declinist debate.⁶ For neo-realists, hegemony or leadership is an important element of stability in the international system based on the assumption that the hegemonic state as well as less powerful states benefit from this arrangement. Unsurprisingly, mainly American academics rejected the declinist approaches and saw stability still resting largely upon its continued and unique ability to lead. In order to support their arguments about America's continuing vitality, the U.S. role in European security and, more specifically, its role in NATO, has been pointed to as the prime multilateral expression of this leadership and as the most enduring symbol of American leadership.⁷

Thus, despite the various end of millennium pronouncements of the dawning of a 'Pacific century' and the reorientation of U.S. interests towards the Pacific Rim, it is still in European security and the extent to which the U.S. assumes the leadership of NATO or the degree to which it has had to compromise with 'Euro' designs, that remains as one of the most important benchmarks of America's hegemonic virility. However some see the hegemonic role that the U.S. assumed in NATO during the cold war as a dangerous measure of its post-cold war position. For instance, David Calleo has argued that NATO today is 'essentially an American protectorate for Europe. As such, it is increasingly unviable.' He argues that global changes have introduced altered distributions of resources and power and that, 'even if the fundamental common interests of the United States and Western Europe dictate a continuation of the Atlantic Alliance ... the old hegemonic arrangements cannot continue without becoming self-destructive.'⁸ It should be noted that the negative changes in U.S. resources and power, to which Calleo refers and which Nye disputes, depend very much upon the variables chosen to measure the relative decline or strength of the U.S.

In rhetorical terms, the end of the cold war was greeted by the 'unipolar' moment or the recognition that the U.S. had survived the cold war as the only intact superpower – just how intact became a focus of the declinist debate referred to above. To President Clinton the U.S. was the 'world's strongest force for peace and freedom, and for security and prosperity.'¹⁰ It is also a country with a historical mission: 'The burden of American leadership and the importance of it, indeed, the *essential character of American leadership* is one of the great lessons of the 20th century. It will be an even more powerful

reality in the 21st century ...Wherever I go, whomever I talk with, the message to me is the same. We believe in America. We trust America. We want American to lead. And America must lead.¹¹ Just as modestly, Warren Christopher pondered, 'American leadership is our first principle and a central lesson of this century. The simple fact is that if we do not lead, no one else will.'¹² In line with Clinton's enlargement and engagement strategies, Strobe Talbott pointed out that 'the world continues to look to the United States for leadership not just because of our economic and military might, but also because we are at our best when promoting and defending the same political principles abroad that we live by at home.'¹³

In the search for the latter-day complement to Kennan's containment strategy different (and telling) slogans were bandied around such as Dick Cheney's 'World Dominance,' George Bush's 'New World Order,' Al Gore's 'Global Civilization,' and eventually, the winner, 'enlargement' of the community of democracies and market economies, emerged.¹⁴ As an important adjunct to enlargement, 'engagement' has also been stressed so that the U.S. remains involved in peacetime activities beyond its borders.¹⁵ Although it is easy, from a non-American perspective, to dismiss such statements as hyperbole, they are nevertheless important as statements of belief that would be incredible in many other countries but, in the U.S. context, they act as a powerful brake on neo-isolationism since with self-proclaimed leadership, dominance, or hegemony, comes an active global role.

The fears of neo-isolationism held by internationalists within Congress and by Europeans have not only been exaggerated but display a misunderstanding of the effects on the U.S. of the end of the cold war. For the European audience in particular these concerns were fuelled by Under Secretary of State, Peter Tarnoff, who on 25 May 1993 put forward the controversial idea that U.S. economic interests are 'paramount' and that, faced with finite resources, 'the U.S. must define the 'extent of its commitments' and that this may, 'on occasion fall short of what some Americans would like and others would hope for.'¹⁶ Although the statement was rapidly disavowed by the State Department, it has in effect become the *leitmotif* for post-cold war U.S. security policy and was enshrined by the Clinton administration by Presidential Decision Directive 25.¹⁷ European fears of American neo-isolationism were reinforced by the Congressional elections of November 1994, which ushered in a Republican majority, and the appointment of Senator Jessie Helms as chair of the Senate Foreign Relations committee, both of these events served to underline the importance of the domestic agenda in American politics. The tension between those who advocate a primarily domestic agenda versus those who advocate a more internationalist 'global leadership' role,¹⁸ is manifest in the European security context with the unspoken assumptions that the European allies should do more to provide for their own security but, at the same time American willingness and ability to assume a leadership role has remained generally unchanged.

The leadership role of the U.S. in European security is not only assumed but a policy goal of the Clinton administration. For instance, the Department of Defense publication *Security Strategy for Europe and NATO*, states that 'preserving and enhancing the effectiveness of European security organizations, especially NATO,' is the 'principal vehicle for continued United States leadership and influence on

European security issues.¹⁹ In the discussion below, the question about whether the Atlantic Alliance is primarily about securing western Europe, or whether it is fundamentally about power relationships, would seem irrelevant – it is assumed that it is not only about defending U.S. and allied interests in Europe but also about ‘strengthening the U.S. leadership role in European affairs.’²⁰

The special role played by the U.S. also comes to the fore when a broader perspective is considered beyond the immediate confines of NATO. Within the Clinton administration much emphasis has been given to expanding the ‘zone of stability,’ which will be attained as the result of ‘prudent security investments in Central and Eastern Europe [which are] likely to parallel the economic benefits we derived from our 40-year security relationship with our NATO allies: increasing employment opportunities, expanded selection of products, and profitable investments and exports.’²¹ To historians perhaps, this will be one of the legacies of the Clinton era – the explicit link between the free trade, expanding markets and democracy, with the U.S. as a catalyst and guarantor which, especially in central Europe, may give birth to stable market democracies. It is also worth noting that for the U.S., in its role as *global* leader, Europe’s significance also lies in its proximity to other areas of geopolitical interest, such as the Mediterranean and the Persian Gulf. The argument could therefore be forwarded that the adaptation and preservation of NATO, including the active engagement of the U.S., is intimately linked to America’s wider international role and status. It would also be quite natural for the U.S. to simultaneously expand its links with Asia and to expand its institutional ties in the region, for example with APEC. Such an expansion of institutional ties need not be a zero-sum game.²²

The Euro-defence debate in the Transatlantic context

Underpinning the debate about hegemonic stability in the current European context, as elsewhere, is the question of *motivation*: more specifically, what incentives does the U.S. have to continue to provide a public good (security) which may be of benefit to less powerful actors and, just as significantly, what incentives are there for less powerful actors to accept a hegemon in the absence of a compelling motive (or threat) to do so? The cold war in western Europe was marked not only by the provision of U.S. leadership and significant resources, but by the assumption that the defence of the U.S. began in Europe and the awareness that, ‘The entire area of Western Europe is in first place an area of strategic importance to the United States.’²³ Self-interest was therefore a significant motive, but not the only one, guiding U.S. policy towards European security. With the end of the cold war there are significant contrasts in the position of the U.S. compared to 1945, especially in its relative economic power, where it can no longer lay claim to 45 percent of the world’s GNP. In addition, the post-cold war international system poses no compelling military threat to the U.S. or its European allies and, inevitably, the willingness of the U.S. to lead and the receptiveness of its allies to be led has shifted. Although it would be inaccurate to portray the cold war years as bereft of differences between the allies (for instance,

Suez comes to mind) the gravity of the consequences of disagreements were circumscribed by the overarching Soviet military threat. With the end of the cold war this constraint has been removed, most notably with reference to relation with third parties and trade. The third party differences include, to name a few, 'the provision of support to Muslim-dominated Bosnia, the priority of Israeli security needs in Middle Eastern policy, U.S. efforts to penalize foreign companies that do business with Iran and Cuba, the maintenance of full economic sanctions against Iraq, and the part human rights and weapons proliferation concerns should play in dealing with China.'²⁴ These disputes, and others, would appear to indicate that in post-cold war transatlantic relations there are an expanding number of issues that may lead to major policy differences with potentially adverse effects on common security.

Trade disputes have featured as some of the most hotly contested transatlantic issues. These disputes include the issue of 'what should or should not be included in the GATT negotiations, subsidies for the aerospace industries, 'open skies' air travel agreements, intellectual property rights, and domestic content stipulations for television and film. The Uruguay GATT round, concluded in 1993 after over six years of negotiation, was also particularly tortuous and protracted. Although other 'clubs' like the G7 also offer means to exert influence, the combined purchasing power of 380 million European consumers,²⁵ backed by an economic union, could soon outweigh much of the U.S.'s influence in trade. The frustrations of the American negotiators during their Uruguay round negotiations with their European counterparts 'shows the importance to the United States of the EU creating streamlined internal decision-making procedures that are conducive to international coöperation.'²⁶ Although there are preferential aspects to bargaining with a EU that can reach common positions on external trade in an efficient manner, a number of problems can be predicted such as European Monetary Union (EMU) increasing intra-EU trade (currently this is growing faster than trade between the EU and the rest of the world), it may also decrease EU sensitivity to currency fluctuations caused by the dollar, and the 'euro' currency unit may challenge the dollar as a major international transaction currency. For the foreseeable future, it would seem that trade relations constitute an unstable core for harmonious transatlantic relations.

Unlike trade, *security* remains an area in which the U.S. still has the ability to exert its considerable influence, though this too has potential for dispute. For instance, the disagreement between the U.S. and its allies over who should succeed Willy Claes as NATO Secretary-General, was prompted by Washington's perception that it had been inadequately consulted prior to public expressions of support for Ruud Lubbers by the European allies. The dispute (largely Franco-American) over NATO's southern command is touched on elsewhere but serves as a further example. It is also worth noting, in a different fora, the split between the U.S. and its European allies over whether Boutros Boutros-Ghali should be appointed as UN Secretary-General for a second period. Although the U.S. was outvoted on the Security Council (14-1) it is a testimony to American power and influence within the organisation that Boutros-Ghali was not reappointed.

The end of the cold war also led to heightened competition for resources between domestic and external programmes. In the U.S., the collapse of the Soviet Union saw an increased concentration on domestic issues such as the abortion issue (under Bush) and the 'gays in the military issue' (confronted by the newly elected President Clinton) to the detriment, as some feared, of any clear strategy or concept for foreign policy, let alone global leadership. Fears of neo-isolationism in the U.S. due to executive and congressional preoccupation with domestic issues were not however exclusively American. Amongst west European allies a similar pattern emerged: the familiar question of orientation across the Channel or the Atlantic came to the fore in Britain; the 'new German question' in France; the social and literal costs of reunification in Germany; the traumatic adjustments to the realities of market economies and post-communist regimes in central and eastern Europe; and the loss of superpower status for Russia, not to mention the tension between reformers and nationalists in the CIS countries. For the U.S. though, in its capacity as superpower, the problem of balancing domestic needs with the demands assumed by its self-proclaimed role of global leadership, posed a far more difficult challenge. The first general issue to be addressed was the obvious one of orientation – where do American interests lie?

