The EU and Eurasia: a bounded security role in a greater Europe

Simon Serfaty

Entering the twentieth century, the most important strategic location in the world was said to be a 'pivot area' that consisted of the northern and interior portion of the Eurasian continent, 'where the rivers flow either to the icebound Arctic Ocean or inward to salt seas and salt lakes having no oceanic outlets.'¹ So it was viewed then, and so it is often viewed now as other 'Great Games' are being staged in or around this same 'pivot area' for the never-ending struggle among or against great powers.

Notwithstanding the significance of the area, the EU has little involvement with 'Eurasia' as compared to the extensive relations it has developed with other parts of the world. Going west, the EU and the United States are forming an 'ever closer union' of their own – a Euro-Atlantic community that would complete a vision that was born out of the ruins of two world wars half-way into the past century. Moving east, the EU is extending this vision to enough new members to make the continent west of Russia 'whole and free' – while cautiously progressing with a special bilateral relationship with Russia as a power in Europe that need not be, and cannot become, a power within the Union. Going south, the empires have come home and past EU dreams of becoming a power in the Middle East have resulted in the fear that too many immigrants are making of the EU a Middle Eastern power – a condition that reinforces the Union's intention of making the Mediterranean the continent's final geographic boundary (notwithstanding its historic presence in a series of islands that would include Malta and Cyprus) while keeping Turkey separate from its institutions.

By comparison, the EU's presence in Eurasia is elusive. For one, it is diluted by the very nature of a 'region' that escapes any reliable definition: thus, while Halford J. Mackinder remained faithful to his concept of a 'pivot area', he redefined it periodically throughout his life, expanding its reach farther east and south.² Moreover, the area is so diverse as to present the EU with challenges that exceed the limits of what its institutions can do.

Politically, the EU lacks a common foreign and security policy, and none is likely to emerge any time soon. Economically, the Union's attention is elsewhere as it attends to the consequences of its enlargement and other dimensions of a heavy parochial agenda. As a result, outside Russia and Turkey, whatever influence is exerted by the EU in Eurasia results mainly from the interests of individual member-states rather than from the presence of the institutions to which they belong. After the events of September 11 2001, however, and in the context of an expanded war on terrorism, this may cease to be true as 'Eurasia' includes or touches upon a number of pivot countries, including Pakistan and Afghanistan, where the EU will be asked by its members, as well as by the United States, to play a separate, distinctive and even vital role.³

End game?

By any standard, the EU does not qualify as a sovereign state, either as a matter of fact (in its territory, population, government and army) or as a state of mind (in its loyalty, values, identity and history). Yet, not only does the EU matter but also, for some of the issues that seem to matter most, it often matters more than its members. Moving in an increasingly integrated space – peaceful, affluent, democratic and de-ideologised – the states of Europe are playing out an ambitious end game: widen in order to deepen, deepen in order to widen, and reform in order to do both.⁴

Deepening is Euro-speak for doing more. It has to do with increasing institutional cooperation in more and more substantive areas, thereby leaving less room for the exercise of national sovereignty. Because each new initiative often sets the stage for the initiative that follows, there seems to be no end to the process and, accordingly, for most of the past 50 years few attempts have been made to define that end point before it is reached. *Widening* is Euro-speak for bringing more members in the community – from six to nine to ten to 12 to 15, and possibly twice as many by 2010. Yet, enlargement is not open-ended and its limits – part geographical, part cultural and part organisational – are real even as they remain unstated.⁵ Finally, *reforming* the institutions has to do with devising new ways whereby an expanding institutional discipline – the *acquis communautaire* – can be effectively imposed on the community.⁶ Predictably, the more the process unfolds and the more institutional reforms are needed through intergovernmental conferences (IGCs) held to modify the original treaties – as will have been the case on three occasions during the period 1996–2004.

This reorganisation of Europe's political space is historically awesome. Yet because the process remains very erratic, moving from setbacks to *relance*, many continue to dismiss it. That will puzzle future historians. When dealing with contemporary Europe and its future role as security actor, particularly outside Europe proper, it is best to think retroactively – what

used to be once upon a time and has been achieved over time, rather than what is and is being attempted at a given time. Thinking in time helps gain the perspective needed to follow Europe's revival during the second half of the twentieth century when, with America's encouragement, its mosaic of nation-states gained unparalleled cohesion and stability as a union of member-states.

Jean Monnet, who viewed the 1957 Rome Treaties as a feeble and 'rather vague' idea, would be astounded.⁷ Can the young member-states of the EU be the old great powers of Europe that celebrated the horrific deaths of tens of millions in the name of a mythical white man's burden, an elusive *mission civilisatrice*, a constrained *Kultur*, or self-appointed and barbaric Soviet commissars? Living in an increasingly integrated and civil space, the new Europeans show an identity that is increasingly common. Over the years, there has emerged a community of people living in a collage of regions whose shared characteristics overcome national stereotypes. Forget the clichés: with cultures increasingly compatible, attitudes have become complementary. Now, the 'ideal' European is found most convincingly as a composite of what the idealised German, French, Spaniard, Italian and Englishman used to be – enhanced by the cultural colours brought by the defunct overseas empires, and completed by the US influence that has spread throughout much of the continent.

