

WORLD PEACE
(DURING THE 70 YEARS OF NATO)

ADRIANO MOREIRA

President of the Institute for Higher Studies
of the Academy of Sciences of Lisbon
Emeritus Professor
of the Technical University of Lisbon

The twentieth century had, in the two wars that were called world wars, the two events that warned of the drift towards the Western Autumn, with no reliable compass, in which we are. In both cases, whether in the conflict of 1914-1918, or in the conflict of 1939-1945, the United States of America was decisive for victory, but it should not be forgotten that, in the texts of the final Treaties, there is the distinction between allies and associates. The United States has assumed this last identification. However, in both wars, where its intervention was decisive for victory, also in both cases the USA was decisive for the change on the political structure of Europe, accompanied by the then enforced definition of the West. In fact, it was President Woodrow Wilson, moderating Clemenceau's rigours, who established the "National State" model as an essential element of

the European unity, extinguishing the Empires: the German, the Austro-Hungarian, the Turkish and the Russian empires, for the USA, finally, not to join the League of Nations. This definition did not erase the European memory of the “*belle époque*”, which, as Jacques Barzun notes, “is due to the great artistic successes of the Cubist Decade and to the extraordinary spirits who promoted social reform and forced a political upheaval that shaped the current concept of State to the whole West”: in his remark he includes Wells, Chesterton, Belloc, and Shaw. But the so-called “turnaround” in European political headquarters did not extinguish, after the peace of the 1914-1918 war, the European fact of “*La main mise sur le monde*”, which the famous Raymond Aron diagnosed in the following way: “the political impulse seems stronger than the economic motivations. The ambition of grandeur and glory animating governments weighs more on the course of events than the more or less camouflaged influence of corporations”. Anatole France was preaching in the desert when, as early as 1905, he was already demonstrating against what he called “*la folie coloniale*”. Europe seemed to treat its Euromundist Colonial Empire as destined to be ignored by the history of the future, and moved to deepen democracy, but at the same time failed to prevent the growth of authoritarian regimes: with Horthy in Hungary (1920), Riviera in Spain, and Mustafa Kemal in Turkey (1923), Pilsudski in Poland (1926), Salazar in

Portugal (1928). The crisis of the 1930s shook the dream of the return to normal life, it hit Europe deeply and its evolution towards democracy, with the exception of France and the United Kingdom, approaching the totalitarian tragedy: Hitler's Nazi Germany (30th of January of 1936), in a context in which gained notoriety General Metachas in Greece (1936), Colonel Beck in Poland (1935), Dolfuss in Austria (1933), and, on the Portuguese peninsular border, the Civil War in Spain, with the Armed Forces headed by General Franco, which lasted from 1936 to 1939, as a preface to the approaching World War. The efforts that Aristide Briand made in France, and Gustave Streseman for Germany, had taken to consecrate Peace by the Treaty of Locarno, in which Germany accepted the frontier of 1918, was a shadow that reduced the visibility of Hitler's revisionism, that led to the tragedy of 1939-1945. Once again, the USA, after being treacherously attacked by the Japanese at Pearl Harbor, and having already signed the Atlantic Charter with Churchill in August 1941 came, by decision of President Roosevelt, to help to win the war, and for the second time in one century, to shape the world governance project with the creation of the United Nations, and putting an end in the legitimacy of the Euromundist Colonial Empire, recalling the warning made by Anatole France. The victory against Hitler's Nazism awakened the threat of the former Soviet ally, first of Hitler and later of the Westerners, with the project of subverting European

Utopia of the “first world” and the “common house of men”. This time, only a balance of “halves” was achieved, with two Europes, two Germanies, two cities of Berlin, and the wars that multiplied in the undoing of the Euromundist Colonial Empire, in which Portugal had its share. The newspaper *Le Combat*, dated May 8, 1945, referred to peace in these terms: “this immense joy covered with tears”. Tears were caused by the monstrous review of the disaster which included, in Europe alone, 30 million deaths, the destruction of cities, entire neighbourhoods that disappeared in London, the misery of the living ones, though rapidly growing the hope for a new future that would overcome despair. The chapter that began would have to include a long introduction that was called “Cold War”. Before the end of the war, at the Conferences of Tehran (November 1943) and Yalta (February 1945), Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin had sought to find an agreement on the future of the world and, first of all, of Europe, but the ambitions of the Soviet Union led them to ask Churchill, though already defeated in the UK elections, to call the Europeans of Democracy to recognize that the Soviets, in all the countries their troops had occupied – Poland, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Hungary, Romania, Yugoslavia, Albania – had taken over. The words on March 5, 1946, were these: “From Stettin on the Baltic to Trieste on the Adriatic, an iron curtain fell on the Continent”. On this date of the democratic weakness of Europe, the United States assumed that in

