

# THE AUKUS INTERNATIONAL LEGAL AGREEMENT AND ITS IMPACT ON INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTIONS AND SECURITY

Mentor Lecaj \*, Donat Rexha \*\*

\* Faculty of Law, AAB College, Prishtina, the Republic of Kosovo

\*\* Corresponding author, Faculty of Economics, AAB College, Prishtina, the Republic of Kosovo

Contact details: AAB College, St. Elez Berisha, No. 56 Fushë Kosovë Industrial Zone 10000, Prishtina, the Republic of Kosovo



## Abstract

**How to cite this paper:** Lecaj, M., & Rexha, D. (2022). The AUKUS international legal agreement and its impact on international institutions and security. *Corporate Governance and Organizational Behavior Review*, 6(2), 62–70. <https://doi.org/10.22495/cgobrv6i2p6>

Copyright © 2022 The Authors

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0). <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

**ISSN Online:** 2521-1889

**ISSN Print:** 2521-1870

**Received:** 20.12.2021

**Accepted:** 01.04.2022

**JEL Classification:** K33, K30, N4, F5

**DOI:** 10.22495/cgobrv6i2p6

This paper focuses on the research of indicators in chronological order, which calls for the conclusion of the AUKUS international legal agreement signed between Australia, Great Britain, and the United States and its impact on international developments. In this article, descriptive, comparative, and analysis methods have been used to examine the scientific thoughts of different scholars, related to various scenarios of the issue being researched. Based on this research, we found out that Brexit, US withdrawal from Afghanistan, especially the AUKUS deal, consider being the dividing line between the old unipolar order and the new multipolar one (Vej, 2019; Wheatley, 2021). We have concluded that in the changing world order, US-European relations have fluctuated profoundly and their adjustment is almost impossible as they have been before. The article raises critical questions on the dynamics in the international system and their impact on security and international institutions. The scientific approach to the study topic is built by arguing the pros and cons of the opinions of various authors, who emphasize that the world order change and malfunction of international institutions are ongoing dynamics and irreversible (Mearsheimer, 2001).

**Keywords:** International Law, AUKUS, EU, International Institutions, China Rivalry, International Security

**Authors' individual contribution:** Conceptualization — M.L. and D.R.; Methodology — M.L. and D.R.; Data Curation — M.L.; Writing — Original Draft — M.L. and D.R.; Writing — Review & Editing — M.L. and D.R.

**Declaration of conflicting interests:** The Authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

It is well known that the AUKUS international agreement is the trilateral security binding pact on the construction of a nuclear-powered submarine, signed between Australia, Great Britain, and the United States is one of the indicators, among many others, which show that the political landscape of the world order has definitely changed and the unipolar international system has been

replaced by a new, more precarious, unstable multipolar world order, which has now surfaced.

The essential legal obligations arising from the above agreement are first and foremost the actions to be taken by the US and the UK, which must provide Australia, which is part of the group of countries that do not possess nuclear weapons at least eight nuclear-powered submarines, which will be put into action through the use of highly enriched uranium (HEU) (Karbassi, 2021).

The legal authorities in this agreement, which will deal with the supervision of the agreement, its implementation: the division of nuclear technology, at this stage have not yet been detailed. But the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, which details and regulates the actions to be taken regarding the transfer of know-how, materials, and nuclear technology from the US, will remain the main legal basis on which the actions will be based by the US during this agreement. Australia, on the other hand, needs to amend and supplement its existing International Atomic Energy Agency measures to ensure that its actions are in line with the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (Karbassi, 2021).

