

# OCCASIONAL PAPERS

---

---

20

## LEADING ALONE OR ACTING TOGETHER? THE TRANSATLANTIC SECURITY AGENDA FOR THE NEXT US PRESIDENCY

*Julian Lindley-French*

INSTITUTE FOR SECURITY STUDIES - WESTERN EUROPEAN UNION  
INSTITUT D'ETUDES DE SECURITE - UNION DE L'EUROPE OCCIDENTALE

43 AVENUE DU PRESIDENT WILSON, 75775 PARIS CEDEX 16

**September 2000**

# OCCASIONAL PAPERS

---

20

---

## **LEADING ALONE OR ACTING TOGETHER?** **The transatlantic security agenda for the next US presidency**

*Julian Lindley-French*

THE INSTITUTE FOR SECURITY STUDIES  
WESTERN EUROPEAN UNION

43 AVE DU PRESIDENT WILSON, 75775 PARIS CEDEX 16

September 2000

*Occasional Papers* are essays that the Institute considers should be made available, as a contribution to the debate on topical European security issues. They will normally be based on work carried out by researchers granted awards by the Institute; they represent the views of the authors, and do not necessarily reflect those of the Institute or of the WEU in general. Publications of *Occasional Papers* will be announced in the Institute's *Newsletter*, and they will be available on request, in the language used by the author. They can also be accessed via the WEU website:  
[www.weu.int/institute/](http://www.weu.int/institute/)

## **LEADING ALONE OR ACTING TOGETHER?**

The transatlantic security agenda for the next US presidency

*Julian Lindley-French* \*

---

\* Julian Lindley-French is a research fellow at the WEU Institute for Security Studies, where he is responsible for transatlantic relations and relations with NATO. He was previously Deputy Director of the International Centre for Security Analysis at the Department of War Studies, King's College, London and lecturer in European Security 1998-99. He has been an adviser to several organisations, including NATO. Publications include articles on European defence, transatlantic relations and UK defence policy.

'These are heady yet baffling times for the world's sole superpower. Less than a decade after the demise of the Soviet Union, the United States is a military and economic colossus. No nation in history has possessed the wealth, military might or technological edge over its rivals that America has today. Yet as the presidential campaign enters its final months, the country seems uncertain about its role and perplexed by the changing array of threats that it faces. There should be vigorous debate about these matters in the days ahead, starting with an assessment of America's critical national interests.'

*The New York Times*, 7 August 2000

# CONTENTS

<b>Preface</b>	v
<b>Introduction</b>	1
<b>I. Forces for change in transatlantic security relations</b>	3
I.1 Introduction	3
I.2 Power and purpose in America and Europe	6
I.3 Defence overkill in the United States	8
I.4 The political partisanship of the US military	10
I.5 What to do with American power?	11
<b>II. Manifest destiny revisited – the American political context</b>	13
II.1 Introduction	13
II.2 The historical context of US foreign and security policy	13
II.3 The contemporary context of US foreign and security policy	14
II.4 Convergence and divergence over foreign policy	17
II.5 Convergence and divergence over security policy	18
II.6 The Bush and Gore teams	21
II.7 The price of leadership	23
<b>III. The transatlantic security agenda on the eve of the new presidency</b>	24
III.1 Introduction	24
III.2 Dysfunctional strategic assessments	25
III.3 Burden-sharing	27
III.4 European defence and transatlantic security relations	29
III.5 The emerging role of coalitions	31
III.6 Enlargement	33
III.7 EU-NATO relations	33
III.8 The transatlantic security agenda for the new presidency	34
<b>IV. Armaments policy, Revolution in (American) Military Affairs and National Missile Defense: transatlantic fissures?</b>	36
IV.1 Introduction	36
IV.2 Armaments policy	36
IV.3 Armaments cooperation and the impact on Europe	38
IV.4 The Revolution in (American) Military Affairs	39
IV.5 The thorny problem of National Missile Defense	41
IV.6 Balancing domestic and allied interests	44
<b>V. Leading alone or acting together – towards a new transatlantic security relationship?</b>	46
V.1 Introduction	46
V.2 Choosing together – a new transatlantic security agenda	47
V.3 Leading alone or acting together?	50
<b>Abbreviations and list of interviews</b>	52



## **PREFACE**

This contribution to the *Occasional Papers* series of the WEU Institute for Security studies emerged from a report undertaken into the state of the transatlantic security relationship and the respective positions of the two candidates on key US-European issues in the run-up to the general election in November. As part of the research the author undertook a series of interviews with senior figures from the White House, Congress and the Departments of State and Defense, as well as academics specialising in the field. Where possible, assertions made by those interviewed have been identified but many of those interviewed did so on the basis that their comments were not for public consumption and it is the duty of this author to respect that stricture. The views expressed herein reflect the personal analysis of the author given the material available, and in no way constitute an official position of the Western European Union.

Julian Lindley-French



## INTRODUCTION

The central contention of this paper is that the problems of political cohesion that have manifested themselves in transatlantic security relations over the past few years go deeper than the questions of defence expenditure and burden-sharing that have so often marked the debate. Indeed, they are the result of markedly different strategic assessments in a complex security environment and, thereafter, ways of managing security. This is partly the result of internal questions over the nature and utility of American and European political and military power, and partly the result of differing political cultures and traditions. Consequently, America and Europe are making different choices over security and how best to promote it with profound implications for transatlantic security relations. Moreover, within the US an important debate is taking place between liberals and conservatives over the role of the United States in the world of the twenty-first century. Therefore, the American presidential election is taking place at an important moment in transatlantic relations. With a new century having just begun, and the Cold War now receding into history, the international security environment in the modern world is complex and dynamic. Old certainties and threats have melted away only to be replaced by a range of new challenges.

The central thesis of this paper is that within the body politic that is the West sufficient skills and capabilities exist, both military and non-military, to manage all and every type of crisis. The problem is essentially one of political organisation. Kosovo demonstrated what can go wrong when such organisation fails. Indeed, not only was Kosovo NATO's first war but also the first time that the Alliance saw action as a coalition of roughly equal political powers in a politically complex collective security operation. This was an uncomfortable awakening for the United States who found itself having to tailor military policy to meet the needs of both Congress and other members of the coalition. At first, the US tried to lead politically when genuine partnership with its European allies would have been far more appropriate and then had to re-assess the situation in mid-operation following the failure of the first phase of the military campaign and European objections. As a result, although the West had all the correct ingredients for successful crisis management the recipe was poor – there were simply too many cooks in the kitchen.

Transatlantic security relations were built upon shared destiny and shared threat. However, the foundations of that relationship are shifting, making it at one and the same time both stronger and weaker. It is stronger because of the profound values that Americans share with Europeans. It is weaker because the very nature of modern security makes it more political, i.e., subject to greater political interpretation and, therefore, policy choice. Americans, particularly conservatives, consistently express their frustration at Europe's seeming inability to improve and increase its military capability. Europeans express their concerns about the exaggeration of both threats and technological capability that repeatedly emerge from Washington. However, whilst Europe is no longer the main external security concern of the United States the major countries of the European Union remain the most influential source of economic, diplomatic and military support for the Americans. A recent report by the Congressional Research Service underlines the strength of that relationship: 'The EU is the United States' largest trading partner, purchasing one-fifth of US exports of goods and over one-half of US exports of services. The United States and the EU have an enormous cross-ownership relationship; each is the largest investor in the other's market'.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Paul E. Gallis, 'France and the United States: Allies and Rivals', (Washington: The Library of Congress, 2000), p. 8.

Equally, the power of the United States is such that choices made by Americans have profound implications for the rest of the world. That is well known. What is less well known is that the power of Europe, particularly Western Europe, also has global implications, as a result of the unprecedented degree of inter-state political cohesion achieved within the European Union. Thus, policy choices made by Europeans also matter. The key question, therefore, not only for transatlantic relations, but the world beyond, centres upon the nature of those choices at a time when there is no clear external threat to condition them. In short, are Americans and Europeans making policy choices that strengthen or weaken the transatlantic security relationship? What is clear is that, given the nature and scope of change in the international system, the next Administration will be forced to set a new course for American policy. The choices made will effectively decide whether the United States leads alone or acts together with European allies too powerful to be led by decree from Washington. Therefore, the focus of this paper is the challenge facing transatlantic security relations on the eve of the presidential election, the positions of American liberals and conservatives on the main issues and points of convergence and divergence between Europeans and Americans.

Following this brief Introduction, Chapter One establishes the main contentions of the paper and examines the forces for change in the relationship and how they effect policy perceptions of the relationship in the United States. Chapter Two looks at the American political climate and assesses the likely impact of a Bush and Gore administration on transatlantic security relations. Chapter Three takes a close look at the main points of political contention in transatlantic security relations and assesses their causes and implications for Euro-Atlantic cohesion, whilst Chapter Four examines three major forces in US policy; armaments policy, the revolution in military affairs and National Missile Defense. Finally, Chapter Five makes a series of recommendations that could help ease the path of transatlantic security relations as it enters a new and uncertain phase.

Transatlantic relations exist in a very different political climate to that which existed at the end of the Cold War. It is a world in which a dominant America and a resurgent Europe stand together at the pinnacle of world power. Indeed, for the first time in world history the dilemma that Americans and Europeans face is not how to contain competing interests but how to make cooperation just, balanced and effective for all. Certainly, transatlantic security relations are worth preserving. The old cliché that the world is a better place when Europe and America stand side-by-side is a cliché precisely because it is true. However, such is the political nature of modern international security that America cannot assume European support, any more than Europe can assume American support. That is not a function of the weakness of the relationship but its political maturity. Indeed, it is the essence of a democratic community.

# CHAPTER ONE: FORCES FOR CHANGE IN TRANSATLANTIC SECURITY RELATIONS

## *1.1 Introduction*

There is always a temptation for such analyses to polarise perspectives on transatlantic security relations. Indeed, it is part of the malaise from which US-European relations suffer. Therefore, this piece starts by saying what is not going to happen. The transatlantic security relationship is not about to fall apart with the arrival of a new president. Americans are not turning their back on Europe and Europeans<sup>2</sup> are not despairing of Americans. However, since 1990 there has been a steady retreat from certainty in the relationship that is likely to intensify and which is reflected today in the complex nature of the relationship. This chapter examines the forces of change in the transatlantic security relationship and introduces the factors that result in contending policy choices being made on the two sides of the Atlantic.

The United States, in spite of its awesome combination of economic wealth and military capabilities, lacks the critical mass of power to dominate outcomes in the international system. Thus, America seeks allies not only to support its role in the international system, but also to legitimise its actions both at home and abroad. The European Union, on the other hand, is an auto-legitimising international organisation that lacks sufficient political cohesion to manage the full range of its security and defence needs independently. Thus, the EU Member-States need the United States to reinforce the economic, political and diplomatic aspects of its security effort with military capability, even though its members include the world's number two and three military powers – Britain and France.<sup>3</sup> Moreover, in a world in which there is no defining threat to automatically condition policy choices, just a series of 'maybes', the influence of domestic pressures and interests on foreign and security policy increases. As a consequence, Europeans and Americans see the same problems, draw different conclusions and then make contrasting choices over foreign and security policy with the result that they often look at each other and ask; 'are you being serious'? In such an environment the opportunities for drift and misunderstanding are manifold and will continue until a new political framework for transatlantic security relations is created that can cope with differences, rather than maintain the pretence that they do not exist. Indeed, Americans and Europeans make foreign and security choices today that are often so profoundly different that they undermine the consensus upon which the relationship is built.

There have been many difficult moments in transatlantic security relations over the past five decades and, as David Trachtenburg of the Senate Armed Services Committee recently pointed out, they have ultimately been managed successfully.<sup>4</sup> However, there are also reasons to believe that the situation today is genuinely novel in that the room for contending choices in the formulation of foreign and security policy is as great as at any time since 1945. For those who believe that the continued vitality and importance of the relationship is fundamental, not just to European security but that of the wider world, a pivotal question becomes apparent. Will Americans and Europeans make enough of the right choices to

---

<sup>2</sup> It is a somewhat unfortunate tendency of western Europeans to use the term 'Europe' to mean only their part of the old Continent. Sadly, for the sake of brevity this author defines 'Europe' to mean the countries of the European Union. For that reason there is no distinction between 'Europe' and the 'EU'.

<sup>3</sup> These standings are based upon defence expenditure in 1999, together with forces deployed and capabilities available.

<sup>4</sup> Interview with the author, Washington, 2 May 2000.

preserve sufficient political cohesion for transatlantic security relations to remain dynamic and effective?

That is the essence of the dilemma that Americans and Europeans find themselves facing in the first decade of the twenty-first century. In the immediate aftermath of the Cold War there was a significant degree of concern in Washington that the Europeans would try ‘to go it alone’ at the expense of NATO. However, a series of security shocks in the 1990s, starting with the Gulf War and culminating with Operations Allied Force and Joint Guardian in Kosovo, placed the debate temporarily in abeyance. However, in the wake of the Kosovo War the need to ensure political cohesion has markedly declined with the result that two structurally contentious dynamics are once again coming to the fore. First, the nature of American power in a not-quite-unipolar world seems to be causing considerable confusion in US strategic thinking about the role of America in the modern world. Second, the emergence of the EU as an international security actor appears to be restricting and complicating the bilateral emphasis of American diplomacy in its security relations with its European allies which reinforces a tendency towards neo-unilateralism. As German Foreign Minister Joschka Fischer puts it ‘...in the twenty-first century, only the United States remains as a truly global power – in political, military, economic, and cultural terms. It feels a responsibility to provide global leadership; it has global interests. Europe, by contrast, is still a political power in the making. Yet no single country, not even a superpower, can solve the problems of tomorrow’s world on its own. For that we all need partners – and Europe is America’s key partner. It would be a mistake to think a unipolar world is a more stable world. History teaches us that just the opposite is true’.<sup>5</sup>

This ‘vacuum’ in EU-US relations results from tensions that exist between the structural change taking place in the international system (with its profound implications for transatlantic security relations) and the institutions and tools traditionally used to manage those relations. In effect, the institutional framework of NATO has become too narrow for managing the changing nature of crises, the changing nature of American and European power and contrasting approaches to policy formulation. Charles Kupchan recognises the need for a new relationship to underpin the Alliance and warns ‘...that the traditional Atlantic bargain is already unravelling, that the status quo is unsustainable, and that the Atlantic link can be preserved only if Europe and America strike a more equitable bargain’.<sup>6</sup>

This is partly due to the relatively low level of systemic tension in the international system, there being no need for the relationship to be as ‘formal’ as it was during the Cold War. Certainly, it is reasonable to assume that if Russia or some other power were once again to threaten Western countries the Alliance would act quickly and effectively. Thankfully, the prospect of such a challenge is remote with the result that political style becomes as important as policy substance in the relationship. For these reasons most Europeans worry more about a Bush administration than a Gore administration because, as Thomas Friedman points out: ‘To listen to the Bush advisers, they are going to just tell Russia, China and the NATO allies that they have to accept US missile defense plans and a scrapping of the ABM Treaty. Like it or lump it. Such unilateralism is either going to blow up the alliance and trigger an arms race

---

<sup>5</sup> Joschka Fischer, ‘Berlin’s Foreign Policy’, *Internationale Politik*, vol. 1, Spring 2000, p. 8.

<sup>6</sup> Charles A. Kupchan, ‘In Defence of European Defence: An American Perspective’, *Survival*, vol. 42, no. 2, Summer 2000, p. 7.

with Russia and China, or it is going to lead to an embarrassing backdown by the Bushies, if they get in office'.<sup>7</sup>

Paradoxically, whilst concerns mount in expert security communities about the state of transatlantic security relations, US and Western European societies move remorselessly closer. Indeed, 'globalisation', first and foremost, represents the economic and political integration of the two leading global trading blocs at both the value and material levels. Europeans believe in the same things as Americans and want the same things as Americans. European public opinion would no more tolerate than American national foreign and security policies based upon a narrow concept of interests and the pursuit of power for power's sake. The days of a Pitt or a Metternich, let alone a Richelieu or a Bismarck, are long gone. Europe must stand for something and, for want of a better way of putting it, that 'something' is democracy, freedom and the American way. That is the great triumph of post-war American policy. Moreover, it is a 'product' that both Europeans and Americans are keen to 'export'. Consequently, Europeans also expect the leaders of the world to behave in a 'responsible', Western way. Indeed, it was just such a popular perception that drove Europe to finally intervene in Bosnia and Kosovo because the nightly visions of tragedy that appeared on European television screens outraged public opinion to such an extent that calls for action became irresistible. This was often in spite of political leaders who had been schooled in the more traditional ways of diplomacy and sovereignty and who had to balance Europe's lack of appropriate military capabilities with popular pressure to act.

Europeans and Americans, therefore, agree on the overall ends of foreign and security policy in the twenty-first century, namely the promotion of a world order in which peaceful self-determination is enshrined as a defining political concept. Moreover, Europeans and Americans are in full agreement that the most effective political means to that end is through the promotion of democratic institutions and the sense of personal responsibility and choice enshrined in a liberal economic order. There may be tactical disagreements over the size of government and its role in individual societies, of the degree of liberalism in the economic order, but these disagreements are as much intra-European or intra-American as sources of contention across the Atlantic.

Unfortunately, the sheer preponderance of US power and a lack of coherent state-based threats to the West in the 1990s precluded an in-depth debate over the nature and use of American power. A Clinton administration that lacked a coherent foreign and security policy doctrine exacerbated this 'drift', confusing and perplexing allies in equal measure. This lack of consistency in US policy-making between 1993 and 2000 was reinforced by an evangelical aspect to American foreign policy that was strengthened, in turn, by both historical and contemporary ignorance about the role and effort of the allies, not only during the Cold War, but most of the twentieth century's other wars.<sup>8</sup> A popular, ahistorical context for American foreign policy that is, in part, reflected in many of the politicians who serve on Capitol Hill and, to some extent, informs them. It is a tendency that is also reinforced by both television and film, which remorselessly removes others from history, bending the truth to suit the popular thirst for self-affirmation, and which reinforces the influence of domestic politics in

---

<sup>7</sup> Thomas L. Friedman, 'Unilateralist Bush and His Wise Men Make a Tricky Target', *International Herald Tribune*, Tuesday, 8 August 2000, p. 8.

<sup>8</sup> An interesting footnote is the recent release of three films during summer 2000. The first, *U-571*, portrays the capture of the Enigma encoding device by the British Navy during World War II as an American operation. The second, *The Colditz Story*, tells the story of a daring American-led escape from Colditz that never took place. The third, *The Patriot*, set during the American War of Independence, shows the massacre of a village by the British that also never took place.

the formulation of American foreign policy. It also helps to create in Americans a sense that they are victims of their own power and forced to act because of either forces inimical to American liberal democracy and American free market economics and/or because their allies are unwilling or unable to fulfil their responsibilities as part of the common effort.