Westward Ho?

Concern that with the end of the cold war the U.S. would lose interest in Europe, prompted by the rapid economic growth of east Asia and growing involvement in Latin America, fuelled speculation about a reorientation of U.S. interest towards the Pacific Rim. For instance, the German Embassy in Washington D.C. began to keep track of the movements of U.S. Congressmen and Senators. What they found was that just over 25 per cent of the members of Congress had been to China while scarcely 10 per cent visited Europe.²⁷ Other evidence, such as the growth in the number of Americans of Asian and Hispanic origins, has also prompted concern that the U.S. is down-grading the significance of Europe in its foreign affairs. While the demographic trends do indeed indicate that those of non-European origin are growing (those with Hispanic roots are growing faster than those with Asian origins) the majority of Americans still claim European ancestry or ethnic origin.²⁸ There are though some significant shifts that may eventually lead to a reorientation of U.S. policy in certain areas: for instance, nearly one in ten people in the U.S. is foreign born (around 24.5 million) and the current leading source for immigrants is Mexico (with 27.2 per cent of the 1996 foreign born population), followed by the Philippines, China, Cuba, India and Vietnam – before 1970 the countries immediately behind Mexico included Germany, Italy, Canada and Britain.²⁹ It is also important, when considering such data, to consider not just numbers but the representation of the various groups in elite positions – on these grounds, Europe has little to worry about.³⁰

Additionally, in official pronouncements the cultural ties between the U.S. and Europe continue to assume tremendous importance. One report notes that President Clinton's four trips to Europe in 1996

were seen as reflecting a historical fact: 'America has been a European power, it remains a European power, and it will continue to be a European power.'³¹ Clinton himself stressed the links between the shared culture and security as follows:

Nowhere are our interests more engaged than in Europe. When Europe is at peace, our security is strengthened. When Europe prospers, so does America. We have a special bond because our nation was formed from the hopes and dreams of those who came to our shores from across the Atlantic seeking religious freedom, fleeing persecution, looking for a better life... From the Pilgrims of 1620 to the Hungarian freedom fighters of 1956 – they gave America the strength of diversity and the passion for freedom. Remarkable generations of Americans invested in Europe's peace and freedom with their own sacrifice. They fought two world wars. They had the vision to create NATO and the Marshall Plan. The vigour of those institutions, the force of democracy, the determination of people to be free – all these helped to produce victory in the Cold War. But now that freedom has been won, it is this generation's responsibility to ensure that it will not be lost again, not ever.³²

These are though presumably links that will become less apparent as the Second World War generation who fought in Europe hand over the reins to the Vietnam generation. For the moment the appointment of a Czech-born, naturalised American, as Secretary of State will serve to ensure that Europe maintains a high profile in State Department concerns. Significantly, Madeleine Albright's first meeting as secretary was with representatives of the EU.³³

So, if there is still a strong European concentration (even bias) in the post-cold war administration, what should the general interest in the Pacific Rim and, more recently, in post-Deng China signify to the European capitals? It may merely indicate that U.S. relations with Europe are not an especially absorbing *political issue* in Washington D.C. (even the NATO enlargement issue is not especially contentious) whereas establishing closer trade relations with China and balancing that with human rights issues, is highly controversial. In spite of the fact that on several occasions Warren Christopher warned of an overly 'Euro-centric' attitude in the U.S. and spoke of the 'primacy of Asia,' many of America's key interests still lie in Europe.³⁴ The importance attached to the 'rising east' by the U.S. Congress and policymakers is due not so much to a reorientation away from Europe but the long-overdue recognition that, 'Since the days of Commodore Perry, the United States has been inconsistent in its Asia policy.'³⁵

By highlighting the significance of Asia to the U.S., the temptation would be to see Europe, and especially western Europe, as more or less stable and therefore less deserving of Washington's attention and effort than Latin American or Asia. Given the sizeable, but nonetheless finite, resources of the U.S., priorities will have to be specified and, the suggestion presented here, is that the security of Europe should

be amongst the highest priorities, if not the highest. This priority will not be easily established however. As Samuel Huntington observed, the U.S. is pulled simultaneously in three directions: south by immigration from Latin America and its NAFTA ties with Mexico; westward by the wealth of East Asia and the efforts to develop APEC as well as migration to the US; and toward Europe. Huntington sees the latter as the most important since, 'Shared values, institutions, history, and culture dictate the continuing close association of the United States and Europe.' He continues, 'Both necessary and desirable is the further development of institutional ties across the Atlantic, including negotiation of a European-American free trade agreement and creation of a North Atlantic Economic organization as a counterpart to NATO.'³⁶ Huntington also argues that preserving and promoting 'western' unity depends more on the U.S. than Europe.

Moreover, in spite of the well publicised differences between the U.S. and the EU on trade, the basic economic indicators suggest that there is potential for expanded ties.³⁷ For instance, The Department of State's Office of European Union and Regional Affairs, states that, 'The EU is the United States' largest trading partner,' with total US-EU trade at \$256 billion in 1995 (up from \$227 in 1994).³⁸ The U.S. and the EU are also one another's most significant source of foreign direct investment. By the end of 1994 the U.S. had invested more than \$251 billion in the EU while the latter had invested more than \$274 billion in the US.³⁹ Additionally, Europe has more of the world's GDP than any other region (35% in 1992 at market exchange rates or 27% at PPP exchange rates) and, in an aspect of trade often missed, Europe provides the U.S. with relatively *balanced trade*, with only a \$7 billion U.S. merchandise trade deficit in 1993, compared to \$115 billion for Asia.⁴⁰

Trade relations obviously cannot be separated from other aspects of transatlantic relations. This is reflected in a Department of Defense report which concluded, 'The [Eurasian] continent is also one of the world's greatest centers of economic power and represents a massive export market for U.S. products... Thus, our continued political, cultural, and economic well-being is inextricably tied to Europe.'⁴¹ These interrelated aspects of U.S. and EU relations are being explored and developed within the framework of the New Transatlantic Agenda (discussed in more detail below) as outlined in a speech given by Secretary Christopher in Madrid on 2 June 1995 and formally adopted by the U.S. on 3 December. What role though does *security* play in relations to the various aspects of U.S. and EU relations?

Security and trade or trade and security?

The neo-functional observation that integration occurs in functional increments, from those areas of least significance (or threat) to state sovereignty, to those of most importance (national security), would tend to suggest that sound economic relations should be established prior to security integration. Thus, a trade pact or North Atlantic Economic Organisation, of the type suggested by Huntington, would to neo-functionalists be a prerequisite for further integration and, eventually, through the spill-over

mechanism and increasingly complex interdependent links, a union would be established including security aspects. In counterpoint, a neo-realist perspective would tend to place security at the centre of any efforts at further integration. In the absence of security structures to inhibit or contain security competitions between the west Europeans, the chances of integration in other areas, according to the neo-realist perspective, would appear remote.

The acceptance of either of these two approaches depends heavily upon whether western Europe is thought to be stable and, if so, the extent to which western Europe could contribute more generally to the security of the region. Three arguments favour a neo-realist interpretation:

- ◆ The crisis in former Yugoslavia illustrated that there is a fundamental lack of common policy amongst the WEU countries and that, absent a firm initiative from the U.S., the tendency is toward friction and competition, not co-operation, as can be seen in the institutional wrangles which have marred the 'Euro defence' debate. In the absence of any common conception of security and responses, it is reasonable to question how common positions on other aspects of European relations could emerge, let alone lead to union.
- ◆ The reunification of Germany has fundamentally altered European security. Moreover the French and British reactions to reunification indicate that the traditional concerns regarding German power have not vanished. Having failed to halt reunification, the French reaction was to moderate Germany power and influence to the greatest extent possible while Britain attempted to build a balance against the possible effects of being, once again, in a Europe with Germany at its centre.
- ◆ The integration process in Europe took place because there were external security assurances and, as a matter of speculation, integration may well not have taken place if the task of designing security assurances fell solely to the west Europeans. The end of the cold war, the reduction in the U.S. military presence, and the reunification of Germany, means that if the EU is to thrive, it must either do so in its own security framework or within the transatlantic context. If it fails to do either, it may well revert to security competition and a loosening of the union and maybe ultimately the failure of the union.

Against this though it has to be observed that the major European powers have been willing to conduct their security relations through international organisations, albeit with differing emphasis placed on each respectively. Nevertheless, there is sufficient overlap between the membership of the main organisations to suggest that these powers are not merely manipulating international organisations as an extension of national interest and adversarial behaviour. Indeed, institutions play a critical role in European security since there is no obvious hegemon who is able or willing to impose order and thus interests and disputes must be expressed in a variety of multinational fora. Jack Snyder has most notably

forwarded the idea of neo-liberal institutionalism as a means of mitigating the Hobbesian condition by 'providing effective channels for reconciling conflicting interests.'⁴² Snyder's concern with avoiding Praetorian politics leads him to advocate a system of international organisations that would collectively work to prevent the emergence of such politics. Neo-liberal institutionalism though requires a willingness to work through institutions in an active manner while neo-realism reinforces the tendency to isolationism. Perhaps it is premature to make any sweeping observations about which tendency is prevalent since both would appear to be present.

Arguably, the U.S. is the main but not the only proponent of neo-liberal institutionalism in the European context while the major European powers exhibit some tendencies toward neo-realist behaviour. Since the U.S. is not a European power but has vital interests in Europe, a strong role within European institutions would seem vital. The U.S. must keep the semblance of even relations between its major European allies (in spite of frequent references to the German 'special relationship') and this is best done in security terms though NATO and a series of accommodations with European organisations. Britain, France and Germany though remain divided on the significance of individual European security organisations but play active roles in a number of institutions including, most importantly, NATO.⁴³ Unbridled neo-realist prognostications would suggest the increasing irrelevance of international institutions except, when convenient, as tools for Praetorian politics. It is all the more important for the U.S. to underline the utility of international organisations for regional (and international) security and in this regard its willingness to exercise leadership and assume substantial burdens within the Atlantic Alliance. The U.S. encouragement (even if half-hearted) of European security institutions is also vital to establishing order in Europe.