the larger unity, the West, of which they were the youngest and strongest part, required a decisive intervention of reconstruction and authenticity, in view of the principles which they inscribed in the Charter of the United Nations, and which concerned all the peoples of Earth. As early as March 12, 1947, President Truman launched the general appeal to “contain Communism”, and on June 5, General Marshall announced financial aid to all European countries, a challenge to which Andrei Zhdanov in September, replied that the world was divided into “two irreconcilable blocks”. The project of Westernization of the world, which Portugal had initiated, and which the UN Charter had transformed into a project that, in Mandela’s later words, would be a “Rainbow” of harmony, was now in suspense, asking the historians if “the European era had come to the end”. The remarkable generation of Western Statesmen, who faced the unprecedented historical crisis, developed a security project, translated into the organization of the North Atlantic Treaty, unleashed a process of recovery of war-ruined States that would be sown with the so-called miracles, while the “Soviet space” sank inwardly, until the fall of the “iron curtain” that Churchill had denounced. Four years had passed since Hitler’s suicide (1945), when 1949 was marked by fundamental facts: the signing of the Atlantic Pact on 4 April, the creation of the German Federal Republic on May 23, Mao Zedong founded the Republic People’s Republic of China, and on October 7 the creation of the German

Democratic Republic is announced. Today we can recognize that it was “security” that allowed the recovery of every Western state that the war had destroyed and that the Soviet project threatened; and at the same time made Europeans understand that the “European unity” that for a century had seemed a “political utopia” was the method that could put an end to the long history of internal conflicts. The North Atlantic Treaty, which is a military alliance, commonly known as NATO, was signed on April 4, 1949, and Article 5 defined that its members support any member subject to an armed attack. Curiously, historians fix the consolidation of the Alliance, under USA leadership, with the challenge of the Korean War and then the rivalry of the Warsaw Pact signed in 1955. It cannot be ignored that the relationship, tending to a hierarchical relationship, between Europeans and the USA, has sometimes been in doubt regarding the Alliance’s ability to successfully respond to a Soviet invasion, being relevant the French concern that has led to its attempt for nuclear autonomy and withdrawal from NATO for some time in De Gaulle’s period. The historical fact is that security was the basic and fundamental value with which the solidarity of the 29 European and American Members prevented the realization of the nightmare of the swift march of the Soviets to the English Channel. Meantime giving reason to the concept of François Jacob, according to which “nobody can guess the path that History draws”. Nothing is definitely

“played/thrown”, Europe politically crushed and economically destroyed by war, under the inspiration of Jean Monnet, well acquainted with the failed past projects of European unity, and the authority of the Christian Democratic leaders, Robert Schuman for France, Konrad Adenauer for Germany, and Gasperi for Italy, with the safe support of the USA, conducted to the so-called “German miracle”, to the “Italian miracle”, and, as the French prefer to say, to the “trente Glorieuses” years of continuous growth from 1945 until the oil shock of 1973, and the beginning of the great world crisis. The militaries, who supported the security strategy that allowed the miracles, should feel rewarded, and Westerners grateful, with the redefinition of their function after the fall of the Berlin Wall, and the collapse of the Eastern Bloc in 1980, that we can consider assumed by the creation of the NATO Council – Russia, after the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, all on an equal position. But because life, as Ortega had taught, is “anticipation and project”, the circumstance of our time challenges the redefinition of the function, if any, of NATO to respond to the changed circumstance. It is no longer a question of Sovietism that died from internal events in which NATO participated, mainly because it existed, in the fullest sense of the word. But the current circumstance led Samuel Huntington, a Pentagon Advisor, to predict that (1993) the foreign policy paradigm would now be “The Clash of Civilizations”, and that Hans Küng, the organizer of the

