

Democracy and Security in the 21st Century

Democracy and Security in the 21st Century:
Perspectives on a Changing World

Edited by

Valentin Naumescu

**CAMBRIDGE
SCHOLARS**

P U B L I S H I N G

Democracy and Security in the 21st Century:
Perspectives on a Changing World,
Edited by Valentin Naumescu

This book first published 2014

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

12 Back Chapman Street, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2XX, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2014 by Valentin Naumescu and contributors

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-4438-5681-9, ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-5681-2

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword	viii
On Promoting Democracy and Security Aurel Braun	
Acknowledgements	xiii
Introduction	1
Democracy and Security in a Multipolar System Valentin Naumescu	
Chapter One: Before the Cold War: A Historical Perspective, Present Connections	
“Behind Closed Doors”: The Myth of the Anglo-Soviet Percentages Bargain (October 1944). A Re-Evaluation and Contemporary Meanings	16
Lucian Leuştean	
Chapter Two: The European Union and Beyond: Crises, Democracy, Changing Policies	
The Treaty of Lisbon, the Common Foreign and Security Policy and its Institutional Consistency Problem	34
Georgiana Ciceo	
Challenges to the Future of the European Union	48
Cristina Vohn	
The CFSP of Post-Lisbon EU: From Theory to Practice	65
Sanda Cincă	
The Culture of the European Security	87
Liviu Petru Zăpârţan	

“In the Guardian We Trust!” National Security in the 2012 French Presidential Elections	100
Ioana-Cristina Hrițcu and Sergiu Mișcoiu	
The European Union’s Action in the Field of Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament.....	133
Mihaela Vasii	
The Eastern Partnership: Still a Relevant EU Policy?	165
Cristian Conțan	
The European Union Strategy for Central Asia and the Regional Democratisation Process.....	185
Cristina-Maria Dogot	
The European Citizens’ Initiative	224
Diana Ancheș	
A Philosophical and Political Treatment of the Blocking Effects of Democracy	248
Viorella Manolache	
Europe 2020: An Agenda for Citizens and States	267
Adrian-Gabriel Corpădean	
Chapter Three: Global and Regional Security Today: Actors, Shaping Forces, Current Approaches	
The Forthcoming Age of Urban Insurgency: Ways to Counteract	286
Octavian Manea	
NATO in the 21 st Century: Spreading Democracy through Security and Assuring Security through Democracy—A Critical Perspective	317
Claudiu Bolcu	
Humanitarian Intervention and Human Security: Sociological, Critical, and Constructivist Approaches to (In)security in Africa	343
Laura M. Herța	
Information Technology: A Force Shaping the Future.....	382
Rareș Păteanu	

Democracy vs. Islam? The Rise of Political Islam in Egypt and Tunisia and the New Regional Security Challenges	404
Ecaterina Cepoi and Marius Lazăr	
Civil War and Proxy War in Syria: The Ugly Face of the Arab Spring	431
Șerban Filip Cioculescu	
The Strategic Partnership between Romania and the United States of America in the Context of the Current Dynamic of the Trans- Atlantic Partnership	458
Bogdan Aurescu	
Contributors	468
Index	473

FOREWORD

ON PROMOTING DEMOCRACY
AND SECURITY

AUREL BRAUN

The search for security is one of the oldest human quests, one which sadly remains in many ways unfulfilled, even in the 21st Century. The struggle for democracy, and here we are looking at what we characterize as the modern form of democracy that basically started with the American Revolution, however is of a somewhat more recent vintage, where remarkable successes have mingled with failures and continuing risks. It is also the case that especially since the 1980s scholars began to assert that systemic analyses have demonstrated that there is a vital linkage between democracy and security.

To help us better understand the seminal issues in these areas there is a rich body of literature on democracy and the prolific field of international relations has certainly provided us with a plethora of works on security. Various books have also sought to elucidate linkages between the two. Consequently it is a fair question to ask why we would need another work on democracy and security. This new book, *Democracy and Security in the 21st Century: Perspectives on a Changing World* provides very satisfying answers here, for it is a major contribution in three significant ways. First, it is a broad and bold analysis that incorporates a wide range of expertise from different authors in a sophisticated and nuanced analysis that is comprehensive and dynamic. Second, the vast majority of the contributors are from a new democracy and bring a fresh perspective to analyzing the significance of that political order and its links to security that for them has a relevance and immediacy that is not always adequately appreciated in older democracies and in sometimes jaded western scholarship. Third, this work effects a very successful melding of theory and practice as directed by the editor Valentin Naumescu. A senior social scientist and a seasoned diplomat, Naumescu has shaped this volume in a way in which there is that necessary organic linkage between theory and

empirical studies to produce the type of dynamic analysis that not only provides for a deep understanding of the subject but it is also forward looking.

It is as well important that what courses through this complex work is a notion of democracy that is essential to understand if we are to fully appreciate its linkage to security. As in the case of all modern democracy there is an obvious draw on the Aristotelian principles where there could be both a good and a bad variant of democracy. In this work democracy clearly transcends the notion of “mobocracy” where majorities could be tyrannical and pivotally points to the underlying principle of democracy in Aristotle that focuses on freedom. It is crucially in a democracy that citizens may have a share in freedom for as Aristotle noted: “but one factor of liberty is to govern and be governed in turn; for the popular principle of justice is to have equality according to number, not worth,... and one is for a man to live as he likes; for they say that this is the function of liberty, inasmuch as to live not as one likes is the life of a man that is a slave.”¹

This Aristotelian principle of freedom matured (even if in an imperfect way) in the creation of the modern democratic political order following the American Revolution. The guiding principle here was the protection of rights rather than the pursuit of virtue. In terms of institutions and processes this meant the very early development in the United States of a system of checks and balances that is at the heart of all current modern democracies. In defining democracies for the purposes of this book then it is worth going back to the American Founding Fathers, in particular James Madison who in Federalist No. 10 was keenly aware of the dangers and vices of popular governments and concluded that because conflicting ideas, passions and interests were part of the fabric of all societies and evident in the nature of man, factions would need to balance other factions to prevent abuse.²

The 21st Century iteration of the Madisonian checks and balances remains vital and is evident in the analyses in this book. Though Abraham Lincoln rightly posited that “the ballot is stronger than the bullet”³ a

¹ Aristotle, *Politics*, Book 6, Part II.

