

Greece's Best Interest: Staying Close to AIR FORCE ONE

Prof. Dr. Ilias Iliopoulos is currently teaching International Relations and History at the University of Athens. He was awarded his Ph.D. (Dr. phil) from the Ludwig-Maximilian University of Munich. He had long been a Professor of Grand Strategy of the Great Powers, Naval History, and Strategy and Geopolitics of Sea Power at the Hellenic National Defence College and the Naval War College, and an Associate Professor of History of Western Civilization, Diplomacy, and Maritime History at the American College of Greece – Deree College

Copyright: @ 2026 Research Institute for European and American Studies (www.rieas.gr) Publication date: 13 April 2026

Note: The article reflects the opinion of the author and not necessarily the views of the Re-search Institute for European and American Studies

In 1991, the then-Belgian Minister of Foreign Affairs *Mark Eyskens* famously retorted that “*Europe was an economic giant, a political dwarf and a military worm*”.

His dictum has been ascertained during the latest **Iranian crisis**. For *the real story of the conflict is not in the Middle East, but in what this conflict has once again revealed about the so called European Union*: the EU did NOT shape the conflict, could NOT protect critical maritime chock-points and vital energy routes, and played NOT the least role either in the course of warfighting or in securing the ceasefire. Albeit all bombastic declarations of Brussels’ *nomenclature* about “*Europe*” being a “*global power*,” “*geopolitical actor*,” or even “*superpower*”, it is a plain fact that **the EU is NOT a Great Power – nor shall it become one in the years to come**.

Quite the contrary, if truth be told the (*Western*) *European ruling bureaucratic elites*, blinded by their *obsession* with the doctrines and narratives of *Cultural Marxism*, have long chosen the path leading to the EU’s *disintegration*. Instead, the *United States of America* is and still remains the world's sole *Planetary Power*, to put it in the

most celebrated words of the late Greek philosopher and historian *Panagiotis Kondylis*, characterized by a unique ability to project power globally. Under such circumstances, the EU Member States, and the European NATO Member States, *will have to decide whether they want to be allies or not*. And since not being allied to the most powerful country in the world is not very wise, they will have to be *good allies*.

For the highly privileged EU's *Politburo* cadres as well as for the numerous subventionized left-liberal and "woke" neo-Marxist *intelligentsia* and mainstream media, this may sound like a blasphemy. Does not the EU count more citizens than the U.S.? Moreover, the combined population of the EU Member States and European NATO Member States is around 450 million – a population more than 100 million greater than that of the U.S.; impressively, these same European nations enjoy an aggregate annual GDP of more than 22 trillion U.S. dollars.

Still, Brussels' *nomenclature* and (Western) European political elites may pass all sorts of resolutions, write voluminous *communiqués* of how to treat the ills of the wider world and spend more and more millions in order to transform Europe into *Eurabia (Bat Ye'or)*, further promote the *Green Deception* or implement the "lgbtqia2s+"-paranoia. They may also muster what is necessary to project stability beyond their borders through non-military means and even provide military forces for peace-keeping in crisis regions. *But the EU's nomenclature will not be able to generate the unitary determination to undertake aggressive military action or, as the U.S. and Israel have recently done, military pre-emption against a possible enemy.*

Despite all persistent and systematic attempts made by the EU's *nomenclature* to promote and implement a historical and ethnocultural *De-Constructivism* of truly *Marxist* nature, it remains an unquestionable fact that, in contrast to the formation of the *United States of America*, the so called *European integration* is not about turning former colonies of the *British Crown* largely inhabited and ruled by *Anglo-Saxon Protestants* into an "ever closer union" but *nation states* with deep historical roots and a long history. These nation states, or to put it in most accurate terms, their ruling political elites have given up much of the *sovereignty* to act on their own, notably in the financial and economic areas; nevertheless, they are highly unlikely to provide the EU with the sovereignty of acting for them in the way nation states used to, and still

act (see the **U.S.** or **Israel**) – *first and foremost, to order their soldiers to die for a fictive “European Union”*.

Surprisingly, the fact that the enlarged EU has – with the inclusion of Cyprus – extended its borders to the Eastern Mediterranean and the Middle East has not produced the ambition to address the strategic consequences that go with this extension. This general inclination to leave the strategic problems out there to others – i.e., the U.S. – is probably the consequence of having lived with American leadership for so long and so well. For half a century the (Western) European political class has become accustomed to the fact that the main initiatives and decisions are taken by the U.S.; (Western) European governments have practised a habit of praising or criticising them, welcoming or resenting them, and in the end going along. When you know that someone else is coping with your problems, there is less incentive to develop the mentality and the capability to do so yourself. (Western) European ruling bureaucratic elites, highly privileged progressivist intelligentsia and largely left-liberal mainstream media have been good and critical backseat drivers: they are aware they cannot get out of the car; they know the rules of traffic, they understand the mechanics of the motor; they even write a “*green*” vehicle manufacturing plan, or they fantasize about producing a car available to endless numbers of *alien* passengers – *but they have never driven the car themselves*.