As a result, America is incapable of true partnership because Americans, regardless of political persuasion, feel obliged to lead. Unfortunately, this limits the debate within the transatlantic context to the nature of American leadership and focuses the relationship on security matters at a time when the pace of globalisation and economic change calls for a much deeper discussion. Indeed, the difficult and often fractious debate over European defence between Washington and its allies has been complicated by an American inability to judge the process as a contribution to wider security, i.e., a process that is not defined by, nor dependent upon, the Atlantic framework per se. As a result, both Republicans and Democrats see the emergence of the European Union as an international security actor primarily as a means for the Europeans to better organise themselves under American leadership. It is for this reason that so many American politicians find it difficult to comprehend an extra-NATO European defence effort.

### ***1.2 Power and purpose in America and Europe***

In spite of the many declarations, conferences, academic treatises and arguments on European defence the architecture of the transatlantic security relationship remains essentially that which existed at the fall of the Berlin Wall. Indeed, it is as if the status quo ante was a plausible option even when the fundamental framework that defined American and European policy during the Cold War has vanished. Therefore, with the advent of a new century, a constructive debate between Americans and Europeans over future policy is essential, although the outcome will still depend to a significant extent on what role America itself wants to undertake in the modern world – engaged neo-unilateralist or detached neo-multilateralist, world enforcer or world policeman? As Peter Rodman explains: ‘The Clinton administration has embodied a version of Wilsonian liberal internationalism, aspiring to base international affairs on moral principles rather than geopolitics...The moral component of this enthusiasm is ironically shared with the neoconservatives on the other side of the political spectrum. The neoconservatives represent, in fact, a Reaganite variant of Wilsonianism. They share the liberals’ ideological enthusiasm for the promotion of democracy and human rights and for humanitarian interventions led by the United States. On the other hand, they combine this ideological outlook with a more muscular strategic view – wanting a powerful military, for example, and being more comfortable about using it – and with an unapologetic advocacy of a benign American hegemony. The liberals feel guilty about American power, the neocons are enthusiastic about it’.<sup>9</sup>

The debate between ‘neocons’ and ‘liberals’ is implicit rather than explicit in the positions of both Governor George W. Bush and Vice-President Al Gore because: ‘In international affairs, it is hard to find serious differences between the parties. A mainstream foreign policy consensus has emerged in recent years among those who will be called to Washington to conduct the policy of either a Bush or a Gore administration’.<sup>10</sup> However, this ‘mainstream

---

<sup>9</sup> Peter W. Rodman, ‘Uneasy Giant – The Challenges to American Predominance’, (Washington: The Nixon Center, 2000) p. 40.

<sup>10</sup> William Pfaff, ‘After a Humdrum Summer, Expect Foreign Policy as Usual’, *International Herald Tribune*, Saturday, 4 August 2000, p. 6.

consensus' in US policy-making, tends to exist to the 'right' of the mainstream political centre of European foreign policy. Moreover, it only extends to the ends of foreign policy, not the means, and does not extend to security policy. Consequently, US policy tends to be both more assertive and coercive than European policy, a process of policy divergence that appears to be hardening. Indeed, in many ways, mainstream Americans and Europeans differ over foreign policy in the same way that they differ, say, over capital punishment or gun control; unable to comprehend how such nice people can believe such things.

Equally, given the choices on offer from Bush and Gore, it seems safe to assume that isolationism, particularly the kind of neo-isolationism expressed by some on the left of the Democratic Party, can be discounted because too much of America's self-image is tied up with its proselytising world role. The focus of the debate, therefore, is over the nature of America's engagement with the world, i.e., how to make American leadership more effective. Governor Bush in his vision of a 'new security environment'<sup>11</sup> places the emphasis squarely on American leadership and reserves the right of Americans to conduct Western policy without undue reference to allies, even if they are consulted. To that end, a Bush presidency is likely to be marked by a determination to re-state American leadership in the form of engaged neo-unilateralism, i.e., 'we are happy to consult you about our plans but we will proceed whatever'. Vice President Gore, whilst far more at home in the foreign policy arena than his Republican rival, is unlikely to prove radically different, although at least: 'Mr Gore has long made a habit of what Leon Feurth, his national security adviser, calls "forward engagement": looking at the next issue on the horizon'.<sup>12</sup>

This 'neo-holistic' security concept suggests a Gore presidency would probably (but it is by no means guaranteed given the personalities on the Gore team) offer Europeans a more active role in the management of complex foreign and security issues without ever ceding the right of leadership: decision-shaping rather than decision-making. A form of detached internationalism that would be stronger on rhetoric than substance. Unfortunately, in a partnership consultation alone is not enough.

One significant distinction between Gore and Bush could be the willingness of the Vice-President to work with Europe through the institutional framework of the EU. Bush, conversely, would most likely focus on strengthening bilateral ties, first and foremost with the UK, but also with France and Germany. Indeed, it is upon that leadership/partnership fulcrum that the relationship currently rests. Certainly, if the transatlantic security relationship was a true value community concepts of partnership in American political discourse would be far more dominant. Unfortunately, to the American political mind it remains essentially a power relationship in which concepts of leadership are dominant with the result that whilst Europeans tend to emphasise the value community,<sup>13</sup> Americans tend to emphasise the power relationship. A distinction which ensures a degree of acrimony and confusion is built into the relationship and will do so until this dichotomy is resolved, one way or another.

---

<sup>11</sup> George W. Bush, 'New Leadership on National Security', speech in Washington DC, Tuesday, 23 May 2000. See [www.georgewbush.com/News.asp](http://www.georgewbush.com/News.asp).

<sup>12</sup> 'In Search of the Real Man', *The Economist*, 12 August 2000, p. 20.

<sup>13</sup> Ironically, Woodrow Wilson called such an edifice a 'community of power'. On 22 January 1917 he stated: 'The question upon which the whole future peace and policy of the world depends is this: Is the present war a struggle for a just and secure peace, or only a new balance of power?... There must be, not a balance of power, but a community of power; not organized rivalries, but an organized common peace'. From Henry Kissinger, *Diplomacy* (New York: Touchstone, 1994), p. 51.

The reason for this dichotomy is not solely America's self-appointed view of the relationship. Firstly, the European Union, in spite of recent efforts, has yet to make the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) work and thus harness the power represented by the undoubted economic, and, indeed, military potential of its rich Member-States. Secondly, the Europeans are engaged in exactly the same debate as Americans over their future role. A debate, ironically, that bears many of the hallmarks of America's, complete with 'founding fathers', (Monnet, Spaak and de Gasperi) and a sense of 'manifest destiny'. Indeed, Europeans today view themselves as being imbued with pretty much the same 'moral exceptionalism', as Americans, even if they do not express it quite so forcibly.<sup>14</sup> As Kissinger points out: 'America's special mission transcends day-to-day diplomacy and obliges it to serve as a beacon of liberty for the rest of mankind; – the foreign policies of democracies are morally superior because the people are inherently peace-loving; – foreign policy should reflect the same moral standards as personal ethics; – the state has no right to claim a separate morality for itself'.<sup>15</sup> The Treaty on European Union is replete with such grandiloquence.

This coincidence of power and 'exceptionalism' also highlights an essential paradox in American policy and helps to explain why conservatives dominate the foreign and defence policy agendas in the United States. Such is the preponderance of power that the US enjoys in the international system that the only way for others to counter such dominance (as opposed to merely accepting it) is through extreme measures, such as the development of weapons of mass destruction. Indeed, influencing US policy has become a central policy objective of most states in the modern world. Unfortunately, several adversarial states seem to have concluded that they can only effectively prevent American (and by extension Western) dominance encroaching upon their sovereignty through the equalising effect of weapons of mass destruction. As a result, American hyper-power is, to some extent, self-defeating, paradoxical and offers fertile ground for those in the US who seek simplistic solutions to problems posed by so-called states of concern, particularly on the American Right. Indeed, the relationship between the so-called 'states of concern' and the American Right is to some extent symbiotic, with the one feeding the paranoia of the other and threatening to turn the rhetoric of threat into a self-fulfilling reality.

### ***1.3 Defence overkill in the United States***

Consequently, the gap between the rhetoric of American politics and the reality of American policy often leaves allies uncertain about the reasons behind US policy choices and concerned about the effect of such choices upon world security. Unfortunately, it is rhetoric (and hyperbole) that American leaders seem to find curiously compelling. For example, both Vice-President Gore and Governor Bush have constantly re-iterated that America does not want to be the world's policeman, but at the same time propose increases in defence spending that can only be justified by such a role, i.e., the achievement of unipolar dominance rather than multipolar supremacy. Give European history it is difficult for many Europeans, irrespective of the patent rectitude of American values, to accept that such increases enhance security. A glance at relative defence expenditure underlines this paradox. In 1999 the US had a defence budget six times greater than Japan (second largest), eight times that of the UK (third largest) and nine times that of France (fourth largest), all close allies. Moreover, the US defence budget was roughly nine times that of Russia and twenty-one times that of China.<sup>16</sup> When

---

<sup>14</sup> Ibid., p. 46.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid.

<sup>16</sup> Figures drawn from *The Military Balance* (Oxford: OUP for the IISS, 1999).



American investment in research and development and qualitative aspects of US armed forces are also factored into the equation, American military power pre-dominance becomes even greater. And yet both Republicans and Democrats emphasise the danger of American weakness at a time when the US, by any decent standard, is already supremely powerful. As the *New York Times* points out: 'The United States has by far the world's most powerful military and invests more money in maintaining them and their weapons than the next 10 countries combined spend on their military'.<sup>17</sup>

The US military has certainly shrunk from its peak during the Second Cold War under President Reagan in the mid-1980s. For example, there are now only 1.4 million troops on active duty compared with 2.2 million in 1990, whilst the US army has shrunk from eighteen divisions, each with a strength of around 15,000 troops, to ten divisions, although it still retains an effective force of 470,000. The US Air Force (USAF) has been reduced from twenty air wings, each with a force of seventy-two aircraft, to twelve, whilst the United States Navy (USN) now boasts twelve aircraft carrier groups rather than thirteen, a reduction from five hundred and twenty eight ships to three hundred and fifteen. Moreover, defence expenditure, at around, \$300 million per year is about twenty-five percent below that of 1985, when adjusted for inflation. At the same time, because the strategic environment is very different, comparisons with the Reagan peak are unrealistic. Indeed, not only was that an historic peak but technology has replaced many platforms with systems, thus reducing the need for large numbers of platforms.

The European Union, on the other hand, has tried to re-focus the security agenda by emphasising the civil aspects of security policy and by promoting an alternative economic basis for inter-state relations. This is partly out of design, partly as a continuum of the European historical experience and partly because Europe has little choice at a strategic level. Unfortunately, recent events, such as Bosnia and Kosovo, have once again highlighted the Clausewitzian role of armed forces in international politics, i.e., as a powerful and rapid means to ensure compliance with policy, and played down the long diplomatic game of enhancing security through economic and political interaction. This is not to say that either a Bush or Gore administration would negate such policies but, rather, that they would tend to emphasise the coercive aspects of policy far more than Europeans. Certainly, the Europeans place greater emphasis on peacekeeping than Americans which would seem, on balance, to be correct, even though Europe has yet to develop sufficient capabilities to master what might be called 'full spectrum peacekeeping'. As the *New York Times* again points out: 'Since the Gulf War nine years ago, the largest military operations have involved protracted peacekeeping, as in Bosnia, punitive air and missile strikes, as in Iraq, or emergency actions to halt ethnic conflicts, as in Kosovo. The future is likely to see more of these interventions, which require different kinds of training, equipment and planning than the large European land battles anticipated during the Cold War. The army, with its heavy weaponry and lack of mobility, seems least prepared to engage in these new conflicts, as seen in Kosovo'.<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> 'America's Military', *New York Times*, op.ed. reproduced in the *International Herald Tribune*, Wednesday, 23 August 2000, p. 8.

<sup>18</sup> 'America's Military', *New York Times* op. ed. reproduced in *International Herald Tribune*, Wednesday, 23 August 2000, p. 8.

#### ***1.4 The political partisanship of the US military***

The Americans have traditionally favoured a more assertive approach to security than the Europeans. However, this is reinforced by the role played by both the US military and the defence industry in the American political process. The United States is driven by ‘money politics’ on both sides of the political divide, a problem that was graphically highlighted in a speech made by Senator John McCain at the time of the Republican Convention in Philadelphia. McCain was graphic in his criticism: ‘We are the beneficiaries of a campaign finance system that is nothing more than an elaborate influence-peddling scheme in which both parties conspire to stay in office by the selling the country to the highest bidder’.<sup>19</sup> There is no more influential player than the military-industrial complex which represents a powerful combination of the military, defence manufacturers and politicians, supported by lobbyists and unions. Indeed, William Pfaff underlines both the nature and the scope of this problem: ‘The mercantile relationships between the manufacturers of the weaponry displayed in Philadelphia, its purchasers in the military and those in Congress who appropriate the money to pay for it became long ago, in serious and not always unconsidered respects, a conspiracy against the electorate. The military’s practice of lobbying Congress, a Cold War development, was consolidated years ago in cooperation with the manufacturers. This is well known and cynically accepted as part of the pork-barrel politics that make America work. What is new is that America’s military leadership has acquired a distinctly partisan political coloring in recent years, and seems no longer content to be the silent civil servant of civilian authority. Civilian leadership no longer is willing to exercise its full constitutional authority over military commanders’.<sup>20</sup>

Therefore, when the Pentagon demands that Europe assumes more of the security burdens it partly reflects the political viewpoint of a political faction with a vested interest in building up a threat scenario for its own political ends. The implication being that if Europe can be persuaded to accept the Pentagon’s strategic assessment it will reinforce the domestic position of the Department of Defense, help in the perennial campaign to increase the defence budget and ensure that the defence manufacturers receive increased orders, thus reinforcing the military-industrial complex. William Greider captures the essence of the problem. The Iron Triangle, he says, is ‘...formed by Congress, the defense companies, and the military leadership – three power centers [which] interact to reinforce their mutual interests: jobs, contracts, new weaponry’.<sup>21</sup>

As a consequence of these powerful vested interests the path from strategic assessment to declared policy is strewn with what might best be termed policy ‘filters’. These influence the process so that the relationship between original input and policy output becomes disjointed. These ‘filters’ are reinforced by the special place the American armed forces enjoy within American society, the relative influence of the defence establishment (as opposed to the civilian foreign policy establishment), and local domestic considerations, such as the placing of work for major defence procurement programmes. Indeed, the power of the United States externally and defence-related special interest groups internally is such that probably at no time in modern history has policy in any country been so domestically-driven and yet had such external implications.

---

<sup>19</sup> ‘McCain Sounds Note of Discord’, *Financial Times*, 31 July 2000, p. 1.

<sup>20</sup> ‘It’s Time for America’s Military to Give Up Politics’, *International Herald Tribune*, Monday, 14 August 2000, p. 8.

<sup>21</sup> William Greider, ‘Fortress America – The American Military and the Consequences of Peace’ (New York: Public Affairs, 1999), p. 52.

It should be emphasised that these ‘filters’ are not confined solely to the American policy establishment. Europe also suffers from a similar problem. The lack of willingness of European powers to invest sufficiently in military security, allied to German and Nordic preferences for a greater emphasis on diplomacy, influence the policy formulation process by way of contrast to that of the United States, and reflect different strategic assessments between Europe and America. As a result, the European Union (as opposed to Britain and France, who stand somewhere in between) tends to take an overly optimistic view of security, so that, whilst the United States overly ‘militarises’ security policy, the Europeans, by and large, overly ‘civilianise’ security policy. Somewhere in between there may lie a happy medium for transatlantic security relations but finding such a juncture of interests and capabilities, given the new strategic context, will not prove easy.

### ***1.5 What to do with American power?***

The combination of unprecedented American power in the world, the internal debate over future strategy, domestic influences over policy formulation and pressure from allies is likely to create a profound dilemma for the next Administration: what to do with American power? Paul Kennedy’s famous thesis of an America in decline seems somewhat passé, given US supremacy, but his central tenet that America must balance its responsibilities with available resources remains valid. As Britain and France are finding out to their cost, sudden increases in relative power in the international system entail as many responsibilities as opportunities, and the new Administration will have a difficult judgement to make about the utility of allies in US security policy and the degree of influence they will be able to enjoy.<sup>22</sup> Whatever the outcome of the domestic American debate over future strategy, the implications for Europeans will be profound because failure to accept the American viewpoint will invariably be linked to burden sharing and Europe’s military weakness (and the implied threat that if Europe fails to accept the American position there will be political and military consequences for the Atlantic Alliance). Moreover, it is unlikely to be a debate that either Europe or America can avoid indefinitely because, as Ambassador Jean Kirkpatrick points out, the launch of the Euro has re-focused US policy on the EU, with the result that there is now a pivotal ‘binary choice’ in transatlantic relations to be made between a cooperative or competitive relationship.<sup>23</sup>

Certainly, the coincidence of external power and internal vested interests has resulted in US military forces that are, from a European perspective, massively over-capable and which seem for the most part to exist for their own sake, rather than as a tool of broader diplomacy, that must be justified to reinforce the ongoing commitment of the American taxpayer. Europeans fear that one justification for such public largesse is by exaggerating both threats and the capabilities of emergent technologies. As a consequence, programmes, such as National Missile Defense (NMD) and the revolution in military affairs (RMA) emerge, which not only complicate relationships with friends, but also threaten to turn foes into enemies, particularly when pressure is exerted upon allies to support initiatives that appear to bear little or no relation to their needs. Thus, allies are uncertain about what to expect from US policy,

---

<sup>22</sup> Kennedy wrote: ‘Although the United States is at present still in a class of its own economically and perhaps even militarily, it cannot avoid confronting the two great tests which challenge the longevity of every major power that occupies the ‘number one’ position in world affairs: whether in the military/strategic realm, it can preserve a reasonable balance between the nation’s perceived defense requirements and means it possesses to maintain those commitments...’ P. Kennedy, *The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers* (New York: Random House, 1987), p. 514.

<sup>23</sup> During an interview with the author, Washington, Thursday, 6 May 2000.

because US policy and politics seem so often contradictory, saying one thing and doing another. Indeed, as Flora Lewis says: ‘There is a peculiar contradiction in the arguments that overwhelming strength is essential but that American force should not be used to pacify trouble spots around the world unless American national interests (which are not defined) are clearly involved. A policy of spend but don’t send may serve some special interests, but it doesn’t address the nation’s needs in a troubled world.’<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>24</sup> Flora Lewis, ‘US Military Policy Ought to Be Getting an Airing’, *International Herald Tribune*, 15 September 2000, p. 6.

## **CHAPTER TWO: MANIFEST DESTINY REVISITED – THE AMERICAN POLITICAL CONTEXT**

### ***II.1 Introduction***

There is also a contradiction in the forthcoming US presidential election. On the one hand, it is the most establishment contest for at least a generation with the focus very much on the domestic. Indeed, with ‘George II’, on one side, and ‘Prince Albert’, on the other, the race certainly has a sense of dynastic succession, something Europeans know only too well. Moreover, the two contenders both come from political clans that are consummate Washington insiders. Equally, nothing is certain because ‘...for the first time in decades almost any electoral result is conceivable, ranging from a clean sweep for the presidency, Senate and House of Representatives by the Republicans, to a clean sweep by the Democrats – or any combination in between’.<sup>25</sup> Certainly, given the nature of the internal American debate over America’s future role, the race for the White House will mark an important milestone in transatlantic relations. This chapter therefore examines the link between American political culture and foreign and security policy in order to place the two presidential contenders in context.