² James Madison, “Federalist #10,” in *The Federalist Papers*, ed. Clinton Rossiter (New York: New American Library, 1961).

³ Abraham Lincoln, “Speech Delivered Before the First Republican State Convention of Illinois, Held at Bloomington, on May 29, 1856,” in *The Writings and Papers of Abraham Lincoln*, (New York: FQ Books, 2010).

corollary in a play by Tom Stoppard, the humorist, is also most apt for modern democracies. He noted, "It's not the voting that's democracy, it's the counting."⁴ And it is this "counting" that involves institutions and processes essential to the viability of a modern democracy. Broadly understood fairness in counting speaks to the entire political order in terms of limitations of power, fairness and due process. This is why some of the most perceptive analysts of modern consolidated modern democracies such as Linz and Stepan have noted that elections are *a necessary but not a sufficient condition* for democracy.⁵ This is also why in this volume edited by Naumescu there are chapters on democratic society, spreading of democracy through security and the blocking effect of democracy. Linz and Stepan rightly pointed out that democracies require a vibrant civil society, relatively autonomous and valued political society, the rule of law, a bureaucracy that can be used by democratic government and an institutionalized, workable economy.⁶

Checks and balances and the multiple principles that underpin modern democracy as enunciated by Linz and Stepan provide seminal internal constraints on the behaviour of governments internally and externally. This is not an argument for perfection, for all democracies are flawed but dictatorial systems simply lack the popular involvement and the requirement for government responsiveness that characterizes democracies and this is where we can see a link to international security. Such a linkage goes back at least to Kantian analysis where in his 1795 essay *Perpetual Peace* Kant contended that in a world comprised exclusively of Constitutional Republics (what we would now call modern democracies that would meet the Linz and Stepan criteria, for instance) there would be one of the necessary conditions for perpetual peace.⁷ The modern iteration of this theory came largely with the seminal work of Michael Doyle beginning in 1983 where, as part of his democratic peace theory, he basically argued that democracies do not fight each other.⁸ It should be noteworthy that essentially both Kant and Doyle argue for a *dyadic* peace,

⁴ Tom Stoppard, *Jumpers*, (London: Faber & Faber Ltd., 1986).

⁵ Juan J. Linz and Alfred Stepan, *Problems of Democratic Transition and Consolidation*, (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996).

⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷ Kant, Immanuel. *Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Sketch*, (London: Pearson PLC, 1957).

⁸ Michael Doyle, "Kant, Liberal Legacies and Foreign Affairs," in *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 12, Vol. 12., No. 4. (Autumn 1983), 323-353; Michael Doyle, "Kant, Liberal Legacies and Foreign Affairs, Part 2," *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 12, Vol. 12, No. 4 (Autumn, 1983), 323-353.

namely that democracies do not fight each other, rather than a *monadic* peace that would suggest democracies are inherently more peaceful and consequently unlikely to go to war. Nonetheless the theory that democracies (again there is a need to employ a rigorous definition of what constitutes a democracy as in Linz and Stepan) do not fight each other, even if not an ironclad rule of history, represents I would argue a vital and powerful tendency. Newer works such as the one by Russett and O'Neal have provided additional important evidence that democracy and peace mutually reinforce each other.⁹ This collective work under Naumescu's editorship thus logically and most helpfully has multiple contributions that look at the linkages between democracy and security in Europe and elsewhere and brings into its analytic focus the Treaty of Lisbon, NATO and ideological or religious developments globally that touch on these key issues.

In terms of perspective in evaluating the above issues, it is worth noting here that even in ideal conditions countries need to confront the traditional security dilemma, which as John Herz put it is "a structural notion in which the self-help attempts of states to look after their security needs tend, regardless of intention, to lead to rising insecurity for others as each interprets its own measures as defensive and measures of others as potentially threatening."¹⁰ This volume however shows that the problems with democracies in the 21st Century have become significantly larger than just the traditional security dilemma and conditions are far from ideal.

True, the implosion of communism in Eastern Europe in 1989 and the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991 brought about tectonic shifts that have profoundly transformed the international system and in many instances brought about remarkable democratic successes. The security that would have followed had the rather triumphalist Hegelian argument put forth by Francis Fukuyama proven valid, (namely that following the collapse of communism humanity had reached what may be seen as a penultimate form of political and economic organization, that is liberal democracy¹¹) however never materialized. Internal and international conflicts have remained endemic and democracies as this volume shows, confront multiple security problems.

⁹ Bruce Russett and John O'Neal, *Triangulating Peace: Democracy, Interdependence, and International Organizations*, (New York: Norton, 2001).

¹⁰ John Herz, "Idealists Internationalism and the Security Dilemma," in *World Politics* vol. 2, no. 2, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1950), 171-201.

¹¹ Francis Fukuyama, *The End of History and the Last Man*, (New York: Free Press, 1992).