If there is a case to be made for a vigorous U.S. role in European security, what are the incentives for the U.S. to assume such a role? Some economic incentives have already been suggested, but there are also some compelling geopolitical considerations. These have been raised most directly by Christoph Bertram:

Europe is the main, if not the only, anchor tying the United States to extra-hemispheric international order. The anchor may not hold. America may become tired of a Europe absorbed with its own identity but continuing to need the involvement and perhaps the deterrent of the United States to prosper in peace. But if that happens, the United States will be saying farewell not only to Europe but to international commitments as well ... the only multilateral institution that holds U.S. foreign policy to a procedure of day-to-day consultation and coordination with other sovereign states is the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation that links Europe and North America. If this link were to break ... it would amount to the abdication of any sustained, predictable, and reliable U.S. commitment to international order.⁴⁴

Bertram raises the issue of how committed the U.S. is to creating a new international order and, as a critical component of it, to enhancing and preserving European stability. In spite of the isolationists, there is ample evidence to suggest that not only does the U.S. does take European security seriously but there is also a strong desire to build upon its security relations with Europe in other areas as a means of enhancing American influence. Other means of protecting and solidifying the U.S. role in European affairs in a permanent manner have been suggested, such as the idea of an Atlantic Union, involving some form of linkage between trade and security issues, as well as closer ties between the US, Russia, NATO and the EU.⁴⁵ Such schemes however run the danger of overstating the commonalities between the different sides of the Atlantic and underestimating the general problems with economic union (whether the EU or NAFTA) as well as significant differences in relations with third parties. The reinforcement of America's security role in Europe may well act as a valuable adjunct to more general links but it is important that progression in security affairs is not held ransom to economic relations or vice versa. The role of security relations as a prerequisite is suggested not only for reasons that have already been outlined, but also because this is quite simply the area that is currently best developed (thus, NATO expansion will take place before EU expansion).

The discussion of these differences can though be helpfully addressed within the general framework of the New Transatlantic Agenda, as Sir Leon Brittan indicated when he stated, 'Of course as befits the relationship between friends, and a close one, we will also have to talk about some of the difficulties, the difficulties caused for the U.S. by the legislation with regard to Cuba and the potential difficulties caused for the U.S. by the prospect of legislation relating to Iran and Libya.'⁴⁶ Although the idea of a full Atlantic Union is rather fanciful, it nevertheless serves as a useful reminder that movement towards common positions on trade and foreign policy will play an important role in buttressing common positions on security issues. The New Transatlantic Agenda may be one such contribution.

The New Transatlantic Agenda, unveiled on 3 December 1995 by President Clinton, Prime Minister Felipe Gonzalez of Spain, and European Commission President, Jacques Santer, was intended to set transatlantic relations on a more appropriate footing for the post-cold war era. The agenda is supported by a *Joint U.S./EU Action Plan* which consists of a number of general principles which the partners have agreed should guide their trade, economic, foreign and security policies.⁴⁷ Amongst its innovations is the creation of a New Transatlantic Marketplace and the Transatlantic Business Dialogue, the latter launched by a conference of U.S. and EU business leaders in Seville in November 1995. Both constitute an effort to strengthen bilateral relations and the Business Dialogue has been described as a 'unique U.S.-European business partnership in confronting additional barriers to trade.'⁴⁸ A whole host of 'soft security' issues are also touched upon, ranging from democratisation, human rights, fighting organised crime, terrorism and drug trafficking, but by and large the discussion of these issues merely codified existing collaborative efforts. Notable for its absence, was the role of 'hard' security as an integral part of the action plan. This absence could either be interpreted as a pessimistic judgement of the ability of the EU to develop a

working second pillar, or the assumption that the creation of a Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) within the EU will merely serve to strengthen the European pillar of the Atlantic Alliance

Responsibility sharing without leadership sharing?

Can the U.S. leadership role be continued virtually unchanged in the post-cold war U.S.-European security relationship – a relationship that have has been marked by several counts against the sustenance of this role, such as the reductions in the U.S. force levels in Europe, the elevated profile of various European security organisations (such as the revived WEU), the development of the CFSP, and moves towards a European Defence Identity (EDI) by its allies? Perhaps more to the point, in the absence of a common security threat to all NATO members, will America's European allies be as inclined to follow U.S. leadership? It would appear that Washington's encouragement of the assumption of a greater allied role, to be accomplished through buttressing of the European pillar of the Alliance, did not however anticipate the need for a new transatlantic security bargain replete with demands for a commensurate political role – most recently manifest in the French demands for a key command post in Naples as the price of further *rapprochement* with NATO.

The development of a number of European security initiatives, such as the revived WEU, the Eurocorps, the Franco-German understanding, and the development of national rapid reaction forces as forces answerable to the WEU (FAWEU) may seem to have posed an 'either' 'or' question in front of European security – either there is to be adjustment in the transatlantic security framework which reflects a larger European role, or European security capabilities will be developed as an alternative, not as an adjunct, to the Atlantic Alliance. There is though an element of bluff to both positions: U.S. encouragement of the European allies to assume a greater share of responsibility for their own defence has been made in the knowledge that there is little chance in the foreseeable future of the allies actually being able to function independently from the transatlantic context; while for the European allies, especially the French, the illusion of there being European alternatives is essential for reasons of national sovereignty, pride and to give credence to the second pillar of the EU (the CFSP). Yet, in spite of the fact that few contest the need for a more effective European security role, the post-cold war turmoil has been responded to 'with a mixture of apprehension and schizophrenia.'⁴⁹

The reasons for the failure of the EU, or any other organisation, to develop a coherent European security identity and policy are well rehearsed – ranging from the renationalisation of defence, the 'new German question,' questions of leadership and influence, problems with other related aspects of 'European identity,' and unequal security challenges to individual European states that undermine the need for a concerted approach. One other important reason is that the European Community developed in a *security vacuum*, while transatlantic relations and U.S. leadership during the cold war were primarily based on a security dialogue built around the existence of a common threat. The post-cold war dialogue is

an interesting twist on its earlier variant: the European dialogue now has an explicit security dialogue while the transatlantic dialogue is increasingly about trade. The heavy emphasis on trade in the transatlantic dialogue, to the detriment of the security dialogue, has prompted remarks like that by Vin Weber, a former Congressman and co-chair of Bob Dole's 1996 Presidential campaign, who commented that, 'There's almost no discussion of Europe in American politics anymore ... and, quite frankly, when it does come up, it's usually in a negative context.'⁵⁰ Put just as bluntly, the common problem besetting both sides of the Atlantic is that, 'Dying for world order when there is no concrete threat to one's own nation is a hard argument to make.'⁵¹

Although defence and security issues were addressed directly (and disastrously) in 1954 in the proposals for a European Defence Community. Later, the European Political Co-operation (EPC) process shied away from any explicit security role and even the 1986 Single European Act barely mentioned security except *en passant*.⁵² Discussion of a security role for the EC was revived in the context of the Intergovernmental Conference (IGC) leading up to the Maastricht Summit of December 1991. This discussion was prompted by several factors: the expansive plans for full political union which would inevitably involve consideration of a security role, the role of a reunified Germany in Europe, the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait in August 1990, and an increasingly active U.S. role in the development of post-cold war European security designs.

From 1989 onwards it was apparent that the Bush administration saw NATO as the central security organisation in Europe, in part as a counterweight to the British and French concerns about German reunification, but also as a means of maintaining influence within Europe. The U.S. also encouraged the development of an EDI and the OSCE in the context of efforts to enhance the European pillar of the transatlantic Alliance. The U.S. conception of post-cold war security 'architecture' preceded any European versions of EDI. Secretary of State James A. Baker III, in an address made in December 1989, reiterated Bush's description of seven months earlier when he spoke of the need for a Europe 'that is whole and free.'⁵³ In Baker's description of the 'new security architecture' he stressed the need for 'old foundations' (NATO) and the need for the construction of new institutions – like the EC and the OSCE process. In an implicit justification for the U.S. role in Europe's security Baker observed:

... hopes for a Europe whole and free are tinged with concern by some that a Europe undivided may not necessarily be a Europe peaceful and prosperous. Many of the guideposts that brought us securely through four sometimes tense and threatening decades are now coming down. Some of the divisive issues that once brought conflict to Europe are reemerging.⁵⁴

The envisaged U.S. role was partially motivated by the concern that reunification of Germany and the end of the cold war may lead to the re-emergence of balance of power politics, the renationalisation of defence and rampant nationalist tensions that may lead to conflict. It is notable that

neither France nor Britain presented a plan in late 1989 or early 1990 for European security, while Germany was scarcely in a position to do so. Instead, the British and French reaction was to work together to hinder or even postpone reunification. In December 1989 Prime Minister Thatcher commented, 'If there was any hope now of stopping or slowing down reunification it would only come from an Anglo-French initiative.'⁵⁵ The role of the U.S. and of NATO became, to senior eyes in the Bush administration, all the more important as a means of ensuring a continued military presence in Europe (nearly all of it in Germany), to assuage Franco-British concerns about reunification, and to keep Germany firmly tied into a multilateral framework. What a reunified Germany and a continuing, albeit reduced, U.S. military presence in Europe could not do was to reassure the Soviet Union. If Gorbachev could be placated, this could only be by stressing NATO's political role and by de-emphasising the military aspects of the Alliance and to underline the importance of the CSCE's pan-European security role and Russia's role therein.

Following Secretary Baker's December 1989 speech, *NATO's Declaration on a Transformed North Atlantic Alliance* in July 1990 set out to define the shape of Europe's security. The declaration has as its ambitious mandate the following: to 'enhance the political component of our Alliance;' to enhance moves within the European Community towards political union, 'including the development of a European identity in the domain of security' which were recognised as contributing to 'Atlantic solidarity;' to propose a 'joint declaration' between the Warsaw Treaty Organisation countries and NATO that 'we are no longer adversaries;' to invite the same countries to 'establish regular diplomatic liaison with NATO;' and to advocate that the 'CSCE should become more prominent in Europe's future.'⁵⁶ The Brussels summit set the agenda for subsequent summits but, most importantly, NATO's role at the heart of European security, built around an American design and a reduced military presence, was assured.