This study topic stimulates critical thinking among scholars of international relations, compares ideas pros and cons to the relevant indicators, which reflects the rapid evolutionary changes in interstate affairs. The referred authors in the paper have examined relevant indicators of the change of world order, connecting them on the basis of the domino effect. Some of the outlines by counting from China's continuation of economic and military rise, the exit of the UK from the European Union, the US withdrawal from Afghanistan, and ending, in particular, the AUKUS international agreement. According to them, these are real indications that the hitherto unipolar world order has definitely changed towards a more insecure multipolar world. Furthermore, this study examines that US geopolitical and geostrategic priorities and interests in the international system have definitely changed. The course of active US politico-military participation in Europe, where its priority was primarily to help countries with old economic, trade, and cultural ties such as Great Britain, France, etc., has changed. Hence, the political and international security priorities are headed to Asia, specifically to prevent China's regional dominance, which is trying to challenge US superiority. It appears that for the US, the old continent — Europe has lost importance compared to Asia, as a result of changing the dynamics in the global arena, the growing influence of China will deter the US foreign policy to pivot to Asia to contain it, and gradually withdraw from Europe (Morillas, 2021; Taylor, 2019).

Moreover, in the first of reviewing the relevant literature, it elaborates indications of some uncertainties of the European Union and analysis the factors that have pushed the US to change the course of security policy and divert its attention from Europe. Then, the impact of Brexit in increasing uncertainty in Europe and creating a sense of a chain reaction for other European Union countries such as Poland and Hungary. Next is the analysis of the uncoordinated withdrawal of the US and its European allies from Kabul. The second part analyses the international agreement — AUKUS, between Australia, the UK, and the US, and its impact on the France-US relations. The part of the topic dealing with security relations issues between the US and the EU in one side and in terms of economic-trade relations in another part of the medallion between these two territories are very important issues addressed in this paper as a result of high amounts of trade in goods and services reaching almost more than 40% of total global trade (European Commission, 2021).

Some authors point out that US-EU relations will never be the same as they have been in the last three decades since the fall of the Berlin Wall. Recent developments in international relations clearly seem to have been taken by surprise and raised fears among European Union countries, which are trying to find a new approach to deal with these dynamic global developments (Varma, 2021). The bi-product of these events is that the enlargement of the European Union seems even more distant an unrealized dream for the aspiring countries of the Western Balkans. This was noticed at the last summit in Slovenia between the EU and the countries of the Western Balkans. The EU is trying to create a common European security architecture with less reliance on the US (Mauro, 2021).

This paper concludes with a statement that a project not undertaken jointly between the US and Europe may be difficult for future relationships, because of a deep division between the main powers. The Franco-German alliance could weaken, the Russian influence could increase to the East and in the heart of Europe, and the Western Balkans would definitely be a hotbed of ongoing tensions towards enlargement to Eastern Europe.

Only a cautious and more serious approach between the Anglo-Saxon countries and the EU will be able to save Europe from dis-unification. Any other security modality may be doomed to fail.

This paper is divided into several sections, in order to understand easily the scientific dilemmas that have been addressed within it. Section 2 of the paper contains a literature review, which includes the analytical and argumentative approach to the scientific issues presented by authors in connection with the matter in question. Section 3 deals with research methodology, which describes in detail the research methods being used in it. In Section 4, the article contains the results and discussions, which list the findings during the research and their critical discussion. Section 5 includes conclusions, which provide a final view and judgment on the issue that has been discussed. Moreover, it offers recommendations for further studies required to be done in this field.

## 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

In this part, the relevant literature is reviewed connected to the topic under discussion. By focusing on the questions from the uninterrupted alliance to the fading of Euro-Atlantic relations.

Some scholars point out that since the fall of the Berlin Wall, where a unipolar world order was created, the US and key European Union countries have begun to act with unwavering synergy in international relations (Wright, 2017). This can be proved by Wallace (2017) who emphasizes that the world order was being dominated by Euro-Atlanticists and the US at the epicenter of politico-military action, while EU countries were increasing their influence mostly in civil and economic activity. These states were also able to cope with the massive influx of people coming from Eastern European countries after the former Soviet Union collapsed. This has led EU countries to formulate common immigration policies at the same time, to resist this large influx of refugees, and sign bilateral agreements with Eastern European countries that promote cyclical migration (Szczepanikova & Van Criekinge, 2018).

