Speak softly and carry a big stick
- Europe in need of hard-liners
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1. Introduction

When Frederick Jackson Turner published his "Frontier Thesis" in 1893 he stated that the American Frontier was closed, and it was President Teddy Roosevelt about a decade later that he took it a step further, and lead America closer to the global stage. The EU is in a similar situation at the moment, with the opening towards the East, this frontier seems to be closed for some time. Just as Teddy Roosevelt had to look for new frontiers (by establishing his "Open Door Policy"), and made sure that the economic and political power of the USA at the turn of the century was turned into worldwide influence, the EU has to make sure, that just like 100 years ago, the EU, just like the USA then, gains more influence. The situation is in that far similar, because the the European "frontier" is also closed, because it is more then doubtful at the moment, that new members will be accepted. Even if Bulgaria and Rumania do have set dates, these can still be pushed back. Not to mention countries like Ukraine, or the Balkans for which it seems nearly impossible at the moment to even start negotiations. Now it s time to look for new frontiers, and to define the new role the EU wants to play in the years to come on the global stage.

Why is it that the largest free trade zone, and strongest economic power in the world is been marginalized constantly? No matter where one looks, the EU does not seem to fulfill it s role sufficiently, according to it s power. This paper is going to look at the new role the European Union has to play on a global level. On the one hand by applying Joseph Nye s Model of a "three dimensional chessboard", regarding in how far the burdens should be shared by the USA and the EU, and with regards to other players using the "TIT FOR TAT" strategy, put forward in Robert Axelrod s "The Evolution of Co-operation". This theory is going to be used as an approach in how to deal with the situation in Iran. If one combines these two models, one can achieve not only more secure world, but also makes it easier to

---

establish a sort of balance of power between the key players in the world. Also the EU not only needs to abandon its "Flower-Power" approach to threats, otherwise it will be hard to establish a reasonable credibility during negotiations, but also start speaking with one voice.

2.0 Theoretical Considerations

In order to lay a theoretical groundwork for this paper, two theories shall be explained in more detail. On the one hand this is the theory of the "three-dimensional chessboard" by Joseph S. Nye, on the other hand it will be the so called "TIT-FOT-TAT"-theory, which Robert Axelrod put forward. Nye’s model is a way to better describe the relationship between the EU and the USA, and in how far these two powers should be trying to divided different spheres of influence between them, it is mainly based on the book "Soft Power"ii, but is also explained elsewhere (see e.g. Ulrich Menzel Paradoxien einer neuen Weltordnungiii). Later on the "TIT-FOT-TAT"-theory is going to be explained, in order to come up with an approach how the EU should be dealing with so called "rogue states".

2.1 The Three-Dimensional Chessboard

Joseph S. Nye describes a model in which the three spheres of influence: the economic sphere, the military sphere, and the sphere of Soft-Power, dominate world politics. These three spheres, are the main coordinates with the realm of international relations. In Order for a country (or NGO, companies or any other global actor) to influence

---


certain developments within a country it has to use one of the three levels (one might also think of the practice in Europe, among other places, where Kings tried to establish influences, or ties by marrying their children to those of other leaders, but this model is no longer sufficient in a globalized world). Even though companies or NGO only have two spheres, the economic and Soft-Power sphere, in order to make their efforts bear fruit, it is very likely, that, especially in any actions within a "rogue state" are closely with cooperation with the native country of these organizations (the example of the Italian Hostages comes to mind, where the Italian government intervened heavily, in order to rescue their citizens). The model Nye suggests is one of a chessboard with three dimensions (or three levels)\textsuperscript{iv}. Each level representing one of the three levels of influence. In order to move a figure on the economic level, one has to take into account the two other levels as well, since they are closely interdependent. It is impossible, to establish schools, which would fall under the sphere of soft-power, without the supply of books, and training of teachers (economic sphere). The same is true if a country intervenes militarily in a country, depending on the majority of the people in this country, the opinion of the intervening country is very likely to change (obviously the opposite is true as well, if human intervention is denied, a former favorably view is very likely to change to a negative one, as happened in the Balkans, towards the Europeans). In the relations between the EU and the USA the sphere of soft-power can be put aside, because even if the British Historian Jundt claims that the close ties between Europe and the USA is only a error in the history which is due to Pearl Harbor\textsuperscript{v}, Europe as well as the USA have a somewhat similar understanding of civil society, and democracy, and even their culture is not all that different. The two remaining spheres, the economic and military sphere, should be divided up between the two. Clearly the military sphere should be "controlled" by the USA, although:"there has been a

\textsuperscript{iv} Nye p. 25ff

\textsuperscript{v} Kreye, Andrian: \textit{Kampf der Modelle} in SZ 07.12.2005
marked consolidation of the defense industry and a visible increase in intro-european collaboration\textsuperscript{vi}, which leads to a certain attractiveness of European military goods. The economic sphere on the other hand should be the sphere of the EU, since its military capabilities not only are far smaller then the ones of the USA, but the economic power of the EU is greater then the one of the USA.