Further, security problems are global but they also very strongly affect Europe. This volume, which begins with an historical analysis, is especially strong in articulating the multiple security problems faced by European nations. There are rightfully questions about the “hard security” guarantees of NATO which only the U.S. is capable of providing. Yet as Naumescu points out, the January 2012 *Strategic Defense Review*¹² not only pivots America to the Asia-Pacific region but it does not reconfirm the vital traditional priority of the trans-Atlantic relationship. Add to this the Obama administration’s aversion to military involvement, its central focus on “extricating” the U.S. from many international involvements and a preference for “leading from behind” that to many is fundamentally a lack of American leadership, it is easy to understand the increasing nervousness, particularly among the new democracies in Europe. As they witness the shrinking of the democratic space in Russia and elsewhere and the rise of extremist movements globally Eastern European concerns are emblematic of larger global problems. Though American declinism may be overstated at times and a post-Obama administration may more fully and vigorously reengage America, for the next few years the search for security depends on strengthening other sources. As some of the contributors including Zapartan, Cinca and Aurescu show, however, the European Union, despite the Lisbon Treaty and its ambition to become a security agent on the international scene, the E.U. has not been capable of fulfilling a replacement role. The U.S./E.U. relationship and American primacy in NATO then remain seminal if there is to be security.

This volume though is considerably more than just about Europe. It has a truly global agenda to which it brings a multi-disciplinary analysis that is most helpful and persuasive. In examining such matters as democracy in Islam, the civil war in Syria, the problems of humanitarian intervention and the power of information technology, it contextualizes the role that democracy can and should play and the crucial linkage to security.

In sum, this book is a most welcome contribution to scholarship that will benefit enormously scholars, students and policy makers alike. It highlights that democracy is not just an ideology but an inspiration that involves optimistic struggle and a constant link to domestic as well as international security. More than an analysis, this work should also serve as a warning about the dangers of complacency and the risks of absent or feeble democratic leadership in achieving security.

¹² *Sustaining U.S. Global Leadership: Priorities for 21st Century Defense*, p. 2., (Washington: The Department of Defense, January 2012).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Special thanks to Dr. Adrian-Gabriel Corpădean, whose dedicated and skilful work has been a great help in endowing this book with its present format and also is supporting some of our authors' efforts of meeting editing standards.

Valentin Naumescu

Cluj-Napoca
November 2nd, 2013

INTRODUCTION

DEMOCRACY AND SECURITY IN A MULTIPOLAR WORLD

VALENTIN NAUMESCU

“The world is changing” is probably one of the most frequent clichés in international politics and media, as well as in social sciences. Beyond the general truth that every generation of scholars dreams of detecting, explaining or predicting the direction(s) of change, whilst believing that its time is unique and tremendously important for the future of humanity, there is certainly a substantial dynamic and a sense of major transformation in any epoch. Hence, we are entitled to restate in this book that the world is changing and to aim to focus our perspectives on two crucial dimensions for people’s lives: democracy and security.

At a time when even the foundations and pre-eminence of the Western order are called into question by both the weaknesses of the transatlantic partnership and the spectacular rise of the Asia-Pacific region, suggesting a switch to a post-Atlantic order, the contributors to this volume give specific answers to present-day interrogations regarding various processes of transformation. We offer, in this book, multidisciplinary perspectives on political, economic, social, technological and cultural dimensions of change and we also propose some possible responses to current global and regional challenges.

The never-ending but fascinating dialogue between the major schools of international relations is substantially present in our volume. Both realism and neorealism, on the one hand, and the social theory of international relations, on the other hand, bring their solid arguments through the voices of the contributors. Military and economic interests of the states, contrasting somehow with cultural interpretations and constructivism, are reflected in interesting approaches to on-going processes.

Since the terrible attacks of 9/11 and especially after the Iraqi crisis, most of the analyses of international politics, hypotheses and academic reflections with regard to the *decline of the Western order*¹ have been based on the idea that we are witnessing a rift with the post-1945 transatlantic relations². What was once thought to be the essential mechanism of containing the Soviet Union's ideological and military ambitions in Europe, namely the North-Atlantic Alliance, has been removed from centre-stage and relocated to a shady zone of little interest.

The West is slowly losing its remarkable post-WWII unity, possibly along with the brightness of its principles and generosity, the confidence in its unlimited growth and prosperity, and the mirage of its omnipotence from the time of the Cold War. Nevertheless, its fundamental set of rules, institutions³ and values continues to form a stable order, sometimes assumed by non-Western countries and often challenged by rising economic powers (e.g. BRICS⁴), and still proposes a *way of life* which is globally attractive, fully rewarding, as well as morally superior to any other political, economic and social system that can be seen outside the Euro-Atlantic space. Under these circumstances, the West's prolonged crisis, more than a simple media fantasy but less than a fatal stalemate, generates an international framework which is suitable for a series of global and regional structural changes, as well as challenging analyses.

We might disagree with the severity of this diagnosis pertaining to the West's decline (in fact an almost 100-year-old idea, if one considers Oswald Spengler's well-known work⁵), but multidisciplinary analytical approaches are definitely useful for a correct understanding of main directions and trends. By integrating the global transformations following the western political, diplomatic and military crisis of 2003, as well as the implications of the financial crisis of 2008-2009, scholars proclaim *the end of the unipolar system* (with reference to the two decades of U.S. hegemony after the demise

¹ Jeffrey Anderson, G. John Ikenberry, and Thomas Risse (editors), *The End of the West? Crisis and Change in the Atlantic Order*, Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 2008.

² Jeffrey Kopstein and Sven Steinmo (editors), *Growing Apart?: America and Europe in the Twenty-First Century*, New York and London: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

³ We consider as institutions of the Western post-war order: the United Nations, the North Atlantic Alliance (NATO), the European Union, the Council of Europe (CoE), the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund.