But Smith (2019) points out that relations between the US and EU countries have been almost continuously associated with disagreements on various issues. However, this connection was perceived by others as an inseparable node and necessary to lead the democratic process in many different countries around the globe, especially in many countries, which had overthrown communist totalitarian systems. They acted jointly in the Balkans, especially in the countries of the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, post-war countries, and since the Dayton Agreement for peace of 1995, the EU had undertaken a number of humanitarian actions such as the building of schools, hospitals, roads, public institution buildings, economic recovery, the rule of law, and democratic advancement, while the US was more prominent with its military presence and political influence to resolve remaining political disputes (European Commission, 2006).

As the EU politically strengthened its institutions and advanced in the economic sphere, it was becoming an unwavering actor and partner for the US in a liberal international system created by them. These relations with harmonized interests are explained in the quotations of the two representatives of the EU at that time. The first one is by Javier Solana who says that the Balkans is a good example to be taken and that "Through coordinated efforts, with the US and NATO, we have ensured that the stability of the region is not threatened by the outbreak of a major conflict" (European Commission, 2006).

The other quote was by Manuel Boroso where he says that "Europe needs the US and the US needs Europe. When we speak with a common voice, no challenge is too great. When we speak with a common voice, we are truly an indispensable partnership" (European Commission, 2006, p. 3).

The synergy that existed between the Euro-Atlanticists gave hope for lasting peace in the existing liberal international order of that time (European Commission, 2006).

However, the common synergy of the action of these dominant actors for nearly 30 years is constantly fading with the economic political, and military rise of China and with the return of Russia to the scene. The international system has begun to change radically and the multipolar international system appears to have become more and more insecure. This has led countries like the US, to redesign their own cooperation and security policies, as well as, of course, many EU countries and other NATO member countries, such as Turkey and Greece. A better understanding of this tense spirit of US-EU relations influenced by China's growth at the international level is given by John Mearsheimer, who two decades ago wrote that the great powers feel fear from other great power countries, and they mistrust each other (Mearsheimer, 2001, p. 17).

The liberal spirit in the international system seems to have seized, and this has naturally eroded relations between the US and European countries, as states naturally redesign their own security policies in a system where states aim to coexist (Ikenberry, 2018). The example is the withdrawal of the US troops from Afghanistan. These events created a global perception of the American superpower, which is eventually turning to its national interests to play differently in a multipolar global order.

This is considered by the elite of EU countries, as a "betrayal" by their main ally, the US. If we analyze this global change by joining the "pieces of the puzzle" to create a more global picture of Euro-Atlantic relations, it is noted that EU countries are reconstructing their security policies, leaving aside liberal values. In addition, this means cooling US-EU synergistic relations (Cormaic, 2021).

Indicators that support this thesis about the current global changes such as Brexit and the AUKUS agreement, and finally the debates about Polexit, have made other countries feel really insecure and vulnerable in a multipolar world. This would initiate more EU military-political actions but these countries may later become more dependent on US support, following fears caused by interference between them by other actors such as Russia and China (Riddervold & Newsome, 2018).

If we do a thorough analysis of the global political landscape from 2019 onwards, it appears that the liberal world order is sinking and that action can hardly be taken to bring back the relations that existed some three decades ago. This change in the liberal sentiment on an international level has undoubtedly terrified the Western political elite, who had built it with a lot of effort, and from which they had benefited (Mearshemier, 2019).

Thus, the EU may need to focus on the integration and consolidation of the armed forces of its member states. However, if the EU intends to continue to be secure, it must create instruments to protect itself from its potential external enemies, without severing all ties with the Anglo-Saxon countries (Bergman, Lamond, & Cicareli, 2021).

A very critical issue needs to be addressed and examined the impact of Brexit is an indication of the weakening of the EU and changing the world order. Most of all it creates instability in the international institutions with an emphasis on EU institutions and damaging the spirit of integrations processes.

Although the exit of the UK from the EU has damaged both entities, without a doubt it has shaken the latter (Thissen, Oort, McCann, Argilés, & Trond, 2020). For both the UK and the EU, there is a myriad of reasons why their future apart will not get better (Ash & Bayrasli, 2021). This can be proven by the so-called "Five Eyes" cooperation of the intelligence agencies of these countries that exchange information. The US cooperates with Australia, Canada, New Zealand, and the UK (Gold, 2020). European countries, on the other hand, cooperate in this field based on Europol rules. From this point of view can be concluded that the cultural connection and trust that these countries have between them are key elements to determine future cooperation (König & Trauner, 2021).