For its part, the emergence of the EC's second pillar was motivated by traditional French concerns about Germany's role in Europe and particularly that of a reunified Germany. President Mitterrand's reaction to German reunification was, as has been noted to resist. But, in the face of Bush's endorsement, the question quickly turned to how to ensnare Germany in a Europe of French design. Accordingly, Mitterrand sought to expand the EC's role and that of France and Germany, by first binding Germany unequivocally to the EMU process and, second, by advocating in April 1990 a second intergovernmental conference on political union that would include discussion of a common foreign and security policy. Although Mitterrand had been in favour of greater foreign and security policy integration prior to German reunification, the assumption had hitherto been that France would be able to deal with a divided Germany from a position of strength. With German reunification the French position changed radically and what was later sought was a *modus vivendi* that would require French adjustment but also tie Germany to a French economic agenda. The trade-off was that in return for French influence over the mark, France would sacrifice some autonomy in its foreign and security policy.

Franco-German security integration had in fact been making cautious steps since 1983 at least, but it was not until a joint letter was issued by Kohl and Mitterrand on 14 October 1991, proposing that a European 'force' be built out of the 4,200 man Franco-German brigade and that this should eventually constitute a Euro corps, that a distinct European contribution to security was made.⁵⁷ The reaction from the Bush administration was to reassert in Rome NATO's position in European security by reiterating a statement made at the North Atlantic Council's June meeting in Copenhagen,⁵⁸ that 'NATO is the essential forum for consultation among the Allies' and the Alliance provides 'one of the indispensable foundations for a stable security environment in Europe.' It was also stressed that 'NATO embodies the transatlantic link by which the security of North America is permanently tied to the security of Europe.'⁵⁹ In spite of the Bush administration's concern (shared by Britain) that EDI and the proposed 'Eurocorps' could weaken NATO, the *New Strategic Concept* incorporated the EDI on paper by arguing that 'it would have an important role to play in enhancing the Allies' ability to work together in the common defence.'⁶⁰

The British reaction to German reunification, and later to the Kohl-Mitterrand initiative, was to balance Germany (and France) by underlining the importance of not only NATO, but of the military role of the U.S. as well. The Thatcher government accomplished this not through the Alliance, which would have had little if any impact on France, but through the Western European Union (WEU) which, since its reawakening in 1984 was enjoying a more visible profile, assisted greatly by its role in the 1990-1 Gulf War. Douglas Hurd promoted the WEU as a 'bridge' between NATO and the EC and a 'means of strengthening the European pillar of the Atlantic Alliance.'⁶¹ The WEU also had the inherent advantage, from the British view, of relying on NATO 'for information and advice on military matters' and since the Eurocorps was seen as a means of enhancing collaboration between WEU member states, it was not unreasonable to believe that it would tether the emerging 'Euro' defence entities to the Alliance's European pillar.⁶²

By late 1991 a highly confusing picture had developed: under U.S. guidance NATO had been substantially modified and was portrayed as 'the essential forum for consultation among the allies;' the Franco-German corps was portrayed by Germany as a means of bringing France closer to NATO, and by France as a means of asserting an independent European defence identity; Britain preferred to play the balancing role by promoting WEU, ostensibly as a 'European' option, but in the full awareness that it relied heavily upon NATO and that it would serve to buttress the European pillar of the Alliance. What was thus required was a formal mechanism that would reconcile the need to establish EDI while, at the same time, enhancing not detracting from the Alliance. Since Germany was most obviously caught in the middle of the French pro-European initiatives and the equally staunch British pro-Atlanticism, it was to them that the task of reconciling these differences fell.

The first stage of reaching a compromise, up to the EC's December 1991 Maastricht negotiations, failed but codified the differences and tensions between the west Europeans. Following the Maastricht meeting, the Treaty on European Union (TEU) continued to reflect compromises between the

parties but highlighted the need for the 'union and its Member States [to] define and implement a common foreign and security policy ... covering all areas of foreign and security policy.' Moreover, the EU requested the WEU to 'elaborate and implement decisions and actions of the Union which have defence implications.'⁶³ Importantly, the treaty also added that the CFSP 'shall respect the obligations of certain Member States under the North Atlantic Treaty and be compatible with the common security and defence policy established within that framework.'⁶⁴ EDI is however *not* mentioned in the TEU but makes its first appearance in the related texts adopted at the EC Summit: more specifically, the *Declaration on the Role of the Western European Union and Its Relations with the European Union and the Atlantic Alliance* states that:

WEU Member States agree on the need to develop a genuine *European security and defence identity* and greater European responsibility on defence matters ... WEU Member States agree to strengthen the role of WEU, in the longer term perspective of a common defence policy within the European Union which might in time lead to a common defence, compatible with that of the Atlantic Alliance.⁶⁵

The TEU was nevertheless an intergovernmental compromise. The French remained as determined as ever to promote an independent EDI and it was to the fledging Franco-German corps that the French turned to. For example, at a meeting in La Rochelle in May 1992 between Mitterrand and Kohl, plans were announced to expand the corps into a Eurocorps. Again, this only served to compound the awkwardness of the German position. In a statement which well illustrates the difficulty of the German position, Kohl referred to the Eurocorps as being 'complementary to NATO' as well as 'part of the way to a European defence identity.'⁶⁶ Expansion of the corps into the Eurocorps was effectively blocked until the issue of its identity and affiliation were answered. Thus, it was not until December that a solution was engineered between France and the U.S., stating that in any 'warlike situation' control of the Eurocorps would go to NATO while, in peacetime, the corps would be free-standing.⁶⁷

The Franco-American solution to the Eurocorps identity opened the way for clarification of the role of EDI vis-à-vis NATO and the U.S. itself. In this area there was in fact less ambiguity since the U.S. had been defining its relations with EDI through NATO since the 1990 London Summit. The underlying theme, that the Alliance supported EDI as a means of strengthening the European pillar along with the understanding that NATO was still the 'essential forum' for consultation among the allies, became the Alliance mantra – espoused most enthusiastically by Britain and the U.S. American support for a EDI within NATO may also have been motivated by the 'inability of the EU to speak with one clear voice on foreign policy' as well as serving notice that there may be occasions when the Europeans will have security interests that are not of direct concern to the U.S.⁶⁸

The watershed, in the form of a grand compromise between NATO and the ESDI and Eurocorps, appeared in a statement of the North Atlantic Council's Brussels meeting on 11 January 1994:

[NATO members] confirm the enduring validity and indispensability of our Alliance. It is based on a strong transatlantic link, the expression of shared destiny. It reflects a European Security and Defence Identity gradually emerging as the expression of a mature Europe. It is reaching out to establish new patterns of cooperation throughout Europe.¹⁶⁹

The question of the WEU's role and identity was also addressed at the Brussels summit when it was agreed that NATO 'support[s] the strengthening of the European pillar of the Alliance through the Western European Union, which is being developed as the defence component of the European Union'.¹⁷⁰ The Brussels summit solved many of the Euro-Atlanticist tensions (at least at the institutional level) and for the U.S. the summit served its national interests by, in the words of President Clinton, promoting 'greater European responsibility and burdensharing'.¹⁷¹

In spite of Clinton's use of the term 'burdensharing' which has traditionally been associated with host-nation support issues, the term has been rejected by Washington in favour of the more expansive idea of 'responsibility sharing' which means an 'increased allied share of roles, risks, responsibilities, costs, and benefits of meeting common security goals and objectives'.¹⁷² The same theme appeared elsewhere in the Clinton administration's attempts to shift the burden of the costs of multilateral peacekeeping costs by adjusting U.S. payments to the UN peacekeeping budget from almost 31 percent to 25 percent by the end of 1995; the difference to be made up by 'other newly rich countries who should pay their fair share'.¹⁷³

The Brussels meeting also marked the launching of the Partnership for Peace (PfP) as an American initiative – the North Atlantic Co-operation Council formed three years earlier had been an Alliance one – and, as such, it marked not only an important development for European security but for U.S. relations with Europe. The unveiling of PfP, which coincided with Clinton's first visit to Europe as President, was portrayed as an attempt to 'build a new comprehensive Euro-Atlantic architecture of security with, and not without or against Russia'.¹⁷⁴ The Brussels summit also saw the unveiling of the Combined Joint Task Force (CJTF) concept, which was designed to offer a practical way of 'strengthening the European pillar of the Alliance through the Western European Union, which is being developed as the defence component of the European Union'.¹⁷⁵ In accordance with this the communiqué stated that, 'The Alliance's organisation and resources will be adjusted so as to facilitate this'.¹⁷⁶ Further details were given in paragraph 6:

[The NATO Heads of State and Government] stand ready to make collective assets of the Alliance available, *on the basis of consultations in the North Atlantic Council*, for WEU operations undertaken by the European Allies in pursuit of their Common Foreign and Security

Policy. We support the development of separable but not separate capabilities which could respond to European requirements and contribute to Alliance security ... (Emphasis added)

The concept of 'separable but not separate' forces which the WEU could use 'in pursuit of the CFSP' achieved the dual British aim of not only tying the WEU to NATO but, equally important, of tying the CFSP to the WEU, and hence to NATO. In short, NATO's January 1994 summit served to 'Atlanticise' EDI to a sufficient degree to gain British support, while leaving sufficient 'Euro' options for the French, and providing a way-out for Germany caught between France and Britain.

The June 1996 Berlin ministerial meeting reinforced and expanded upon the earlier Brussels decisions. The Berlin decisions, among other things, restated the Alliance's determination to 'develop the ESDI *within* the Alliance.' From an American perspective, the decisions in Berlin 'will also allow our European allies to strengthen their capabilities within the Alliance...and to develop European command arrangements within the Alliance that preserve NATO's unity and the Transatlantic foundation.'⁷⁷ The Berlin communiqué reinforced the earlier Brussels one by supporting the 'creation of coherent military forces capable of cooperating under *the political control and strategic direction* of the exclusively European security organisation, the Western European Union.'⁷⁸

By the beginning of 1994, with the Brussels summit, the general shape of European security had been established in what amounted to a Euro-Atlantic compromise. The European allies had effectively recognised the primacy of NATO in European security as a price to be paid for the continuing involvement of the U.S. and, on the other hand, the U.S. had accepted the presence of a stronger 'European' voice within the Alliance. The U.S.'s interests in accepting the enhanced role of its European allies was based on two factors: firstly, was the need to maintain more 'selective and effective' options where action could be taken by the European allies if American national interest was not at stake and; secondly and more pragmatically, there was the realisation that, 'For any major threat – including nuclear threats – the Europeans will continue to look to the United States and to NATO as the principal guarantors of their security.'⁷⁹