Even as Europeans gain a better sense of the reality *communautaire* they form, they fail to understand how their emerging community serves them, and why. Not surprisingly, that creates new tensions with institutions that often seem to proceed 'as if' they knew better than the states they serve. 'The concept of "as if"', wrote Timothy Ash, 'is a subjective, idealistic self-definition in which the idea takes absolute precedence over reality and consciousness determines being.'⁸ For the EU, the concept means treating 'Europe' as if it holds the same legitimacy as each of its members, even though their citizens view it as a cage within which their democratic institutions are imprisoned and their national identity is diluted. The agenda could not be any more parochial. For the citizens to accept a recycling of their cherished nation-state within an ill-defined union of member-states, the European institutions will have to do more in such areas as jobs, income distribution, ageing populations and inadequately funded pension funds, immigration flows, education, national cohesion, political leadership and much else. Not 'as if' but 'what if' the EU could save the nation-states, once again, from their inability to attend to issues that cannot be resolved individually as effectively as collectively.⁹

On September 11 2001 an unpredictable 'what if' entered the transatlantic and Eurasian mix within which the EU was to play out its end game. History need not unfold further to conclude that America's loss of its territorial invulnerability, assumed to be inviolable, will impact not only on the United States and its vision of, and role in, the world, but also on every region

and, within each region, every country too. With all nations asked to choose sides – ‘with us or against us’, insisted President George W. Bush on 20 September – alliances and adversary relations will be tested in ways that are likely to change them significantly, for the much better or the much worse. With the EU countries open to catastrophic, terror-ridden scenarios developed south of the Mediterranean, new ‘civilisational’ hostilities could seriously impact on their relations with the Greater Europe that lies outside the EU’s institutional boundaries, including Russia as well as Turkey and its immediate neighbours in the Caucasus and Caspian region – all institutional orphans that receive limited attention from the EU.

On the whole, however, the end game that began in the latter part of the 1990s will still be nearing completion at the end of this decade. This means that by that time, Europe will have progressively become: larger, with 25 members or more, but excluding, under any conceivable circumstances, Turkey, Russia and any former Soviet republic except the Baltic countries; deeper, with a functioning euro zone comprised of at least all current 15 EU countries, including Great Britain; more globally engaged, with an increasingly common (but still incomplete) foreign policy that would reflect the improved cohesion of EU countries, but with none of the political will required for evoking yet a common defence policy; somewhat stronger, with some early elements of a common security policy in place, including institutions but also minimal capabilities for rapid deployment in and beyond Europe; and more united as a reborn superpower, though not as an emerging superstate.

Going west: an ever closer union

After World War II and throughout the Cold War, America’s embrace of the idea of Europe was never unconditional. Nor, for that matter, did it ever need to be. Instead, the US commitment to a united and strong Europe relied on criteria of political, economic and societal convergence that would help the countries of Europe act more like the United States, even if they could not quite ‘be’ the United States. But these were also criteria of institutional convergence that would enable an emerging European Community to join the United States in a community of action where the values and the interests shared across the Atlantic would be translated into common policies. In other words, an ever more united and stronger Europe would become inseparable from the United States, even as it remained separate from America.¹⁰

During the formative Cold War phase of Europe’s construction, US apprehensions were significant but also comprehensible. Keeping the Communists out of coalition governments in NATO countries was a matter of common sense. With hindsight, the passions aroused over US opposition to Eurocommunism, in Italy and elsewhere, are baffling. Whatever else was said, Communist participation in allied governments would have adversely

affected NATO cohesion. Sustaining the US dollar as the Euro-Atlantic currency of choice was also compelling. As was shown during the monetary storms of the 1970s, an erratic dollar rattled more than the sole US economy. Preserving the US control of the nuclear deterrent should not have been a matter for serious debate either: who else? Even assuming that de Gaulle had a visionary sense of the future, being right 25 years too early would also mean having been wrong for 25 years too many. And so the discord went – never so far, however, that any country in Europe withdrew from the alliance, and never so disruptive that the United States might wish to derail the unfolding process in Europe.¹¹

Early in the 2000s, US concerns over the conclusive phase of the European construction are different. Centrist republics in Europe can hardly raise fears comparable to those raised by political changes during the Cold War. The ‘foreign national parties’ of yesteryear have become ‘European national parties’ as they enter into domestic coalitions that barely move from centre left to centre right. As Europe expands to the east, criteria of membership are comparable to the criteria that were implicitly outlined earlier for the Euro-Atlantic community, including democratic structures, market economy and the ability to compete. For 50 years, the United States remodelled the countries of western Europe to its image, and now it is their turn to refashion eastern Europe to that new image.

Some ambivalence remains, however. A united Europe whose strength would rest ultimately on the joint pillars of its single currency and a common security and defence policy could be viewed either as a counterweight or as a counterpart of American leadership and power. The distinction is real. The defining image of a counterweight is adversarial, as the ‘weight’ to ‘counter’ would be primarily, if not exclusively, that of the United States.¹² Fears of such a counter have to do with the assumption that Europe’s follower-ship must be absolute lest America’s leadership be weakened. As the image gains focus, the euro emerges as a challenger, even a threat, to the dollar – a global reserve currency whose economic clout would make it an effective *force de frappe* aimed at deflating or reversing US influence everywhere. A common security, foreign and (eventually) defence policy would provide this counterweight with capabilities that might confirm the rise of Europe as an option to the United States in areas where American leadership was traditionally tolerated for lack of available alternatives. The additional risk raised by such emerging military capabilities would not be that they might be used in spite of the United States and NATO. The risk would be that the ‘authorised’ use of an ‘autonomous’ force would be so ineffective (or premature) as to force subsequently an American involvement that the United States might not have considered otherwise. In this case, far from being a counterweight, ‘Europe’ and its alleged new power would have proven to be a counterfeit.¹³

Standing in exaggerated opposition to the counterweight view of Europe’s future is a more united, larger and stronger Europe acting as a counterpart

to the United States.¹⁴ The driving assumption behind this view is that what has been happening in Europe over the past 50 years has been generally good for America, and that more integration would be just as good (and certainly better than any alternative). Admittedly, the rise of a strong euro as a global currency could harm a dollar that has provided well for Europe's (and America's) affluence, and an autonomous Europe could hamper a US leadership that has served well Europe's (and America's) security. Yet, while differences between the two sides of the Atlantic remain – geopolitical, economic and cultural – these have been narrowing significantly as America becomes more European, and Europe more American. In sum, more integration in Europe need not mean less America in an integrated Europe.