The UK, which is separated from the old continent by water, has historically "played diplomatic and military games" with the countries of old Europe. This country at these times of rapidly changing world order as a result of China's rise eventually leaves the EU and further strengthens its ties with its special ally, the US. This re-rapprochement between these countries could also be analyzed from the perspective of the same cultural identity, as both countries are part of the Anglo-Saxon axis. Another reason for the change

in the course of its foreign policy could be the dominance of populist politics on this island, inspired by the slogan "Return of control", where the final result in the vote was 52% to 48% in favor of the UK exit from the EU (Scully, 2018).

If we analyze the phenomenon of Brexit from a global perspective, although it seems to have damaged this country economically and politically, this has undoubtedly damaged the EU as well. In external perception, the latter seems to be weaker in the international arena, after losing a country with nuclear weapons, a place with a veto right in the Security Council as well as a country with great historically colonial influence in the world. This has made the EU, as an organization that aims to strengthen and change its institutional structure internally, to become a federation, appear to come to an end. Also, if Brexit is analyzed in the context of the future of the EU, this case could cause a chain effect in other member states. The increase of nationalism within the EU countries for instance in France, Poland, etc., could cause some of these countries to organize referendums on the exit as a result of growing dissatisfaction with the EU. For this reason, the current European elite, in order to preserve the EU, has given the UK the opportunity, if it changes its mind, to have its doors open in the EU (Henley, Rankin, & O'Carroll, 2020).

After the exit of the UK, the crisis in the Eurozone has started to increase, exaggerated by the migration crisis that doesn't seem to have an end soon. Euroscepticism will continue to grow, as, in Hungary, Poland, and other eastern countries, as well as the Western Balkan countries' hopes of joining the EU are fading day by day. This has led Franco-German countries to redesign their foreign and security policies on how to behave in a multipolar international order, much more precarious than three decades before the fall of the Berlin Wall (Bulmer & Quaglia, 2018).

Although it is too early to come to a concise conclusion about the long-term consequences of the exit of the UK from the EU, it appears more certain that the integration of other countries in the EU is less certain. Brexit has also raised the idea that what has been achieved so far has achieved its peaks and from now on we can expect a decline in the desire of other countries to integrate into this entity (Sampson, 2017).

Brexit marks the end of a chapter and the beginning of a new chapter in the world order and many scholars that understand global politics there are many reasons to believe that the future is more uncertain for all. Various analyzes and surveys on social networks and podcasts show the sensitivity out of fear for the future from political, economic, and security aspects. Connoisseurs and supporters of realist theories expected that Brexit would happen one day because the UK could not tolerate German hegemony in the Eurozone (Ash & Bayrasli, 2021). This decision of Britain to leave the EU has undoubtedly threatened the bloc of democratic states, which have coexisted peacefully for decades (Jaishankar, 2016).

Also, slow economic growth has shaken the credibility of traditional liberal economies facing the trade shifts with Asia and immigration within. In the absence of the UK, populism rises in Western countries, followed by the impact of inter-sectarian conflicts in the Middle East, China's enormous

military-economic growth, and increasing Russian provocations in the Western Balkans, Eastern Europe, and Eurasia. All this made the EU feel more insecure without the UK and increased the possibility of losing importance on the global stage.

From a historical aspect, the UK has been the main pillar of the world order as the main beneficiary. The role of Brexit in the weakening of the EU indicates that the UK has a respectable place in NATO, has a significant influence in the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank. For that reason, this British exit has created instability in international institutions too. It also has an influence through a number of post-war institutions, which promote peace, security, and global economic development (European Parliament, 2018).