The truth is that, for (Western) European bureaucratic elites to leave initiative, decision and implementation largely to the U.S. has been a sensible arrangement during the Cold War era. It has remained a convenient arrangement since then. After all, *even when the U.S. acted unilaterally in the wider world, it usually served the interests of its allies as well*, to a certain degree at least. In return for the U.S. looking after the conflicts in the wider world, the (Western) Europeans could concentrate on building up their *Common Market*, the *European Economic Community*, gradually enlarging it and renaming it to the *European Union*, and so on and so forth.

In the early 1990s, the EU decided to *play the king* in South-Eastern Europe – ***and it made a mess***. Thereafter, the ***Clinton Administration*** intervened actively, in accordance with its liberal, *Wilsonian* narratives of *social engineering abroad*. Later on, when SEPTEMBER 11 *shocked* America and the world and President ***George W. Bush*** asked for help from U.S. allies in the WAR AGAINST TERROR – and while

the Europeans were busy spending plenty of time and grey cells to solve the notorious *one million dollar-question, who of them was authorized to make the call to the U.S. President* – the first guy on earth who rushed to visit *George W. Bush* and report his will and readiness to actively support the U.S. was the *President of the Russian Federation Vladimir Putin*. NATO, once America’s coalition of choice, became one among many – to say nothing of the EU. “*The mission defines the coalition*”, as the then-Defense Secretary *Donald Rumsfeld* used to put it.

And now? Clearly, President ***Donald Trump*** and his Administration are by far more *assertive* than any of their predecessors and their view of world order runs counter to deep-rooted ***left-liberal fallacies*** of the (Western) European political elites, opinion leaders and mainstream media.

Yet, Europeans cannot risk transatlantic divorce. Their political class will therefore have to do its best to manage the marriage and, at the same time, maintain support for it at home. The latter will require much more attention by the political class than it has received so far. Neither the temptation to gain domestic support by criticising the U.S. nor that of overselling the progress of the alleged “*European foreign and security policy*” has always been resisted, leaving public opinion with the false impression that a *mythicized “Europe”* can provide an *alternative* to the alliance with the U.S. Worse, **in its current form of the *Trump Derangement Syndrome (TDS) Anti-Americanism* has gone out of proportion in all European mainstream media, from London to Paris to Munich to Athens.**

The amazing, possibly unique characteristic of the ***American Benevolent Hegemony*** is that the political class of the sole *Planetary Power* not only does not mind others taking part in its foreign policy discussions but actively invites them, at least *as long as the “others”, that is the Europeans, make clear that they are and want to remain allies.*

It must be evident that, *to cancel the alliance with the U.S. is not a serious option for serious European governments.* A *collateral benefit* of this would be, of course, that it would accelerate the *disintegration* process of the EU: forced to *choose* between an EU which still remains *a political dwarf and a military worm* on one hand and the U.S. on the other hand, many Member States will side with the latter, particularly the nations of *Eastern and South-Eastern Europe.*

The maintenance of the alliance with the U.S. is now and for the foreseeable future in the *national interest* of the European countries. *Anything else makes no sense for Europe, not today and not tomorrow.*

*This is of vital significance, particularly for **maritime nations** of the RIMLAND, namely the coastal perimeter of the Eurasian landmass, such as Greece. Luckily, Athens did not follow the path of *denial of help* for the U.S. – a path taken by France, Germany, Spain, and even Britain. On the contrary, *Greece provided, once again, critical support to the U.S. military operations in the major Eastern Mediterranean and Middle Eastern region, from the very first moment – as it always has been the case.**

It was the right thing. It should be followed soon by a more active support for the U.S. forces operating at Persian Gulf – in the form of Greek Navy surface ships and Special Forces units, per instance.

(Western) European governments have gone *too far* denying the U.S. any sort of help during the latest conflict. As former White House Press Secretary *Ari Fleischer* said in an interview with FOX News Channel's *Sean Hannity*, "*they know they have angered Donald Trump, and Donald Trump does things about it.*" And he added: "*When this is all said and done, there is going to be a thorough re-examination and reconfiguration of alliances that I believe our allies have taken for granted.*"

In the light of the above, it is in the overriding national interest of Greece to stay close to the AIR FORCE ONE.