The political, economic, strategic and even cultural indivisibility of the Euro-Atlantic space will be sorely tested in the early 2000s. Predictably, an America targeted by 'evildoers' intent on turning back the clock of their history, as well as that of other nations, a thousand years will not be satisfied with half-hearted support. The magnitude of the killing – approximating the official total of the Revolutionary War or of Pearl Harbor's 'day of infamy' – made the peaceful resolution of this 'act of war' neither possible nor desirable. This shared threat was also promptly perceived in Europe, where heads of state and government quickly understood their own vulnerability. '*Ich bin ein New-Yorker*' – this was Europe's time to respond to these events with tones of solidarity voiced in the name of their own interests as well as on America's behalf. Coming days after the unprecedented NATO decision to view the attack against New York and Washington as an action covered by Article 5 of the 1949 Washington Treaty, the EU pledge of 'unlimited solidarity' for the campaign against the 'barbaric acts' of September 11 provided the United States with a powerful reminder that even a nation without peers needs the comfort of its allies. To paraphrase John F. Kennedy again, entering the new century, it is Europe's turn to ask not what America can do for the Old World but what the Old World must do with America.¹⁵

Bigger is safer

After World War II, the division of Europe was not preordained. Rather, the United States envisioned a whole and united Europe that would rely on the Grand Alliance, including the Soviet Union, to achieve a lasting reconciliation with the defeated states, including Germany. Sensitive to the conflicts that had followed the end of the previous world war, the Truman administration reasoned that Europe's instabilities would be best overcome within an integrated, democratic and affluent continental space. In June 1947, the American offer of Marshall aid was extended to the east, but Moscow's refusal was imposed on neighbouring countries that were to start a 'community' of their own a few years later. As the Cold War was unfolding, the Atlantic idea, which was a European idea, helped overcome resistance to a

European construction that the United States was more determined to pursue than the Europeans themselves.¹⁶

Entering the 1990s, the end of the Cold War briefly appeared to threaten both ideas and both institutions. By then, however, Europe and America's earlier choices had become irreversible. Now, talks of dissolution of NATO (in the United States) or withdrawal from 'Europe' (for any of its members) had become meaningless. Instead, enlargement to the east quickly became the favoured option that would move NATO but also the EU beyond their Cold War areas so that neither could be moved out of business. In 1995, Europe's fourth enlargement – to Austria, Finland and Sweden – involved nearly all the European states that had chosen to be, or were compelled to remain, neutral during the Cold War. In 1999, NATO's fourth enlargement to the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland involved three of the four countries in Central Europe that had previously constituted the dividing line between the east and the west.

EU enlargement is a vital dimension of Europe's future and a central dimension of an evolving Euro-Atlantic security partnership in the twenty-first century. First, a larger EU is the most effective way to extend the democratic stability of western Europe to the continent. What else is there? The transformation of Europe's hard core – France, Germany and Italy – is a case in point: it is within a united Europe that France ended its wars of the republics, Italy began to complete its unification, and Germany exhausted its appetite for living space. Examples of domestic upheavals within the European community have been few and have become fewer. At the margins of Europe, Ireland first, then Spain and Portugal, and Greece next, also gained unprecedented democratic stability and affluence thanks, in part at least, to the advantages of EU membership: economic gains, financial transfers, political centrism and western legitimacy. Finally, domestic challenges to stability mounted by ideological or separatist groups could be all the more successful as the EU progressively helped contain the risks that the governments' reaction might raise for civil liberties that would have otherwise been left unprotected.

A sense of failure resulting from unfulfilled promises of enlargement would be destabilising. The EU timetables for enlargement must be robust and credible, and deadlines that serve short-term political interests at home but cannot be met within the EU – or are not met because of these interests – are self-defeating. In the 1990s, too many target dates for enlargement were postponed when the prerequisite of institutional reform within the EU imposed criteria on member-states even more difficult to meet than the criteria for membership faced by applicant countries. But, unlike the case with NATO, the benefits of EU membership are as quantifiable as their costs, and a failure to make membership work after it has been granted would be no less significant than a failure to grant it. After the Cold War the countries of central and eastern Europe endured many years of economic pain and turbu-

lence, even under conditions of growth, as the need to prepare for the *acquis communautaire* denied the generous peace dividends expected by the people. Now, these sacrifices must be justified not only with the fact of membership but also with its rewards – meaning, rewards of economic affluence and democratic stability. A decade after the end of the Cold War, these rewards remain far short of public expectations.¹⁷

Bidding for NATO membership does not help bids for EU membership, but achieving one does help the other. Admittedly, because both institutions are distinct, the two processes of enlargement should remain separate. Yet, a parallel enlargement of both institutions would enable them to work together more effectively than under conditions that keep European NATO states that are not EU members away from EU initiatives, and EU states that are not NATO members away from NATO initiatives. Such convergence occurred during the Cold War, when the European Economic Community grew from six to 12 – and NATO from 12 to 16 members. By 1986, only one of the new European Community states (Ireland) had failed to join NATO as well, and only three of the 14 NATO European countries were not European Community members, with only Turkey wishing otherwise (unlike Norway and Iceland). After the Cold War, the gap widened again: the three neutral states that joined the EU in 1995 did not seek NATO membership, and none of the three countries that joined NATO in 1999 were in the EU although all were included in the short list of EU applicants.