### ***II.2 The historical context of US foreign and security policy***

Any assessment of American foreign and security policy must, first, avoid the assumption that the US is a political monolith and, second, draw a distinction between foreign and security policy. Whilst there is a significant level of consensus between conservatives and liberals over the objectives of foreign policy there are considerable points of contention over the means. Condoleezza Rice, widely tipped to become a Republican National Security Advisor, effectively sums up the consensus: ‘The process of outlining a new foreign policy must begin by recognizing that the United States is in a remarkable position. Powerful secular trends are moving the world towards economic openness and – more unevenly towards – democracy and individual liberty. Some states have one foot on the train and the other off. Some states still hope to find a way to decouple democracy and economic progress. Some hold on to old hatreds as diversions from the modernizing task at hand. But the United States and its allies are on the right side of history’.<sup>26</sup>

Beyond that the picture becomes more complex, with the foreign policy debate that is currently under way in the United States being probably the most profound that has taken place for a century, because it concerns the application of American power in the twenty-first century at a time when the preponderance of American power is such that it can shape the international system in a way that hitherto no state could contemplate. As a result, the US debate is no longer focused primarily on the European security order. In many ways the debate echoes that of 1900-1919 between Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson when the US emerged as a world power after a century of self-colonisation in the wake of the 1898 Spanish-American War, and which was justified by a latter-day international version of ‘manifest destiny’.<sup>27</sup> This not only justified expansion within the American continent, but also

---

<sup>25</sup> ‘The End of the Beginning’, *The Economist*, 12 August 2000, p. 43.

<sup>26</sup> See Condoleezza Rice, ‘Promoting the National Interest’, *Foreign Affairs*, January/February 2000, p. 46.

<sup>27</sup> Henry Kissinger writes: ‘By 1820, the United States found a compromise between the two approaches which enabled it to have it both ways until after the Second World War. It continued to castigate what went on

helped Americans of the period avoid unfavourable comparisons with European colonialism of the age.

Robert Zoellick, another Bush adviser, captures this phenomenon succinctly: ‘At the opening of the Twentieth century, the United States began a quest similar to today’s. The rise of American power, revolutions in technology, and great clashes abroad set the stage for a historic transformation. Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson dominated the age, as they debated and labored to promote their visions of America’s role in a new international system. In 2000, the world is again in an era of rapid change, reminiscent of its military power, and the country’s ideas are unparalleled. But as former British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher cautioned her colleagues, we must “expect the unexpected”. A primary task for the next president of the United States is to build public support for a strategy that will shape the world so as to protect and promote American interests and values for the next 50 years’.<sup>28</sup>

### ***II.3 The contemporary context of US foreign and security policy***

Again, the debate focuses not on the nature of American interests and values, these are by and large agreed upon, but how best to promote them. Indeed, the American foreign policy process can be likened to a corporate balance sheet in that performance is constantly monitored with one of the key criteria for success being the degree to which America penetrates new ‘markets’ by exporting its values and ideas. For this reason values and interests cannot be separated. As indicated earlier, this proselytising role is fundamentally embedded in America’s view of itself because the United States sees itself not just as a nation, but an idea which defines itself by constantly assessing its ‘exceptionalism’. This sense of self becomes particularly powerful when there is no external competitor to condition the choices of American decision-makers. As a consequence, there is no clear concept of ‘interests’ in the traditional (and increasingly passé) European sense on either side of the American political divide. Indeed, it is no coincidence that it was Americans who rejected European concepts of balances of power when Wilson won the debate with Roosevelt<sup>29</sup> and who are once again challenging more recent concepts of sovereignty by putting values before borders. As Al Gore said recently: ‘We must now view what could be called the classic security agenda – the question of war and peace among sovereign states – in light of these new realities. But we must recognize that there is a New Security Agenda...a set of threats that affect us all and that transcend political borders’.<sup>30</sup> However, whilst American policy remains wedded to the ends of what could be called a Neo-Idealist tradition, paradoxically, the *means* by which policy is pursued are often fundamentally Realist, particularly when conservatives are in power, with the result that defending America can never be just a passive state, but an active and dynamic process. As the *New York Times* points out: ‘America also makes its own democracy more secure by promoting democracy elsewhere. The evolution of Russia and China into enduring democratic states would make the world a safer place and erase two of the greatest potential

---

across the oceans as the reprehensible result of balance-of-power politics while treating its own expansion across North America as “manifest destiny”’. Henry Kissinger, *Diplomacy* (New York: Touchstone, 1994) p. 34.

<sup>28</sup> Robert B. Zoellick, ‘A Republican Foreign Policy’, *Foreign Affairs*, January/February 2000, p. 63.

<sup>29</sup> Wilson said ‘...this age is an age...which rejects the standards of national selfishness that once governed the counsels of nations and demands that they shall give way to a new order of things in which the only questions will be: ‘Is it right?’ ‘Is it just?’ ‘Is it in the interests of mankind?’’. From Henry Kissinger, *Diplomacy* (New York: Touchstone, 1994), p. 51.

<sup>30</sup> Al Gore, Speech to the International Press Institute, Boston MA, Sunday, 30 April 2000.

threats to US security. Encouraging democracy and the rule of law in these nations should be among the primary goals of the next president'.<sup>31</sup>

At the same time, the formulation of American foreign policy has become increasingly populist as Congress has successfully encroached upon the powers of the presidency and traditional east coast élites have been replaced, trends that will certainly continue to be a feature of the contemporary American political process, irrespective of who wins the White House in November. As David Calleo puts it: 'Over the past three decades, the Congress, the courts and the states have frequently combined to cut the presidency down to size. Nothing illustrates this trend more than Clinton's ordeal. Despite the President's continuing popularity with the electorate, and his impressive achievements in the economic field, his presidency has been subjected to the most savage constitutional attack since Nixon's time. What are the consequences for American foreign policy of this weakened presidency? They form a litany of complaints: foreign policy, dominated by Congress, pursue an incoherent aggregate of private agendas. In trade legislation, congressional unilateralism regularly defies not only presidential authority but also the country's treaty obligations. In defense spending, congressional pressure greatly affects not only decisions about arms purchases and military organization but basic strategic doctrine – as, for example, when the Senate refused to ratify the Test-Ban Treaty, or now, as it apparently forces the Administration to pursue missile defense, along with renegotiation of the ABM Treaty'.<sup>32</sup>

Paradoxically, the popularisation of American foreign policy has come at a time when the American people are, by and large, less interested in foreign policy. As Stephen Walt writes of the election of President Clinton in 1993: 'America's preponderance has caused most of its citizens to lose interest in foreign affairs...US preponderance and the state of public opinion are inextricably linked. Americans are not interested in foreign policy because they recognize how favourable the current situation is. So they elected a president who promised to spend less time on the phone with foreign leaders and more time on domestic issues...' <sup>33</sup> Walt goes on to say that Americans also elected a Congress whose 'disdain of foreign affairs was almost gleeful'. So, how can such popularisation be defined? Since 1993 Congress has wasted no opportunity to defeat Clinton at every foreign policy opportunity. Thus, Congress has justified its increased role in foreign policy by claiming to act in the name of the people, not as an end in itself, but rather as a means with which to embarrass the incumbent president, i.e., the popularisation of foreign policy for narrow and often very partisan (and by European standards quite extreme) political reasons. To some extent, therefore, America's external power has been used to buttress domestic political positions by providing a battlefield over which partisan arguments are fought and a platform from which to project parochial ideas onto an often bemused world. In the absence of a 'disciplining' external force this entrapment of foreign policy by domestic, partisan legislators is likely to continue.

Furthermore, as traditional east coast élites have given way to a more complex and diverse power élite who have no particular allegiance to the Old Continent, American foreign policy has lost some of its focus. Indeed, as problems have become more multilateral, America has tended to become more unilateral. In many ways, Condoleezza Rice typifies and exemplifies

---

<sup>31</sup> 'America in the World', *New York Times* op. ed., reproduced in *International Herald Tribune*, Tuesday, 8 August 2000, p. 8.

<sup>32</sup> David P. Calleo, 'The Evolving Role of the United States Presidency and Congress in Shaping Global Leadership', presentation to seminar entitled, 'The New Transatlantic Agenda: Facing the Challenges of Global Governance', Istituto Affari Internazionali, Palazzo Rondinini, Rome, 7-8 July 2000, p. 5.

<sup>33</sup> Stephen Walt, 'Two Cheers for Clinton's Foreign Policy', *Foreign Affairs*, March/April 2000, p. 65.

the gradual (and not unjust) move away from the WASP (White, Anglo-Saxon Protestant) establishment. America's ethnic minorities have long been under-represented in foreign and security policy circles which, sadly, is something shared with Europe. However, her positivistic Republican foreign policy agenda seems, on occasions, almost naïve and will undoubtedly be undermined by the realities of day to day management of a complex, inter-dependent world in which a significant degree of ad hocery becomes a plain necessity. In particular, American political sensitivity towards high-risk foreign operations will further undermine any such approach to foreign policy, not least because of concerns in Congress.

This paradox will also lead to difficulties with key allies as American politicians of both persuasions again look to the troops of their allies, notably Britain and France, to undertake the more dangerous ground missions. After all, a British or French body bag is far more acceptable than an American. Indeed, this makes American calls for greater burden-sharing often appear so galling to Europeans, particularly the British and French, and suggests an almost 'self-pitying' aspect of American power – America the victim of its power, America alone in a world of fools and enemies – that frustrates Europeans.<sup>34</sup> Indeed, this problem cannot be overstated, because so many of the tensions in transatlantic security relations stem from the essential hypocrisy of the US position. The next Administration would do well to avoid too many lectures on burden-sharing whilst European forces do the lion's share of the peacekeeping in East Timor, Sierra Leone and Kosovo. America is *the* status quo power and, however it justifies its actions to itself, acts first and foremost out of its own concept of interests, complicated though that may be. One reason for this self-pity is that many Americans do not like to admit that they are as much constrained by their power (both domestically and internationally) as they are liberated by it, i.e., they are the *most* powerful, not *all*-powerful. Until a 'New World Order' is created that reflects America's 'Manifest Destiny', Americans will still tend to regard themselves as an isolated beacon of hope surrounded by a sea of despotic despair. As a result, US political and popular sentiment will always tend to oscillate between calls for assertive leadership and expressions of frustration.

Three contradictions make American policy vulnerable. Traditionally, Americans have feared not the loss of political or territorial integrity but rather the loss of a self-proclaimed, self-justifying sense of moral superiority that can bind Americans into a sense of themselves. For this reason, isolationism, and to some extent unilateralism, are political chimeras because America will never kick the habit of foreign interventionism nor the need for the affirmation it brings. However, as they perceive new threats on the horizon, real or imagined, it will be interesting (and a little worrying) for Europeans to see how this impacts upon policy. It could well reinforce America's need for allies, not just to share burdens but also risks. To some extent, this need for the moral high ground explains the ambivalent attitude the US has towards the European Union which also needs values to bind its diverse members. Indeed, the relationship between the EU and the US to some extent reflects the complex relationship between France and the US, i.e., a kind of ideological one-upmanship over who was the first to give the international system a value-based framework and a never-ending dialogue over who is the true guardian of those values. Hitherto, the fact of American dominance has

---

<sup>34</sup> This problem is beginning to seriously exacerbate strains in the transatlantic relationship, particularly between the US and UK. To underline the nature of the problem it is worth quoting a letter to the *International Herald Tribune* from an American working in Kosovo. Bruce Hatch writes: 'I have worked as an election operations planner in Haiti, Sierra Leone, East Timor and in Kosovo . . . In those instances where the US military has participated, I have often been mystified by their reluctance to act compared with other military contingents. The "paper tiger" label is a common one, much to the dismay of individual American troops whom I am sure would be only too happy to get their hands as "dirty" as their British cousins do.' 'US Role in the Balkans', *International Herald Tribune*, 20 September 2000, p. 5.



downplayed this competition, but the supremacy of the politico-economic over the politico-military in the modern world, and the EU's undoubted strengths in these areas, has made the Union a current and very genuine contender for ideological leadership of the value community (as opposed to the power community) that is the West. This competitive dichotomy reinforces two increasingly distinct approaches to (and choices over) foreign and security policy that will impede policy cohesion. Moreover, as Europe becomes steadily militarily stronger the battle over the ideological and political leadership of the West will intensify.

#### ***II.4 Convergence and divergence over foreign policy***

Conservatives assert that what is good for America is good for the world. This auto-legitimation underpins the moral justification for neo-unilateralism even if it offends (traditional) European concepts of sovereignty. America is a global power, with global responsibilities allied to a superior vision and the power to do something about it. Indeed, as Governor Bush said in a recent speech: 'Some have tried to pose a choice between American ideals and American interests – between who we are and how we act. But the choice is false. America, by decision and destiny, promotes political freedom – and gains the most when democracy advances. America believes in free markets and free trade – and benefits most when markets are opened. America is a peaceful power – and gains the greatest dividend from democratic stability'.<sup>35</sup>

Republican foreign policy doctrine tends to be more defined, decisive and effective than Democrats but remains a complex amalgam of Idealism and Realism, which is once again highlighted by Condoleezza Rice: 'American foreign policy in a Republican administration should refocus the United States on the national interest and the pursuit of key priorities. The tasks are:

- to ensure that America's military can deter war, project power, and fight in defense of its interests if deterrence fails;
- to promote economic growth and political openness by extending free trade and a stable international monetary system to all committed to these principles, including in the western hemisphere, which has too often been neglected as a vital area of US national interest;
- to renew strong and intimate relationships with allies and who share American values and can thus share the burden of promoting peace, prosperity and freedom;
- to focus US energies on comprehensive relationships with the big powers, particularly Russia and China, that can and will mold the character of the international political system; and
- to deal decisively with the threat of rogue regimes and hostile powers, which is increasingly taking the forms of the potential for terrorism and the development of weapons of mass destruction'.<sup>36</sup>

Democrats reject the neo-unilateralist implementation approach not just because it is 'morally' wrong, but because in a complex multilateral environment unilateral exercises of power do not always result in desired outcomes. For these reasons, Gore places more emphasis on multilateralism and 'soft' security. 'Today, at the dawn of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century, we

---

<sup>35</sup> George W. Bush, 'A Distinctly American Internationalism', speech in Simi Valley, California, Friday, 19 November 1999. See [www.georgewbush.com/News.asp](http://www.georgewbush.com/News.asp).

<sup>36</sup> Condoleezza Rice, 'Promoting the National Interest', *Foreign Affairs*, January/February 2000, pp. 46-7.

need a foreign policy that addresses the classic security threats – and understands the new ones as well. We need a new approach for a new century – grounded in our own economic and security interests, but uplifted by what is right in the world. We need to pursue a policy of “forward engagement” – addressing problems early in their development, before they become crises; addressing them as close to the source of the problem as possible; and having the forces and resources to deal with those threats as soon after their emergence as possible’.<sup>37</sup> Moreover, Democrat concerns over the unilateral use of power are also reinforced by a skein of neo-isolationism to the Left of the Democratic Party that acts as a brake on Democratic neo-internationalism without ever blocking it, as demonstrated by the protectionist lobbying of the main trades union movement, the AFL-CIO. Therefore, Democrats tend to adopt a more circumspect approach to foreign policy that is reinforced by a strong preference for domestic policy. Equally, isolationist tendencies can be found at the popular level across the political divide and represent a powerful minority tendency to which politicians of both hues must at least pay due regard.

Furthermore, Democrats also tend to place greater emphasis on the economic rather than the military aspects of relationships, which again suggests that a Democrat administration would find relations with Europe easier. This is underlined by Bowman Cutter, Joan Spero and Laura D’Andrea Tyson, economic advisers to Al Gore: ‘The next Democratic president must define American economic relations with Europe in terms of the EU. As it has long done, the United States should encourage European unification, which is a stabilizing, modernizing force. But while Europeans share US goals and values, they also increasingly resent American economic, political, and security hegemony. Thus, the next president must work to ensure that Europe does not turn inward and that transatlantic economic, political and security ties are strengthened. The Clinton administration has already laid the groundwork for ongoing high-level dialogue with the Europeans on economic cooperation and common global challenges through the New Transatlantic Agenda’.<sup>38</sup>

### ***II.5 Convergence and divergence over security policy***

If the US debate over foreign policy remains essentially one of means rather than ends, the debate over the future direction of American security policy is more complex. In many ways security policy is the litmus test of commitment, i.e., it is a political metaphor to demonstrate the commitment to ‘defending’ America in its fullest sense and, therefore, tends to be an area where Democrats are traditionally vulnerable to Republican pressure. Certainly, Republicans are prepared to exploit Democrat ‘weakness’ on security policy: ‘He [Bush] pointedly contradicted Mr Gore’s assertion at the convention that the US military is in sound shape. ‘I don’t care what’s said in the political campaign’...’there are signs of a military in decline and we must do something about it’. He [Bush] promised that as president he would boost military spending, improve pay levels and ‘restore morale’.<sup>39</sup> Moreover, whilst both sides of the political divide recognise that not even the US is strong enough to manage the international system unilaterally, conservatives tend to believe that such a goal remains not only an ambition but a duty, i.e., the creation of sufficient military power to enable the US to act as a hegemon, if and when necessary, and thus assure its dominant position in the world. Liberals,

---

<sup>37</sup> Al Gore, speech to the International Press Institute, Boston MA, Sunday, 30 April 2000.

<sup>38</sup> Bowman W. Cutter, Joan Spero, Laura D’Andrea Tyson, ‘New World, New Deal’, *Foreign Affairs*, March/April 2000, p. 85.

<sup>39</sup> ‘Gore Says Rise in Polls tied to Issue Campaign – Bush Calls for end to Military Decline’, *International Herald Tribune*, Tuesday, 22 August 2000, p. 3.

on the other hand, tend to regard such ambition as folly because it is both unattainable and would impact negatively upon the other major government spending programmes, such as health, social security and education. They tend also to see the achievement of America's mission as being less exclusive which makes them more natural allies for Europe, which is reflected in the contrasting positions of the two parties.

A Gore administration, therefore, would expect to reach a consensus with the EU (and its member-states) rapidly. However, the European position still remains significantly different from that of the Democrats and the danger is that even they will confuse this alternative European viewpoint over the means of policy with a lack of willingness to act. Senator Joseph Lieberman, ranking Democrat on the Senate Armed Services Committee and vice-presidential candidate, framed the dilemma of the Democrats succinctly when he said: 'While we must be prepared to act alone, we will tend to act with allies; their views about force and its application may be different from ours. Accordingly, we have to focus less on achieving maximum possible force and more on achieving what my colleague Carl Levin has termed "maximum achievable force". By this he means that a variety of constraints will likely exist that will determine what means we can use and how and where we can use them'.<sup>40</sup> However, the question remains; will that 'maximum achievable force', be a minimum acceptable force to the US?

