

Wendelin Ettmayer

The Diplomatic Revolution in Europe- Repercussions upon the transatlantic Relations

In my 'diplomatic address' I will try to give a realistic view of the European Integration-process: Its successes and short comings. The whole lecture will be divided into four parts:

1. The Diplomatic Revolution in Europe
2. Achievements and crises
3. The European Defense and Security Policy
4. Repercussions upon the transatlantic relations

1. The Diplomatic Revolution in Europe:

During the last two generations the legitimacy, the goals and the means of the diplomatic relations among European States have totally changed. Also changed have their attitudes towards War and Sovereignty.

- 1.1. The legitimacy of foreign policy, throughout the centuries, was based on the increase of the power of the state and the glory of the monarch. Foreign policy was power-politics. The history of diplomacy was the history of wars, of peace-negotiations, followed by other wars.

In this field a revolution has taken place. In today's Europe the legitimacy of foreign policy is the promotion of the welfare of the people: Improving living standards, Human Rights; the promotion of commerce and culture; the creation of jobs and the protection of the environment.

The Welfare state has got an international dimension, especially a European dimension. The welfare of the people, not the increase of the power of the state, legitimizes foreign policy in today's Europe.

- 1.2. The traditional goals of foreign policy – the increase of the power of the state – are still taught in our schools; Metternich, Bismarck and Kissinger are still presented as the great heroes of diplomacy. This corresponds to the traditional way diplomacy was conducted in the past: after the peace of Westphalia (1648) a system of states emerged in Europe, where mutual relations were upheld by the principles of the sovereignty of the state and territorial integrity. States were not subject to a superior authority. National interest was the driving force of foreign policy. Diplomacy was focussed on the maintenance of the Balance of

Power. The soldier and the diplomat constituted a unified whole. Diplomacy reflected the 'Art of the Possible'; war was seen as the continuation of politics; albeit by other means.

Why did all that change? After the horrible sufferings during the Second World War, European countries started the process of integration; based on economic cooperation and the establishment of supranational institutions. The promotion of the welfare of the people became a component of foreign policy world-wide. In the frame of the United Nations, special Agencies were established, like the United Nations Conference for Trade and Development (UNCTAD); the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund (UNICEF), the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees; the United Nations Development Program or the World Food Program.

But, in Western Europe some countries went much further: With the establishment of the Council of Europe, the protection of Human Rights, pluralistic democracy and the rule of law became generally recognized principles, monitored by an international organization, the Council of Europe; and with the foundation of the European Community for Coal and Steel, **a** supranational management of central parts of a national economy should prevent all wars in the future. The thinking behind those initiatives was that economic integration should push back national interest and promote political cooperation and integration.

- 1.3. The result was that in Europe we not only established a new legitimacy for foreign policy and new goals for diplomacy, but also new means to safeguard peace and security.

The traditional means of foreign policy were 'Realpolitik'; 'raison d'Etat' and 'War'. That meant that a state was allowed to do everything to increase its power; a state was entitled to practice a behavior forbidden in private: to kill, to destroy, to wage war.

Contrary to those traditional means, the new means which should safeguard peace and security in Europe are cooperation and integration. Today we follow a new logic: The logic of war was replaced by **the** logic of values: democracy, Human Rights, the rule of law.

It has become unthinkable that European Countries wage war against one another. In Europe, war is not anymore considered the prolongation of politics by other means.

The logic of maintaining peace by a balance of power, established on the basis of confrontation, was replaced by the concept of cooperation. That's how we achieved sixty years of peace in Western Europe.

The sovereignty of the state, which used to be absolute, has been drastically diminished in many fields. The traditional way to guaranty peace was the respect of national sovereignty, combined with **no-interference** in internal affairs of a country. This approach has also

totally changed: Today peace is built on the respect of basic values like Human Rights, Democracy and rule of law. And the implementation of those values is subject to international monitoring by organizations like the Council of Europe **and** the European Union or the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE). Those Organizations have the right to interfere into **the** internal affairs of all member states to safeguard the implementation of those values.

I would like to demonstrate the changes that have taken place **with** one example: Who was 'great' in history: Rulers like Alexander the Great; Caesar, Charlemagne, Peter the Great, and many others went down in history as great heroic figures, because they succeeded to establish an empire, to increase the power of the kingdom, no matter how many sacrifices that took, **how** many people lost their lives. Today, such a behavior would not only not be considered as 'great', **such** a behavior would bring the perpetrator immediately before a War Tribunal.

2. Achievements and crises

The achievements of European integration since the Second World War are remarkable: **In** Western Europe **almost three** generations enjoyed peace and prosperity; that has never been the case in 2000 years of European history. Old, hereditary enemies have become friends, like France and Germany; centuries of confrontation were replaced by cooperation.

Why now all of a sudden such difficulties like the Euro-crisis? The basic failure is easy to understand: European nations gave up sovereignty in several fields: Some countries gave up their national currencies; many countries opened their borders, they gave up national border control. The problem is this: Countries gave up essential parts of their national sovereignty but no European sovereignty was established.

When the Euro was introduced as a common currency in 1999, it brought many advantages: For travelers it was not necessary anymore to exchange money; all member countries got low interest rates, so it was rather easy for countries like Greece to accumulate enormous debts.

An optimistic language was supposed to pave the way for a better reality. In this sense we talked and still talk about the 'Economic and Monetary Union' (EMU) as the basis for the common currency, but in reality the Economic Union was never created. The question is, if it can ever enter into effect: the political and economic cultures within the Euro Zone **are too different**. Many examples show that: Whereas Austria cuts the number of civil servants, 60000 new teachers are hired in France; the retirement age is raised in Germany, but lowered in France; in times of economic crisis, the political parties in Finland were competing to impose more austerity, whereas in Greece they are all opposed to austerity policy.