A strategy of dual enlargement would keep the two processes of enlargement separate, but it would recognise that EU and NATO decisions are not separable as the two institutions best equipped to serve as primary guarantors of the new European security order.¹⁸ To achieve this goal, each institution should also reach out to European states that already belong to the other. Thus, by 2005–7, most European members of an enlarged NATO are likely to be in the EU, while most members of an enlarged EU will probably have joined NATO, thus extending the boundaries of a Greater Europe to the Baltic region, central Europe and Slovenia. By that time, too, the reorganisation of a common Euro-Atlantic space may begin to cover the former neutral states that objected to NATO membership, including Austria (and even, in the not-too-distant future, Sweden and Finland), as well as persistent Euro-sceptics that stood away from the EU (including Norway). Thus, the convergence between NATO and EU membership would have been restored in the east and the south, thereby building new common ground for complementary strategies in these areas. NATO does not command the wide variety of diplomatic and commercial tools available to the EU to influence the decisions that might lead to unwanted military actions. The EU does not command the decisive type of capabilities available to NATO to shape events after these decisions have been made. For both NATO and the EU, dual enlargement is a vital dimension of a western strategy for the unfinished security business in and beyond Europe.

With NATO and the United States thus standing on each sideline of the playing field, the transatlantic dimensions of the EU's end game are clearly drawn. Entering the twenty-first century, America has a relationship with Europe that is no longer reversible. It may not be, and not wish to become, a European power, but it is, and is bound to remain, a power in Europe. Such a conclusion is not an invitation to debate America's membership in the EU, but it is a plea to debate the consequences of America's status as a non-member member-state within the EU. In short, a vital but carefully hidden dimension of EU enlargement has to do with the structure of US relations with the EU, as well as with the nature of EU–NATO relations.

Going east: smaller is better

Farther to the east, it is politically ironic that the disintegration of the Soviet Union initially moved Moscow and its former republics farther away from the Europe that Mikhail Gorbachev hoped to lease as a common home. At least the Soviet Union had an ideology that many in Europe were seemingly prepared to endorse for a while. But it also had a history inherited from a Russian state whose steadfast expansion to the west sought to define a territorial niche – ‘a safe and productive location’, according to Robert Legvold – on a continent that Dostoevsky and Tolstoy understood much better than Marx, Lenin and Stalin.¹⁹ Now, nothing is left of the Soviet Union except a leadership that has more to do with the remnants of the amputated Communist empire it inherited by default than with *la grande Russie* of an earlier Europe.

Throughout the Cold War, the Kremlin never viewed ‘Europe’ on its own terms. Rather, an emerging European community was misrepresented as a sort of NATO without America's (nuclear) teeth – too tempting for Moscow to ignore but not strong enough to fear. Accordingly, Soviet policies towards the then-European Community were policies towards the United States, whose periodic tensions with one or more EU states provided opportunities – usually illusive – to drive a wedge between the two sides of the Atlantic. After the Cold War, however, a sense of neglect and even harassment by the United States progressively sharpened Moscow's interest in Europe and its union. As Stephen Cohen observed at the time, ‘By 2000, some 81 per cent [of Russians] believed that US policy in general was anti-Russian and even pro-Western Russians thought a “reverse iron curtain” was being imposed on the country's borders.’²⁰ In July 2000, a newly elected president, Vladimir Putin, readily approved a ‘Foreign Policy Concept of the Russian Federation’ that identified the EU as Russia's second highest priority – after the CIS, but before any other part of the world, including the United States and China. Confirmed in Putin's state-of-Russia message in April 2001, this new Russian vision was offered as a direct response to the EU's earlier Common Strategy on Russia – the first of its kind on both accounts, form

(‘common strategy’) and substance (Russia).²¹ In October 2001, the EU–Russia summit tasked the High Level Group on Common European Economic Space, a joint group formed earlier that year, to elaborate a concept for closer bilateral economic ties over a 15-month period and in ways that seemed to parallel the EU’s approach to creating a single market. With Russia’s primary interest thus moving towards the EU, and with the EU responding in kind, Moscow’s interest in privileged ties with individual European countries – especially France and Germany – has acquired a double significance: not only on their own merits but also in terms of their role in, and influence over, European integration.²²

The consequences of Russia’s belated discovery of the EU should not be exaggerated, however. Their relations are complicated by a tenacious idea of Russia’s place in Europe – an idea that has defied the realities of geography, withstood the trials of history, adjusted to repeated waves of authoritarian governance, and never integrated those convictions that some rulers occasionally sought to import from other countries. Tim McDaniel has described this idea as the certainty that Russia has a distinctive cultural and historical tradition that sets it apart from the rest of Europe and guarantees its future as a great power.²³ Not surprisingly, the problem with this idea of Russia – *la grande Russie* and *la Russie éternelle* – is that the Russian state can no longer support it, the Russian people can no longer endure it, and Europe can no longer afford it.

Russia is too close to ignore, too big to integrate, too unstable to rattle, and too nuclear to offend: neither the United States nor the states of Europe could afford for long to neglect the risks of disintegration within Russia and its related spillovers elsewhere. Yet, while tensions between the petty realities of what Russia is and the grand illusions that shape its self-image remain, they have become less urgent because Russia can no longer have the sort of universal ambitions that still characterised Russian policies during their most recent Soviet phase. Even Moscow’s regional aspirations are illusive: the 300 million Muslims systematically antagonised by Russia since the Cold War, the 1.3 billion Chinese whom Russia repeatedly offended after World War II, and the hundreds of millions of neighbours that Russians have openly harassed throughout history are poised for geopolitical revenge.²⁴ The conclusion for Russia is all too obvious. Isolation is not an option, and the best of all available choices is a closer relationship with its former adversaries in the West, individually but also with the institutions to which they belong or hope to join. That is well understood by Putin, whose attempt to bring Russia deeper into the EU need not clash with his post-9/11 bid for a special relationship with the United States as a non-member member-state of the military organisation, NATO, that was initially designed to contain the Russian empire.