Lieberman also implicitly highlights an enduring paradox in US security policy. Both Democrats and Republicans agree that any threat to US territory must be minimised, and US casualties kept to a minimum. However, a persistent feature of American policy since the Gulf War has been the uncertain balance between a determination to act and a fear of casualties. Indeed, it is the fear of casualties that undermines both the commitment of Democrats to internationalism and Republican aspirations to unrivalled, *effective* global military supremacy and which encourages the Saddams and Milosevics of this world to repeatedly test American resolve. This leads politicians of both political hues to place at times excessive faith in technology-driven military solutions to complex political problems (aided and abetted by the defence-industry). As indicated earlier, it also places a greater premium on allies, such as the British and French, who enjoy a more robust political culture and who are prepared to put troops directly into the line of fire, even when their fundamental interests are not threatened, a factor that is often conveniently overlooked in the burden-sharing debate.

Certainly, the conservative establishment is lobbying hard for a Clausewitzian concept of 'absolute warfare'<sup>41</sup> and superiority across all levels of warfighting that can justify massive defence and procurement budgets and the huge outlays in research and development that they entail. To underpin these arguments they emphasise new 'threats' posed by rogues states, weapons of mass destruction (WMD) and the breakdown of both the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) and the Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR). *Joint Vision 2020*, which in

---

<sup>40</sup> Joseph Lieberman, 'Transforming National Defense for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century', speech to US Army Conference on Strategic Responsiveness, 2 November 1999. See [www.leiberman.senate.gov](http://www.leiberman.senate.gov).

<sup>41</sup> Clausewitz was at the junction of Enlightenment and Romantic military thought in that whilst he believed that war was inherently uncontrollable and unpredictable it was the task of strategy to master these uncertainties through the crushing and rapid sustained application of power. This required armed forces of country to be both dominant in general and then at decisive points. The strength of an enemy lay in its armed forces thus the objective was to smash them, not merely force a retreat because in such an event defence would become attack and attack defence.

many ways reflects this thinking, underlines the need for the US to dominate all aspects of warfighting, whilst at the same time highlights the very limited role and utility of the Allies.<sup>42</sup>

Liberal political vulnerability in the realm of security policy is also reinforced by the prestige that the Armed Services now enjoy in American society.<sup>43</sup> Indeed, to question the right of the armed services to have the latest and the best is to be un-American, even if such an approach makes little sense from a European strategic viewpoint that still instinctively seeks balances in the modern world. Defense Secretary William Cohen, ironically a Republican, speaking to the Veterans of Foreign Wars convention in August, underlined the Administration's sensitivity on this issue. He said: 'I am not here as a Republican, I am not here on behalf of the Democratic administration...But I want you to know something: we have the finest, the best-led, the best-equipped, the best educated, the finest fighting force in the history of the world. We have that today...We have begun the largest sustained increase in military spending in a generation'.<sup>44</sup> Governor Bush, sharing the same platform gave a contrasting view and underlined what he saw as the long neglect of ordinary soldiers and a military in decline. This contrast between America and Europe is reinforced by the contrasting (very different?) value that Americans and Europeans place on foreign and security policy establishments. In the United States the defence establishment is better funded than its civilian foreign policy counterpart because of its greater prestige and, ergo, its greater influence on policy-makers. The reverse is true in Europe. Indeed, the *International Herald Tribune* underlines the need for some balance to be restored when commenting on the possibility of General Colin Powell becoming Secretary of State in a Bush administration '...he [Powell] would bring to the State Department a powerful voice to counterbalance the better-funded Pentagon and influential National Security Council. His supporters, who are widespread and include people from both parties, say his stature and managerial experience could revive a dispirited department'.<sup>45</sup>

Therefore, the position of liberals is far closer (and domestically far weaker) to that of Europe but by no means identical. They question the emergence of China as a threat and whether states such as North Korea, Iran and Iraq can justify a national missile defence system. They also tend to argue in favour of soft security, limited warfare concepts with armed forces better tailored to fight sub-strategic conflicts, as well as the more assertive use of economic and political tools. However, the central tenet of the conservative case; the pre-eminent need for a strong America, a 'need' that the right pretty much defines, remains politically unchallengeable. That said, mainstream Democrats are likely to remain more open to the EU's security case than Republicans and in the event of a Gore administration is more likely

---

<sup>42</sup> *Joint Vision 2020* states: 'The overall goal of the transformation...is the creation of a force that is dominant across the full spectrum of military operations – persuasive in peace, decisive in war, preeminent in any form of conflict. In 2020, the nation will face a wide range of interests, opportunities, and challenges and will require a military that can both win wars and contribute to peace. The global interests and responsibilities of the United States will endure, and there is no indication that threats to those interests and responsibilities, or to our allies, will disappear. The strategic concepts of decisive force, power projection, overseas presence, and strategic agility will continue to govern our efforts to fulfill those responsibilities and meet the challenges of the future', *Joint Vision 2020*, (Washington: Department of Defense, 2000), pp. 1-2.

<sup>43</sup> Indeed, apart from the Vietnam fiasco US armed forces have always enjoyed a high level of prestige in American society in spite of George Washington's concerns about the dangers of a permanent standing army. To some extent this has been a myth that has perpetuated itself. Even the famed US Cavalry of the late-nineteenth century upon which Hollywood lavished so much attention ranked fourteenth in the world after Bulgaria. There is no denying that today myth and reality have combined to become fact.

<sup>44</sup> 'Cohen Rebuffs Criticism of Defense Outlays', *International Herald Tribune*, Wednesday, 23 August 2000, p. 3.

<sup>45</sup> 'Powell Seen As Asset Despite Policy Differences', *International Herald Tribune*, Tuesday, 1 August 2000, p. 3.

to offer an opportunity to reinvigorate the relationship through a renewed common strategic assessment.

Furthermore, Liberals believe that Republican policies could provoke threats through premature and unilateral American action that would de-stabilise a strategic balance that has yet to solidify, particularly with regard to China. In effect, they are keen to avoid threats posited by conservatives becoming a self-fulfilling prophecy. Conservatives assert that only unilateral action now will prepare the US for the ‘inevitable’ strategic challenges that will emerge post-2020, even if such action entails casting aside such pillars of the arms control regime as the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty. Indeed, echoes can be heard of Professor Samuel Huntington’s famous Clash of Civilizations argument in the conservative strategic case, rejecting, as they do, balancing future Chinese power or even merely ‘containing’ it.<sup>46</sup> Thus, their objective is to dominate all strategic developments. This reinforces the need for American leadership to defend the West against what it regards as an inevitable challenge from Confucian and Islamic strategic competitors that will undoubtedly emerge, an argument Europeans find very hard to ‘buy’.

## ***II.6 The Bush and Gore teams***

As indicated earlier, in many ways, Bush and Gore are very similar. These were men who were prepared for power from an early age. *The Economist* points out that Gore’s father, a long-time congressman and senator from Tennessee ‘...made damn sure that his son was lodged at the heart of the Washington establishment’,<sup>47</sup> whilst Stephen Sachur says ‘...Gore will do anything to gain power’.<sup>48</sup> Bush, on the other hand, remains uniquely vulnerable to the Clinton charge that the only reason he wants to be president is because ‘daddy’ also held the post. There are issues that divide these two scions of the political establishment, although they are primarily domestic, such as social security, health care and education, but it is questionable how deep these differences go. The abiding impression, therefore, is of two men who are fulfilling the destiny set for them by others, rather than men of deep personal convictions committed to their respective causes. This reinforces the implicit sense of ‘royal’ succession that dogs this election, a contest for power between two Washington cliques. In such circumstances the views of the people around them matter as much as those of the candidates themselves.

A striking feature of the two camps is the role of both new and old faces in the campaign teams. Whilst there are new faces, there is also a wealth of experience and knowledge that anchors both the Bush and Gore campaigns, particularly in foreign and security policy. However, there are also differences. As *The Economist* points out: ‘George W. Bush has relied from the outset on the homegrown trio of Karl Rove, Joe Allbaugh and Karen Hughes. But his wife Tipper and daughter Karenna aside, Mr Gore is surrounded by a changeable cast

---

<sup>46</sup> Huntington wrote: ‘The West is and will remain for years to come the most powerful civilization. Yet its power relative to that of other civilizations is declining. As the West attempts to assert its values and to protect its interests, non-Western societies confront a choice. Some attempt to emulate the West and to hjoin or to ‘bandwagon’ with the West. Other Confucian and Islamic societies attempt to expand their own economic and military power to resist and to ‘balance’ against the West. The central axis of post-Cold War world politics is thus the interaction of Western power and culture with the power and culture of non-Western civilizations’. Samuel P. Huntington, *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order* (London: Touchstone, 1996), p. 29.

<sup>47</sup> ‘In Search of the Real Man’, *The Economist*, 12 August 2000, p. 19.

<sup>48</sup> Steven Sachur, BBC-TV News, 14 August 2000.

of hired guns and political professionals, including almost nobody who has been around since the beginning'.<sup>49</sup>

The Bush team clearly enjoys a strong mix of experience, expertise and new blood, even if it is of a fairly consistent 'engaged unilateralist' persuasion. However, Ambassador Jean Kirkpatrick<sup>50</sup> believes that the team is to some extent politically split with Richard Perle and Paul Wolfowitz to the right of the Republican Party whilst George Shultz, James Baker and Dick Cheney more internationalist. Brent Scowcroft and Henry Kissinger are also providing advice and guidance behind the scenes which gives some idea of the experience supporting the Republican ticket. This division is reflected by the make up of the centrist elements of the team which includes new players such as Condoleezza Rice and long-term Washington insiders such as Paul Wolfowitz, Robert Zoellick and Stephen Hadley.

If the Republican team suffers from an inner policy fracture the Gore team is also replete with strong personalities. The focus of the Vice-President's team during the campaign has been his National Security Advisor Leon Feurth and former Secretary of State, Warren Christopher, which reinforces the impression that a Gore Presidency will tend to be a more robust version of the Clinton administration. However, the powerful figure of Richard Holbrooke stands in the background, whilst other influential figures on the team include Ambassador Robert Hunter, former Ambassador to NATO, and Ambassador Richard Gardner. Certainly, whoever is chosen as Secretary of State and Secretary of Defense after the November 2<sup>nd</sup> elections will indicate the initial overall direction of a new Gore Administration, although Gore also sees himself as a foreign policy specialist, a *marked* difference with Clinton. The choice of Senator Joseph Lieberman as running mate, although a moderate on most domestic issues, suggests a hardening of the position of the Gore team on foreign and security policy to counter the assertive agenda of the Republicans. The *International Herald Tribune* writes: '[Lieberman] would in some ways nullify the appeal of Governor George W. Bush's running mate, Dick Cheney, as man of experience who is tough on defense. Mr Lieberman is considered a hawk on military matters...'<sup>51</sup>

Furthermore, whilst Holbrooke has been tipped (and has been tipping himself) to become the new Secretary of State, the relationship with Gore is never likely to prove easy. Ironically, the man widely tipped to be a Republican Secretary of State, Colin Powell, would probably bring a far more diplomatic and cautious approach to office than Holbrooke. This is underlined again by the *International Herald Tribune* which also highlights the difficulties that Powell is likely to face, especially with his own colleagues '...while General Powell could prove a potent political asset in this fall's presidential campaign, if he becomes secretary of state the past suggests he could find himself at odds with the other principal makers of foreign and defense policy within the Bush camp. Most Bush advisers and many conservatives have backed more aggressive use of the US military for such purposes as removing the Iraqi leader, Saddam Hussein, defending Taiwan against Chinese intimidation and promoting democracy in the Balkans. Shaped by his experience in Vietnam, however, General Powell used his positions under Mr [George W.] Bush's father. President George Bush, and under President Bill Clinton, to warn about the dangers of US intervention, the need for clear political objectives and the need to deploy overwhelming military force to achieve those objectives'. The *International Herald Tribune* goes on: 'In his book *The Commanders*, the Washington

---

<sup>49</sup> 'In Search of the Real Man', *The Economist*, 12 August 2000, p. 20.

<sup>50</sup> Interview with the author, Washington, Thursday, 4 May 2000.

<sup>51</sup> 'Selecting Lieberman is Seen as a Bold Move; Religion May be Issue', *International Herald Tribune*, Tuesday, 8 August 2000, pp. 1 and 3.

Post assistant managing editor, Bob Woodward, recounted that General Powell kept a quote from Thucydides under the glass covering on his Pentagon desk: “Of all manifestations of power, restraint impresses men most”<sup>52</sup>. Certainly, a Powell tenancy at the State Department might mitigate against the more assertive elements of the Bush team. On the other hand, his relationship with other powerful figures is likely to prove difficult and could complicate Republican policy-making.

### ***II.7 The price of leadership***

Given the nature of the American political system, the role of defence-related special-interest groups, the increased presence of Congress in policy formulation and popular sentiment, it is conservatives who are winning the debate over the future direction of both foreign and security policies. To a significant extent the Democrats’ platform on foreign and security policy has been conditioned by the Republican agenda. Unfortunately, irrespective of the personal strengths and positions of Al Gore sophistry tends never to challenge political instinct in the American electoral process. The first duty of any politician is to win power, nowhere more so than in the US. However, the result is a situation in which American politicians make ever more grandiose claims to an ill-informed public about America’s role in the world, their ability to defend the US, the essential righteousness of the American ‘cause’ and the ‘unacceptable’ free-riding of Allies.

Leadership is, therefore, not only a function of power but a form of ideological and moral superiority, whereas partnership, ideological and moral equality, is akin to weakness and, thus, political suicide. The resurgent nature of the American economy, the supremacy of the American armed forces and the popularisation of policy formulation through Congress provides the environment for what could become a dangerous belief that somehow the United States can act unilaterally in the world and control outcomes. This aspiration has been further strengthened by the primacy of domestic politics over international politics which has raised a popular expectation of superiority, bordering on invincibility, that will be difficult to satisfy in a world that will not always follow America’s lead. It will fall to America’s closest allies to disabuse Americans, particularly conservatives, of this profound misreading of the international security environment, first and foremost, the European Union.

---

<sup>52</sup> ‘Powell Seen as Asset Despite Differences on Policy’, *International Herald Tribune*, Tuesday, 1 August 2000, pp. 1 and 3.

## CHAPTER THREE: THE TRANSATLANTIC SECURITY AGENDA ON THE EVE OF THE NEW PRESIDENCY

### *III.1 Introduction*

Whilst not the only important strategic relationship, transatlantic relations will remain for the United States central to its external policy, with Europe continuing to act both as a 'consumer' of security and, increasingly, as a 'producer'. So, what will be the main issues on the transatlantic security agenda for the next Administration? The consensus in Washington is that both Bush and Gore will attempt to re-assert US leadership of the relationship.<sup>53</sup> Bush, to establish himself as the leader of the West and to reinforce his foreign and security credentials domestically and Gore because, as a first-term president and former vice-president, he would feel vulnerable to attacks from conservatives that he was Clinton re-visited. Clearly, the first year of the new Administration is going to be a difficult period in US-European relations. However, because the European foreign and security concept is markedly closer to that of Gore, and, because many of the Gore team have already been involved in protracted negotiations over the past eight years with Europeans, they are unlikely to want to start the process anew. However, that cannot be taken for granted. Equally, there will also be powerful incentives for a new president to be seen to 'whip the Europeans into line' to counter the power of a new Congress in the early months of a new presidency. Thus, there will be a strong tendency for both Bush and Gore to reinforce the image of presidential authority by highlighting the differences that exist with Europeans.

Unfortunately, the new Administration might find such an approach counterproductive, because, as Flora Lewis points out, 'One of the reasons the Europeans are so eager to organize their own rapid reaction force is that they are no longer convinced they can count on agreeing with the United States on what is to be defended by the allies, where and when. They worry both about Washington refusing to respond to what they discern as threats, and Washington rushing unilaterally into conflict and dragging them in.'<sup>54</sup> Furthermore, the security agenda is also likely to be complicated by extraneous trade-related disputes, such as the row over hormone-treated American beef, the tensions between the US and UK over the protracted failure to reach an 'open skies' agreement, US tax breaks to major exporters and European subsidies to the proposed Airbus A-3XX super-jumbo airliner programme. However, the security and defence relationship will remain important, partly because of the issues that are in contention.

There are two main categories of policy contention between the United States and Europe that the next Administration, irrespective of its political leanings, will have to face; political and functional. Within these broad categories there are a range of difficult issues in the relationship that include dysfunctional strategic assessments, burden-sharing, European defence and the future of NATO, enlargement, armaments policy and cooperation, the revolution in military affairs (RMA) and, of course, National Missile Defense (NMD). None of these issues is a 'pure' foreign or security matter, because they are all influenced to a significant extent by parochial interests on both sides of the Atlantic that act as policy 'filters' and which impact adversely upon transatlantic security relations.

---

<sup>53</sup> Research carried out by the author, Washington, 1 May 2000.

<sup>54</sup> Flora Lewis, 'US Military Policy Ought to be Getting an Airing', *International Herald Tribune*, 15 September 2000, p. 6.



### ***III.2 Dysfunctional strategic assessments***

Policy variance between Europe and America is nowhere more apparent than in the respective strategic assessments, i.e., analyses undertaken by Europeans and Americans of threats and opportunities in the world and how to deal with them. The domestic ‘filters’ that influence the process of policy formulation between strategic assessment and declared policy in both the United States and Europe result in two very different approaches to security that cannot be dismissed as either American neo-unilateralism, on the one hand, or European free-riding, on the other. During the Cold War the binding mechanism that ensured strategic cohesion was self-evident, namely the Soviet threat. To some extent, the delay in a thoroughgoing analysis of the strategic environment in the post-Cold War world was due to the very fluid state of the international security environment and the lack of a clear threat. In addition, both the US and Europe were keen to benefit from a post-Cold War ‘peace dividend’, and as a result slashed defence budgets by around 25% on average without considering the strategic environment too closely.

At the same time the cuts took place without any real attempt to reform the force postures and force structures of either American or European forces which remained (and by and large remain) geared to fighting a major war in Central Europe. This helped put off the search for a new common US-European strategic assessment until either more definable, traditional interstate threats emerged, or the nature of new transnational threats forced a radical re-think. However, since the early 1990s the military postures of the US and Europeans have slowly diverged, with the Americans seeking ever more advanced capabilities and the Europeans, by and large, relegating military security down the league table of political importance. For ten years, transatlantic security relations existed in a kind of strategic limbo. Certainly, any threat to the territorial integrity of a NATO member would have to trigger an Alliance-wide response. However, beyond that basic strategic security premise the situation becomes less clear and more political and, as Bosnia demonstrated, increasingly subject to bilateral issue-by-issue negotiations that take place beyond the NATO framework.