⁴ Brazil, Russia, India, China, South Africa.

⁵ Oswald Spengler, *The Decline of the West*, Ed. Arthur Helps, and Helmut Werner, New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.

of the Soviet Union) and a certain fade-out of the European-American strategic alliance. It is somewhat ironic to notice that just a few years earlier, in 2001, Henry Kissinger had written triumphantly: “At the dawn of the new millennium, the United States is enjoying a pre-eminence unrivalled by the greatest empires of the past”⁶.

In fact, the central issue of the entire debate around the idea of Western order reflects the controversy over the United States’ status of single superpower. “Whether the U.S. is a hegemon represents an issue decided by a ‘generalized other’, not by the U.S. on its own, and from this point of view the cultural formation of identity (subjectivity) is a form of power, as poststructuralists said”⁷. That is how Alexander Wendt explained, in 1999, the essence of the social constructivist theory of world politics.

Thomas P. M. Barnett denies Zakaria’s famous 2008 hypothesis of a post-American world. Rather optimistically, the author of *Great Powers: America and the World after Bush* believed, in 2009, that “this is still America’s world [...], a world of our making”. Trying to look at the future, Barnett claimed that “the next years will constitute the first true test of globalization. As our globalized system continues processing its worst financial crisis ever, President Barack Obama encounters an international order suffering more deep-seated strain than at any time since the Great Depression”⁸.

The potential of the Western alliance to regulate and control violence and armed conflicts in different parts of the world, as well as to reduce the tensions on global markets, has also waned. This is not only due to the weakening relations between the United States and the European Union, but also to the extraordinary rise of the global emerging powers and of the complexity of economic problems, as well as of historical, religious and cultural fault-lines fuelling regional conflicts. To give just one example, the contradictory developments in the aftermath of the “Arab spring” (2011-2012) pushed the western democracies towards an unprecedented moral dilemma, culminating with the embarrassing silence related to the military coup followed by bloody confrontations in Cairo, in July 2013.

After the dramatic transformation of Eastern Europe in 1989, the world has changed again. We are now moving *beyond the “post-Cold War era”*, which is already a completed chapter of history. Albeit we do not yet have the name of the nascent epoch, what we know for sure is the fact that there

⁶ Henry Kissinger, *Does America Need a Foreign Policy?: Toward a Diplomacy for the 21st Century*, New York: Simon & Schuster Paperback, 2001, p. 18.

⁷ Alexander Wendt, *Teoria socială a politici internaționale (Social Theory of International Politics)*, Iași: Polirom 2011, p. 189.

⁸ Thomas P.M. Barnett, *Great Powers: America and the World after Bush*, New York: G.P. Putnam’s Sons, 2009, p. 4.

are several major competitors on the global scene. Their power and influence are constantly growing. While the United States' supremacy as a global political power is not called into question at this time, there is conclusive evidence of a massive economic, technological and military ascension of China, India and the Asia-Pacific region as a whole, all the way to international pre-eminence, also accounting for the United States' strategic rebalance towards the Pacific area.

For the first time in post-war history, the U.S. government published in January 2012 a policy paper (*The Strategic Defense Review*) which does not reconfirm the priority of the transatlantic relations, while the growing importance of Asia-Pacific is clearly emphasized: "U.S. economic and security interests are inextricably linked to developments in the area extending from the Western Pacific and East Asia into the Indian Ocean region and South Asia, creating a mix of evolving challenges and opportunities. Accordingly, while the U.S. military will continue to contribute to security globally, we will of necessity rebalance toward the Asia-Pacific region."⁹ Meanwhile an aged, indebted, less competitive and increasingly divided Europe is heavily struggling to overcome a long and complicated crisis which still seems far from its end. For sceptical authors, the European project appears to be "exhausted". For the most optimistic analysts, it is simply deemed "business as usual", since the entire history of European integration has in fact been a long series of ups and downs.

From the political to the economic dimension and from military to strategic issues, the "*post-American world*" which Fareed Zakaria has so accurately described¹⁰ is moving towards a multipolar architecture, with several centres of growth and influence that are competing for resources and pre-eminence. Accordingly, the global economy and international politics are facing a shift of "gravity centre" from the Atlantic to the Pacific¹¹. Therefore, it came as no surprise to hear the minister mentor of Singapore, Lee Yew, saying in crystal clear words that "the centre of economic and geopolitical gravity is shifting from the Atlantic to the Pacific... Trade, investments and economic ties will make this the world's most important and dynamic region during the 21st century."¹² Meanwhile, the Western order, established after the

⁹ *Sustaining U.S. Global Leadership: Priorities for 21st Century Defense*, p. 2, The Department of Defense, Washington D.C., January 2012.

¹⁰ Fareed Zakaria, *Lumea post americană (The Post-American World)*, Iași: Polirom, 2009.

¹¹ Valentin Naumescu, "From the Atlantic Order to the Pacific Pre-Eminence: A Historical Shift?" in *Studia Universitatis Babeș-Bolyai / Studia Europaea*, issue no. 2/2012, Cluj-Napoca: Cluj University Press, 67-82.

¹² Lee Kuan Yew, *Battle for preeminence*, in Forbes,

end of WWII, struggles amid a confusing international context. The *global leadership vacuum*, according to Der Spiegel, on the occasion of the 2013 Munich Security Conference, renders “Europe incapable and America unwilling”, while “international institutions, such as the United Nations, NATO and the European Union are suffering from an identity crisis of what they are supposed to do”¹³.