Russia’s territorial intimacy with Europe is reinforced as enlargement brings the EU and NATO closer to, and even into, Russian territory through

the enclave of Kaliningrad, where Moscow's demands for special transit rights will have to be addressed by the time the Baltic countries became EU members. Admittedly, Russia was from the start a main feature of NATO enlargement, if only because of an implicit need to accommodate its objections when NATO moved into central Europe in 1999, and, after that, prepared its entry into former Soviet territory – before the 'wars of 9/11' seemed to marginalise that decision even before it was to be announced at the NATO Prague summit in November 2002. But even then, EU countries too had to show sensitivity about the impact of their own decisions on Moscow, a feat initially less complex than for NATO because there could be no ambiguity over a Russian membership in the EU, which could not be an option either then or for the predictable future.

Short of opening the doors of either institution, NATO and EU members are somehow learning to live cooperatively and lastingly with Russia. A Janus-like Russian face that smiles at one and frowns at the other will not work because a frowning Russia, wherever it looks, is likely to scare even the side at which it is smiling. Admittedly, the security questions raised after the events of September 11 made of Russia a most valuable and capable ally – one whose resources, institutions and experience would suit especially well the security needs faced in and beyond Afghanistan. Yet, a separate grand bargain with the fallen superpower in search of a mission and an institutional home would have dire consequences for both NATO and the EU. With regard to the former, an ever-closer bilateral relationship between the United States and Russia would introduce new ambiguities within and about NATO, where the EU allies (with the possible exception of Britain) would fall at the margins of US interests. That in turn would redirect the EU efforts towards a Common Security and Defence Identity that would be asserted within or in spite of NATO, leaving Britain torn between the aspirations of its prime minister, Tony Blair, across the Atlantic and his ambitions across the Channel.

Going south: farther is safer

Passion was the glue for the collective 'We' of the nation – the passion that kept the few different from (and better than) the many who were to be kept away across territorial and ideological lines. Notwithstanding the erosion of much of that passion, some of its darker sides linger, especially to the south. Thus, in June 1955, the choice of Messina as the site of Europe's *relance* after the French defeat of the European Defence Community was ironic. Messina was the small Italian port where the Christian fleets had paused before going to battle with the Turkish fleet, whose destruction in Lesanto kept the Infidels away.²⁵ Nearly five hundred years later, and half-a-century after Messina, Europe's Christian 'We' still aims at a rigid separation from the Muslim 'They': the farther, the safer.

That may change, but not yet. For Europeans whose loyalty is evolving from the nation-state to the institution to which it belongs, the related question of identity is best answered with a recognisable sense of a plausible 'They' whose leaders must be feared and kept at a distance. Lacking that threat, it may be tempting to turn against something (the post-World War II idea of Europe or a post-Cold War idea of America) or someone (the elusive foreigner or the intrusive Iman). Populist calls to arms follow readily: these are the *déjà entendus* of yesteryear – close the borders and protect the sacred patrimony from intruders that must be denied access or worse. This is a Cartesian logic turned inside out – I am, therefore you are not. Each affirms its specificity in order to escape the other's – 'foreign, different, if not barbarian, fundamentalist or fanatic' are words that can define both Europe's worst vision of Islam and Islam's worst vision of the West.²⁶ In sum, there is little debate where enlargement ends: at the border of the Eurasian countries that Moscow used to control, and across the Mediterranean where individual EU countries used to find the size and the resources they lacked on the continent.

As EU boundaries move in the direction of Malta and Cyprus, an ever more populous and religious Middle East is feared as a dagger pointed at the soul of an older and depopulated Europe. Admittedly, Turkey and its neighbours in the Caucasus and Caspian region are hardly part of the Middle East. Yet a cultural self-definition of the EU pushes them away from the European landmass and conditions the debate surrounding Turkey and its meagre prospects for EU membership, notwithstanding the vague promises extended in December 2002. Indeed, if Turkey were given a role in Europe commensurate with its size, power and potential, the EU would be transformed into a power in the Middle East. But that is unlikely. While Turkey's bid for membership is thus stalled in the maze of institutional reforms that will make access negotiations even more tedious and inconclusive after enlargement to the east is completed, the millions of immigrants who have overcome the increasingly higher legal and physical ramparts raised on their way into Europe are transforming the EU into a Middle Eastern power.

The Euro-Atlantic dialogue about Turkey and its place in Europe points to an ironic reversal of roles between an America that thinks in geopolitical terms and a Europe that responds with semi-formulated cultural or ethnic arguments. Geography, as well as history, explains Europe's (and America's) position. Turkey is a pivot state for nearly every issue of importance to the United States (and its EU allies) on the Eurasian continent, including but not limited to the needed transit routes for Central Asian oil and gas.²⁷ For the wars of 9/11, it is one of America's two most significant NATO allies (with Britain) – and, accordingly, one whose dependability ought to be reinforced with the secular rewards of democratic affluence expected from EU membership. In the American view, therefore, EU enlargement to Turkey would make NATO stronger as its borders are extended to Syria, Iraq and Iran, as

well as the Caspian states. Indeed, according to some who worry about alleged anti-American sentiments in the new Europe, America's most reliable European allies are non-EU countries that include Turkey but also Russia.²⁸

That view is not shared in Europe, where Turkey is still feared as an unwanted community partner – an alien and even hostile neighbour that would make the EU weaker by threatening the institution's internal balance, especially but not exclusively culturally. Yet with a large and growing range of EU activities and projects dependent on some kind of consultation with, or cooperation from, Turkish ministries and agencies in order to operate or develop effectively, there is no escape from closer ties. In short, with prospects for Turkey's membership in the EU dim to non-existent for the balance of the present decade and beyond, their dialogue should focus more explicitly on the best ways to strengthen Turkey's European-ness within the EU with cooperative projects that would weaken that country's own concern over the influence of an anti-Turkish, pro-Greek sentiment among EU members.²⁹