A debate over the nature and scope of new threats now finally appears to be under way, primarily as a result of the NMD demarcate, which once again underlines the importance of the next presidency for transatlantic security relations. Unfortunately, this debate has not begun in the most conducive of climates. Joseph Cirincione, a liberal defence analyst, argues that the conservative position on NMD marks such a new departure that it is, in effect, a new security paradigm. ‘Hundreds of articles and speeches by conservatives have used the South Asian [nuclear] tests and the Korean and Iranian missile launches as proof that future threats are unpredictable, our intelligence estimates are consistently unreliable, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction fundamentally unstoppable and, thus, the only truly effective response is reliance on American defense technology. This requires substantial defense budget increases and the deployment of new weapons systems, including new types of nuclear weapons and, most prominently, missile defense systems. Conservatives have skilfully deployed expert commissions and congressional investigations to endorse this view’.<sup>55</sup> It is important that Europe resists calls that are clearly partisan whilst, at the same time, engaging conservatives in vigorous debate. Indeed, Europe must not be ‘shamed’ into accepting a strategic threat assessment that is not commensurate with its own analysis simply to keep

---

<sup>55</sup> Joseph Cirincione, ‘The Missile Defense Divide’, from Burkard Schmitt and Julian Lindley-French (eds.), ‘National missile defense and the future of nuclear policy’, *Occasional Paper* 18 (Paris: WEU-ISS, September 2000), p. 34.

American conservatives happy or out of fear of damaging the transatlantic relationship at a sensitive time.

The debate also takes place after ten years of accumulated tension in the relationship as a result of the contending security policy choices made by Europeans and Americans. What is now clear is that transatlantic security relations in the twenty-first century will be more about managing the consequences of those choices than trying to find a single institutional framework that, by definition, pre-supposes common choices. Indeed, as Steve Cambone, Research Director of the National Defense University (NDU) in Washington, points out, the problem of policy divergence is very real and raises two fundamental questions.<sup>56</sup> First, to what degree do American and European strategic assessments diverge? Second, is there sufficient political consensus between Americans and Europeans to find workable solutions? Unfortunately, both of the presidential candidates appear to view what are complex political problems solely as a function of American leadership. For example, in spite of his professed multilateralism Vice-President Gore recently said: 'For all of my career, I have believed that America has a responsibility to lead the world'. Mr Gore continues '...we have a responsibility to lead the world in meeting the new security challenges. We must make forward-looking investments at home and abroad to conquer the new threats that are jointly menacing to us all – and to rise to the possibilities of the moment to reshape the world'. A clear expression of the confluence of external ambition and internal influence.<sup>57</sup> Governor Bush, whilst recognising the importance of allies said recently that: 'All our goals in Eurasia will depend on America strengthening the alliances that sustain our influence – in Europe and East Asia and the Middle East...For NATO to be strong, cohesive and active, the President must give it consistent direction: on the alliance's purpose; on Europe's need to invest more in defense capabilities; and, when necessary, in military conflict'.<sup>58</sup>

The next Administration will therefore face a dilemma: how to lead a team when no-one agrees the goal, who should be captain, where to play, and in which every member wants to discuss tactics. Therefore, if effective political cohesion is to be restored the debate must not simply be limited to the *nature* of American *leadership*, but rather the *quality* of *partnership* in a world where both traditional and non-traditional security risks abound and in which there is more than enough room for every kind of approach to security management to be accommodated. This entails a new, thoroughgoing discussion on the ends and means of the West's policy that will have to be confronted sooner rather than later. As indicated earlier, American claims to leadership of the West are being undermined by a profound contradiction that the next Administration will also need to resolve if it is to enter such a strategic discussion with sufficient political credibility. As Richard Cohen points out: 'Throughout Europe, the United States is perceived as a gutless superpower. There is some justification for that. During the Kosovo operation, US bombers flew so high to avoid missile fire that they endangered the civilian population below. Senator John McCain, once a fighter pilot himself, called this policy "immoral" . . . It's different in Britain. The Brits recently rescued six of their soldiers and one Sierra Leonean soldier who were being held hostage by a Sierra Leone rebel group called the West Side Boys . . . The West Side Boys, and other such outfits, are much less likely to mess with Britain again.'<sup>59</sup>

---

<sup>56</sup> Interview with the author, Washington, 1 May 2000.

<sup>57</sup> Al Gore, Speech to the International Press Institute, Boston MA, Sunday, 30 April 2000.

<sup>58</sup> George W. Bush, Speech entitled 'A Distinctly American Internationalism', Simi Valley, California, Friday, 9 November 1999.

<sup>59</sup> 'Is the US Too Timid to Use its Forces?', *International Herald Tribune*, 15 September 2000, p. 7.

The political leadership of the West is not just a question of military capability but political legitimacy and political will. No basis for a reinvigorated transatlantic security relationship can be established without a common strategic perception of threats and opportunities. Re-establishing a common transatlantic strategic assessment must be a priority for the next Administration.

### ***III.3 Burden-sharing***

This political dichotomy is implicit in the European strategic assessment. At a tactical level, European military security policy is quite effective, with a significant amount of peacekeeping activity being undertaken. The divide with the US occurs over the issue of strategic, i.e., extra-European warfighting capability, for which there is a lack of desire to spend the increased sums that would make such a capability possible. Thus, at a strategic level Europeans tend to hope that threats match defence budgets rather than matching budgets to threats. This is the essence of the burden-sharing dilemma. Americans of all political persuasions tend to view this problem primarily through the prism of military capability, i.e., the ability of Europeans to undertake a greater share of the military security tasks. The United States clearly wants its European allies to do more, not just in Europe, but beyond. However, the US also appears unwilling or unable to accept that any increase in European military capabilities will also be reflected in degree by degree shifts in the political balance within the Alliance, towards a European concept of security and, over the longer-term, European co-leadership.

This approach frustrates Europeans and is reinforced by an American tendency to downplay the efforts of the allies. For example, during the crisis in Sierra Leone ‘...the Administration declined to help the UN peacekeepers and raised the ire of the UN secretary-general, Kofi Annan, by trying to charge expensive rates for the use of Pentagon aircraft to ferry soldiers of other countries to Sierra Leone. Now, officials say, the Administration has switched tack after extensive criticism in Congress and angry exchanges with the British government [which contrary to some reports does regard itself as a fundamental element in the European effort] which made it plain behind closed doors that it felt left alone in Sierra Leone’.<sup>60</sup>

These tensions underline the lack of clarity in both American and European thinking about the future of the relationship that makes the burden-sharing issue so politically delicate. Symptomatic were the problems that arose during the latter stages of the Kosovo Crisis, the European determination to insert ground troops should have given them a far greater say over the conduct of the operation than the Americans were prepared to concede, and yet many in Washington still accused the Europeans of ‘free-riding’. Indeed, of the 23,000 troops deployed only 2,100 were American and they were not involved in the risky operation to enter Kosovo. By 16 June the UK had deployed 6,267 troops, the Germans 1,747, the Italians, 1811 and the French 1,402. Given the dominant (but by no means unilateral role the US took in the air operation) this seemed effective and balanced burden-sharing.<sup>61</sup> At the same time, the US was unwilling to operate exclusively within the Alliance framework, establishing a parallel and separate chain of command for US forces because they feared ‘a war run by committee’.

Some European countries, notably Britain and France, *are* trying to bridge the gap between the two strategic assessments by generating force structures that can act both as effective focal

---

<sup>60</sup> ‘US to Train Africans for Sierra Leone Duty’, *International Herald Tribune*, Thursday, 10 August 2000, p. 2.

<sup>61</sup> NATO morning briefings and operational updates from ‘Kosovo Online’, [www.kforonline.com](http://www.kforonline.com).

points for European operations, whilst at the same time, support the Americans. However, such an approach is not without problems, as a recent *Whitehall Paper* on UK Security Policy highlights: 'If it is assumed that the most likely forms of coalition warfare will be conducted with the US, this puts a premium on being able to interface with US forces and being able to work alongside a high-tech force (even in a relatively low-tech environment). An issue arises as to whether, if UK forces are geared to working with the US, this may put strains on their ability to work with less capable powers. More interesting questions are raised in those circumstances where the US is not involved, for then the question of Britain's own leadership role will be at issue'.<sup>62</sup> Therefore, whilst the US strives to master the full warfighting spectrum the European allies, even the UK and France, find themselves faced with a hard choice. Either remain focused upon collective defence capabilities, such as heavy Main Defence Forces, or concentrate on developing collective security capabilities, such as lighter more mobile force elements. The lack of available resources will not permit both, and will result in one of two dilemmas. Either European forces that have a little bit of everything, but not much of anything or forces that are very good at a limited number of missions. Thus, functional considerations continue to drive strategic policy in Europe in a way that Americans find very hard to comprehend. This was reflected in the Amendment tabled by Senator Kyl, which was attached to the protocol amending the North Atlantic Treaty at the accession to NATO of Poland, the Czech Republic and Hungary. It called upon the allies to develop lighter forces that would '...reflect [their] commitment to collective defense *and* to conduct crisis response operations...distant from their home stations, including beyond the Allies' territory'.<sup>63</sup>

Furthermore, the terms 'burden' and 'sharing' will also need re-defining. In a world of complex traditional and non-traditional risks burden-sharing can no longer simply be a test of military virility. The true test of European commitment to an equitable sharing of burdens will, therefore, be the EU's ability to realise its own strategic vision through the balanced and effective provision of diplomatic, economic and military tools. If the EU fails to deliver on its aid programmes, diplomatic initiatives, technical assistance programmes *and* create an effective European Rapid Reaction Force (ERRF), Americans who criticise Europe, irrespective of their political allegiance, will have a genuine point. It is certainly the case that Europe remains weak, even by its own assessment, in key areas of military capability, such as Intelligence, force mobility and force sustainability that will have to be corrected if European policy is to be taken seriously, not just by the US, but potential adversaries. A more natural benchmark could be sufficient forces and materiel to place European forces roughly halfway between where Europe stands today and what many American analysts call for. This seems a reasonable objective given because the Western Europeans are still the second most powerful military bloc in the world. Therefore, implicit in the Europe strategic assessment is the maintenance of comparative advantage, as a minimum objective, over potential sub-strategic threats in and around Europe, and the retention of some ability to operate with US forces elsewhere. Interoperability and limited extra-European sustainability, therefore, should be the true test of future Alliance military cohesion, not simply a European version of US force structures.

Unfortunately, recognition of allied efforts would also effectively re-define the terms of the relationship and, once again, question the natural right of the US to lead, although some

---

<sup>62</sup> Julian Lindley-French (ed.), 'Coalitions and the Future of UK Security Policy', *Whitehall Paper*, September 2000, (RUSI: London), pp. 4-5.

<sup>63</sup> See K. Donfried and P. Gallis, 'European Security: The Debate in NATO and the European Union', CRS Report for Congress, 25 April 2000 (Washington: Library of Congress), pp. 2-3. Emphasis added.

Democrats are at least beginning to accept such a possibility. Carl Levin, in an amendment to Senate Resolution 208 entitled 'United States Policy Toward NATO and the European Union' said: 'I have long been a supporter of the European Security and Defence Identity (ESDI) and I am a supporter of the US-sponsored Defense Capabilities Initiative (DCI) that was recently adopted by NATO. NATO's Operation Allied Force demonstrated a capabilities gap between the United States and our NATO Allies. I welcome the stated determination of our European Allies to develop the capability to act on their own. I welcome the fact that they are providing 80 percent of the forces participating in the NATO-led Kosovo Force. I would welcome it if our European Allies would handle the next crisis that develops in Europe'.<sup>64</sup>

Ultimately, the problem of burden-sharing is linked to role definition within the transatlantic security relationship and, therefore, the respective strategic assessments, the problem being mainly political, rather than military-technical or budgetary. Until the United States overcomes what NATO Secretary-General George Robertson calls its 'schizophrenia' about Europe's role, the burden-sharing issue will remain problematic. Europe retains the impression that the US wants Europe to do a lot more and pay a lot more for both European and extra-European security without any commensurate increase in political influence. The next Administration must move to dispel these impressions by making it clear from the outset that partnership is a very real prospect for Europeans, and that the level of European influence will be linked, at least in part, to what capabilities – political and military – it can bring to the table.

#### ***III.4 European defence and transatlantic security relations***

NATO remains, for all the reforms over the past ten years, primarily the seat of American power within Europe and thus reflects both the ends and the means of American policy. That, in itself, is no bad thing because the United States is a European power with legitimate European security interests. However, as the EU countries and the United States take increasingly divergent positions on threats and the means with which to deal with them, transatlantic security relations will begin to incur opportunity costs, i.e., as Europeans develop European defence, the ability to reform the institutions of the Alliance collectively will be progressively reduced. Europe must create an alternative vehicle to reinforce its *autonomous* security capacity, which is the role of the Common European Security and Defence Policy (CESDP) of the EU. This is vital because the emergence of the EU as an international security actor is not just an incremental step on the road to the creation of some future European Federation but an expression of an alternative European way of 'doing' security, and the new Administration will have to accommodate this variance.

Equally, Americans must not confuse an alternative way of going about things with a refusal to undertake burdens equitably. The Headline Goal underlines Europe's ambition. It calls for the EU to be able to undertake the Petersberg Tasks of rescue and humanitarian missions, peacekeeping and the role of combat forces in peacemaking 'in their fullest sense' by 2003, with such forces capable of full deployment within sixty days and sustainable for up to a year. For a corps-sized force of 50,000 to 60,000 troops that suggests a minimum of 180,000 combat capable troops available for European operations by 2003. That is the baseline and, as indicated earlier, much rests on whether Europe can turn the rhetoric into reality. There *is* a capabilities gap, not so much between the United States and Europe, because that is a pointless comparison, but rather between Europe's stated intent and its ability to fulfil it.

---

<sup>64</sup> Congressional Record, Monday, 8 November 1999, 106<sup>th</sup> Congress, 1<sup>st</sup> Session.

Paradoxically, whilst the US clearly has the capability to act, it often appears to lack the political will to do so, whereas (at least some) Europeans have demonstrated the will and yet lack the capabilities.

The key phrase of the Helsinki Declaration, which refers to undertaking the Petersberg tasks 'in their fullest sense' entails that, at some point in the next ten to fifteen years, European forces should be able to undertake a Kosovo-type operation without recourse to US assets. That will be the ultimate test of burden-sharing and probably a definition that Europeans and Americans can agree upon. Again, given the timidity which American politicians have shown, compared with their British and French counterparts, over hazardous peace support operations (PSO) the enhancement of the West's capability in peacekeeping and peacemaking represented by the European emphasis on full spectrum peacekeeping rather than full spectrum warfighting, is highly defensible. Indeed, Europe is correct to emphasise such a role. As Jim Hoagland writes '... when Mr [Kofi] Annan broached the subject of moving a US aircraft carrier toward Sierra Leone during the hostage crisis there, he met delay and obfuscation from Washington. Britain's prompt response set the stage for the hostage rescue. George W. Bush's attacks on US involvement abroad seem to have made the Clinton administration even more timid as the campaign season heats up'.<sup>65</sup>

Dr Simon Serfaty at CSIS calls the Common European Security and Defence Policy an 'intra-European affair' that does not involve the US and represents no threat to the political cohesion of the Atlantic Alliance. Unfortunately, this is an exceptional view and concerns remain in Washington about the ultimate ambition of the EU's security policy, not only in the Republican and Democratic camps but throughout the bureaucracy of government. This is partly the result of an inability of the American leadership to grasp the political significance of the CESDP and partly because they grasp it only too well. Frank Kramer, Assistant Secretary of Defense at the Pentagon, reflects a broadly held American view that finds it difficult to envisage scenarios for the deployment of the European Rapid Reaction Force (ERRF) outside of the NATO framework. Unfortunately, this is only one dimension of European defence and it is clear that Europe needs to emphasise the progressive role of European defence as a means by which Europeans can re-construct self-confidence in their ability to act, both autonomously within Europe and beyond. Thus, European defence is as much a political means as a military end, and unless the United States is more actively involved in EU defence discussions these suspicions will continue to beset the American policy establishment irrespective of who takes the White House. A high-level discussion between Europeans and Americans about plans to develop European defence after 2003 would go a long way to establishing confidence between the new Administration and Europeans, because without it neither a Democrat nor a Republican administration would countenance any substantive compromise over American leadership within NATO and will remain wary of granting Europeans too greater autonomy over operations, particularly if the use of NATO 'assets' involve American equipment and personnel. At the same time, the US must recognise the security dilemmas that they pose Europeans. Bosnia and Kosovo underlined the capricious nature of American policy. The new Administration should attempt to rebuild some certainty amongst its European allies over the criteria for US action.

Dick Grimmett of the Congressional Research Service says that the key to successful and pragmatic US-EU security relations is what he calls 'RSI' – rationalisation, standardisation

---

<sup>65</sup> Jim Hoagland, 'Who Wants Peacekeeping? Put Up or Shut Up', *International Herald Tribune*, Thursday, 3 August 2000, p. 8.

and interoperability<sup>66</sup>. This is undoubtedly correct. An important objective for the EU's CESDP, therefore, must be to ensure operational cohesion with American forces. Far from limiting policy choices for both Americans and Europeans it will establish a 'best practice' benchmark, even if the Europeans do not (and they will not) buy the revolution in military affairs (RMA) as a complete package. Moreover, it would enhance the ability of European leaders to act both autonomously and in concert with the United States. However, a clear statement of intent from the next Administration to that effect would be welcome.

Stanley Sloan, a long-time security specialist at the Congressional Research Service and an adviser to the Gore Campaign on defence policy, highlights the contradiction in American thinking: '...it is possible to look at the history of Europeans' efforts to coordinate their defence efforts and to see a lot of talk but little action. Today, the talk has become even more grand, making the political intent appear even more serious. However, most European governments continue to reduce spending on defence and, overall, continue to fall further behind the United States in deployed military capabilities for force projection, intervention, and high-tech warfare'.<sup>67</sup> Sloan is, of course, correct in his criticism of European rhetoric. However, Sloan's assumption that US force goals are the measure by which Europeans should be judged misses the quintessential point; Europe is unlikely to go to war with the United States. In addition, American commentators from across the political spectrum not only under-estimate the political challenges that Europe is endeavouring to overcome and the progress already made, but fail to give European countries due credit for attempting something that Americans would never consider – a reduction of the military-operational independence of each member state and the loss of defence-industrial autonomy in pursuit of an (as yet) unproven policy. Moreover, as Robert A. Levine points out '...Europe is no longer threatened by a major attack from anyone'.<sup>68</sup>

### ***III.5 The emerging role of coalitions***

In the immediate wake of the Cold War it was agreed by both sides that the preservation of NATO should remain paramount, a decision the value of which has been proved by subsequent events in the Balkans. However, the decision to preserve the strategic tool in many ways prevented a discussion about strategy itself, which, in turn, impeded the work of the Alliance. However, in spite of being starved of sufficient funding by both North American and European members, NATO has attempted to adapt itself in the past ten years for a range of new missions. On the one hand, this has involved 'widening' the Alliance by offering membership to three former Warsaw Pact countries and launching an ambitious programme of progressive integration for others. On the other hand, it has involved 'deepening', the Alliance by launching the Europeans Security and Defence Identity (ESDI) and the Defence Capabilities Initiative (DCI). As a consequence, NATO today finds itself trying to manage a range of incomplete and under-funded programmes because Europeans and Americans cannot agree on either the ends, nor are they prepared to will the means to complete them. Both a Gore or Bush administration will continue to pursue the management of security matters through NATO. However, the Alliance is ill-equipped to manage the increasingly wide range of missions assigned to it, and unless this mismatch between roles and resources is resolved it

---

<sup>66</sup> Interview with the author, Washington, Thursday, 4 May 2000.