The general disengagement of the United States, especially from Europe and to some extent from the Middle East, is not only seen in terms of a strategic rebalance towards Asia-Pacific, but also as a sign of a changing world. From the security perspective, it is already commonplace to state that the world does not have a “global policeman” any longer. Beside the early 21st century new political and military realities, analysts outline high levels of competitiveness, economic interests and increasing stakes gliding to the East. Growing markets flourish in Central Asia, South and East Asia. In only two of these countries, namely China and India, we encounter about one third of the total population of the world. After the so-called “two lost decades”, Japan is thriving under the new government of Shinzo Abe, but tensions have arisen in its relations with China. From one ocean to another, states and nations are reshaping strategies so as to tackle the massive global “war for resources”, which was initially predicted in the early 1970s by the Club of Rome.

The present volume is structured into three distinct sections. A historical perspective from the 20th century (just before the Cold War) with consistent connections to today’s international politics opens the series of contributions. The first half of the past century was a time when Europe was still seen as centre-stage. Historian Lucian Leuștean reveals the major continental impact of the attitudes of two non-European powers at the end of WWII, namely the Soviet Union and the United States. Ruined by the terrible confrontations of the twentieth century and playing second fiddle in world politics, European powers gradually agreed to abandon the global pre-eminence of the old continent. Both the World Wars and the Cold War had destructive effects on Europe’s prestige and power, and made possible the switch from a failed “European order” to the American century. Neither the UK nor France or Germany had succeeded in retaking centre stage at the global level after 1945 or 1990, despite the remarkable progress of European integration in the past

<http://www.forbes.com/forbes/2010/1011/rich-list-10-opinions-lee-kuan-yew-current-events-preeminence.html>, consulted on February 26, 2013.

¹³ Gregor Peter Schmitz, *Global Leadership Vacuum: Europe incapable, America unwilling*, Der Spiegel, February 1, 2013, <http://www.spiegel.de/international/world/the-global-leadership-vacuum-europe-incapable-america-unwilling-a-880945.html>, consulted on July 29, 2013.

six decades. Politically, economically and militarily, Europe is no longer the centre of gravity of the world. This is where we start from.

Lucian Leuștean argues that “neither the percentages agreement nor the Yalta Conference in February 1945 deserve the role of milestones, not in the issue of the spheres of influence in post-war Europe, not in the issue of the Eastern Europe’s abandonment into the Soviets’ hands. The essential decision in this problem was the American leaders’ one not to have their troops present, at the end of the war, in the eastern part of Europe. The British were not capable either of convincing the Americans to do it, or to act by themselves.” In fact, what we can easily understand from this international arrangement is the acceptance of the realist approach of the balance of power, by both Soviets and Americans, and the attitude of disregard of the great powers towards Central and Eastern European nations, at the end of World War II.

After 1990, the Western paradigm finally extended to the East and covered most of the “betrayed” part of Europe. Both the North-Atlantic Alliance (in 1999, 2004 and 2008) and the European Union (in 2004, 2007 and 2013) opened their gates to a considerable number of post-communist countries in the sensitive and also historically disputed region situated between Germany and Russia. The reunification of Europe within the European Union is therefore considered by many Eastern Europeans as a historical and moral restitution after the half-century-long political, military and ideological split of the continent. However, as I said before, the post-Cold War enthusiasm seems already obsolete in both Western and Eastern Europe, while increasing frustrations, populist approaches and xenophobia gain prominence in European politics.

Europe is a chapter in itself. After the Lisbon Treaty of 2009, the European Union finds its way with difficulty, sinking into economic and political uncertainty. The contributions unveil different perspectives regarding the CFSP (Common Foreign and Security Policy), the Eastern neighbourhood approach (EaP – Eastern Partnership) or the European strategy for the economically emerging Central Asia, the EU’s non-proliferation and disarmament policy, the “Europe 2020” agenda or even the outcome of the European project. Academics, diplomats and EU experts leave their own professional imprint and intellectual mark on a wide range of political, conceptual, but also technical issues.

According to Professor Liviu-Petru Zăpârțan, “the Union has aimed to become a security agent of the international scene, assuming a series of initiatives which also have their basis in its cultural background, in the fundamental orientations of its axiology. Through the Lisbon Treaty, the political dimension of the Union was consecrated, the integration of some

states released from under socialism was validated and so, new themes of European security were asserted". The author notices the switch that took place in European security studies, from military threats (hard security) to economic, environmental or societal threats (soft security), conceptualized for the first time by the Copenhagen School. Following the academic approach from the early 1990s, Zăpârțan remarks that "the study of security has become more complex and – even though it is still an important field of international relations analysis – it has been extended to social, food, energy, environment, value and even personal security, from the street climate to the one of the workplace, from transport safety to human rights, from human rights to moral anarchy and then, to collective security".

With regard to the CFSP, Sanda Cincă states, in her contribution, that "although European leaders have often recognized the need for the EU to redefine its role in the international system by creating a more effective and coherent foreign policy, these ambitious goals remained unfulfilled, each time being just reaffirmed. Taking into account the failures which have been recorded in this area so far, the Lisbon Treaty represented a step forward, by bringing changes to the architecture of CFSP". With a different analytical discourse, Georgiana Ciceo does not see the Treaty of Lisbon as a major step forward (at least not for the CFSP), whilst her findings are rather cautious and do not offer very encouraging perspectives. In her own words, "the Treaty of Lisbon does not come up with ultimate clarifications. It does not alter the intergovernmental character of CFSP, it does not change significantly its decision-making mechanisms, and it does not modify radically the positions of the existing institutions in the decision-making structures of CFSP. It mostly subscribes to the policy of small steps towards, transforming the existing fragmented actorhood of the European Union into a more coherent one." Speaking about the unity and effectiveness of European external action, the reference to the famous rhetorical question attributed to Henry Kissinger has become almost commonplace: "Who do I call if I want to speak with Europe? Give me a name and a phone number!", suggesting the vulnerability of the European Union as a global power, in comparison to the United States, because of the lack of a single voice with regard to foreign policy and security issues. To some extent, the Lisbon Treaty and the creation of the European External Action Service (EEAS) have attempted to solve the old confusing decision-making process.