Foundation for World Ethics, proposed to correct in the sense that “there is no world peace without religious peace”. Therefore, deeply devoted to the study of the three major religions – Christianity, Judaism, and Islam – he summarized: “There is no peace between nations without peace between religions. There is no dialogue between religions without basic research among religions”. It does not seem that there is a contradiction between the conclusion of the scholar and statesman Huntington and that of Professor Father Küng, unless one does not admit that religion is a fundamental part of differentiated cultural conceptions. And this date, when Sovietism is on the western lands more replaced by populisms, the most disturbing of these are those led by “eucrats” already in power, or in search of it, and even suddenly Iran tends to be identified as “the other” that occupies part of the void opened by the fall of sovietism. Other challenging emergencies are lining up, including China’s ambition to regain sovereignty in waters that have for centuries ceased to navigate, the new Russia wanting to enforce a frontier of interests broader than the geographical frontier, or, to be brief, the old call “third world” multiplying aggressive attitudes. Until the fall of sovietism, Portugal was always a loyal member of NATO, invited by the United States and the United Kingdom, mainly for the *functional power* derived from the Azores, with no impediment by the regime, quoting therefore a commentary (January 1951) by General Eisenhower, which would be as

follows: “Of all the European statesmen with whom I spoke, Salazar seemed to me the most lucid and advised”. The management of relations with the USA was prudent and accurate, the care not to forget that the Peninsula had two States was observed, and Portugal successfully participated in the missions that were broadening the international projection of NATO, and responded with honour, supported by its Armed Forces, to the requirements of the Strategic Concept approved in 2010 in Lisbon: collective defense, crisis management, and cooperative security¹.

It turns out that on this date of the celebration of NATO’s 70th anniversary, the circumstance (a variable whose identification marked Ortega’s thinking) forces serious meditation on the response that the Western reality, with the value of Atlanticism connecting the European Union and the USA parcels in the North Atlantic, will give to the change of challenges, which NATO cannot omit. Firstly, the internal issues of the European Union to which the NATO Security Cordon has given viability. In the first place, the strategic concept of the Union, if any, when the party framework, expressed by the European Parliament, has a complexity that makes us forget the ideological definition of the foundation, without revealing, until now, statesmen of the stature of the founders. While it

¹ See the summary of “*Portugal e a NATO – Breve ponto da situação*” / “*Portugal and NATO – Brief situation*” by Lieutenant-Colonel José Brandão Ferreira, in the Military Magazine “*Revista Militar*” n. 2607, April 2019.

cannot be ignored that Parliament is the only elected body, it is enough to think that in France, in the election of May 29, thirty-four lists have appeared to nominate 79 Members of the European Parliament – MEPs, of the 751 who will be in Strasbourg, if the United Kingdom also attend. In this pluralism, the phenomenon of “populism” stands out, in search of the “true people”, notably the European Group of Nations and Freedoms (ENF), the limitation of freedoms in Austria, Belgium’s Vlaams Beling, Italy’s League, the real Finnish, the Polish right wing Law and Justice Party (PiS), the Eucraties of the so-called UKIP (UK Independence Party), the German longing for National Socialism, and, without exhausting the enumeration, the party of Jean-Marie Le Pen, at a time when the authority of the Chancellor of Germany weakens, and the fleeting prestige of President Macron is disappearing. Jérôme Fouquet concludes that “today everyone fights for a different Europe, transformed from the interior. But among the main candidates no one ever proposes the federal leap... they all talk about ecology and they all want a Europe that protects, a more social Europe”. The deep lines of cleavage are reduced, we have before us some fifty varieties of grey. Among us, the serene and insightful observer Viriato Soromenho-Marques (*Depois da Queda, a União Europeia entre o reerguer e a fragmentação /After the Fall, the European Union between the uprising and the fragmentation*, 2019) concludes: “I insist, the EU is on the verge of a decline to where it will slip if the

present course is not changed, thus resulting in a fragmentation of negative consequences, unforeseeable, but certainly with enormous impact, not only for the old Continent, but for the global order”.