\textbf{2.2 TIT-FOR-TAT, Game Theory}

The so called "TIT-FOR-TAT"-theory is described a length in Axelrod s book, this paper is only going to focus on the part, which can be applied to the international relations. The theory was developed for a game called \textit{Prisoner s Dilemma}. The dilemma is as follows\textsuperscript{vii}, two prisoners are being interrogated separately, without knowing what the other is saying. They can either cooperate with the interrogator, or remain silent, (cooperate or defect). It's a dilemma, since it's not known how the other is reacting, hence its impossible to see whether it pays of to cooperate or defect. Axelrod created a tournament where experts in different fields where asked to submit computer programs in order to compete. In the first round 6 entries competed, and the simplest of all, TIT-FOR-TAT, won. After analyzing these results, and making them public, he send out invitations to another tournament, this time 68 people submitted their programs. Even though the results of the former round where publicized and everybody could have also send in a" TIT-FOR-TAT", nobody but the original creator did so, and to everybody's surprise it won again.

So what the did the " TIT-FOR-TAT"-program do? At first it started out with cooperation, and from than-on would react to the opponent. This means if the opponent defected, " TIT-FOR-TAT" would defect in the next round, and if the opponent cooperated " TIT-FOR-TAT"

\textsuperscript{vi} Jones, Seth G.& Larrabee Stephen F. \textit{Arming Europe} in The National Interest Winter 2005/06
\textsuperscript{vii} Axelrod p 7ff.
would also cooperate. Even programs submitted in the second round, which were based upon "TIT-FOR-TAT" (such as "TWO-TITS-FOR-TAT", which cooperated twice before defecting) did not do as well as the original. A pattern could be seen though, out of the best 8 ranked programs 7 were nice (meaning cooperating), and out of the last 15 only one was nice. Hence it payed out to cooperate, it just depends on the amount, and again "TIT-FOR-TAT" did the best. (For a more detailed description of the tournament look at Axelrod P. 27ff, respective for the results 192).

3.0 Application of the Theories

In the following two parts these two theories are going to be applied to the sphere of international relations. While on the one hand Nye’s model is going to explain the relationship between the two major players on the political sphere: the EU and the USA, the second part is going to deal with in how far "TIT-FOR-TAT" can function as a sort of guideline for the EU with dealing with the situation in Iran, and its nuclear power program.

3.1 EU-USA Relations (Nye)

There have been numerous descriptions of in how far the new relationship of Europe and the USA have developed. After the "end of history" viii not only the EU needs to find its role on the world stage but also the USA. True the USA has become the "lonely superpower" it has to chose a way of dealing with it accordingly. As the events of the post-war-Iraq have shown, the USA are no longer capable of unilaterist actions, and need support of allies. This can be accomplished by a "coalition of the willing", but by doing so the USA have to look for new partners all the time, since allies and interests shift constantly.

viii Francis Fukuyamas famous description of the new world order after the collapse of the Cold War, and in how far that was the end of History see: Fukuyama, Francis. The end of history and the last man New York 1992
Therefore it would be in the USA's interest to look for a partner who not only has the same cultural background, but is also mostly christian dominated. The new role of the EU on the other hand cannot be as an opposition to the USA either. For one, the EU is at the present moment too weak to defend itself much less establish peace in other parts of the world or even has the capabilities for any humanitarian interventions (the so called "battle groups" are not nearly being able to be deployed for action). One does not need to go as far as Robert Kagan, who claimed that "...the real division of labor consisted of the United States "making dinner" and the Europeans "doing the dishes" ix. This is not the role the EU should be going to play (or is very likely to play either). It would be not only a waste of resources, but as Kagan points out correctly Europeans have more experience then the USA with governing the world, since they did it for the better part of the last centuries x. So there has to be a cooperation between the two Western Powers. Because even though "that may not be easy to achieve, given divergent American and European perspectives, but the benefits of cooperation outweigh the cost of any compromise" xi. Here comes the "three-dimensional chessboard" of Joseph S. Nye into play. The third level, the one of soft power can be neglected for the moment in this description, since most of the cultural products of the USA and the EU tend to be rather similar. If one looks at the connection between television channels such as MTV or others, the development of shows such as "Big Brother" xii (or other reality shows for that matter) clearly indicated the close cultural relations between the two continents. This leaves one with two spheres, the sphere of economics and military. It is true, as said by Kagan and others, that the EU is not very likely to catch up with the USA's defense budget (if ever), but it is also true that it needs to be im-