As a European Union expert in disarmament, Mihaela Vasiu brings a valuable and consistent perspective on the European Union's action in the field of nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament. Approaching the thorny issue of the Iranian nuclear file, Vasiu notes that "it is fully consistent (...) that the EU has been involved in the diplomatic efforts with regard to Iran,

concerning the latter's nuclear programme. It is important to note that the EU High Representative Catherine Ashton is currently leading the E3+3¹⁴ talks with Iran. The role of the EU in the field of prevention has been clearly recognised internationally."

Cristian Conțan, from the field of diplomacy, comes with a more technical contribution to the Eastern Partnership, in the context of the approaching Vilnius Summit, which is likely to bring new Association Agreements on the part of a number of EaP states. "While security issues in the EaP region are not meant to be addressed through the EaP policy", he remarks, "it is expected that enhanced relations with the EU, reducing trade barriers, promoting good neighbourly relations or supporting confidence building measures, as well as making full use of the multilateral dimension of this policy which fosters cooperation among the six¹⁵ EaP countries would contribute indirectly to the resolution of the frozen conflicts". Despite Russia's political and economic pressures against any progress of the former Soviet republics towards the European Union, the upcoming Vilnius Summit of November 2013 will probably be a historical opportunity for (maybe) two or three of the six EaP member states to sign their Association Agreements (AAs). Although the European perspective of the Republic of Moldova, Georgia and Ukraine could mark at Vilnius an important step forward, the strategic competition for this region will continue in the coming years. As the Stratfor agency has predicted¹⁶, the European Union and Russia are disputing pre-eminence in this political and economic European periphery (once part of the Soviet Empire), while President Putin is continuing his campaign of strengthening Moscow's influence and international profile.

The external action and strategic interests of the European Union go far beyond the Eastern Neighbourhood Policy. Central Asia is nowadays one of the most dynamic, resourceful and potentially attractive regions in the world. Cristina-Maria Dogot contributes with an analysis of the EU's strategy for Central Asia and also with regard to the democratisation process in the region. Due to its geographical position, our contributor explains that "at the crossroads between China, Russia, Ukraine, Iran and Afghanistan, its

¹⁴ The E3+3 are the three European countries (UK, France and Germany) plus the US, Russia and China. The six countries are, in this context, also referred to as P5+1 (i.e. the five nuclear weapon states, members of the UNSC, plus Germany).

¹⁵ The six member states are: Ukraine, the Republic of Moldova, Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, while Belarus is participating only in the multilateral dimension of the EaP, rejecting a bilateral relation with the EU within the EaP policy.

¹⁶ Stratfor - Analysis, *Increasing Russian and EU Competition for Influence in Moldova*, <http://www.stratfor.com/analysis/increasing-russian-and-eu-competition-influence-moldova>, consulted on October 1st, 2013.

abundance in terms of mineral resources and its important capacity to produce energy, the EU considered the 'great strategic importance' of the region. The EU did not disregard the interests of other key actors in Central Asia, such as Russia, China, the US, Japan or even Iran and Turkey, but it announced that it had 'a strong interest in using all the means at its disposal to promote the peaceful political and economic development of the region', with the main objective 'of promoting the stability and security' and of supporting Central Asian countries 'in their pursuit of sustainable economic development and poverty reduction'. Nevertheless, the advance of Europe in Central Asia is still a difficult process, while Russia, under Putin's regime, is struggling to protect its influence and interests in a region that is more or less politically confused, at the borderline of the democratic paradigm, and not yet very convinced of its Western-oriented future.

Our contributors are not only preoccupied with the external actions of the European Union, but also with the domestic aspects. Speaking about the democratic deficit, Diana-Ionela Ancheș has identified "four essential aspects which are implied by this problem: the legitimacy of institutional structures and of the relationships between them, the representative character of the institutions and of the political staff in relation to the equality among citizens, the functional character of the institutional system of the European Union and the citizens' participation in European political life." Based on this perspective, the 2014 elections for the European Parliament could be seen as a relevant benchmark for the popular support of the European Union in its present format, if we consider the results, as well as the turnout. The rise of radical populist, nationalist and Euro-sceptical parties in the past years does not offer an encouraging framework for pro-European movements.

The idea of democracy remains a fundamental value and a sensitive aspect for many European authors. Regarding the long-debated issue of the democratic deficit, Cristina Vohn identifies two main theoretical approaches: "one predominantly supporting the existence of the democratic deficit within the Union's institutional system, represented in particular by the contributions of Simon Hix and Andreas Follesdal, and another arguing for the legitimacy of the EU, whose main supporters are now Andrew Moravcsik and Majone Giandomenico." It is more and more evident that the issue of legitimacy becomes a growing concern for Brussels, since after the failure of the Constitutional Treaty in 2005 there have been several expressions of popular mistrust in European institutions during the crisis, especially in the most economically affected member states.