<sup>67</sup> Stanley R. Sloan, 'The United States and European Defence', *Chaillot Paper* 39 (Paris: WEU-ISS, April 2000), p. 43.

<sup>68</sup> Robert A. Levine, 'Missile Defense is mostly About Politics, Not National Security', *International Herald Tribune*, Wednesday, 8 August 2000, p. 8.

will only heighten problems of political cohesion within the Alliance. This must be a priority for both the next Administration and Europeans, because a properly funded NATO is not just defence expenditure but a sound security investment.

Unfortunately, contentions between the US and Europe over the management of sub-strategic threats are almost inevitable. Therefore, such a relationship must be capable of accommodating two contending threat assessments and the four levels of military capability that exist within the Atlantic Alliance. Unfortunately, the Alliance framework is probably insufficiently flexible for latter day European and extra-European crisis management. Indeed, in spite of the provisions for such operations within the Alliance the Treaty of Washington remains too dominated by Article 5. NATO's future, therefore, is dependent upon it developing a role as a political and military interoperability nexus.

The political realities of the relationship also suggest that it will become far more informal. Irrespective of Quints or Quads, many future transatlantic consultations will take place beyond formal institutional frameworks in the form of bilateralism or Contact Group-type arrangements. This informality will be reflected in the operational approach to crisis management which will place far greater emphasis on ad hoc coalitions and access to a pool of assets both within and beyond a transatlantic framework. Indeed, pivotal players for these kind of operations will not only be coalition leaders and framework powers, but also those nations that can legitimise such operations in region. Host nation support will be essential, with the key to success being, once again, political and operational flexibility. Indeed, the very nature of the threats themselves, both traditional and non-traditional, will also require a range of approaches – political and economic, as well as military. They will also require teams of players for the conflict prevention, conflict management and post-conflict reconstruction phases of a crisis. Current US policy pays insufficient regard to the political and military aspects of coalition building beyond formal institutional settings.

As a result, bilateral security relations with major European allies are likely to become even more important than they are today. Great powers still matter in the world and the transatlantic security relationship cannot be enacted solely within institutional frameworks. As Curt Gasteyer points out '...as long as state structures are the salient entities determining the international order, inter-state relations will remain, as Henry Kissinger noted, one of the 'permanent factors' in world politics. This is especially true for the actors on the Eurasian continent and their relations with the sole remaining maritime and world power, the United States'.<sup>69</sup> The future of the relationship, therefore, to a significant degree rests upon US relations with Britain, France and Germany. However, an early agreement with France on overall policy direction, compatible institutions and effective structures would be useful. This would not only remove a perennial roadblock to the equitable reform of transatlantic security relations but would also set the tone of US-European relations for the life of the next Administration and beyond. Indeed, France will be a pivotal player in future transatlantic security relations. A first step to a new relationship could be a French effort to convince the new Administration that the EU is not trying to develop a direct security relationship with the US simply to redefine the position of France within the transatlantic security relationship by by-passing the integrated military structure of NATO. Unfortunately, continued hostility towards France can be found in both the Republican and Democratic camps, which will continue to make it difficult for an Administration to concede too much. These sentiments are particularly strong in Congress in which France is still regarded as presumptuous for

---

<sup>69</sup> Curt Gasteyer, 'The Future Shape of the International System', *Internationale Politik*, vol. 1, Spring 2000, p. 73.



questioning the right of the United States to lead, and in which the arguments of the 1990s over France's re-integration into the NATO integrated command structure, the future command of NATO's Southern Command (AFSOUTH) and Combined Joint Task Forces (CJTF) still resonate.

### **III.6 Enlargement**

Neither the enlargement of NATO nor the EU has figured prominently as a major issue in Washington during the presidential elections, although enlargement is likely to become an issue in the run-up to the NATO Review Conference in 2002. Certainly, EU enlargement is not a major factor in political Washington because there is little knowledge about, or interest in, the political aspects that underpin it. However, the EU should not delay indefinitely because for both Democrats and Republicans EU enlargement will be a political litmus test of the commitment of EU Member-States to security and stability in Europe. Unfortunately, indications are that the Intergovernmental Conference (IGC) currently examining changes to EU institutions to enable enlargement to take place will fail. If that is so, there will be political implications for the transatlantic relationship in the wake of the EU's Nice Summit in December 2000 which will further complicate the first year of the new Administration. Dr Simon Serfaty of CSIS says that the EU needs to make a 'down-payment' on enlargement, possibly by including a few smaller countries at the earliest opportunity (Cyprus or Slovenia, for example) because this will assure US public opinion that the Europeans are serious in their efforts to stabilise the European security space.<sup>70</sup> Moreover, Ambassador Jean Kirkpatrick sums up what is a bipartisan attitude concerning the reasons for enlargement: 'Europe today has many similarities with post-World War One Europe in that it is full of a mix of political optimism, ethnic distrust and weak states. In the past this created the environment for the rapid appearance of violent regimes. Russia is the largest and potentially most dangerous of the weak states and has to be both effectively engaged and contained'.<sup>71</sup> There is no easy solution to the dilemma that is enlargement but the EU must make strenuous efforts to convince both the new Administration and Congress that it remains committed to the progressive expansion of its membership. Indeed, to the American political mind, enlargement is intrinsically linked to burden-sharing. For Europe to fail on one could prove troublesome; for Europe to 'fail' on both will make it very difficult for any US administration to cede political ground to the Europeans over leadership of the West.

### **III.7 EU-NATO relations**

The main forum in which these various tensions will manifest themselves is undoubtedly EU-NATO relations. Indeed, practical arrangements for cooperation between the two organisations cannot be separated from the broader issues. NATO continues to be the *sine qua non* of America's European security policy supported by a strong bipartisan consensus. As Stanley Sloan points out: 'Irrespective of who takes the presidential oath next January, it appears that official US policy will continue to put top priority on ensuring the vitality of NATO. Support for developments on the European level will be conditioned by this reality. As long as the United States has vital interests in Europe – which without doubt will be for the foreseeable future – and as long as NATO is the main security connection to the Old

---

<sup>70</sup> Interview with the author, Washington, Tuesday, 2 May 2000.

<sup>71</sup> Interview with the author, Washington, Thursday, 4 May 2000.

Continent, US administrations and the Congress will want to ensure that any changes in the transatlantic relationship protect US interests and preserve NATO's good health'.<sup>72</sup>

Furthermore, Sloan's contention that US support for European defence is conditioned by the continued centrality of NATO in European security is correct. Unfortunately, because of the many arguments between Europeans and Americans over the past ten years both sides have become sensitised to expressing concerns openly and frankly. The result being that when problems do arise concerns are often expressed through a series of metaphors, such as objections to what is seen as exclusion of the six non-EU, NATO members from the EU decision-making process, the threat of 'EU-caucusing' within the Alliance and barriers preventing the effective implementation of the Combined Joint Task Force (CJTF) programme. The partners, therefore, need to get back to basics – what is the Alliance for and how should it approach its task? Sadly, an opportunity was missed at the Washington Summit because NATO's new Strategic Concept was longer on rhetoric than direction with many of the key political issues left unresolved.

Not surprisingly, EU-caucusing (rather than Euro-caucusing) within NATO remains the main US concern. Neither a Bush nor a Gore administration would tolerate being presented with faits accomplis by the eleven NATO, EU Members. Ian Brzezinski, on the staff of Senator Jesse Helms, and Ken Myers, adviser to Senator Richard Lugar, both believe that such a policy could be the prelude to the division and eventual demise of the Alliance, and Europeans should certainly treat these warnings with due care.<sup>73</sup> At the same time, EU caucusing is inevitable and, what is more, will probably prove the best mechanism by which to move progressively to a more equitable political partnership within the Alliance. There is also bipartisan agreement that the EU should not create parallel institutions to NATO because of the danger of unnecessary competition between the two organisations. However, a certain degree of duplication is also inevitable, and from an EU organisational viewpoint, entirely necessary, particularly in areas such as command and control, and strategic intelligence and lift. Equally, NATO alone may no longer be sufficient for the coordination of an increasingly complex political relationship between the US and Europe and some new forum might eventually be needed, which could open up a line of possible policy development for the new NATO-EU Working Groups.

Modern crises also require such broad and sophisticated responses that academic discussions over a hierarchical relationship between the EU and NATO ('NATO First' policy) are misplaced. Unfortunately, the debate in the US over NATO-EU links is undermined by two pivotal factors. First, neither the Bush nor Gore teams have a clear vision of the purpose of NATO. Conservatives have tended to see NATO as the basis for a global security fire brigade, whereas liberals are drawn more towards more non-traditional aspects of security for which NATO is ill-suited.

### ***III.8 The transatlantic security agenda for the new presidency***

Since Kosovo, transatlantic security relations have grown steadily more contentious following American accusations about the abject nature of European performance during the Kosovo campaign. This was not entirely fair because whilst European performance in the air was

---

<sup>72</sup> Stanley R. Sloan, 'The United States and European Defence', *Chaillot Paper* 39 (Paris: WEU-ISS, April 2000), p. 50.

<sup>73</sup> Interviews with the author, Washington, 4 May 2000.

certainly abject it was no worse than American performance on the ground. However, the Americans are now less convinced of the practicality of European support for American action elsewhere which could encourage a Bush administration in particular to pursue neo-unilateralist policies. Therefore, the next Administration would be well-advised to link improved European capabilities to a greater European political influence over the West's political direction and military conduct. Liberals seem more willing than conservatives to accept an autonomous European capability if significant military assets are developed by the European Allies. Indeed, liberals seem by and large more open to what might be called the 'arms for influence' argument than conservatives who, whilst consistently pressing for improved European capabilities, seem unwilling to countenance giving up American leadership.

## **CHAPTER FOUR: ARMAMENTS POLICY, THE REVOLUTION IN (AMERICAN) MILITARY AFFAIRS AND NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE: TRANSATLANTIC FISSURES?**

### ***IV.1 Introduction***

US foreign and security policy is driven by a range of determining factors: threat assessments, the promotion of ideas, trade and commerce, the interests of allies, to name but a few. However, what is striking about US policy formulation is the role of domestic factors. No policy areas underline the influence of domestic interests over external policy more than armaments policy, the revolution in military affairs (RMA) and National Missile Defense (NMD). The sheer scope of US armaments policy and the ambition of the RMA and NMD raise two pivotal questions; for what and against whom? The problem for foreign analysts is that elements of strategic truth can be found to justify all three of these initiatives. Certainly, it is reasonable for the US to seek to improve its military capability, every nation aspires to that. Equally, it is also reasonable that the US, because of its unique power position, should consider new ways of defending itself. It is, after all, the most likely target for the disabused, given its unrivalled status in the world. What Europeans find troubling, however, is often the seeming lack of linkage between the security situation and the programmes proposed by the US. Thus, the scale of American policy ambitions and their potential impact upon European security leaves many Europeans perplexed. This chapter examines the dynamics behind specific policy choices in the US and raises concerns about the forces that appear to drive them, at least in part.

### ***IV.2 Armaments policy***

The US armed forces are the most advanced in the world and their appetite for hi-tech weaponry is insatiable. Indeed, such is the advantage the American military possesses over all-comers that it is not surprising that the achievement of a decisive military-technical advantage seems attractive to American politicians and defence planners alike. At the same time, it is not unreasonable for the US military, faced with global responsibilities that go far beyond those of its European allies, to seek force multiplying technological solutions. However, not only do many Europeans question the achievement of strategic military dominance but there are also justified concerns about the true relationship between strategy and the extent to which vested interests influence this process. Certainly, US armaments policy in the US is influenced to a significant degree by one of the most powerful special interest groups in the US, the 'Iron Triangle', a powerful alliance of the military, Congress and defence industries which profoundly influences both US defence policy and both political parties.

The fear in Europe is that ability of the major defence manufacturers to lobby the political process in the US acts as a barrier against a reasoned assessment of America's true military equipment requirements given the strategic environment. Republicans are traditionally more susceptible to such influence but there is little reason to believe that a Gore presidency would confront the system because, as *The Economist* points out: 'Mr Gore is a consummate Washington insider, a man whose inner circle is dominated by lawyers, lobbyists and PR men, and whose dowry to Mr Clinton in 1992 included one of the best oiled cash machines on the Potomac. Mr Gore's staff have routinely moved into jobs that mine the golden interface

between government and the private sector'.<sup>74</sup> Money politics is the stuff of American political life.

Equally, whilst it is difficult to assess the extent of the influence of the defence lobby and pork-barrel politics on US defence policy it is clear that such influence is significant. Bob Paulson, a leading defence-industry consultant underlines the symbiotic nature of the relationship: 'The CEO [Chief Executive Officer] at Lockheed Martin needs to build a new fighter plane. He's got all those factories, and none of them is full. So, where does he put the work? Ideally, ignoring the politics, the CEO would like to put all the work in one or two of those factories and close the others so that, over time, he will wind up with 70-80 percent utilization and save a lot of money. But that requires him to tell at least half of the congressman who are supporting him: 'I'm closing the plant in your district. I'm laying off all those loyal workers who used to applaud your speech at the ceremony where we roll out the new plane, workers who have always voted for you and contributed to your campaign'.<sup>75</sup>

In the past ten years a thoroughgoing consolidation of the American defence industrial base has taken place that has seen the number of prime defence contractors shrink from thirty-two in 1993 to nine. A process that has not only impressed Europeans, but been held up as an example to follow. On the face of it such consolidation would appear to be a logical reaction to a shrinking market. However, the process is incomplete with the result that the United States possesses a defence industry that, from a European viewpoint, in many ways remains over-sized and surplus to requirements given the relatively low level of strategic tension in the international system. William Greider highlights the contradiction between strategy and economics that strikes the observer: 'A hard, painful economic paradox lurks beneath all the facts...the military-industrial complex is ...in [a deep] hole today in terms of costly, idle factories – despite the massive layoffs and the blizzard of corporate consolidations. Scores of plants have been closed or merged in the last seven years. More than one million employees have been dismissed. Yet, overall...there's still too much of it. A lot of excess productive capacity has been eliminated, but not nearly enough: the market for weapons is shrinking even faster than the factory floor space. By not facing this reality, the Pentagon is pushing the hardest questions off into the future. Eventually, this should set off explosive political arguments – whose factory must be finally closed? – and may even pit the Iron Triangle's three sides against each other'.<sup>76</sup> Ironically, the problem between requirement and productive capacity could get worse under a Gore administration. 'Mr Lieberman has regularly voted for increases in the Pentagon's budget. Two major defense contractors, General Dynamics Corp. and United Technologies Corp., have plants in Connecticut [Mr Lieberman's constituency] that employ thousands of workers'.<sup>77</sup> Unfortunately, the resolution of this dilemma would appear to be the development of ever more advanced systems that simply add layers of technological redundancy to already superior American equipment by offering US forces ever more of the ever better. In effect, the United States is locked into an arms race with itself with the result that major players such as Lockheed Martin and Raytheon are even more dependent upon one customer – the US government.<sup>78</sup>

---

<sup>74</sup> 'In Search of the Real Man', *The Economist*, 12 August 2000, p. 18.

<sup>75</sup> William Greider, 'Fortress America' (New York: Public Affairs, 1999), p. 91.

<sup>76</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 68-87.

<sup>77</sup> 'A "Business Friendly" Democrat', *International Herald Tribune*, Thursday, 10 August 2000, p. 3.

<sup>78</sup> The possible exception is Boeing, which has a strong civil airline sector, albeit one that is currently in trouble. See 'Building a New Boeing', *The Economist*, 12 August 2000, p. 69.

### ***IV.3 Armaments cooperation and the impact on Europe***

Moreover, whilst the US leads the world in the export of second generation equipment<sup>79</sup> Europe is the only other group of allies that could buy high technology in the kind of quantities that could ease the work-flow dilemma of American manufacturers and thus bridge the gap between large domestic orders.<sup>80</sup> As a result, the European allies could find themselves embroiled in a policy of massive technological redundancy at a time when the process of consolidation in Europe leaves its 'champions' particularly vulnerable to take-overs. As Burkard Schmitt points out '...US industrialists have not concealed their intention to increase their presence in European markets. In Europe's major arms-producing countries, which also represent the most important markets, this penetration can only happen through links with local companies. For European firms this prospect has not been free of risks, because the difference in size would have de facto ruled out an alliance on an equal footing: for cooperation they would have run the risk of relegation to the level of subcontractor; a full scale merger could easily have ended up as simply the acquisition of the European company by the American giant'.<sup>81</sup> In such circumstances, without the protective embrace of European governments, keen to ensure autonomous security policy-making is not reduced by an American industrial imperative, the danger remains that Europeans manufacturers could become little more than sub-contractors. As a consequence, Europe would find itself producing the wrong kind of equipment, for the wrong type of military, locking Europe into an industrial and military dependency.

At the same time, the prospect of an equitable, two-way open market in defence equipment remains unlikely. The Europeans have little the US wants, with the result that Europeans are often irritated by the patently one-sided nature of the 'deals' on offer.<sup>82</sup> As one senior British Aerospace executive recently put it: '...when the Americans talk about partnership, they take and never give'.<sup>83</sup> As a consequence, neither the US, nor Europeans are likely to agree open access to their respective markets or allow major transatlantic mergers. Indeed, in an interview with Sir Richard Williams, Chairman of BAE Systems, the *Financial Times* of July 31<sup>st</sup>, 2000 wrote: 'A merger between BAE Systems and one of its big two US rivals, Boeing and Lockheed Martin, is 'completely impossible' in the foreseeable future...big US mergers were 'inconceivable' because the Pentagon and State Department were not ready. Top Pentagon officials concerned about the financial health of some US weapons suppliers, have said the time is not ripe for big transatlantic mergers, but encourages links such as small purchases and joint ventures'.<sup>84</sup> In effect, protectionism is still the name of the game on both sides of the Atlantic.

---

<sup>79</sup> Richard Grimmett of the CRS published a report on arms sales in August 2000 that underlined American superiority in arms sales to developing countries. Grimmett said, 'Obviously, the United States's position has been consolidated as the leading weapons supplier – both for the world as a whole and for the developing countries'. See 'Arms Sales Take Jump with US at Forefront', *International Herald Tribune*, Tuesday, 22 August 2000, p. 7.

<sup>80</sup> It is why the European Union insisted in putting the 1997 merger between Boeing and McDonnell Douglas through its merger and acquisition review process.

<sup>81</sup> Burkard Schmitt, 'From cooperation to integration: defence and aerospace industries in Europe', *Chaillot Paper* 40 (Paris: WEU-ISS, July 2000), p. 25.

<sup>82</sup> There are some peripheral areas such as advanced communications and simulators. However, the last major piece of defence equipment sold to the Americans was the UK's V/STOL *Harrier* in the early 1970s and that only after the US had virtually taken control of the production process.

<sup>83</sup> Interview with the author. Contributor wished to remain anonymous.

<sup>84</sup> 'BAE Chief Rules Out Mergers With US Rivals', *Financial Times*, Monday, 31 July 2000, p. 17.