x Kagan 114

xi Zbigniew Brzezinski The choice : global domination or global leadership New York : Basic Books, c2004

xii which originated in the Netherlands before it made its success all around the world
proved in order for the EU to be a reasonable partner in negotiations. Hence the sphere of the military should be taken on by the USA for the time to come until the EU can also fulfill that role. The EU should focus more one the economic level, the second sphere of Nye’s model, the EU has not only an unmatched economic power, but it is also seen as a more “peaceful” partner by many countries around the globe. The USA does not have the same means of accomplishing its goals. The EU can offer trade relations in order to convince countries to promote democracy, it can also, to those within geographical reach, extend the prospect of membership, or privileged membership status\textsuperscript{xiii}. These are options which the Constitution of the EU has within its powers (if it gets ratified within the future), and which are not open to the USA. The USA does have these options as well, but here is again where reputation comes in, the EU is seen as a much more reliable, and peaceful partner, as the recent talks in South America have shown.

3.2 The EU3-Iran Talks

This section is going to focus on the situation in Iran, but other scenarios (such as North Korea, China or Iraq, to name only a few other, could be described, but Iran always has been a European Issue\textsuperscript{xiv}). After Mahmoud Ahmadinejad got elected, European talks with Iran seemed to go nowhere, since nobody really knows what the president was up to. Recently, the situation has become even worse, with de Villepin becoming the new Prime Minister, and the German Foreign Minister Joschka Fischer not being reelected, the EU3-Talks\textsuperscript{xv} are in a deadlock. There is no-one within Europe who is either willing, or has the

\textsuperscript{xiii} something which the Right in the EU has suggested to apply to Turkey if Turkey does not improve on its humanitarian standards. A ”privileged membership” opposed to full membership consists of the part taking in defense tactics, trade relations and so on, it does not entitle however to financial support, or voting rights.

\textsuperscript{xiv} Kissinger, Henry / Diplomacy P.523ff New York : Simon & Schuster, c1994

\textsuperscript{xv} EU3 meaning the United Kingdom, Germany and France; and the new foreign minister of Germany, Walter Steinmayer, was facing serious problems not too long into his turn, after information surfaced of his involvement, or that of the former chancellor, in the war in Iraq. The situation in France and England are some-
authority to voice Europe’s concerns. While Mahmoud Ahmadinejad might just do "re-forms" on the inside, he might also try to make his mark towards the US by working closer with the EU. That is where Europe’s big chances lie. In many muslim counties the USA are seen as "Satan" or "evil". Whereas Europe still seems to have a somewhat positive image, since it’s not perceived as the bully. But the recent remarks by Mahmoud Ahmadinejad on Israel and the West clearly indicated that he is not going to play it easy. But it’s especially of the past of these countries that they need to make every effort to make things better. It is not about widen the EU’s sphere of influence, but to secure this world. If one is to apply the "TIT-FOR-TAT" theory on this dilemma, there seem to be more solutions to the problem. First one has to look at the situation, Iran was constantly threatening to start up its enriching program once again, and it finally did. Whether that’s due to distract from a weak performance of the new president (it took 4 elections in order to vote for a new Oil-Secretary) or whether this is all part of a new anti-western islamist rhetoric needs to be seen. It is obvious, that this is not only part of a new level of confrontation, but it also reflects a new self-confidence, and a seemingly independence towards the West. Part of it is, that the new administration fears that Iran might be next to be attacked, but this is a fear not very fell founded, since the USA has reached its "imperial over-stretch", hence another unilaterist police action on the part of the USA is very unlikely (even more so, since it is doubtful in how far the few remaining European allies will stay at the US’s side, and Iran is not going to join the USA on such a mission any time soon).

In this particular scenario only the EU3, or the EU for that matter, can negotiate. In many middle-eastern countries the USA are seen as either "evil" or "satan". But this is exactly where the chance of the EU lies. If one takes the model of "TIT-FOR-TAT", and es-

---

xvi They were responsible for many wars in the area, and in how far it can pay out to exploit one’s "anti-americaness" showed the election results in Iran, since the president is known for his part in the revolution of 1979.
tablishes a framework within there lay reasons for cooperation on the part Iran, and more so reasons of cooperation on the EU-side. The bottom line on the EU side is, to prevent Iran from creating its own nuclear warheads, so what can be done in order to achieve that, what kind of incentives can be found to make Iran agree. Going with the model described, the EU3 should offer the Iranian government cooperation on the development of civil reactors, or as the russian government has done, offer to enrich the nuclear material for Iran\textsuperscript{xvi}. In any event the EU has to establish a credibility in order to be accepted as a negotiating partner, and taken serious by Iran. It is in any event absolutely necessary that the EU is moving away from its so far practiced "Flower-Power" attitude\textsuperscript{xvii}. This is again where credibility comes in, not only regarding the country one is dealing with, but it also affects the reputation of the EU. In a globalized world, dominated by mass media, where any even is transported in real time to any place on this globe "...the stakes of the current situation expand from those immediately at hand to encompass he influence of the current choice on the reputation of the players"\textsuperscript{xix}. The conflict in Iran is not going to be the last in a long line of conflicts. The reputation which the EU is now building for itself is crucial for future situations \textsuperscript{xx}.