Viorella Manolache introduces the dimension of political philosophy, in an attempt to create conditions for a further reflection and a deep understanding of the European malaise. According to her own commitment, the

author “seek(s) to identify and diagnose the ambiguities (and perhaps not as much the crises) of the contemporary European space, proposing a re-launching of the debate (with a clear politico-philosophical focus) on the subject and object of Europe and democracy”. One of her interesting findings looks fairly similar to the outcomes and conclusions of two other contributors (mainly Diana-Ionela Ancheș and partly Adrian-Gabriel Corpădean) and states that “while recent European reforms have failed to correct the democratic deficit, thus contributing to the consolidation of a European regulatory system, European citizens have been unable to give meaning to ‘civic commitment’ and find independent sources of political ‘input’ oriented towards the legitimization of free public deliberation”.

Democracy and domestic politics in major EU member states are essential ingredients of the political shape and behaviour of the European Union. Sergiu Mișcoiu and Ioana Hritcu propose a meaningful analysis of the French presidential campaign of 2012, with a focus on identity and societal security issues, which reveal another side of France. “By using the methodologies of discourse theory”, the two contributors explain, “we will try to investigate the ways in which [...] the association of themes such as immigration or identity with the topic of national security were reflected in the discourses and campaign strategies of the two contenders in the run-off elections and impacted on the decision-making processes of voters”. The switch from Sarkozy’s conservative government to Hollande’s socialist approaches was a key moment not only for France and French democracy, but also for European politics. The alternation of power in Paris has not yet generated economic and social satisfaction in the second largest economy of the Euro zone. On the contrary, President Hollande is the French head of state with the worst popular support after the first year in office. This new disappointment is one more reason for populists and radicals to point out that there are actually no effective “political solutions” to be picked from mainstream politics.

The EU’s perspectives in the medium term are obviously difficult to be anticipated, but the preliminary outcomes of some fundamental programmatic documents can reveal interesting aspects. Analysing the progress report of the *Europe 2020 Agenda*, Adrian-Gabriel Corpădean seems less optimistic than other authors. “At this point in time”, he writes, “we are most certainly entitled to state that the failure of the Lisbon Strategy is unquestionable, as albeit its key objectives were ambitious and summarised a course of action that Europe taken as a whole hoped to pursue, the entire framework lacked consistency and coordination”.

Looking beyond the frontiers of the European Union, we see strategic, political, cultural and technological changes reshaping the world we live in. The third set of contributions is an attempt to detect and understand some of

these dynamic processes. Democracy and human security therefore face a number of challenges, stemming from a new set of pressures and demands. Our contributors deal with the concept of national security, the present and future roles of NATO, urban insurgencies and ways to counteract, humanitarian intervention and human security, the impact of new information technology, the rise of political Islamism in the Middle East and Northern Africa after the “Arab spring” and the strategic partnership between the United States and Romania (with a focus on the project of the American anti-missile shield in Europe), in the context of present transatlantic relations.

NATO has obviously been for a long time the cornerstone of Western post-WWII order. The concept of “the West” in itself was defended and strengthened during the Cold War through the political, military and also symbolic North-Atlantic Alliance. Claudiu-Alexandru Bolcu proposes an analysis of NATO’s post-Cold War meaning and transformation. “By investigating NATO’s responses to the security challenges of the 20th and 21st century”, we foster the opportunity “to reveal that there is indeed a case for security and democracy as two complementary concepts, one being a sort of default condition for fulfilling the other”. Also, he asserts that “the success of implementing and maintaining either of the [concepts] is context-dependent, as well as actor-dependent (when it comes to both the agent delivering either security or democracy and the one receiving or implementing them).”

The foundation of NATO and the Western order essentially reflects the strategic transatlantic partnership. Although the United States and the European Union have not had the best decade in their long and successful relations, Bogdan Aurescu is rather optimistic. He definitely supports the establishment perspective, while his contribution emphasizes the classic (and hopefully long-lasting) approach of European and American common values and interests. “In a world strongly marked by globalization, by the proliferation of media communication and by the rise of new, asymmetric and transnational risks and challenges, the trans-Atlantic partnership will certainly remain the cornerstone of the global security architecture, a catalyst of global cooperation and a global stabilising factor.” One of the most appreciated Romanian high-ranking diplomats and specialists in international law, Aurescu, also believes that “the US–EU relations represent the strongest partnership in the international arena, an essentially strategic partnership, with the goal of interaction lying not only in common values such as peace, democracy and human rights, but also in economic compatibility and shared perspectives on local, regional and international security. The trans-Atlantic partnership must remain the fundamental point in the EU’s approach to the international system and the engine for the promotion of peace, stability and

democracy in the world, as well as one of the most effective instruments of asserting the Union's role as a global actor".

Octavian Manea presents his findings on several "mega-trends" of future security environments and insurgencies. He mentions the "empowerment of the individual" (with all possible consequences), along with "the dispersion, the diffusion and migration of power. It is not merely a geographical tendency, from the West to the rising East, from the Euro-Atlantic world to the Indo-Pacific region, but we are currently witnessing the slow-motion erosion of the traditional Westphalian state in favour of non-state actors (individuals, communities, cities and networks). This particular phenomenon has huge implications, from the perspective of the ability of states to respond and counteract future threats". An exciting interview with general David Petraeus gives more substance and empirical relevance to his contribution.

Two substantial contributions approach the current situation in the Middle East and Northern Africa after the Arab spring of 2011. Our Arab space experts, Marius Lazăr and Ecaterina Cepoi, bring their common view on Tunisia and Libya (with some references to Egypt), while Șerban Filip Cioculescu proposes a political, social and religious interpretation of the tragic Syrian civil war. The expectations with regard to the Syrian conflict are not optimistic, either in the short or in the long term. Dr Cioculescu believes that "certainly, there is a possibility that Syria will turn into a completely failed state like Somalia, where gangs and warlords control pieces of the territory and prevent the state from regaining full control. The division of Syria is another possible scenario, and it would create at least two small Syrian territories (two 'Syrias'): one populated by Sunnis and the other by Alawites, Shias, Druze, Christians etc." When we were preparing this book, the success of the U.N. experts in monitoring the destruction of Syrian chemical weapons (after the attack with Sarin gas against civilians in Damascus, in the summer of 2013) was not yet seen as certain.