Equally, Stanley Sloan highlights the political threat to the transatlantic relationship from the failure to develop an effective armaments cooperation regime. He points out the US would need to increase the procurement budget from \$50bn to \$80bn per annum to meet the equipment requirements of US forces given the current US threat assessment.<sup>85</sup> Even at \$50bn per annum the US procurement budget is some 30% larger than the defence budgets of the UK and France. Moreover, Sloan believes that the need for such a unilateral increase will trigger a burden-sharing debate during the next Administration whomsoever is in power, particularly in Congress because it would highlight the discrepancy between the US and European effort. However, these demands are a function of America's strategic assessment/armament policy process with its unique combination of external and internal determining factors. It reflects a significant point of divergence with Europe. The focus, rather, should be on achievable cooperation. Dick Grimmatt of CRS calls for the establishment of what he called 'first principles'<sup>86</sup>, i.e., the identification of areas where standardisation is essential to interoperability as a basis for developing cooperative equipment programmes. This is probably the most that can be hoped for in the current situation. As indicated above, one area where Europeans and Americans could cooperate to mutual advantage could be the development of technologies that enable interoperability. For example, within NATO today there are four different levels of capability: US, UK and France; pre-enlargement NATO members and finally, Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic.

Europeans have every reason to remain wary of the US defence industry because of its influence over US defence policy. Certainly, it is not driven by altruism towards Europe. Indeed, the US defence industry exemplifies the paradox in transatlantic relations; political partners, military allies and fierce commercial competitors. If the next Administration places a premium on transatlantic security relations it would be well-advised to curb some of the excesses of the defence industry both at home and abroad. Unfortunately, as Greider points out: 'The military-industrial complex is awesomely resourceful, its power deeply rooted in the life of the nation, but it will not survive if the political system finally understands this new reality. The facts argue for a fundamental shift in national priorities, for a real demobilization now that the Cold War has ended. The hard politics of making those changes remains very difficult to face'.<sup>87</sup> *Caveat Europa?*

#### ***IV.4 The Revolution in (American) Military Affairs***

There is a powerful link between US armaments policy and the revolution in military affairs (RMA). Indeed, it is another area of US security policy in which allies find difficulty in dissociating fact from hyperbole, justified defence investment from pork-barrel politics. As indicated above, *Joint Vision 2010* and *Joint Vision 2020* give the impression that the Pentagon believes that, for the first time in history, a decisive technological lead over potential adversaries is possible. Certainly, there are a range of perfectly legitimate functional dynamics that drive the move towards a 'full spectrum warfighting' capability. For example, no state can ignore the impact of information technologies (IT) on warfare, both offensive and defensive. As western societies become ever more computer dependent they become ever more vulnerable to cyber-warfare and the US is correct to be examining the implications and developing systems that can exploit such technologies. Certainly, Europe has been slow in

---

<sup>85</sup> Interview with author, Paris, 16 May 2000.

<sup>86</sup> Interview with the author, Washington, Wednesday, 3 May 2000.

<sup>87</sup> William Greider, 'Fortress America' (New York: Public Affairs, 1999), pp. 117-18.

recognising the scale of the possibilities and dangers associated with cyber-warfare and must take steps to correct this failing.

However, a suspicion remains that some US calls for Europe to improve its capabilities in this area are more to do with US corporate commercial needs than European military needs, particularly in the areas of digitised warfare that form the core of the revolution in military affairs (RMA). The arguments are well-rehearsed and come from respected sources. For example, David C. Gompert, Richard L. Kugler and Martin C. Libicki warn that: ‘The transatlantic schism [in technology] could turn fatal to the alliance in the event of a violent conflict with a WMD-armed rogue over shared interests, in which European forces fail significantly to respond alongside US forces, especially if high American casualties result. Well short of such a crisis, the disparity in US and European capabilities and strategy can cause the United States and its closest friends to work at cross-purposes in peacetime’.<sup>88</sup>

Equally, the issue of policy choice is tacitly acknowledged later in the Gompert, Kugler, Libicki argument when they point out that: ‘European militaries are not challenged by the same mission as their American cousins, i.e., to be able to destroy the forces and the infrastructure of any distant rogue that threatens important allied interests, even if it brandishes nuclear, biological, or chemical weapons. Therefore, they face no imperative to improve their projection capability, to strengthen their stand-off precision-strike systems, to integrate their sensors, to network their forces, and to enhance their joint warfare capability’.<sup>89</sup> To be more accurate, it is not that Europeans do not accept the ‘imperative’ but rather question the *degree* of that imperative as it relates to the threat that Europeans perceive and their preparedness to live with vulnerability. The US makes choices about the degree of vulnerability it is prepared to tolerate, so do Europeans, the implication being that Europeans are used to living with a good deal more than Americans. The development by the US of advanced digitised war-fighting capabilities reflects those choices. Certainly, the RMA is already creating a profound imbalance between US and European capabilities and associated interoperability problems, but these are as much policy-driven as technology-driven, reflecting the differing strategic assessments. Europe must be careful to choose only those aspects of the battlespace dominance, situational knowledge and information denial package that meet *their* requirements. Equally, the Americans are correct to call for Europe to at least undertake a serious assessment of its technology needs given the European need for force multiplying capabilities, even for peace support operations (PSOs).

The US is also correct to look at the potential of technological advances, such as remote sensing, mainly because the technology is there and clearly has military applications. However, since the Gulf War there have been spectacular claims about the effectiveness of such technology that has not been borne out in fact which makes Europeans understandably suspicious of those who espouse such programmes. Many of the claims that emerge from the Pentagon about the role of technology seems to Europeans to be over-stated. For example, Ambassador Richard Burt echoes many Europeans when he questions just how ‘revolutionary’ this technology is.<sup>90</sup> The sheer scale of claims made by US proponents for such technologies suggests that what is driving such programmes are forces once again intrinsically linked with the well-being of new military-industries, such as computer hardware and software giants, as it is with a genuine strategic assessment of America’s security needs.

---

<sup>88</sup> David C. Gompert, Richard L. Kugler, Martin C. Libicki, ‘Mind the Gap – Promoting A Transatlantic Revolution in Military Affairs’ (Washington: NDU, 1999), p. 7.

<sup>89</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 10.

<sup>90</sup> Interview with the author, Washington, Friday, 5 May 2000.



The next Administration will therefore have to convince Europeans otherwise if the US expects Europe to invest heavily in these as yet unproven (in many cases) technologies. As Lawrence Freedman states: 'It is almost impossible to identify any country or group of countries that would have the resources to match the US in RMA capabilities, even if inclined to do so...The challenge for many countries will be to identify that level of extra capability that is worth a dedicated military investment rather than a cheaper adaptation of programmes under development for the civilian market'.<sup>91</sup> Freedman adds '...few are likely to accept in advance dependence upon US systems even when, at times of crisis, they have little choice but to do so. The most important allies of the US will make an effort to stay abreast of these technologies and to adopt them where possible, if only for purposes of interoperability and to gain access to US policy-making at times of crisis and war. It will become the subscription to be taken seriously as an ally'.<sup>92</sup>

The problem for Europeans is to identify the effective from the effusive. Certainly, Europe needs to do more, particularly in the areas of Critical National Infrastructure protection (CNI), Information Operations (IO) and Information Assurance (IA). Equally, American concepts of the bloodless cyber war seem to many Europeans not only unattainable but dangerous in that it could make a coercive security policy and war-fighting seem an option all too convenient. Moreover, given the European emphasis on peacekeeping and peacemaking, much of this technology seems by and large irrelevant, the majority of military operations being decidedly low-tech. The next Administration will have to accommodate European allies who regard the RMA as more a revolution in American military affairs than a revolution in their own.

#### ***IV.5 The thorny problem of National Missile Defense***

Ever since President Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) in 1983, American president's have toyed politically with an issue that to many Europeans seems more Star Trek than security policy. In certain respects little seems to have changed. National Missile Defense is as much about politics as it is territorial defence, something conceded even by American conservatives. As Robert A. Levine points out: 'One cannot question ABM and be considered a conservative, compassionate or not. It has become a symbol of strong national defense, even though it contributes nothing to that defense. The same tens of billions spent on training, military pay, diversification of the armed forces, even new hardware, would contribute much more. Why do the Democrats go along? Because in the last eight years the president has done well by going along with anything. Halfway, be it to salvation or stupidity, defines the middle of the road, and the middle of the road wins elections'.<sup>93</sup> In spite of President Clinton's decision in September to defer deployment it is clear that the issue will continue to affect transatlantic security relations during the next Administration.

The US has attempted to justify NMD by highlighting the threat posed by states such as Iran, Iraq and North Korea. Unfortunately, Europeans find great difficulty in believing such threats justify an asymmetric arms race with, say, China who would feel compelled to match ever more advanced American defences with ever more numerous ballistic missiles. Indeed, as the *International Herald Tribune* points out: 'US intelligence officials have informed President Bill Clinton that China is likely to accelerate its nuclear arms buildup if the United States

---

<sup>91</sup> Lawrence Freedman 'The Revolution in Strategic Affairs', *Adelphi Paper* 318, 1998, p. 70.

<sup>92</sup> *Ibid.* p.72

<sup>93</sup> Robert A. Levine, 'Missile Defense Is Mostly About Politics, Not National Security', *International Herald Tribune*, 9 August 2000, p. 8.

erects a national defense against long-range missiles...'.<sup>94</sup> Proponents say that NMD is not aimed specifically at China. *Joint Vision 2010*, the Pentagon's medium range policy planning statement, suggests otherwise when it talks of the emergence of a 'peer competitor' in the Pacific rim.<sup>95</sup> Even the traditionally loyal British have profound difficulties in matching US threat perception with observable threat. A July 2000 report of the British Parliament's Foreign Affairs Select Committee states: 'We are not convinced that the US plans to deploy NMD represent an appropriate response to the proliferation problems faced by the international community'.<sup>96</sup> Such an analysis from a cross-party committee of America's closest ally, the territory of whom will be essential to the successful functioning of NMD, does not sit very comfortably with the comments of Condoleezza Rice at the Republican Convention in Philadelphia at which she stated that a Bush administration would seek to develop a missile defense system '...at the earliest possible date'.<sup>97</sup>

Ironically, NMD, subject as it is to all the policy filters discussed earlier, might be the one programme that bears serious long-term examination by Europeans. However, there are two problems. First, the US is endeavouring to use relatively minor contemporary threats to justify a programme that is really about the future. Second, until recently, NMD was an excellent example of the neo-unilateralism about which Europeans have complained so readily. Europe was not consulted about a programme that had significant security implications for Europe, not least the potential transfer of threat from the US onto European allies. However, Europe must be careful not to dismiss American concerns out of hand whatever the motives behind them, because neither Europeans nor Americans are really sure how the threat assessment will change. It could be that threats emerge more quickly and are of a more dangerous nature than most Europeans seem to think (or, rather, hope). The two great imponderables; the impact of NMD upon arms control and its technical effectiveness to some extent obscure the central point – can such a system be justified by the strategic environment within the deployment period envisaged? Thérèse Delpech underlines this point. 'This supplement (NMD) to deterrence might seem particularly tempting when new actors, with unknown doctrines (if any) are appearing on the international scene, including potentially 'undeterrable actors'. The very existence of such actors, unable to grasp the risks they are facing when confronting nuclear weapon states (NWS) is debatable, but what is not is the reckless decisions taken by Iraq in 1990 (gathering against it the largest coalition since the Korean War, which involved four nuclear powers) and 1991 (particularly when Baghdad decided to attack Israel) and by Serbia in 1999, when Milosevic confronted NATO, the world's most important military alliance'.<sup>98</sup> In effect, Europe and America are betting on two different security policy horses and making policy choices accordingly, with Europeans *hoping* threats do not materialise, whilst American conservatives are *betting* they do, and American liberals find themselves caught uncomfortably between the two.

Certainly, Europeans should not simply jump on the 'Vast Right Wing Conspiracy'<sup>99</sup> anti-NMD bandwagon without thinking the issues through. As indicated earlier, there are

---

<sup>94</sup> 'China to Counter Missile Defense', *International Herald Tribune*, Thursday, 10 August 2000, p. 4.

<sup>95</sup> *Joint Vision 2010* (Washington: Department of Defense, 1998).

<sup>96</sup> 'UK Panel Questions US Missile Shield Plans', *International Herald Tribune*, Thursday, 3 August 2000, p. 7.

<sup>97</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 7.

<sup>98</sup> Thérèse Delpech, 'Missile Defences and Deterrence', in Burkard Schmitt and Julian Lindley-French (eds.), 'National missile defence and the future of nuclear policy', *Occasional Paper 18* (Paris: WEU-ISS, September 2000), p. 35.

<sup>99</sup> This was the phrase used in an interview on ABC TV's 'Good Morning, America' by Hillary Clinton to attack those who raised suspicions about the possibility that her husband had had an affair with Ms Monica

arguments that can sustain the NMD case. Steve Cambone, who was Staff Director for the Rumsfeld Commission, says: 'Those who disagree...quarrel with specific details concerning the threat. It is said to be insufficiently imminent, numerous or robust to require the development of a ballistic missile defence, with all that that entails. Alternative measures are thought more appropriate – some combination of carrots and sticks to lure North Korea, Iran, Iraq, India and Pakistan and other proliferators, away from their programs. But these objections do not go to the heart of the Rumsfeld Commission's analysis or its warning: the ballistic missile threat to the US has gone from being chronic to acute, from potential to real'.<sup>100</sup>

Europeans might question Cambone's assessment of the missile threat, but there are grounds for debate between those pro and 'agin' NMD over the nature of the threat the United States faces. Equally, any debate between Americans and Europeans will need to be both sober and informed. Unfortunately, what debate that has taken place has been of the megaphone variety within the context of a US election race. As a consequence, it is easy for allies to jump to the conclusion that NMD demonstrates that domestic interests take precedence over international obligations. Easy, because to some extent it is true. Furthermore, because consultation started so late Europe found itself with little alternative than to say either a very public 'yes' or 'no', with all that implied for transatlantic security relations. Indeed, NMD should be an object lesson for any Administration how not to manage transatlantic security relations and it can only be hoped that those lessons have been learned for the future. Europe still fears that any decision to move ahead will take place not as a result of an informed debate, but rather because it makes Democrats look tough on defence (even though they do not really want NMD) and Republicans look even tougher. As a result, the unfortunate impression is given that a scheme that is unproven both in technical and political terms will be foisted, not just on the United States, but on the world, for purely American domestic reasons. This is unfortunate because the real questions are not being addressed. Does America need NMD? Does the sheer scale of American power in the world create threats for the United States that others do not face? Would such a system be a good defence? These are valid questions that Americans have every right to raise. Dr Zbigniew Brzezinski says that NMD *is* driven by domestic political forces and it is difficult for Americans to understand why Europeans oppose it because Americans are not used to living with vulnerability in the way that Europeans take for granted.<sup>101</sup> Indeed, the United States needs to feel protected in a way Europeans do not and it is the responsibility of any President, technology permitting, to ensure such protection.

Even so, the United States must first prove the case for such a system to its allies and then show good faith by publicly committing to a process of mutually-agreed treaty adjustments prior to deployment of NMD. This will involve the disclosure of all aspects of the National Intelligence Estimate (NIE) that justifies the programme. Indeed, the support of the allies for such a politically contentious programme cannot and must not be assumed, and the new Administration could assuage European concerns by offering to set up a joint committee to examine future implications for the Alliance of NMD-type systems.

---

Lewinsky. It has since passed into the American political lexicon to describe the Clinton administration's attitude to any attack on it.

<sup>100</sup>Stephen Cambone, 'Threats and Risks Prompting a Commitment to Ballistic Missile Defense', in Burkard Schmitt and Julian Lindley-French (eds.), 'National missile defence and the future of nuclear policy', *Occasional Paper* 18 (Paris: WEU-ISS, September 2000), p. 13.

<sup>101</sup>Interview with the author, Washington, Thursday, 4 May 2000.

The stakes are high because failure to reach agreement with Russia and other interested parties, however onerous that process might be, will establish a dangerous precedent for future unilateral treaty break-outs that cannot be in the interests of any status quo power, let alone the pre-eminent. It will also lay a future Administration open to the charge of neo-unilateralism that is antithetical to modern transatlantic relations. The Alliance of 2000 is not the Alliance of 1950. As Joseph Cirincione makes clear: 'If the United States disassembles diplomatic restraints, shatters carefully-crafted threat reduction arrangements and moves from builder to destroyer of the non-proliferation regime, there will be little to prevent new nations from concluding that their national security requires nuclear arms. Nor will it be just a matter of diplomatic emergency meetings. Nuclear insecurities and regional tensions could freeze foreign investments, strangling economic growth both regionally and globally'.<sup>102</sup>

#### ***IV.6 Balancing domestic and allied interests***

Armaments policy, the Revolution in Military Affairs and National Missile Defense are policy choices driven by both domestic considerations and the US strategic assessment in much the same way as, say, the EU's Common European Security and Defence Policy (CESDP). That much is clear. To that end, they reflect the political cultures of their time and place. Europeans cannot merely dismiss them out of hand, nor merely accept the American fiat. At the same time, the influence in all three areas of American neo-unilateralism is sufficiently worrying that it is reasonable for Europeans to seek assurances from the next Administration that it continues to attach importance to allies and alliances and is prepared to make the kind of compromises necessary to make them work effectively. Equally, these are issues that are not going to disappear and will, to some extent, represent a bellweather for transatlantic security relations, not just during the next Administration but beyond. If handled badly these issues could create three new Ds: the self-duplication of US armaments policy, the decoupling of Europe from America because of the RMA and discrimination against European security as a result of a unilateral decision to deploy NMD.

As ever, the problem is ultimately political, because too often such initiatives are introduced into the transatlantic framework in a way that is not conducive to sound transatlantic security relations. If the relationship is to flourish, rather than merely survive, then both sides will need to adopt a new approach that will require more openness and constructive engagement. In a sense the US and its allies need to enter into a phase of renewal and confidence-building. Indeed, in spite of all protestations to the contrary, the Allies have tended to 'ambush' each other with new initiatives. Americans do not like European defence outside of NATO for obvious and understandable reasons. Europeans feel equally ill at ease with American initiatives that far from enhancing world security threaten to damage it. Europeans do not like 'leaps in the dark' with *their* security for reasons that seem, on occasions, to have little to do with *their* security.

In short, Europe needs convincing about the RMA and NMD in particular, and it will be the responsibility of the next Administration to convince them not to expect free-thinking people to meekly go where no European has gone before. It is a function of partnership, and it is a function of change. The choice Americans make in November matters, and it is up to them to make it, but European concerns should be listened to because it is the choices that Europeans

---

<sup>102</sup>Joseph Cirincione, 'NMD and Arms Control', in Burkard Schmitt and Julian Lindley-French (eds.), 'National missile defence and the future of nuclear policy', *Occasional Paper* 18 (Paris: WEU-ISS, September 2000), p. 35.

and Americans make thereafter that will either refresh the political relationship at the core of the Alliance or dilute it to the point of irrelevance. No-one seriously believes that the transatlantic security relationship is about to fail but at the same time no-one has, as yet, proposed a relationship based on partnership that will succeed against the diverse challenges of a new world in a new era. US armaments policy, the revolution in American military affairs and National Missile Defense hardly ease that dilemma.