For the U.S., the compromise might have appeared to have weakened its hand in Alliance politics and maybe its influence in European affairs, but in practice the reliance of the European allies upon key U.S. resources and assets stood to reinforce its leadership role. Underlying the U.S.'s position was a certain realism (or pessimism, according to one's view) concerning the ability of the EU, WEU, or Eurocorps not only to show sufficient consensus but also upon the ability to mount anything but a small, close to hand, operation. For instance, Richard Holbrooke, better known for his role in negotiating the Dayton Accords, accused the Europeans of 'literally sleeping through the night' while Clinton was forced to negotiate a settlement in the stand-off between Turkey and Greece in the Aegean Sea in February 1996.⁸⁰ Stuart Eizenstat, the former U.S. Ambassador to the EU, observed that, 'An effective foreign policy, even in the post-Cold War era, still requires the ability to project a credible threat of military power.'⁸¹ In a similar

vein his successor, James Dobbins, noted in an earlier speech that "I and the major European nations, including Germany, are prepared to send their young men abroad to fight, and to die if necessary, in a European cause, under a European flag, and within a European command, no amount of planning for a European security identity will field a single battalion."⁸² Thus, Washington may remain reassured by the fact that U.S. leadership is unlikely to be challenged within European security. Yet there is also a contradictory American *ennui* with its European allies for not assuming their full role in affairs, especially when a crisis is closer to hand than for the US. Roy Denman posed the question of why the U.S. should continue to assume the major role in the Middle East peace process when it is 3,500 miles to the west of its allies; his answer was simple, "The European Union is about as capable of pursuing a common foreign policy as a rocking horse is of winning a steeplechase."⁸³

In spite of the criticism of European slowness or ineffectiveness, there is also historical ambivalence within the U.S. about how 'European' (and thus independent) as opposed to transatlantic, the U.S. would like its allies to become. In this regard the development of the CFSP and ESDI may not be harmonious since the former may well be portrayed, especially by France, not as an adjunct to the transatlantic pillar, but as a conspicuous alternative. The latter, ESDI, may however be seen as an invitation to continue to lean somewhat heavily on U.S. initiative, leadership and resources. Still, many of the concerns about mutual abandonment by the U.S. and its European allies are exaggerated for two reasons: first, there is (as yet) no European foreign let alone security identity or policy plus there needs to be clearer public support and consensus on these issues before a European Foreign Minister (Monsieur PESC) can be considered and; second, the U.S. is central, and will remain so for the foreseeable future, to the practical operation of any European security operation (a theme examined below with reference to the CJTF concept).

The compromises of 1990 and 1994 were also 'essential to the pursuit of shared goals outside Europe.'⁸⁴ Thus, Italy's willingness to allow unlimited use of its military facilities during the Gulf War, Spain's logistical support and Portugal's decision to allow broad access to facilities in the Azores, or Turkey's support for Operation Provide Comfort II, all serve as a reminder that the American security commitments to Europe have significant effects for potential military operations in adjoining areas such as the Middle East Littoral or North Africa. Indeed, if developments since the end of the Gulf War are an indication, the activities of the U.S. European Command (USECOM) have risen faster in this area of command responsibility than any other, with six 'out-of-area' operations being sustained or launched in 1994 alone.⁸⁵ The use of Europe-based U.S. forces for operations in the surrounding areas is however one that is more likely than not to engender disagreement between the U.S. and its European allies since in many areas of foreign policy, such as the Middle East, U.S. policy has differed notably from that of its European allies.

Consolidating leadership – the CJTF concept

The best indicator of U.S. influence over European security is perhaps the CJTF which, although it could theoretically operate in the WEU context, is nevertheless in practice reliant upon the willingness of the U.S. to contribute vital command, control (C²) and logistical assistance. The WEU, even when operating in its Petersberg Task⁸⁶ guise (which it is assumed will continue to be its mission with collective defence left strictly to NATO) has been operationally inefficient because 'the organisation lacks a permanent command structure and other standing military capabilities' and the organisation also remains divided on the role it should play in crisis situations and on 'substantive issues of policy.'⁸⁷ Even in the only existing *de facto* CJTF missions (SUPPORT HOPE and TURQUOISE), to deliver humanitarian and medical supplies in Rwanda, France and Britain relied heavily upon the US.

The CJTF concept however does provide a new and practical lease of life for the WEU while also assuring continued U.S. leadership in European security. Furthermore the CJTF concept also confirms NATO's role as *primus inter pares*, since the North Atlantic Council effectively has veto power over *any* missions employing NATO assets -- this means that the US, as a non-European and non-WEU power, will have a great deal of influence in establishing initial missions but, thereafter, any mission is supposed to be under the political and military control of the Europeans, with NAC only monitoring.

The continuing heavy American bias in senior command positions within NATO is a further indication of U.S. influence, although in this case there is considerable pressure from the European allies to reallocate commands including a call for a European SACEUR.⁸⁸ France has more recently, as part of its realignment with NATO, demanded a French commander for NATO's southern command (traditionally a U.S. admiral). The extent to which the U.S. is willing to share command and control positions with its allies is a delicate issue: a perception in Congress that the U.S. has sacrificed too much power and influence may lead to a deterioration in US-European relations and a diminution of support for NATO.

Command and control structures have proven highly resistant to change since they not only reflect relative influence within the Alliance but they become a matter of jealous national patronage. Further adjustment of command responsibilities is unlikely since the implementation of a new force (and thus command) structure for NATO, which became effective in July 1994, saw the reduction in the number of major NATO commands from three to two – Allied Command Europe (ACE) located near Mons, Belgium, and Allied Command Atlantic in Norfolk, Virginia. Allied Command Channel, a British command, was disbanded and absorbed by ACE. A further major change was the creation of three subordinate commands under ACE responsible for the southern, central and north-western regions. The subordinate commands are, respectively, AFSOUTH run by an American four-star admiral, AFCENT a

German four-star general and, AFNORTHWEST a senior British four-star RAF officer, they are located in Naples, Brunssum (Netherlands) and High Wycombe (Britain).

The new command structure leaves the U.S. with three of the top five commands (in Norfolk, Mons and Naples) and since a European-sub command has gone, the French government have been pushing for the U.S. to relinquish its command in Naples. However the U.S. has adamantly refused arguing that they have conceded enough already to the 'Europeanisation' of the command structure by conceding extra powers to the European deputy-SACEUR. The U.S. also points out that the Naples command covers the Mediterranean Sixth Fleet as well as the Middle East, Bosnia and North Africa.⁸⁷ Still, the French government argues that an enhanced European role within NATO should be reflected in greater European command responsibility. Volker R  he, Germany's defence minister, has backed the French demand but his British counterpart, Michael Portillo, has described this as 'unrealistic.' Italy and Spain have also backed the French position but with a discernible lack of enthusiasm. A meeting of the NATO defence chiefs in mid-November produced no agreement on this question in spite of a French compromise suggestion for a rotating US-European commander at Naples. This suggestion was rejected by the US. The issue of the perceived need for more European command responsibility should also be considered in terms of its potential impact upon the first-tier of possible central European NATO members (commonly assumed to be the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland with, maybe, Slovakia and Slovenia). The issue of who may be in the first or second tier of membership may become intertwined with the French-US dispute since the former favours Romania's accession in the first round while the U.S. is opposed to such a possibility. For those who do gain membership in the first round, the issue of whether they will feel less or more reassured by a greater (west) European role in C² structures remains an open question.

The importance and potentially debilitating effects of command disputes surfaced during the Dayton negotiations. The choice of an American military commander for the Implementation Force seemed logical but the EU Council of Ministers insisted that the civilian counterpart should be a European. Although the High Representative that was eventually agreed upon was a European, he did not fill his post until after a number of acrimonious disputes and not before the U.S. significantly pared the power of the civilian position. As Pauline Neville-Jones has observed, 'the time spent on unprofitable power plays could have been used to bring the military and civilian agendas together and to ensure greater overall coherence.'⁸⁸

Within the CJTF context alone, the command, control and intelligence (C²I) question has been partially addressed but it remains to be seen how the agreed structures will fare in practice. An obvious problem arises if the European members of NATO wish to act independently through the NATO C² structures (for instance, through the Allied Command Europe Rapid Reaction Corps -- ARRC): how do non-US personnel learn U.S. command positions at short notice? Under an agreement for the U.S. to leave its senior command posts intact, this immediate problem has been resolved but perhaps only to open

up another -- the impression, even if mistaken, may well be communicated that the U.S. wishes to exert influence or maybe even control over European-directed CJTF operations by remaining in senior command posts. Other scenarios may arise that could lead to some highly awkward and possibly destabilising results. For instance, would the French participate in a CJTF operation when they are not proportionately represented in the command structures and when they may be outnumbered by (non-participant) U.S. officers? If the CJTF operation is to take place under the WEU's guise, what would the U.S. role be in this eventuality if the operations were carried out through ARRC?

Two further issues arise in relation to C² in the CJTF context. First, control of operations may, as has been argued, involve WEU taking command of operations that will involve NATO assets and the tacit co-operation of the US. But, what happens if the U.S. decides to withdraw even its tacit co-operation for internal political reasons, as it did with *Operation Sharp Guard* when fundamental differences occurred between the U.S. and its allies about the continued need to interdict vessels carrying arms to the Bosnian Muslims? On this occasion instructions were also issued to halt the exchange of military information to the U.S. allies. As Maynard Glitman has commented, this was 'hardly the role one would have expected for the "leader of the Alliance," and it seriously threatened both the Alliance and the U.S. position in it.'⁹¹ Second, related to the complicated C² structures that are likely to prevail, the question of accountability needs to be raised. Let us suppose that the CJTF has been deployed to support a UN operation under a WEU guise, using NATO assets, with the co-operation of the U.S. – who then is accountable for the outcome of a given action? One possible answer is to examine the mutual finger pointing that took place at the beginnings of the collapse of the former Yugoslavia when one institution after another failed to address the deteriorating situation. Arguably, as a result, the credibility of all institutions has been damaged.

The question of internal command and control reorganisation is also complicated by the resistance in the U.S. Congress to the idea of U.S. troops operating under foreign commanders. Although there are cases of non-combat U.S. troops serving under a Turkish commander in Somalia or a Swede in Macedonia or a Canadian in Bosnia, there is an extreme reluctance to do so in a *combat* role.⁹² The anxiety has been expressed in a number of official documents, most notably Clinton's May 1994 Presidential Decision Directive 25 (PDD-25) which laid down the terms and conditions for U.S. participation in multinational peacekeeping operations. Amongst the conditions was that U.S. participation will be 'selective and effective' and that the U.S. contribution should be under U.S. command and that there should be a defined time frame to the operation.