It turns out that the new circumstance internally revealed a set of challenges that no European State could face alone – the environment, migrations, the economic and financial crisis, the euro favoring the Directory model insecurely assumed by the French-German collaboration, the multiplication of populism, the disorderly Brexit of the United Kingdom –, and the mismatch between Western democracies with half a century of testing the co-operative method, in the face of States coming from the Soviet collapse with a half-century struggle to regain sovereignty – all with the consequence of widespread feeling of the need for political reform, but without clarity of projects beyond the semantic protection of the possible meanings of Federalism or the reinvented Union. But, as if rethinking the environment that surrounded the beginning of the Union, the radical change in the security issues. It is when the facts demand to take up the challenge of security in the South Atlantic, which gives prominence to the “Portuguese Strategic Triangle”, that the attack on the Twin Towers in New York (2001) showed that the progress of science and technology allow the *weak* to hit the *strong*, that populist system invades the American political system in

the line of “betrayal of elites”, which has led the journalist Sylvain Cypel to consider “trumpism” as a “paranoid style” for having changed the American historical concept that “the United States is the largest Nation in the World”, by the version of “exceptionality” of USA, and, let us add, the President’s personal conviction of his exceptional historical importance. His interventions – Israel, North Korea, Iran, Treaty of Paris, NATO funding, preaching intervention in the United Kingdom, show that the value of “Atlanticism” in the whole “West” tends to be lessened by the resurgence of the old American concept that the march towards the Pacific is the manifest destiny of the Nation.

Following the annexation of Crimea by Russia in 2014 and its ambitions on Ukraine, the values, principles and objectives agreed in 1997 by the NATO-Russia Founding Act and the Rome Declaration of 2002 were affected: it is mutual the accusation of expansionist ambition, giving Russia special prominence to the intervention in its claimed waiting for influence, notably the fact that Europeans take the perspective of integrating Ukraine and Georgia, as well as Western interventions in Kosovo, Iraq and Libya.

In short, if Trump prefers to deal with the plurality of European States in isolation, the Soviet Union does not appreciate that the former space of its half

Europe has been integrated into the Union. The circumstance tends to project a competing triangle image, China, Russia and USA. In this image the Union seems to prioritize economic issues, neglecting to ascertain and assume a geostrategic role. Security is once again challenged to ensure, first of all, reasonable immunity regarding the effects of competition in the USA-Russia-China triangle, and gain enough respectability to have a voice in the renewal of world governance, to avoid the catastrophe that will be the bankruptcy of the replacement of *hard power* that uses the populism of Trump, the *soft power* that Obama tried, and the *smart power* that Mrs. Clinton could not use. The circumstance that made it possible to organize the security indispensable to the recovery after World War II implied a recovery of the political structure, and to put the tonic emphasis on the economy. Changing the situation now requires geopolitics to intervene, at least, in order to tackle the challenges that, as I have said, no single European country can face in isolation. And so it lucidly began to include in NATO's 70th anniversary the enumeration of the strategic challenges of the new circumstance. The content of the recent election to the European Parliament showed that the internal problems of States were more present than those of European interdependence. What calls for attention is the weakening of the spirit of the founders, who responded with the people to Churchill's call: "Europe to rise". The disaster of the war, and the Soviet threat, made it possible

to organize security, and to establish a solidary concept of the West, with Atlantism cementing the effort. On this date, the multi-polar competition requires not only military security, but to strengthen the concept in order to respond to the policies of the Triangle in competition, USA, China and Russia, each showing that European Union's secondary importance is convenient to them. Proving that leaving the Union is difficult, is demonstrated by the Brexit of the United Kingdom, and that weakening internal solidarity by appealing to the memory of the past of unrepeatable sovereignties, or to the populisms of an imagined future delivered or received from the "true people", was visible: this is not really a formulation of a new political regime, but a crisis. A crisis in which the most unexpected factor is that of the "trumpist" populism that affects Western solidarity and sows global risks. Not recognizing that the "crisis" has an outer component, to which the United States does not escape, which is the reaction against globalism of the secular westernization of the world, with the passive that in the USA covers the liquidation of natives in which the Iroquois stand out, with the submission of the former colonial area to extractive regimes, to ethnic, cultural, and religious discrimination; to wars of liberation. This includes the importance of the conflict with Islam, so deeply studied by Hans Küng, the organizer of the World Ethics Foundation, to avoid the prediction of Huntington (1993), in foreseeing "The Clash of Civilizations", with religious

values inscribed in the terrorist methodology. The crisis of circumstance has led to discuss the circumstance of a European Spirit. It is a matter of urgency if the spirit of NATO, which has safeguarded the space of the restoration of Europe, is not defended and reinforced, which implies correcting the misuse of American leadership: it is the fidelity until today to the Utopia of the UN, that demands to secure “a single world”, that is, without wars, and “the common homeland of men”.

Catholic University – Estoril

25/06/2019