

## **Mars and Venus Revisited: Lessons and Perspectives for Transatlantic Dialogue, CSIS**

Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen,

I am delighted to speak on the occasion of the 10th anniversary of the US-Baltic Charter at the Centre for Strategic and International Studies, which, due to the intellectual contribution of its scientific and political authorities not only carries out extensive research and offers political insights, but also comes up with global visions and specific solutions for the today's world that faces challenges and as well as opportunities. Today I would like to speak about the US-European relations and the position of Lithuania – a small, yet dynamic country in the Baltoscandic Region of Northern Europe. First, I am going to discuss the importance of interests and values in the international politics, then I will speak about the US-European security community and the challenges that it faces.

For a long time, especially during the Cold War years, it used to be widely believed that power and national interest counted most in the international relations. However, we have recently witnessed new developments in the international agenda and become aware of the fact that such new factors as norms, values, identity, and culture play not a lesser part in world politics. I believe that interests and values in politics are two sides of the same coin. It is very often that values and identity have a great impact on our interests. And values must guide us in politics as well, because they are inseparable from our identity, interests, and finally actions. That, which we believe in, what we cherish, and what guides us in our life, that is our true identity. I am convinced that there must not be a place for double standards, because uncompromising pursuit of benefit, not only the political one, buries values. Therefore, cherishing of ideals and the importance of norms must not be choked up by egoistic calculations.

I would also like to discuss the present US-European relations. Sometimes scholars say that the Americans came from Mars, while the Europeans, from Venus. This metaphor speaks about power as a fundamental variable in the international politics: the essential difference between the US and Europe is the imbalance of powers and different strategic cultures springing from the existing hegemony of the US. However, I believe that this culture is embodied in different tactics in pursuit of the same goals. It is just that the US has real power and makes use of it, while the power of the EU is divided; therefore, it is little wonder that the EU focuses more on negotiations, mediation, exchange, and adherence to the norms. I think that if the reformed Lisbon Treaty comes into force, Europe will see greater solidarity, security, efficiency, democracy, power, and even, giving an answer to the famous question, "Who do I call if I want to call Europe?", it will have a phone number and a specific person to make a call to in Europe; and US will be possible not just to make a call to that person, but also to jointly negotiate the preservation of the same values and implementation of similar goals.

Ladies and Gentlemen, the rule of the law, democracy, market economy, respect for minorities and other European values can be considered as a result of long-term development of Europe and security guarantee provided by the US. The EU coexistence itself is a sui generis since it implies, although paradoxically, a permanent coordination of the often conflicting interests of states assembled on the basis of the above-mentioned values. Probably EU decision-making is

not a New Byzantium but its liberal intergovernmentalism leaps to the eye, hence agreement and negotiations are an integral part of European identity.

Even if seen from a historical perspective, since the World War II to our days, when the institutional framework of American-European relations was usually and primarily identified with NATO, relations between Europe and the US were characterized both by partnership, and by a domination of the US. During the entire Cold War period, Europe, excluding some countries, was comfortably lazy, developing into a „culture of recreation“. The European security was safeguarded by Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty, US nuclear shield and conventional armed forces. The top guarantee, however, was the determination of the US to act – the quality that still stays the same despite the end of the Cold War.

Both in the US and Europe, there are certain decisive moments that determine and shape the process of security awareness: I mean the fall of the Berlin Wall in Europe and the destruction of the Twin Towers in the US. President George W. Bush stated in 2006 that ‘for Europe, September the 11th was a moment, for us, it was a change of thinking’. The understanding of common threats – terrorism, global warming, international organized crime, despotic regimes, local wars, democratization problems, energy and cyberspace security, proliferation of dangerous technologies and nuclear weapons, migration and even physical safety in the face of growing energy and food prices – calls for discussion of common responses to these challenges.

I am convinced that any sustainable security community is impossible without the development of value-guided relations. While some seem to see the signs of increased competition between the US and Europe, I believe in prospects for a growing partnership. One can admit that Europe has been fostering “soft security” aspects such as development cooperation, crisis prevention, civil and police missions, negotiation instruments, and has often been slow to respond to emerging security challenges, but once the transatlantic relation has intensified, European efforts have been a success. On the other hand, transatlantic partnership should not be viewed as an easy ride. Naturally, the EU cherishes its ambitions to develop into an independent geopolitical player. However, it needs resources and a vision for that goal. After all, there is hardly a security challenge relevant only to Europe or to the US; and this makes us natural partners looking for the ways to confront them. Global challenges mean global responsibility. History seems to have taught us a lesson, and we should well know that our own security will hardly prevent from smouldering or fuelling conflicts in the neighborhood.

Today, a defence spending and technology gap between the US and Europe has been growing wider. Not before long the political will of the European states will be forced to admit that military forces on both sides of the Atlantic Ocean will soon be unable to act together due to different resources and political attention to common challenges. Europe and the US – to my mind – can have a common policy as regards climate change, energy security, fight against terrorism, enlargement of democracy and so on, and both parties can develop a constructive cooperation. I know that competition for better investment conditions and potential profits are natural factors driving economic progress. Still, let us not sacrifice our values for the sake of profits, instead, let us exert our efforts to face common challenges. In the global context, Europe and the US share common values, and the emerging challenges are not of individual

but universal character. It is not Venus or Mars that Europe and the US come from, it is the Earth with common problems and means to address them.

One of the most important goals in the future is the necessity to retain US attention for Europe and – through continuous joint European-American project – to complete building secure and stabile Europe up to Caucasus. All eastern European neighbors have Euro-Atlantic aspirations and we must help them. Following the Bucharest Summit in spring 2008 and negotiation mandate for the European Commission regarding new PCA between EU and Russia, we have been often approached with a question why Lithuania is such an arduous supporter of NATO enlargement, promoting countries which are not in the immediate vicinity, or countries out of the Lithuanian investment focus? I have a simple answer: we believe in common Western values and their spread among other countries. The support for the enlargement of transatlantic institutions is right both in moral as well as strategic, since it has justified itself and has been yielding geopolitical and geostrategic dividends. Nowadays Euro-Atlantic expansion has encouraged a positive transformation of a state, pushed forward the success of reforms and increased stability and security. Some still iterate that the US is from Mars, while Europe is from Venus. Thus, these planets should follow different orbits, and have little chances for a dialogue. Nonetheless, I would like to point out that Europe has numerous supporters of a transatlantic dialogue. They are sometimes referred to as “New Europe”, or post-communist block, which knows the price and taste for freedom. Apparently this new brave Europe could serve as an “enthusiasm vitamin” – balanced for Venus but suitable for Mars too. Thank you very much for your attention. Your comments and questions are welcome.

2008-07-02