## CHAPTER FIVE: LEADING ALONE OR ACTING TOGETHER - TOWARDS A NEW TRANSATLANTIC SECURITY RELATIONSHIP?

### *V.1 Introduction*

The contentious issues in transatlantic security relations demonstrate the changing and yet enduring nature of the relationship. Europeans and Americans share the same values and believe in the same ideals, but no longer can Washington assume Europe's support for its leadership in a politically volatile international environment. Indeed, to limit the debate to military burden-sharing is to miss the essential point about the transatlantic security relationship, namely that it survives more by the nature of the values it espouses than the military hardware it deploys. The relationship will not survive or fall over the odd percentage increase (or otherwise) in defence expenditure by the European allies. Therefore, the United States will have to become used to the increasingly conditional nature of European support for its leadership. Part of the problem is rhetorical. Robert Zoellick typifies conservative thinking: 'The United States should not be complacent about its allies' roles. Europeans say they want to shoulder a greater defense responsibility – and they should – especially when it comes to policing their own continent. But a wide gap still separates Europe's defense oratory and its actual spending on the necessary capabilities. The United States should encourage its NATO allies to face this reality and to recognize the mutual benefit in having European defense forces operating in close concert with the US military through coalitions. Ultimately, an effective European defense arm will require serious participation by British, French and German troops'.<sup>103</sup> Right sentiment, wrong message. If the contribution of British, French, German and Italian troops in places such as Albania, Bosnia, East Timor, Kosovo, Sierra Leone and Somalia is not 'serious' then a re-definition might be useful.

Unfortunately, whilst Europeans and Americans may basically agree over the objectives of security policy, and even the ends of a common strategy, the domestic 'filters' through which strategic assessment must pass before becoming policy are markedly different on the two sides of the Atlantic. The power of the so-called Iron Triangle (the Pentagon, defence-industries and politicians), the prestige of the American armed forces within American society and the relative greater influence of the defence establishment, compared with the civilian foreign policy establishment, promote a tendency in the US towards a more coercive approach to security policy. Whereas, on the European side, the lack of willingness of European powers to spend significant amounts on military security, allied to preferences for greater emphasis on diplomatic solutions,<sup>104</sup> ensures that the European Union (with Britain and France caught uncomfortably in between) tends to place too much emphasis on cooptive aspects of security. As a consequence, US security policy tends to be overly 'militarised', whilst European policy overly 'civilianised'. William Pfaff supports this contention: 'A parallel development [to the political involvement of the American military] has been the militarization of civilian thought

---

<sup>103</sup>Robert B. Zoellick, 'A Republican Foreign Policy', *Foreign Affairs*, January/February 2000, p. 74.

<sup>104</sup>The role of Germany should not be under-estimated in this process. Hans W. Maull, writing in the IISS Journal *Survival*, writes 'While clearly representing an important evolution, [the new German] security posture does not constitute a fundamental departure from Germany's post-war foreign-policy identity as a civilian power. In the new security environment, some of Germany's core values became mutually incompatible, or at least difficult to reconcile. What has emerged is a new security posture which manages to reconcile most (if not all) core values of Germany's post-war foreign-policy role concept with the requirements of a new security setting. This new security policy still closely approximates the civilian-power ideal'. Hans W. Maull, 'Germany and the Use of Force: Still a 'Civilian Power'?', *Survival*, Summer 2000, vol. 42, no. 2, p. 56.

in government. There is now consistent recourse to military remedies when dealing not only with foreign policy challenges, but also with such civil society issues as terrorism and the drug trade'.<sup>105</sup> The future of effective, practical (as opposed to rhetorical) transatlantic security relations rests, to a significant extent, on finding a new juncture of interests and capabilities that balances these differing approaches.

Furthermore, until the internal debate over the future direction of US strategy is completed then it will be difficult for Europeans to fully play an effective part in the West's new mission. The Europeans are global political players, but it is the US that has the greatest influence on the policy agenda of the West and the world beyond. It is for these reasons that a Bush or a Gore Presidency could well prove important historically, not so much because of the respective strengths of the individuals themselves or their policy differences, but rather because the debate over America's future role will take place on their watch. Furthermore, such is the importance of that debate for Europe that Europeans have every right to influence it by whatever legitimate means they have at their disposal.

Grounds for optimism are not hard to find and should not be subsumed by the sniping that so often characterises the political relationship. At the popular level, Western Europeans and Americans are becoming ever more similar both in the quality of life they enjoy and the values they believe in. To a significant extent this reflects a triumph of American policy because latter day Europeans no longer tolerate the interest-based, power policies that marked the European system of the eighteenth, nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries. Europeans, like their American counterparts, expect a world based on values and demand that their countries and, by extension the EU, actively promote such values. Americans and Europeans, therefore, agree on the ends of policy. However, the relationship will be badly damaged if it is led by a hegemon unwilling or incapable of considering the advice of its allies and unable to make choices for the good of all. Unfortunately, the first year of the next presidency could prove difficult because administrations tend to start off with a bullish agenda and with a determination to shape the world according to an American vision. As Henry Kissinger points out: 'No other nation has ever rested its claim to international leadership on its altruism. All other nations have sought to be judged by the compatibility of their national interests with those of other societies. Yet, from Woodrow Wilson through George Bush, American presidents have invoked their country's unselfishness as the crucial attribute of its leadership role. Neither Wilson nor his later disciples, through the present, have been willing to face the fact that, to foreign leaders imbued with less elevated maxims, America's claim to altruism evokes a certain aura of unpredictability; whereas the national interest can be calculated, altruism depends on the definition of its practitioner'.<sup>106</sup> Normally, after a year or so, it is the world that wins and ambitions moderated.

## ***V.2 Choosing together – a new transatlantic security agenda***

Europe faces three key transatlantic questions. First, how to prevent any structural damage to the relationship during the first year? Second, how to ensure that Europe's legitimate security concerns are understood in Washington? Third, how to cope with an Administration frustrated by its efforts thereafter? The starting point is sound, because no-one is deliberately setting out to wreck transatlantic relations and the relationship remains founded upon good faith.

---

<sup>105</sup>'It's Time for America's Military to Give Up Politics', *International Herald Tribune*, Monday, 14 August 2000, p. 8.

<sup>106</sup>Henry Kissinger, *Diplomacy* (New York: Touchstone, 1994), p. 46.

However, the challenge should not be underestimated. So, what is to be done? Certainly, as things currently stand there would be little point in proposing an entirely new architecture because that is politically unrealistic and unnecessary, and Europeans and Americans need first to make existing institutions work more effectively. Equally, several initiatives would help to balance political feasibility with plausible effectiveness in transatlantic relations:

*A revitalised political superstructure:* re-invigorate the moribund New Transatlantic Agenda launched at the Madrid Summit in 1997 and extend it by promoting meetings between the EU fifteen and the US (15+1) and meetings between the fifteen, the US and Canada, the six other non-EU, NATO members and the EU accession countries (15+19). This would not impede bilateral relations that the United States has traditionally favoured but could help to ensure a politically broader-based, coordinated reaction to almost any given scenario during a crisis and match different skills to particular challenges. For example, the inclusion of the so-called post-neutrals would open up new diplomatic avenues.

*New joint strategic assessment:* this would enable Americans and Europeans to make a reasoned assessment of security risks and challenges and agree appropriate responses. However, it would involve unimpeded European access to American National Intelligence Estimates and reciprocal rights for the United States. This could lead to a new joint threat assessment and policy research centre.

*EU strategic assessment:* to reinforce the joint strategic assessment the EU should prepare a thoroughgoing threat analysis that would continue the process of harmonising the threat assessments being carried out by the fifteen, taking into account US and NATO planning.

*New annual EU burden-sharing audit:* domestic choices implicit in both the Bush and Gore manifestos are also likely to reinforce US frustrations over a range of issues the most obvious being burden-sharing. The US has chosen a global security role (and to fund it) but a mood exists in Washington that the US is, in fact, a victim of its power and that it has been forced into just such a role by recalcitrant allies. To overcome this perception the EU should produce an 'audit' of European operations to show the scope and extent of European commitment to peacekeeping and peace enforcement operations world-wide, as well as more robust efforts.

*EU defence expenditure audit:* implicit in US criticism of the European effort is a lack of investment in security and defence. However, it is not simply a question of how much money is spent but how it is spent and what plans there are to spend it more effectively. An annual EU audit showing both changes in the level of funding and the nature of expenditure could help to mute such criticism.

*Development of NATO as an interoperability nexus:* the emerging gap in military doctrine as a result of a widening gulf in military technology is also a significant cause for concern. The revolution in military affairs (RMA) is being driven by the need to avoid US casualties, the differing threat perception discussed above and the belief in the Pentagon that they can achieve a decisive technological edge. The Europeans do not accept these arguments but the EU should support the development of NATO as a technology nexus, the focal point for enabling technologies that could help to bridge the emerging gap in technological capability between the US and its European allies. This would build a further layer of flexibility into transatlantic relations.



*US-EU high-level working group on European defence:* European defence creates a certain degree of political anxiety in Washington amongst both Republicans and Democrats. To reduce these concerns and to reinforce Europe's commitment to create an autonomous capability within the framework of the transatlantic relationship it would be useful to establish a high-level US-EU Working Group on European Defence that could act both as a consultative body and as a further means of enhancing political cohesion and interoperability.

*EU analysis of implications of the revolution in military affairs for European defence:* Europe will not follow the American lead in the digitisation of military force. It has neither the need nor the resources to do so. However, elements of the RMA will be necessary to maintain European comparative advantage over sub-strategic threats and to ensure an effective degree of interoperability with American forces. Hitherto, individual Member-States have undertaken their own studies and there is a limited amount of work being carried at NATO. An EU analysis would help establish a benchmark for forces and look at the technologies available, together with their military application.

*Joint EU-US committee on implications of NMD:* If such a programme of consultation and due consideration is undertaken then NMD can be considered on its merits. Equally, such 'consultation' should include both a threat assessment and a realistic statement of what technology could achieve in the defence of Europe within the time frame of the threat assessment. This would amount to far more than vague promises of future protection for European cities if the allies mute their criticism. For example, some demonstration of a realistic and effective Theatre Missile Defence (TMD) system would be useful. Equally, the US would be ill-advised to attempt to circumvent the ABM Treaty (ABMT) by, for example, upgrading the capability of a ship-borne TMD system because this would contravene the spirit of the treaty which is, in many ways, as important as the letter. Indeed, before the allies can acquiesce to the scrapping of the ABM Treaty the US will have first to prove to Europeans that the nature of the threat is such that the Treaty is actively impeding security as a result of a very changed strategic environment. Only then will Europeans seriously begin to consider such a system on its merits.

*Political elite awareness campaign in the US:* Javier Solana, the High Representative (HR), has made several visits to Washington to explain developments in both the CFSP and the CESDP and to communicate the EU/WEU position in the areas identified in this report. This policy needs to be intensified. In the medium-term it could be useful, however politically tricky, to examine the possibility of the HR holding informal joint sessions of the Senate and House Armed Services and/or Foreign Relations committees on a regular basis. First, to ensure that there are no surprises for the American political elite. Second, to explain to Congress the extent of European effort and commitments. Discussions with senior figures and representatives during the course of this research have indicated that such an approach would not only be feasible but desirable.

*Policy elite awareness campaign in US:* neither the political objectives of the CFSP, nor the military goals of the CESDP are understood in key policy-making areas within the US policy process. This highlights the need for a systematic and continuous process of engagement by both the EU and Member States in Washington and at every level of the legislature and the executive. There is, for example, little recognition of the relatively minor role that military and security defence plays in the overall mission of the EU, a message that needs to be conveyed at every opportunity. The EU will never be a European NATO.

*Public awareness campaign in US:* some of these problems could be offset by a popular campaign using both print and electronic media that appeals directly to the American people. Such a campaign would highlight the close ties that bind Europe and America with the efforts being made to improve Europe's ability to be a 'force for good in the world'. The campaign would also seek to increase the EU's political profile and to offset concerns within the US about the implications to NATO and transatlantic relations in general of Europe's defence effort. Moreover, it would also seek to sensitise American public opinion to the need for partnership with Europeans in the modern world and, indirectly, influence the internal US debate of the future direction of American foreign and security policy. The campaign could be sustained over a significant period (two to three years) and focus upon Javier Solana as a spokesman for Europe. The High Representative (HR) has a telegenic presence that would be well-suited for a telegenic society. The campaign would involve a series of planned articles, interviews and events that would 'personalise' the CFSP in the shape of the HR. In a sense, it would enable Americans to put a face to the EU.

### ***V.3 Leading alone or acting together?***

This piece has endeavoured to show that the range of forces of change acting upon the transatlantic security relationship are both broad and structural and the result of a very changed and changing strategic environment. In the short-term it is reasonable to assume that neither a President Bush nor a President Gore would instigate radical change in the relationship because neither take radical positions on the issue. Indeed, there is more likely to be an emphasis on the rhetoric of continuity with both Republicans and Democrats continuing to emphasise their support for the CESDP, whilst at the same time reminding Europeans of the need for strong US leadership and the continued primacy of NATO.

At the core of the new transatlantic security relationship would be a new agenda with two basic elements. First, a recognition that whatever approaches the United States and Europe take towards their respective security goals each party can be relied upon to act in good faith to preserve the overall architecture. This requires a significantly greater degree of trust on the part of both Americans and Europeans. Certainly, Americans can no longer freeze the relationship as if in some late-Cold War time-lock and Europeans cannot pretend that the US has no legitimate role in the development of EU security and defence mechanisms. Second, the mechanism for enabling Europe and America to act in pursuit of common security objectives must become far more flexible.

There are sufficient points of convergence to believe that such a relationship can be made to work. Firstly, both sides still attach a great deal of importance to transatlantic security relations. Secondly, there is fundamental agreement that in the event of a renewed strategic threat the Alliance would prove as effective and durable as it did during the Cold War. Thirdly, the mission of NATO is far from complete. These factors are not at issue. However, future security management will need as many actors as there are those who can contribute because modern security management is not a question simply of leadership or military capability but of building the right team for the right job and endowing it with appropriate political legitimacy. In a word, partnership. Unfortunately, hitherto both the Bush and Gore camps have shown insufficient flexibility and by over-stressing America's right to lead have undermined America's ability to lead. A strong European point of view, is going to be a fact, whatever level of military capability Europeans possess. Europe will certainly question American leadership if that leadership is flawed, as demonstrated by Europe's by and large

unified response to NMD. Moreover, the European emphasis on politico-diplomatic power is as least as valid as the American emphasis of politico-military power – so long as it works. Indeed, that is Europe's challenge because the EU still finds it far easier to disagree with the actions of others, particularly the United States, than to provide plausible alternatives. There is a point somewhere between American military capability and current European capabilities that would match European military power to its legitimate security needs. Indeed, the European vision of a complex holistic approach to security that employs a broad range of economic and political means, backed up by a military option is probably more appropriate for the modern age if the very values that give the West its sense of moral exceptionalism are not to be undermined by overweening power.

Europe must, therefore, stand firm in its vision of security, not just for itself, but also for the sake of the West as a political entity. What is needed ultimately is a debate, not over the nature of American leadership, but rather the nature of US-European partnership because only such a partnership will provide the leadership with political legitimacy so necessary in a complex world. Might cannot be right simply because it is a fact, however good the intentions. Power must be legitimised, and a legitimacy is a function of representation. Representation is, after all, the foundation of the American way. Perhaps it would be best to leave the last word to Henry Kissinger: 'America will be the greatest and most powerful nation, but a nation with peers; the *primus inter pares* but nonetheless a nation like others. The American exceptionalism that is the indispensable basis for a Wilsonian foreign policy is therefore likely to be less relevant in the coming century. Americans should not view this as a humbling of America or as a symptom of national decline. For most of its history, the United States was in fact a nation among others, not a preponderate superpower. The rise of other power centers – in Western Europe, Japan, and China – should not alarm Americans. After all, sharing the world's resources and the development of other societies and economies has been a peculiarly American objective ever since the Marshall Plan'.<sup>107</sup> Leading alone or acting together? It will be tough choice for the next Administration, but there is only one choice to make.

---

<sup>107</sup>Henry Kissinger, *Diplomacy* (New York: Touchstone, 1994), pp. 809-10.

## ABBREVIATIONS

ABC TV	American Television Network
ABM	Anti-Ballistic Missile
ABMT	Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty
AFSOUTH	NATO Southern Command
A-3XX	Proposed Airbus Civilian Transport Aircraft
BAE	British Aerospace (BAE Systems)
B-2	US Strategic Bomber
CESDP	Common European Security and Defence Policy
CFSP	Common Foreign and Security Policy
CJTF	Combined Joint Task Force
CNI	Critical National Infrastructure
CRS	Congressional Research Service
CSIS	Center for Strategic and International Studies
DCI	Defence Capabilities Initiative
ERRF	European Rapid Reaction Force
ESDI	European Security and Defence Identity
EU	European Union
HR	High Representative
HR/SG	High Representative/Secretary-General
IA	Information Assurance
IT	Information Technology
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organisation
NDU	National Defense University
NIE	National Intelligence Estimate
NMD	National Missile Defense
NPT	Non-Proliferation Treaty
NWS	Nuclear Weapon State
MTCR	Missile Technology Control Regime
PfP	Partnership for Peace
PPEWU	Policy Planning and Early Warning Unit (EU)
PSO	Peace Support Operation
R&D	Research and Development
RMA	Revolution in Military Affairs
RSI	Rationalisation, Standardisation and Interoperability
SDI	Strategic Defense Initiative
TMD	Theatre Missile Defence
UN	United Nations
USAF	United States Air Force
USN	United States Navy
WMD	Weapons of Mass Destruction
WEU-ISS	Western European Union Institute for Security Studies

## **INTERVIEWS**

(All interviews were carried out in Washington DC, 1-5 May 2000)

Congressman R. Bartlett, Republican Member of the House Committee on International Relations

Congressman D. Bereuther (written response), Republican Member of House Committee on International Relations

Fred Beauchamp, Director, NATO Affairs, Pentagon

Antony Blinken, Director, Europe, National Security Council

James Bolton, American Enterprise Institute

Lisa Bronson, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, Pentagon

Ian Brzezinski, House Committee on International Relations, Majority Staffer (Republican)

Dr Zbigniew Brzezinski, Senior Counsellor, CSIS

Amb. Richard Burt, IEP Advisers

Dr Steve Cambone, Director, National Defense University (NDU)

Dick Grimmett, Congressional Research Service (CRS)

Amb. Jeanne Kirkpatrick, American Enterprise Institute

Frank Kramer, Assistant Secretary of Defense, Pentagon

Ken Myers, Office of Senator Lugar

Mary O'Brien, Office of Chairman Ike Skelton, House Armed Services Committee (Republican)

Dr Simon Serfaty, Director of Europe, Center for Strategic and International Security (CSIS)

Dr David Trachtenberg, Majority Staffer, Senate Armed Services Committee (Republican)

Dr Kori Schake, National Defense University (NDU)

Stanley R. Sloan, Westminster Consultants

Al Volkman, Head of International Cooperation, Department of Defense

Hoyt Yee, Deputy Director, Europe, National Security Council

Robert Simmons, Senior NATO Adviser, State Department