Within NATO though the U.S. military presence in Europe on the ground consists of substantial elements of two divisions (3rd Infantry Division and 1st Armoured Division) – the former participated in a US-led multinational corps commanded by a U.S. V Corps commander while the latter is assigned to a German-led multinational corps as well as the ARRC. The multinational corps under German command places U.S. forces under 'temporary operational control' of trusted, competent Allied commanders in

order to strengthen the bonds of coalition warfare.”⁹³ Although this may appear to signal a significant modification on the command and control issue, it is worth noting that the German-led multinational corps, as with all NATO integrated forces, comes under the command of SACEUR who is of course also U.S. CINCEUR.⁹⁴

The CJTF concept has made the issue of reaching new command arrangements a matter of (contentious) priority. In a sense the question of who wears what hat will remain moot until the Europeans have the capacity for genuinely independent action in the EU-WEU or even under UN guise. Even a reduction in U.S. key commands and a European SACEUR would leave the U.S. with a *de facto* operational veto over such operations since, in any of the above European formats, the assistance and facilities of the U.S. would be required for logistics, communications, intelligence, heavy air-lift, sea-lift (if a major operation is foreseen), and probably diplomatic backing. In this regard the U.S. would appear to have little to be concerned about since, behind the European bluster for more responsibility, is the question of whether there is the will to commit resources. This question was raised by an official DoD publication when it was observed that, “some European states will push hard to develop a European Security and Defense Identity, but few will increase their capabilities for independent military action.”⁹⁵

Knowledge and power

The issue of sharing intelligence assets will also prove controversial. Unlike command and control arrangements, which belong to a specific organisation, intelligence for the various European security operations is based on national resources. NATO relies heavily upon American intelligence assets and the WEU is aware of this as a potential source of weakness in the organisation’s ability to act independently in the CJTF context. Some preliminary steps have been taken to address this, such as the WEU Torrejon satellite centre. There are several other schemes to build satellite systems that may match the American KH-11 systems and other airborne surveillance systems. Currently, however, the European LANDSAT and SPOT systems cannot deliver the resolutions required for military intelligence and their utility is largely for civilian projects (such as mapping and environmental uses). French-led efforts to develop a satellite system (Helios 2) that will rival the current U.S. systems will not only be expensive but, if past behaviour is indicative, may result in equally expensive competition as rival British and German systems are developed for a highly specialised and small market. The same problems will also appear with respect to the EU’s CFSP which will likewise remain highly dependent upon NATO (or US) intelligence assets. The strongest argument for developing an independent European intelligence capability is in fact not to be found in the NATO or WEU contexts, but in peacekeeping. The significant divergence between U.S. and European positions, allied with growing U.S. reluctance to become involved, may well point

Europe in the direction of developing an independent intelligence capability. Whether the expense and effort involved could be justified to European electorates remains doubtful.

The development of European designed and manufactured systems that could allow for independent action in all fields is not only unnecessary but unlikely given the limited budgets and the high costs associated with research and development. Volker R  he, Germany's defence minister, illustrated the difficulties of the choices involved when, in reference to the possibility of developing both the Eurofighter and a Franco-German satellite system, he rejected the latter arguing that the former is 'far more important for me as defence minister than satellites ... there is no money in the budget for that.'⁹⁶ The political realities of making choices between the development of different systems is also driven by national economic considerations of what may be beneficial for German or other industry and export potential, versus the costs of participating in the four-nation \$24 billion venture as well, of course, as the opportunity cost of any government expenditure on weapons systems versus, say, health care facilities for the elderly. The debate over what to spend public funds on is all the more difficult with the absence of a compelling military threat that would allow politicians to make a case for higher and more comprehensive defence expenditure. Such debates also serve to illustrate the differences between the national legislatures and Brussels with a notable gap between the willingness of the former to give effect to a truly European CFSP with an implementable ESDI, while the latter continues to conceptualise without addressing the ramifications of the hard national decisions that will be needed.

The CJTF concept has restructured European security in a manner foreseen by few. What has emerged is certainly not as coherent or, one suspects, deliberate as security 'architecture.' Instead, a complex series of multilateral arrangements and links between the OSCE, WEU, UN and NATO has emerged with NATO unambiguously at the centre of the web. The emerging web however leaves much to be desired with evident gaps or even mismatches between the organisations that have become evident in the joint WEU/NATO *Operation Sharp Guard*, the UN/NATO command structure in Bosnia or the EU/OSCE in Nagorno-Karabakh or Chechnya. Of special interest is the way in which the CJTF has redefined both the U.S. role in European security and European security itself. Since none of the EU members can guarantee the capacity and wherewithal for independent action, the U.S. has succeeded in both reducing its burdens in Europe (most notably by a reduction in U.S. force levels in Europe from 326,000 to 100,000) and, at the same time, it has enhanced its influence vis-  -vis its European allies. The US's *de facto* veto power over WEU/CJTF operations makes the formation of a truly independent European security identity a long-term project at the best. Attempts to formulate a CFSP will be necessarily circumscribed by the logic of the CJTF concept.

The same tendency has been reinforced by NATO's multinational rapid reaction forces (RRF).⁹⁷ The incorporation of nearly all NATO forces, down to division level, in the RRF structure makes it extremely difficult to envisage a member state withdrawing its forces from an operation that, as the name suggests, relies upon the ability to react very quickly and, once committed, a rethink of their mission and

applicability would be just as difficult. On paper though, participation in such operations remains in the hands of the member states to consider on a case-by-case basis. Underlying any such operation is a heavy reliance upon U.S. C²I assets as well as logistics. None of this would be of major concern if a convergence of philosophy and approach to peacekeeping on the part of the U.S. and its allies was not an issue. Because it is, it may have profound effects.

The CJTF concept applies to non-Article 5 missions while the RRF's, including the ARRC, are designed mainly but not exclusively for NATO contingencies. Use of the CJTF will therefore tend to highlight quite fundamental differences between the U.S. and its European allies on Petersberg tasks. In so far as one can generalise, European approaches to the support of peacekeeping have tended to stress a distinction between UN Charter Chapter 6 operations (peace keeping) and Chapter 7 (peace enforcement) and the traditional tenets of classical peacekeeping, such as impartiality, consent and minimum use of force, have been upheld. The US, in an approach not shared by Canada, has tended to do away with the distinctions between Chapters 6 and 7, preferring to see all as chapter 6, and has shown an increasing willingness to be partial (targeting, for instance, General Aideed and not other warlords with equally unsavoury reputations in Mogadishu), an increased willingness to intervene without consent (usually on a humanitarian intervention pretext as in the north of Iraq), and willingness to use considerable force in peace enforcement operations. The significant, and sometimes bitter, exchanges over policy and practice in Bosnia between Canada, Britain and France on the one hand and the U.S. on the other, are worthy of note. Other notable differences have become apparent between France and the U.S. over the wisdom of the cruise missile attacks against Iraq, between the U.S. and the European allies participating in *Operation Sharp Guard* which led to the U.S. withdrawal from the embargo on 11 November 1994, and between the U.S. and its European allies over the Middle East peace process. The withdrawal of the U.S. from enforcing sanctions in the Adriatic was perhaps the most serious crisis in the Alliance since Suez and it followed months of tension over differences between the US, who favoured tougher military action in Bosnia but who had no ground troops, while the key UNPRFOR players, most notably Britain and France, both with significant numbers of military personnel on the ground, favoured a more restrained approach. The withdrawal not only shattered the fragile consensus, but more significantly it gave rise to questions about NATO's suitability for peace operations generally.⁹⁸

Yugoslavia: Saving the Transatlantic Alliance?

In August 1995, after forty months of sporadic engagement (and the loss of 10,000 civilian lives in Sarajevo alone), NATO became a major actor in the conflict with the unleashing of five waves of air strikes against Serbian positions throughout Bosnia. The air strikes of 30 August involved over 200 sorties of NATO planes (including 48 U.S. planes) and it was the largest military operation ever mounted by

NATO. The air strikes were to have a profound effect on the conflict in Bosnia and paved the way to the negotiating tables at Dayton. Beyond this, as Bhaskar Menon has commented:

The breadth and intensity of the airstrikes stood in stark contrast to the cumulative record of sporadic and ineffectual military action orchestrated under the aegis of U.N. forces and the notorious 'dual key' arrangement, which provided the U.N. civilian leadership a veto over NATO military action ... It took the shelling of the civilians in Sarajevo – now coupled with the very real spectre of a costly, militarily dangerous, and politically humiliating withdrawal of UNPROFOR – to mobilize a response from the Western powers. That response would seek to circumvent the United Nations: the robust application of NATO military power, supported by active American diplomacy, would define a new phase in the Balkan War.⁹⁹

The Dayton Peace Accords of December 1995, backed by a 60,000 strong NATO force and 20,000 U.S. troops, saw NATO assume prime responsibility for securing the peace and for securing the cease-fire arrangements. The role of NATO in relation to the accords was complicated by statements in 1996 from President Clinton and Secretary of Defense Perry that the U.S. contingent would remain no longer than a year, reflecting worries held by the U.S. public and Congress about Somalia-type 'mission creep' and protracted involvement. In spite of the decision to prolong the U.S. troop presence into 1998 it was nevertheless apparent that, absent the U.S. contribution, the other NATO contributors (mainly Britain and France) would be reluctant to guarantee the fragile Bosnian peace.

The withdrawal of the U.S. from the Adriatic embargo operation and the NATO air strikes of August 1995 and after, suggest several tentative conclusions. First, in both cases the willingness of the U.S. to be involved, or not, is clearly critical and America's NATO allies would seem to have neither the ability nor the will to mount their own peacekeeping operations. The catalyst leading to the air strikes against the Serb targets was the appearance of assertive U.S. leadership. Second, the failure of the European allies to agree upon a common policy and, consequently, to halt the escalating violence, had the combined effects of: undermining much of the credibility of any independent European security entity and thus pulled France towards NATO and paved the way for full French participation in NATO's Military Committee; it pulled Britain closer to France; it moved Germany closer to Maastricht's 'second pillar' as a means of enhancing the overall integration effort and also acted as an important prompt for Germany to play a more active military role in the region and beyond; and to Washington it stressed not only the importance of the transatlantic partnership to western Europe, but its indispensability.

Conclusions

The years since 1989 would suggest several tentative conclusions to U.S. approaches to CFSP and ESDI. First, American equivocation about what its global, let alone regional, security role was to be in the post-cold war international system produced the largely false impression that neo-isolationism was rampant. We have though seen that, since 1989, the Bush and Clinton administrations (perhaps with some reservations about the first Clinton administration) had quite clear ideas about developments in Europe as a whole and, in particular, the consequences of German reunification. Both administrations, although of different political persuasion, worked on the assumption that Europe is important to American security interests. The compelling American security interest in Europe is to maintain a security core around which other relations can be built and expanded. In the absence of a strong NATO, with a firm U.S. hand in leadership, there may well not be a 'western Europe' with whom to build any other transatlantic structures like the New Transatlantic Agenda, quite aside from any projected Atlantic Union.