The tensions faced in building a multicultural community within the EU, and separately within each of its members, serve as reminders of the obstacles facing its extension to Eurasian states and former colonial dependencies in the Greater Middle East about which the EU and its members show a considerable interest, but which they have no intention of including in their institutions at any time in the foreseeable future. Pretending otherwise can only arouse self-defeating expectations among Europe's neighbours, and worsen Europe's own concerns about them. Most generally, regions that remain politically diffuse and elusive can only afford or generate a security structure with Europe and with the United States that remains invisible.³⁰ Thus, more realistic than a broad Mediterranean community is the limited free trade area envisioned by the Barcelona framework as the centrepiece of an architecture that relies on performance-linked financial support and even new institutional linkages for dialogue, security and otherwise. After September 11, the case for a free trade area to which the United States might be associated was strengthened further. Non-state groups and even regimes that advocate terror will not be defeated, let alone pre-empted, by the use of overwhelming military power alone. After the war has been won militarily, it still needs to be ended politically: reconciliation demands reconstruction, and reconstruction will be especially needed if these wars spread further to a distraught and hopeless populace among adversaries and allies alike. The logic applies to the totality of the Greater Middle East, going from North Africa to the Persian Gulf, but it also applies to the newly independent states of the Caucasus and Caspian region – with the latter countries grossly neglected by the EU and most of its members despite a geopolitical significance that was vital long before September 11.

While NATO will remain the security institution of choice for the foresee-

able future, it is not a full service institution – no more and possibly even less than the EU. Soft security issues that impact on stability can be addressed most effectively by the EU, with the direct support of its members and with occasional assistance from the United States and even NATO. Conversely, hard security issues are best managed by the United States, within or outside NATO, whose members should be entitled to a right of first refusal when their support is sought, and within or outside the EU. This is not a recipe for an ill-defined ‘multilateralism *à la carte*’ or an artificial division of labour: both sets of issues are separable but they cannot be separated, and, accordingly, so are policies that address them. A neglect of soft security issues would exacerbate issues of hard security, while the neglect of hard security issues would stall issues of development and reconstruction.

In the Greater Middle East more than anywhere else, EU countries hold and respond to different priorities and vulnerabilities that stand in the way of common policies among them, let alone between them and the United States. Now as before, *laissez-les faire* is not an option. The region is just too important (energy supplies), reckless (terrorism), dangerous (four major wars), unstable (*fin de régimes*), expensive (for keeping the peace and waging war) and intrusive (because of the domestic spillovers of instability and war in the area) to be abandoned to the goodwill and capabilities of others. Yet, on the whole, differences within the EU have been getting smaller, and initiatives based on specific national interests now embody a European policy rather than the interests of one EU country only. As shown in 2002, over President Bush’s denunciation of a so-called ‘axis of terror’, but also over Israeli prime minister Ariel Sharon’s attacks against a so-called ‘coalition of terror’, such convergence could not be seen as readily between Europe and the United States. Indeed, the reverse may prove to be true, and the compatibility of US and EU views for the region will be sorely tested in coming years.

Going global

During the Cold War, the Atlantic idea helped develop a community of values that protected its members from military aggression. Simultaneously, the idea of Europe also helped develop a community of interests that could protect its members from war with each other. Both ideas were complementary as neither could have been launched and blossomed without the other. The Atlantic idea and the organisation that embodied it helped keep the peace, but the idea of Europe and the institutions to which it gave birth helped do away with the very idea of war. Neither the peace of the bullies nor the peace of the braves, the peace achieved by the EU is a peace of contentment and assimilation that was initially guaranteed by NATO. No gain, however construed, could compensate the ‘winners’ for the losses that would result from a war between EU countries, whatever its origin. In truth, within the EU, there is no threat of a return to past conflicts: in the 1990s,

post-Cold War conflicts in Europe all took place in countries that were not eligible for membership any time soon, notably those in the Balkans and the former Soviet republics.³¹

While the EU, unlike NATO, cannot protect its members or its neighbours from external aggression, it can help keep peace between them, within and outside the European continent. In several primary areas of conflict in Europe, including the Balkans, credible prospects for membership can encourage moderation: arguably, some of the horror that plagued the former Yugoslavia in the 1990s might have been avoided had the EU been involved earlier. While no country in southeastern Europe, with the exception of Slovenia, can realistically expect to enter the EU before 2010, every country in southeastern Europe should still be able to view the EU as part of its future. The process is not open-ended, however, and the geographic 'E' of the EU may prove more restrictive than the historic 'North Atlantic' definition of NATO. Yet, short of membership the EU can still play a useful role in helping its non-EU neighbours by acting more like a bilateral donor than an international financial institution.³²

While the institutional and budgetary consequences of enlargement will continue to limit such a role for the years to come, the EU is none the less making substantial contributions to the management of soft security issues at its extended boundaries. Thus, at the January 2002 conference held in Tokyo in the context of the war in Afghanistan, the EU (both the Commission and the member-states) pledged a total of 2.3 billion euros for the period 2002–06, amounting to 45 per cent of the total pledges made in Tokyo. Concerned with a spillover of the war onto the European continent, the EU also made substantial commitments for Pakistan, including aid and preferential trade treatment extended to textiles, and for Central Asia it doubled its allocations.³³ In future years, more will be expected from the EU, especially for the Arab–Israeli conflict, where a pronounced pro-Arab bias often leaves the EU at odds with the United States, and in the Persian Gulf, where the United States and most EU members continue to hold different views on the political rehabilitation of both Iran and Iraq. But for the EU to respond to these lofty expectations, its members will first need to agree over the boundaries of a common foreign policy that is still debated not only among them but also between the institutions that represent them.