4.0 Outlook/Conclusion

Looking at the recent developments, not only in Iran, it is clear that there needs to be something done, in order to secure the region in the middle East. It is crucial to demon-

\textsuperscript{xvii} of course it is doubtful in how far this offer was completely altruistic, after Russia and Iran signed an arms deal over defense missiles

\textsuperscript{xviii} even though this seems to be a problem being immanent the EU, if one only thinks of the so called "Blue Letters" warning countries again and again of their violation of the deficit

\textsuperscript{xix} Axelrod 151

\textsuperscript{xx} even though far stretched it is interesting to notice that the citizens of those countries are more likely to be kidnapped, in which the governments tend to negotiate, and eventually pay the terrorists
strate some power. It is the responsibility of the rich, developed countries of the World to stand up to the problems of the world, and not to leave them alone, only because it seems to be helpful to domestic problems to be in opposition to the US, as it seems to be the case so often in the EU. If one takes Germany for example, especially because what it has been through, it should be a setting an example to new members of the EU, when it comes to defending, and establishing democracies. It has to stand up, and say "look at us: we ve been the worst dictatorship in world, but now look where we are". It cannot always wait for the father US to fight the wars, and protect it. It needs to emancipate itself. It cannot hide behind a comfortable pacifistic view. It has been proven in the past that that s not a secure point to be.

The war in Iraq divided Europe enough, and recent developments should be taken as an opportunity for a new beginning. The failed referendums on the European Constitution in France and the Netherlands should be taken as a chance to change the position. The failed referendums were a sign that the people of Europe aren t ready yet for fundamental changes. It has only been a year since the European Union expanded to 25 members, it came as no surprise that this new challenge would not work out. The people of Europe have to be given a chance of adapting to thee new idea of Europe. "The European Dream", as it s been called is not even in the making, as of now it s a nightmare. While Europe is going through a metamorphosis and thinking about its place on the world s stage, it should think about the potentials lying within itself. It is the world s largest free trade zone. Europe needs to become aware of its own power, which clearly is not military but economic power. But to exercise this power, and to be taken seriously by other countries outside the EU, it needs not only to speak with one voice, but also with a strong one.

---

xxi obviously not as Jacques Chirac did, when he declared that France might use his atomic weapons

xxii to only name the Bombings in Madrid and London, not to mention that most terrorists of 9/11 had been living in Germany

It needs to establish itself as an alternative, not an opposition, to the US. If Iran, doesn’t want to work with the US, the EU needs to be there, and offer its help or advice as a mediator. The US can threaten countries with its sheer military dominance, but the EU needs to put pressure on “dangerous” countries economically.

There needs to be a “one voice” policy from the EU. The war in Iraq was a prime example of how US interests interfered with the interests of the EU. Instead of speaking with an united front, “old” and “new” Europe emerged. This development was not only not helpful to the interests of the EU, but unnecessary. It would have been more helpful, even to the "opposing" countries, to support the UK and US (and the other allies). In times where terrorism seems to be on every agenda, it’s dangerous to be portrayed not as one front. If the West is disunited among itself how is it supposed to set an example to the developing democracies around the globe? It is to hope that the new chancellor in Germany will have a different approach to its own, and EU’s interests. Even though the individual interests of the single European countries need to be addressed, the big picture needs to be kept in mind as well.

Europe needs to speak with one voice, and not only become a power within the world, but send a message out to those who threaten national security at home. Europe needs to get rid of its “flower power” attitude towards problems, and actually execute its powers. It doesn’t need to be militarily, but if it would cut back on trade with those troubled spots, leaders in those countries would acknowledge the power behind Europe. But as long as Europe speaks with more then one voice, and even worse, contrary voices, it's a free-for-all for friends and foes. Friends, because they know they cannot rely on Europe anyhow, because things need to be talked about first, and foes because nothing ever follows from Europe’s threats. If one only says he is going to punish somebody but never will, it will be-
come a joke. Europe can do much more then peacekeeping. It needs to step up to the plate and take its responsibility.
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