Second, the role that the U.S. assumed until 1994-5 was obscured by the debates within western Europe about CFSP and ESDI. The debates showed quite clearly that there was little, if any, European consensus about security 'architecture' or the role that the U.S. or NATO should be accorded. The eventual compromise between the British, French and German positions was reached largely because of U.S. initiatives launched through NATO, not in spite of them. In the absence of active U.S. involvement in post-cold war European security it is far from clear that any coherent structure would have evolved and that, as a consequence, western Europe may well have slipped back into concert based structures reminiscent of nineteenth century Europe. With the inability of the major European powers to address the problems of post-cold war security in a collective manner, the task of doing this fell to the U.S. who assumed the mantle of global leadership as the Berlin Wall collapsed. Arguably, given the differences between the major European powers during the post-cold war years, the U.S. was the *only* actor in a position to balance the conflicting interests.

Third, the deteriorating situation in Yugoslavia in 1990-1 was, to used Jacques Poos' unfortunate phrase, supposed to herald 'the hour of Europe.'¹⁰⁰ As the crisis unfolded it became apparent to all that talk of a common policy and the ability to back it with force, were illusions. Only when the U.S. assumed the initiative, commencing with air-strikes against Serb held positions around Sarajevo, did the western European actors (principally France and Britain) assume an effective role. The message sent to the other side of the Atlantic was just as clear – there is no European security without U.S. backing. Paradoxically, it was the unfolding events in former Yugoslavia that lay behind the historical January 1994 NATO summit in Brussels, where NATO agreed to support the 'European pillar of the Alliance through the Western European Union, which is being developed as the defence component of the European Union.' This understanding, and those that followed, constitute the necessary fiction that there is a European

Defence Identity and a CFSP while, at the same time, the 'Euro' structures are so clearly intertwined with U.S. command and good will within NATO, that the self-appointed leadership role of the U.S. rings true to an American audience.

Finally, these comments have been offered during a time of transition and there is much that remains unclear and incomplete. For instance, the development of CFSP depends heavily upon the outcome of the IGC while the future of NATO is obviously going to be determined by the expansion issue and whether any NATO-Russian agreement holds.¹⁰¹ Whatever developments lay in store, it seems reasonable to suggest that an active U.S. security role in Europe is necessary not only for the future of European integration, but for the security of the region as a whole. Stable security relations and involvement in Europe are also a matter of compelling self-interest for the U.S. since this is the core of its relations with western Europe and, in large part, a defining factor in its superpower status.

ENDNOTES

- ¹ Denmark, Portugal, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom bear special mention.
- ² These ideas, and others, are summarised in Richard K. Betts (ed.), *Conflict After the Cold War: Arguments on the Causes of War and Peace*, (New York: Macmillan, 1994).
- ³ Paul Kennedy, *The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers: Economic Change and Military Conflict from 1500 to 2000*, (New York: Random House, 1987), p.xxiii.
- ⁴ Joseph S. Nye, Jr., *Bound to Lead: The Change in the Nature of American Power*, (New York: Basic Books, 1990) p.261.
- ⁵ David P. Calleo, *Beyond American Hegemony: The Future of the Western Alliance*, (New York: Basic Books, 1987). For a more recent argument in the 'declinist' tradition, see Donald W. White, *The American Century: The Rise and Decline of the United States as a World Power*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996).
- ⁶ It should be noted that a debate had already been established on declinism amongst economists, IPE scholars, and economic historians and Kennedy's work acted as a catalyst for the most general debate. For earlier work in the 'declinist' genre see, Charles P. Kindleberger, *The World in Depression, 1929-39* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973); Stephen Krasner, 'State Power and the Structure of International Trade,' *World Politics*, 28 (3) (April 1976), pp.317-47; George Modelski, 'The Long Cycle of Global Politics and the Nation-State,' *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, Vol. 20 (2) (April 1978), pp. 214-35; and Mancur Olson, *The Rise and Decline of Nations*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1982).
- ⁷ See, for instance, Henry R. Nau, *The Myth of America's Decline* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990); and Samuel P. Huntington, 'The U.S. – Decline or Renewal?,' *Foreign Affairs*, Vol.67 (2) (Winter 1988/89), pp.76-96.
- ⁸ For example, President Clinton stated that, 'The United States will continue to take the lead in NATO...' Address by President Clinton to the people of Detroit, *The Legacy of America's Leadership as We Enter the 21st Century*, 22 Oct. 1996 (Washington D.C.: Department of State, 1996).
- ⁹ Calleo, *Beyond Hegemony*, p.3-4.
- ¹⁰ (see note 7).
- ¹¹ Ibid. (emphasis added).
- ¹² Warren Christopher, 'America's Leadership, America's Opportunity,' *Foreign Policy*, No.98, Spring 1995, p.8.
- ¹³ Strobe Talbott, 'Democracy and National Interest,' *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 75(6), Nov./Dec. 1996, p.63.
- ¹⁴ Douglas Brinkley, 'Democratic Enlargement: The Clinton Doctrine,' *Foreign Policy*, No.106, Spring 1997, pp.114-6. For an examination of the same theme see, Vincent A. Auger, 'Seeking "Simplicity of Statement": The Search for a New U.S. Foreign Policy Doctrine,' *National Security Studies Quarterly*, Spring 1997, Vol. III (2), pp.1-21.
- ¹⁵ *Strategic Assessment 1996: Instruments of U.S. Power* (Washington D.C.: National Defense University), pp.96-99.
- ¹⁶ John M. Goshko, 'Reduced U.S. Role Outlined: But Soon Altered,' *Washington Post*, 26 May 1993.
- ¹⁷ Executive summary text of PDD-25 may be found in *U.S. Department of State Dispatch*, Vol.5 (20), 16 May 1994, pp.318-21.
- ¹⁸ Strobe Talbott has made the interesting point that the criticism of the Clinton administration's emphasis on enhancing democracy overseas comes not only from isolationists but also from some internationalists who warn that 'a "crusade" on behalf of democracy will overstretch American resources and mire the United States in endless, debilitating brawls, often on the side of undeserving clients.' See Strobe Talbott, 'Democracy and the National Interest,' *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 75 (6), Nov./Dec. 1996, pp.47-64.

- ¹⁹ *United States Security Strategy for Europe and NATO*. (Washington D.C.: Department of Defense, Office of International Security Affairs, 1996) p.5.
- ²⁰ *Ibid.*, p.18.
- ²¹ *Ibid.*, p.2.
- ²² The same argument could be applied to developing EU ties with Asia.
- ²³ Joint Chiefs of Staff 1769/1 'United States Assistance to Other Countries from the Standpoint of National Security,' 29 April 1947, quoted in John Lewis Gaddis, *The Long Peace: Inquiries into the History of the Cold War*. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987), p.40.
- ²⁴ Samuel P. Huntington, *Foreign Affairs*, Nov./Dec. 1996, p.44.
- ²⁵ The figure represents the combined populations of the European Trade Area countries.
- ²⁶ C. Randall Henning, 'Europe's Monetary Union and the United States,' *Foreign Policy*, No.92, Spring 1996, p.96.
- ²⁷ Martin Walker, 'China Preys on American Minds,' *Guardian Weekly*, 6 April 1997, p.6.
- ²⁸ In the 1990 U.S. Census, of the 249 million counted, 87% indicated specific foreign ancestry and 57% indicated European ancestry. 'U.S. Census 1990,' extracts in *United States Security Strategy for Europe and NATO*.
- ²⁹ William Branigin, 'One in 10 Americans is Foreign-Born,' *Guardian Weekly*, Vol.156 (16), 20 April 1997, p.15. The report also reflects that the racial and ethnic make-up of the foreign born population has also changed strikingly. Nearly 85.8% of the foreign born who arrived before the 1970s were whites, that proportion dropped to 62.1% for the first six years of the 1990s. During the same period, the percentage of African-Americans more than doubled, to 8.7%, and the proportion of Asians and Pacific Islanders tripled to 28.6%. Hispanics (who may be of any race) accounted for 43% of newcomers since 1990 and 32.2% before 1970. The Census Bureau lists the current U.S. population as 84.2% white, 13.3% black, 1.6% Asian-Pacific Islander, and 7.4% classified as Hispanic.
- ³⁰ For a contrasting view on this issue see Philip Gordon, 'Recasting the Alliance,' *Survival*, Vol.38 (1), Spring 1996, pp.32-58. It should be noted that in other respects, particularly the importance of the Alliance as a tie between the U.S. and its allies and the pessimism that free trade could carry out this function, the author's views are similar.
- ³¹ *United States Security Strategy for Europe and NATO* (1996), p.1.
- ³² Quoted in Strobe Talbott, 'Democracy and National Interest,' *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 75(6), Nov./Dec. 1996, p.63.
- ³³ Sir Leon Brittan commented, 'It comes as no surprise to me that the first meeting you are holding should be with the representatives of the European Union.' See Remarks by the Secretary of State Madeleine Albright, Dutch Foreign Minister Hans von Mierlo, and the Vice President of the European Commission, Sir Leon Brittan, *The U.S.-EU Ministerial*, Remarks to the Press, 28 Jan. 1997 (Washington D.C.: Department of State, 1997).
- ³⁴ Quoted in Philip H. Gordon, 'Recasting the Atlantic Alliance,' *Survival*, Vol.38 (1), Spring 1996, p.39.
- ³⁵ Richard Halloran, 'The Rising East,' *Foreign Policy*, No.102, Spring 1996, p.21.
- ³⁶ Samuel P. Huntington, 'The West: Unique, Not Divided,' *Foreign Affairs*, Vol.75 (6), Nov./Dec. 1996, p.44.
- ³⁷ At the time of writing a dispute was being waged between the EU and the US over the practices used to clean and prepare poultry intended for export.
- ³⁸ Office of European Union and Regional Affairs, Bureau for European and Canadian Affairs, *US-European Union Relations*, 3 Dec. 1996.
- ³⁹ *United States Security Strategy for Europe and NATO* (1996), p.1.
- ⁴⁰ 'Strategic Assessment 1995' (INSS) quoted in *United States Security Strategy for Europe and NATO*. (Washington D.C.: Department of Defense, Office of International Security Affairs, 1996).
- ⁴¹ *Ibid.* loc. cit.
- ⁴² Jack L. Snyder, 'Averting Anarchy in the New Europe,' *International Security*, Vol.14 (4), Spring 1990, p.83.
- ⁴³ Although the evidence in the case of France is mixed, there would appear nevertheless to be a pattern of closer formal relations between France and NATO.