As to traditional security issues, there should be no misunderstanding. For many years to come, significant capability gaps and interest divergences among EU countries themselves will continue to stand in the way of coordinated, let alone common, EU action. Predictably, these differences are even sharper, and getting wider, in a Euro-Atlantic context – between the United States and the states of Europe within NATO, and even between a US-led 'NATO at 20' (*cum* Russia) and the EU from which both the United States and Russia are excluded. Indeed, in 2001–02, the military campaign in Afghanistan pointed to a new American doctrine of strategic relevance that

provided for 'mutually assured recrimination' across the Atlantic. Because large 'coalitions of the willing' might confuse or dilute the mission, as had been shown during the 1999 war in Kosovo, credible offers of usable capabilities from willing coalition partners were mostly ignored or dismissed as unnecessary. With the transatlantic 'capabilities gap' scheduled to grow dramatically in coming years, the military 'need' for allies may, therefore, be questioned increasingly in the United States. When recognised within or outside NATO, such a need will be determined by the unavailability of US capabilities (for lack of interest or lack of will) or by the availability of new allies (on grounds of geographic location or political convenience) more than by the capabilities of traditional European allies.

Yet the security agenda for the twenty-first century is an agenda *tous azimuts* of traditional and new security issues. This agenda will demand large coalitions of countries, including but hardly limited to NATO countries, that are not only willing but also capable of administering the full range of national power, hard and soft. None of the global wars waged in the twentieth century is likely to serve as a model for what President George W. Bush dubbed the 'first war of the twenty-first century'. To each mission its own coalition, with all coalitions assembled into a pyramidal structure that would keep the few national powers at the top still dependent on the many countries and even institutions grouped at the wider bottom. How these coalitions are managed – and how they perform – may well determine the future of NATO and the conditions under which the EU will evolve as a security institution of primary or complementary choice for its members. The goal for NATO and the EU, as well as for their respective member-states, is not to do everything together but to be sure that together they all do everything that is needed for attending to the security of a whole and free Euro-Atlantic area.

Notes

- 1 Halford J. Mackinder first presented his thesis in January 1904. See Arthur Hall, 'Mackinder and the Course of Events', *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 45:2 (1955), p. 109.
- 2 Mackinder's evolution is discussed in detail by Hall, 'Mackinder', pp. 109–26.
- 3 'There is no need to throw out regional peculiarities altogether', writes Charles King in an excellent review essay, but 'the real challenge is to recast what counts as the geographic area (or, more likely, areas)'. Eurasia, adds King, 'will be meaningful in the future only if it seriously admits Turkey, Iran, and perhaps Pakistan and Afghanistan into the mix'. Charles King, 'Post-Postcommunism: Transition, Comparison, and the End of "Eastern Europe"', *World Politics*, 53:1 (2000), pp. 143–72.
- 4 For a brief statement on the nature of this end game, see my 'Reflections on European Unification', *Responsive Community*, 11:3 (2001), pp. 4–7. A longer discussion appears in my 'Europe 2007: From Nation-States to Member States',

- Washington Quarterly*, 23:4 (2000), pp. 15–29.
- 5 These limits suggest that countries that were not conducting access negotiations in 2002 are not likely to enter the EU over the next 15 years if ever – including especially Russia and all former Soviet Republics except the Baltic countries. Exceptions include countries that have declined or opposed membership thus far (Norway and Switzerland) and countries in the former Yugoslavia (besides Slovenia) that could gain membership in the early 2010s.
 - 6 Andrew Moravcsik, 'Europe's Integration at Century's End', in Andrew Moravcsik (ed.), *Centralization or Fragmentation? Europe Facing the Challenges of Deepening, Diversity, and Democracy* (New York: Council on Foreign Relations, 1998), pp. 1–58.
 - 7 Jean Monnet, *Memoirs* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1978), p. 403. 'I have never doubted', adds Monnet, 'that one day this process will lead us to the United States of Europe; but I see no point in trying to imagine today what political form it will take ... No one can say.' *Ibid.*, pp. 523–4.
 - 8 Timothy Garton Ash, *The Uses of Adversity: Essays on the Fate of Central Europe* (New York: Random House, 1989), p. 106.
 - 9 Admittedly, a utilitarian form of legitimacy is a double-edged sword that cuts both ways. As the EU is viewed as an effective producer of gains for its members, its legitimacy grows, and so does public support for, or indifference to, further institutional deepening. Conversely, as the effectiveness of the EU decreases, its members can readily turn to its institutions to explain their own failures and erode the legitimacy of the EU institutions.
 - 10 This theme is developed at greater length in my *Stay the Course: European Unity and Atlantic Solidarity* (New York: Praeger, 1997).
 - 11 Return, for example, to the 'limited war' waged between France and the United States in the mid-1960s over NATO, including President Johnson's dismissal of any response to de Gaulle that might disrupt the 'natural' amity between the two countries and, by implication, further disrupt relations between the United States and its European allies. Frank Costigliola, 'LBJ, Germany, and the "End of the Cold War"', in Warren I. Cohen and Nancy Bernkopf Tucker (eds), *Lyndon Johnson Confronts the World* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994), p. 195.
 - 12 For examples of this view, see Peter Rodman, *Drifting Apart? Trends in US–European Relations* (Washington, DC: Nixon Center, 1999); and John Bolton, 'European Common Foreign, Security, and Defense Policies: Implications for the United States and the Atlantic Alliance', *Hearings*, House Committee on International Relations, 106th Congress, First Session, 10 November 1999, pp. 65–78.
 - 13 Whether in 1917 or in 1941, but also most recently in the Balkans in 1995, the use of US military power in Europe aimed at wars that the countries of Europe started or joined but failed to end on their own. With regard to Bosnia, Richard Holbrooke has written that the war could only be ended in Dayton after, 'finally, we told the Serbs that henceforth the United States and NATO, not the U.N., would decide if they were in compliance'. See Richard Holbrooke, *To End a War* (New York: Random House, 1998), p. 157.
 - 14 Charles Kupchan, 'In Defence of Europe's Defence: An American Perspective', *Survival*, 42:2 (2000), pp. 16–32; also my testimonies, 'European Common