Starting from the "transitology paradigm and its limits", Ecaterina Cepoi and Marius Lazăr affirm that "the future of Tunisia is still marked by uncertainty. *Ennahda*'s temptations to perpetuate its power by any means and the ambiguous relations that it maintains with the Salafi movement, which, although officially criticized, are often used for political or strategic purposes against rivals, call into question the compatibility of political Islam with real democracy, as a value of political governance". With regard to post-Qadhafi Libya, the two contributors believe that "the assimilation or dissolution of the numerous brigades and militias that have remained outside the new security structures, especially in the case of those that programmatically refuse to integrate into the new system, with some violently contesting it – like the jihadi groups, is one of the keys to Libya's recovery".

From a totally different perspective, with apparently no direct political connections, Rares Pateanu from the York University of Toronto provides a very accurate definition of the changes and new paradigms in information technology, with a significant impact on society and the transformation of day-to-day life. “In its less than 70-year-long history, computers and Information Technology have undoubtedly brought dramatic change to the world we live in, and with it, to just about every aspect of human interaction”, concludes Professor Pateanu in his overview of the most recent innovations in IT. For the overwhelming majority of us, IT is already an important ingredient of daily life and it can be considered part and parcel of ultimate human security, dealing with essential aspects like communication and planning, information, banking services, payments etc. These *soft changes* of the 21st century are in fact reshaping the way people live in different parts of the world, though they have nothing to do with war, military, hard security, alliances or high politics.

Concluding my introductory remarks, there is no unique answer or panacea for European malaise, the present crises or the structural threats haunting this changing, unpredictable world. Through various viewpoints, the contributors to this book approach certain aspects of the current transformations in strategy, politics and economy, according to their expertise. Less than a holistic prediction of the world of tomorrow, but more than a simple description of some structural changes in the realm of democracy and security, this volume offers an all-in picture of the main pressures, actors, interests, risks, but also opportunities which appear to change the global or regional order at the beginning of the twenty-first century.

Bibliography

- Anderson, Jeffrey, Ikenberry, G. John, and Risse, Thomas (editors), (2008), *The End of the West? Crisis and Change in the Atlantic Order*, Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.
- Barnett, Thomas P.M., (2009), *Great Powers: America and the World after Bush*, New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons.
- Department of Defense, (2012), *Sustaining U.S. Global Leadership: Priorities for 21st Century Defense*, Washington D.C.
- Kissinger, Henry, (2001), *Does America Need a Foreign Policy?: Toward a Diplomacy for the 21st Century*, New York: Simon & Schuster Paperback.
- Kopstein, Jeffrey, and Steinmo, Sven (editors), (2008), *Growing Apart?: America and Europe in the Twenty-First Century*, New York and London: Cambridge University Press.

- Lee, Kuan Yew, (2010), "Battle for preeminence", *Forbes*,
<http://www.forbes.com/forbes/2010/1011/rich-list-10-opinions-lee-kuan-yew-current-events-preeminence.html> consulted on February 26, 2013.
- Naumescu, Valentin, (2012), "From the Atlantic Order to the Pacific Pre-Eminence: A Historical Shift?", in *Studia Universitatis Babeş-Bolyai / Studia Europaea*, issue no. 2/2012, Cluj-Napoca: Cluj University Press, 67-82.
- Schmitz, Gregor Peter, (2013), "Global Leadership Vacuum: Europe incapable, America unwilling", *Der Spiegel*, February 1, 2013,
<http://www.spiegel.de/international/world/the-global-leadership-vacuum-europe-incapable-america-unwilling-a-880945.html>, consulted on July 29, 2013.
- Spengler, Oswald, (1991), *The Decline of the West*, Ed. Arthur Helps, and Helmut Werner, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Wendt, Alexander, (2011), *Teoria socială a politicii internationale (Social Theory of International Politics)*, Iaşi and Bucharest: Polirom.
- Zakaria, Fareed, (2009), *Lumea post americană (The Post-American World)*, Iaşi and Bucharest: Polirom.

CHAPTER ONE

BEFORE THE COLD WAR: A HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE, PRESENT CONNECTIONS

**“BEHIND THE CLOSED DOORS”:
THE MYTH OF THE ANGLO-SOVIET
PERCENTAGES BARGAIN (OCTOBER 1944).
A RE-EVALUATION AND
CONTEMPORARY MEANINGS**

LUCIAN LEUȘTEAN

Abstract

The Moscow meeting between Winston Churchill and Joseph Stalin in October 1944 is certainly best known for the existence of an apparent agreement to a percentage table covering some countries of South-Eastern Europe. This table became part of the accepted mythology of Allied secret wartime diplomacy. Following Churchill's hint in his book *The Second World War*, most historians and analysts explained the deal as a cynical bargain that settled down the fate for hundreds of millions of people. Although there have been some voices contesting allusively or vehemently such an explanation, the myth has survived almost untouched. I am trying once again to challenge this interpretation and my endeavour is based not necessarily on new evidence but on the refined and logical meanings of the events. Last but not least it is an honest attempt to find out some contemporary meanings for British-Soviet arrangements from October 1944.

Keywords

Churchill, Stalin, percentages agreement, world war II, Balkans, myth.

The facts

By the end of World War II, at the beginning of October 1944, when the eastern front was, for several weeks already, in collapse, and the Nazi Germany's allies were signing, one by one, the armistices with the