All in all one can say that the Europe project was too optimistic: The protagonists were convinced that **the** Monetary Union would lead to a

political Union. Certainly some common rules were established: A national budget deficit should not be higher than 3 % of the GDP; the national debt should not over 60 %. In all member countries, the inflation should be kept low. Other rules show the **lack of reality** of the Euro project: It was stipulated, that no assistance should be granted to countries in need; and states which would not obey the rules should be punished. **This is totally unrealistic** if we **only** consider the billions of dollars given in subsidies to the Euro-zone members, which ran into difficulties.

Considering all those developments, the fundamental difficulty is this: The basic question, **whether** the European Union should become a real political Union or remain a confederation of nation states **s** is unsolved. It is not clear how much political sovereignty the member states want to keep and how much they want to give up. This question not only concerns the currency, but also other fields: Should there be a European army or should Europe rely on NATO for its defense? There is certainly a Strategic Partnership between EU and NATO as far as crisis-management is concerned (the so called Berlin-plus-agreements). But the basic question, to what extend **a** European army should be established is not resolved.

3. The European Defense and Security Policy (EDSP)

According to the EU Treaty the military defense remains within the competence of the nation state; only unanimous decisions can be taken in that field.

On the other hand Europe should be active towards the outside world, spread its values and participate in crisis management. In this sense, the European Defense and Security Policy is not about great armies and great wars, but about participation in conflict management.

The Lisbon Treaty which entered into force on December 01, 2009, established the post of High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy. Political and military solidarity among EU Member states was also stipulated in the treaty by a mutual assistance clause and a solidarity clause.

3.1. The European Security Strategy (ESS) is a doctrine, which should provide a framework for its actions abroad. It was adopted in December 2003 in order to implement EU-values and objectives in the field of Foreign and Security Policy.

The ESS contains an analysis of global threats and challenges to European security like: terrorism; proliferations of weapons of mass-destructions; regional conflicts with international impacts; failing states or organized crime.

The ESS sets three objectives for defending security and promoting values:

- By conducting a policy of conflict prevention (by civilian and military capabilities)
- By building security in the neighborhood
- By promoting multilateralism through international law and the United Nations

3.2. The main activities in the framework of the ESS are the 'Petersberg tasks' and crisis management. The 'Petersberg tasks' focus on humanitarian and rescue operations; on peace keeping; on crisis management and peace making. Police activities should also contribute to assure the rule of law in an area of crisis; strengthen the civil administration or protect civilians.

3.3. Some examples of European Security and Defense Policy (CSDP)-operations are the following: Among the military operations EUFOR Concordia can be mentioned which was deployed in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (FYROM) in 2003 in order to enforce stability for the implementation of the 'Ochrid-agreement'. The EUFOR Artemis Operation was deployed in the Democratic Republic of Congo. Its mandate was to secure refugees centers; the airport and the safety of NGO's.

3.4. The Althea-Operation in Bosnia-Herzegovina was started to guaranty the implementation of the Dayton-agreement.

As far as civilian cooperation is concerned, the EU Police mission in Bosnia- Herzegovina of 2003 can be mentioned; as well as the Police Mission in the FYROM of the same year. A mission in Georgia had the goal to improve the rule of law in that country; a goal shared by the police mission in the Democratic Republic of Congo.

All in all CSDP-operations are aimed at conflict management; preventing crises from unfolding and stabilizing post conflict situations.

To quite an extend the notion of a European Defense and Security Policy is wishful thinking and does not correspond to reality. Defense matters stay within the exclusive competence of a member state. Actually especially the great countries follow their own security interests: Great Britain for example joined the US in the Iraq War of 2003; whereas Germany and France were opposed. The great powers followed their own policy concerning Moscow and Beijing; there are different approaches concerning Kosovo or a Palestinian state and different attitudes were taken when a 'no fly zone' was proclaimed over Libya.

But again: Some of the European protagonists hope that concepts (?) used could create a new state of mind, a new reality.

4. Repercussions upon the transatlantic relations:

The ESS stipulates that the transatlantic relationship is irreplaceable: 'Acting together, the EU and the United States can be a formidable force for the good in the world Our aim should be an effective and balanced partnership with the USA.' The cooperation with the US is certainly an essential reason for the EU to build up its defense capabilities and to increase its coherence.

At the same time, we should not forget that quite some differences have developed between the European and American mentalities: We have developed a different attitude towards war among ourselves and toward the outside world. The use of military force in order to implement policy goals among European countries has become unthinkable. At the same time the use of force towards the outside world has also changed. Within Europe the military is not anymore deployed to support the national diplomacy. No matter how great the discrepancies with Greece or in Brussels are, no European country would rely on its army to back its cause.

A US scholar recently stated that "a Foreign Policy without the backing of the Military is like a baseball game without the baseball bat". This way of thinking does not anymore exist in Europe.

At the same time the Europeans have developed different attitudes concerning essential challenges of our time: How to cope with the environment (Kyoto); the importance of the international Criminal Court; the role of the UN in a multi-polar world or sovereignty in general.

All in all we can say that the European project has achieved fantastic goals in only two generations: peace and security; a European diplomacy which does not rely on war and a foreign policy that concentrates on the wellbeing of the people. At the same time, some basic questions remain unsolved, the most important one among them: should Europe become a federal state or remain a confederation of national states?