- Foreign, Security, and Defense Policies', *Hearings*, House Committee on International Relations, 106th Congress, First Session, 10 November 1999, pp. 94–104, and 'U.S.–European Relationship: Opportunities and Challenges', *Hearings*, Subcommittee on Europe of the House Committee on International Relations, 107th Congress, First Session, 25 April 2001, pp. 8–16.
- 15 See my 'The Wars of 9/11', *International Spectator*, 36:4 (2001), pp. 5–11, and 'The New Normalcy', *Washington Quarterly*, 25:2 (2002), pp. 209–19; also, Antony Blinken and Simon Serfaty, 'Regional Strategies–Europe', in Kurt M. Campbell and Michèle A. Flournoy (principal authors), *To Prevail: An American Strategy for the Campaign Against Terrorism* (Washington, DC: CSIS Press, 2001), pp. 211–21.
 - 16 For an especially enlightening – and beautifully written – account of the US postwar debates about Europe and its future, see John L. Harper, *American Visions of Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).
 - 17 As noted by Charles Gati in 2002, the 'sense of confusion and ambivalence' in the ten countries of central and eastern Europe is best reflected in the fact that their publics 'have failed to re-elect any of their governments since 1989'. Charles Gati, 'All that NATO Can Be', *National Interest*, 68 (2002), p. 81.
 - 18 James Sperling, 'Two Tiers or Two Speeds? Constructing a Stable European Security Order', in James Sperling (ed.), *Two Tiers or Two Speeds? The European Security Order and the Enlargement of the European Union and NATO* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999), p. 186.
 - 19 See Robert Legvold, 'The Three Russias', in Robert A. Pastor (ed.), *A Century's Journey* (New York: Basic Books, 2000), p. 190.
 - 20 Stephen Cohen, *Failed Crusade: America and the Tragedy of Post-Communist Russia* (New York and London: Norton, 2000), p. 33.
 - 21 'Common strategies to be implemented by the Union in areas where the Member States have important interests in common' were mandated by the 1997 Amsterdam Treaty. Approved in June 1999, the Common Strategy on Russia was first dismissed by Moscow as a 'simplified register of policy already carried out by the EU'. None the less, the choice of Russia as the first target of these common strategies in 1998–99, Russia's subsequent response in 2000–01, and the initial EU–Russia summit held in Moscow in May 2001 confirm the end of the inertia that had characterised EU–Russian relations. Hiski Haukkala and Sergei Medvedev (eds), *The EU Common Strategy on Russia: Learning the Grammar of the CFSP* (Helsinki: Ulkopoliittinen instituutti; Bonn: Institut für Europäische Politik, 2000).
 - 22 More on this in my 'A Euro-Atlantic Ostpolitik', *Orbis*, 45:4 (2001), pp. 597–607.
 - 23 Tim McDaniel, *The Agony of the Russian Idea* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1996).
 - 24 Zbigniew Brzezinski, *The Geostrategic Triad: Living with China, Europe, and Russia* (Washington, DC: Center for Strategic and International Studies, 2001), pp. 55ff.
 - 25 Luigi Barzini, *The Europeans* (New York: Penguin, 1983), p. 55.
 - 26 Tariq Ramadan, *To Be a European Muslim* (Markfield and Lancaster: Islamic Foundation, 1999), p. 1.
 - 27 F. Stephen Larrabee, 'U.S. and European Policy toward Turkey and the Caspian Basin', in Robert D. Blackwill and Michael Stürmer (eds), *Allies Divided: Transatlantic Policies in the Greater Middle East* (Cambridge, MA.: MIT Press, 1997), p. 144.

- 28 Jeffrey Gedmin, 'The Alliance is Doomed', *Washington Post* (20 May 2002).
- 29 David Blanchard, *Turkey and the European Union* (London: Centre for European Reform, 1998), pp. 40–3.
- 30 See my 'Europe, The Mediterranean, and the Middle East', *Joint Force Quarterly*, 24 (2000), pp. 56–62; and George Joffé, 'The Euro-Mediterranean Partnership: Two Years After Barcelona', *Middle East Program Briefing* (London: Royal Institute for International Affairs, May 1998).
- 31 John Mearsheimer thinks otherwise. 'Almost every European state, including the United Kingdom and France, still harbors deep-seated, albeit muted, fears that a Germany unchecked by American power might behave aggressively'. Driven by the inescapable logic of 'offensive realism', EU countries remain driven by the imperative 'to be the hegemon – that is, the only great power in the system'. Indeed, for the EU, as well as for NATO, 'there is little evidence that [it] can compel member states to act against [its] strategic interests'. Applied to Europe, this theoretical reading of past and recent history (involving, for example, great power relations in the Balkans in the 1910s and the 1990s) is intellectually challenging but factually misleading and analytically flawed. John J. Mearsheimer, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics* (New York: W. W. Norton, 2001), pp. 2, 364.
- 32 Esther Bremmer, 'Redefining European Security? Insights from United States, European Union, and German Assistance to the Russian Federation, 1991–2000', *AICGS/DAAD Working Paper* (Washington, DC: AICGS, 2002).
- 33 'The European Union and Afghanistan', issued by the EU Presidency with the European Commission Delegation, Washington, DC, May 2002.