- ⁴² Christoph Bertram, *Europe in the Balance: Securing the Peace Won in the Cold War*, (Washington D.C.: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1995) p.3.
- ⁴³ See, for instance, Charles Kupchan, 'Reviving the West,' *Foreign Affairs*, Vol.75 (3), pp.92-105; and Simon Serfaty, 'America and Europe Beyond Bosnia,' *Washington Quarterly*, Vol.19 (3), Summer 1996, pp.31-44.
- ⁴⁴ Office of the Spokesman, U.S. Department of State, *US-European Union Cooperation*, Remarks by Secretary of State Christopher, Italian Foreign Minister Susanna Agnelli, and Vice President of the European Commission, Sir Leon Brittan, 11 April 1996.
- ⁴⁵ *Joint U.S./EU Action Plan*, 3 Dec. 1995 (Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of State, 1996).
- ⁴⁶ *The New Transatlantic Agenda: Update*, Prepared by the Bureau of European and Canadian Affairs, (Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of State, 4 Feb. 1997).
- ⁴⁷ Mark M. Nelson, 'Joint Foreign Policy Remains Distant Dream for European Union,' *The Wall Street Journal*, 26 Sept. 1996.
- ⁴⁸ *Ibid.* loc cit.
- ⁴⁹ Arthur Schlesinger Jr., 'Back to the Womb?,' *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 74 (4), July/Aug. 1995, p.7.
- ⁵⁰ The Single European Act only empowered the EC to address 'political and economic aspects of security.' See *Treaties Revising the Treaties Establishing the European Communities and Acts Relating to the Communities* (Single European Act), 11 June 1986, Title III, Treaty Provisions on European Cooperation in the Sphere of Foreign Policy, Article 30, Paras. 1-2.
- ⁵¹ Address by President George Bush, Oklahoma State University, 4 May 1990, excerpted in, Adam Daniel Rotfeld and Walther Stützel (eds.), *Germany and Europe in Transition*, (Oxford: SIPRI/Oxford University Press, 1991), p.97.
- ⁵² Address by James A. Baker III, U.S. Secretary of State, to the Berlin Press Club, 12 Dec. 1989, quoted in Rotfeld and Stützel (eds.), p.96.
- ⁵³ Margaret Thatcher, *The Downing Street Years*, (New York: Harper Collins, 1993), p.796.
- ⁵⁴ *London Declaration on a transformed North Atlantic Alliance*, Issued by the Heads of State and Government participating in the Meeting of the North Atlantic Alliance, 5-6 July 1990 (Brussels: NATO Press Office).
- ⁵⁵ On Franco-German defence integration see, Simon Duke, *The New European Security Disorder*, (London: Macmillan/St Antony's, 1996), pp.215-254.
- ⁵⁶ See NATO Press Communiqué M-1 (91)44, 7 June 1991.
- ⁵⁷ *The Alliance's New Strategic Concept*, agreed upon by Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council, Rome 7-8 November 1991, Part II, Paras. 17,21,22.
- ⁵⁸ *Ibid.* Article 52.
- ⁵⁹ *Defending Our Future*, Statement on Defence Estimates 1993, Cm.2270 (London: HMSO, July 1993), p.16.
- ⁶⁰ Article IV of the *Treaty of Economic, Social and Cultural Collaboration and Collective Self-Defence Signed at Brussels on March 17, 1948, as Amended By "Protocol Modifying and Completing the Brussels Treaty,"* Signed at Paris, 23 Oct. 1954, (Brussels: Western European Union).
- ⁶¹ *The Treaty on European Union*, Title V 'Provisions on a Common Foreign and Security Policy,' Article J.1, 7 Feb. 1992.
- ⁶² *Ibid.* Article J.4.
- ⁶³ *Declaration of Belgium, Germany, Spain, France, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Portugal, and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, which are members of the WEU and also members of the EU on The Role of the Western European Union and Its Relations with the European Union and with the Atlantic Alliance*, 10 Dec. 1991, Introduction (Brussels: WEU Press and Information Service).
- ⁶⁴ Quoted in Simon Duke, p.223.
- ⁶⁵ For details of the December compromise see, Robert J. Art, 'Why Western Europe Needs the United States and NATO,' *Political Science Quarterly*, Volume 111 (1), Spring 1996, p.29.
- ⁶⁶ Lionel Barber, 'Reinvigorating the Transatlantic Alliance,' *Europe*, Feb. 1996, pp.21-2.
- ⁶⁷ NATO Press Communiqué M-1 (94)3, *Declaration of the Heads of State and Government Participating in the Meeting of the North Atlantic Council*, Brussels, 11 Jan. 1994.

⁶¹ Ibid.

⁷¹ *Statement of the President*, (Washington D.C.: The White House, Office of the Press Secretary), 6 Sept. 1996.

⁷² *United States Security Strategy for Europe and NATO*, (1996), p.26.

⁷³ Press Briefing by National Security Advisor, Anthony Lake, and Director for Strategic Plans and Policy for the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Lieutenant General Wesley Clark, 5 May 1994, *U.S. Department of State Dispatch*, 16 May 1994, Vol.5 (20), p.319.

⁷⁴ Opening Statement, Special Meeting of the North Atlantic Council, Brussels, 10 Jan. 1994 (Brussels: NATO Information Service).

⁷⁵ *North Atlantic Council, Declaration of the Heads of State and Government participating in the Meeting of the North Atlantic Council held at NATO Headquarters, Brussels, 10-11 Jan. 1994*, (Brussels: North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Press Communiqué, M-1 (94(3)), Para.3.

⁷⁶ Ibid. Para.5.

⁷⁷ James B. Steinberg, *Advancing NATO's Adaptation*, Remarks by the Director, Policy Planning Staff, U.S. Department of State, before the Atlantic Council of the US, 13 June 1996 (Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of State, 1996).

⁷⁸ *Fact Sheet: NATO Adaptation/Enlargement*, Bureau of European and Canadian Affairs, 12 Feb. 1997 (Washington D.C.: Department of State, 1997). (Emphasis added)

⁷⁹ *United States Security Strategy for Europe and NATO*, (1996), p. 35.

⁸⁰ Ibid. loc cit.

⁸¹ Stuart Eizenstat, 'Why Europe Must Forge Stronger Security Links,' *Financial Times*, 2 Dec. 1995, quoted in Terrence R. Guay, 'The European Union's Intergovernmental Conference: Pressures for a Common Defence Policy,' *National Security Studies Quarterly*, Spring 1997, Vol. III (2), p.51.

⁸² Lionel Barber, 'Europe Urged to End Reliance on U.S.,' *Financial Times*, 25 May 1993, quoted in Terrence R. Guay, p.52.

⁸³ Roy Denman, 'A Common European Foreign Policy? Not Yet, But In Time,' *International Herald Tribune*, 6 Nov. 1996.

⁸⁴ *United States Security Strategy for Europe and NATO*, (1996) p.15.

⁸⁵ USECOM has deployed forces 51 times to 30 countries since the end of the Gulf War. The six operations referred to are PROVIDE COMFORT (N.Iraq, 1991-), SHARP GUARD (Adriatic, April-1993), DENY FLIGHT (Bosnia, April 1993-), ABLE SENTRY (Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Spring 1993-), SUPPORT HOPE (Rwanda, June-Sept. 1994).

⁸⁶ The tasks are defined in the *Petersberg Declaration*, Western European Union, Council of Ministers, Bonn, 19 June 1992, as 'humanitarian and rescue tasks; peacekeeping tasks; tasks of combat forces in crisis management, including peacemaking,' (Section II: On Strengthening WEU's Operational Role, Para. 4).

⁸⁷ David S. Huntington, 'A Peacekeeping Role for the Western European Union,' in Abram Chayes and Antonia Handler Chayes (eds.), *Preventing Conflict in the Post-Communist World: Mobilizing International and Regional Organizations*, (Washington D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1996), p.437.

⁸⁸ Jim Eberle, 'NATO's higher command,' in Lawrence Freedman (ed.), *Military Power in Europe*, (London: Macmillan, 1990).

⁸⁹ 'War over Naples,' *The Economist*, Vol.341 (7994), Nov. 30 1996, p.34.

⁹⁰ Pauline Neville-Jones, 'Dayton, IFOR and Alliance Relations in Bosnia,' *Survival*, Vol.38 (4), p. 50.

⁹¹ Maynard Glitman, 'US Policy in Bosnia: Rethinking a Flawed Approach,' *Survival*, Vol. 38 (4), p.73.

⁹² A sensitivity sharpened on all sides by the humiliating procession of the stripped body of a U.S. serviceman through the streets of Mogadishu combined with criticism of the U.S. since the operation in which the serviceman died had not been sanctioned through the UN structure.

⁹³ *United States Security Strategy for Europe and NATO*, (1996), p.20 (emphasis added).

⁹⁴ For details of the respective command positions and attached responsibilities see, *NATO Handbook*, (Brussels: NATO Office of Information and Press, 1995), pp.168-187.

⁹⁵ *United States Security Strategy for Europe and NATO*, (1996), p. 35.

⁹⁶ 'Rühe stirs weapons controversy,' *Financial Times*, 26 Nov. 1996, p.3.

⁹⁷ NATO's 1991 *New Strategic Concept*, established multinational defence corps as well as multinational rapid reaction air, sea and ground forces (RRF). The RRF's consist of Immediate RRFs (brigade-sized formations) and the ACE Rapid Reaction Corps (ARRC).

⁹⁸ See 'Patching up NATO,' *The Economist*, 19 Nov. 1994, p.18.

⁹⁹ Bhaskar Menon, 'Making and Keeping the Peace,' in John Tessitore and Susan Woolfson (eds.), *A Global Agenda: Issues Before the 51st General Assembly of the United Nations*. (New York: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc.), p.15-16.

¹⁰⁰ Quoted in Mario Zucconi, 'The European Union in the Former Yugoslavia,' in Abram Chayes and Antonia Chayes (eds.), *Preventing Conflict in the Post-Communist World: Mobilizing International and Regional Organizations*, (Washington D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1996), p.237.

¹⁰¹ See, Tatiana Parkhalina, 'Of myths and illusions: Russian perceptions of NATO enlargement,' *NATO Review*, Vol. 45(3), May-June 1997, pp 11-16.