A genuine analytical approach to this global momentum will show that this undoubtedly has a negative impact on world democracy and also undermines the inter-consensus of countries that have maintained global peace and stability. Ivo H. Daalder, a former US representative to NATO underlines that Brexit "... will completely destroy the international order...", it sets a precedent. It is potentially corrosive." (Yardley, Smale, Perlez, & Hubbard, 2016). That Brexit may be an indicator of the new world order and that this has undoubtedly weakened the EU shows us the symbolism in China, where two days after the British vote, in a hotel in Beijing, the New International Development Bank of China held its first meeting with 57 countries that are registered as members. A new institution, called the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank was created to give China the opportunity to increase its influence over the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. In addition, for the Russian president Putin, it seems the British vote was an unexpected gift. Brexit has left Europe facing parallel challenges in both maintaining its unity and maintaining its global influence (Yardley et al., 2016).

The other indication that definitely and obviously the world order change is the AUKUS deal which needs to be examined and interpreted in a critical manner in correlation with US withdrawal from Kabul.

If are to be compared the cooperation of the Euro-Atlantic countries almost two decades ago, easily can be noticed that they acted in harmony since the declaration of the joint war on terrorism, the intervention in Afghanistan and Iraq, as well as the nuclear crisis in Iran. Together they have jointly opposed Russian intervention in Ukraine and Georgia. But the sudden withdrawal of the US from Kabul, without coordination with the countries of the EU, can be considered as an indicator that Euro-Atlantic relations have been seriously damaged (Morcos & Ellehuus, 2021).

Based on this indication, it can be concluded that Europe is not the priority of the US foreign and security policy, but the continent of Asia, especially China. This conclusion is further clarified by the statement of President Biden, who stated that when dealing with the "old continent", the message remains the same "America first". The US seems to be considered by Europe's military capabilities, which are not strong enough to influence Asia, so the US withdrawal from Europe will further divide these countries among themselves, and it seems that each state individually will redesign its foreign

policies (Coffey, 2021). This is confirmed by the reduction of the US military presence in Europe, which during the Trump presidency had withdrawn nearly 10,000 US troops from Germany, reducing its military presence, which is also not so effective in preventing Russia from Europe (Gordon & Lubold, 2020). The withdrawal of the US from the Paris climate agreement and the agreement on Iran's nuclear program also indicates that the US is deepening another foreign policy course without the EU countries (Anghel, Immenkamp, Lazarou, Saulnier, & Wilson, 2020).

The change in the world order, which started almost 5 years ago with the coming to power of US President Trump, is almost taking shape today. In September 2021, the three Anglo-Saxon countries: Australia, the UK, and the US signed the trilateral security pact known as "AUKUS" (von Hippel, 2021).

This pact is interpreted by almost everyone, without exception, as a mechanism to curb the growth of Chinese influence in the Pacific and to balance the growth of its military and nuclear capabilities. This pact will enable Australia to develop nuclear submarines. However, if we analyze the impact of this agreement on the relations between France and the Anglo-Saxon countries, this act has deeply damaged the relations between these countries and has further encouraged other countries, hastened by fear, to take various actions on security issues. For example, Germany and Japan have begun to cooperate on security issues, countries that started World War II some eighty years ago. This agreement has damaged relations between France and the Anglo-Saxon countries. The statement was given by the French Foreign Minister Le Drian, who considered this pact as a "knife in the back" for France, where the latter lost an agreement previously signed with Australia worth nearly US\$90 billion. The seriousness of the damage to the relationships is also evident with the departure of the French ambassador from the US and Australia. France canceled the planned Franco-British defense summit, and also did not invite Britain to resolve the refugee crisis in Franco-British waters. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of China also reacted to this agreement, emphasizing that this agreement has intensified the peace competition and resembles a Cold War mentality (Geiger, 2021).

This deal best reflects the strong cultural ties that the Anglo-Saxon countries have with each other. The foreign policy and military and diplomatic interaction of these international entities had been observed in the two world wars, the Korean War, Iraq, Afghanistan, and NATO policy-making. And this synchronization of geopolitical and geostrategic interests is possible because these countries have common historical, cultural, and linguistic ties. These countries have also supported each other, especially the US has supported the UK financially, in joint trade and investments (U.S. Embassy and Consulates Relations in the United Kingdom, 2018).

American policymakers have planned, together with the Anglo-Saxon countries, to oppose the rising powers of China and Russia in the international system (Smith, 2019).

This shift could encourage the EU to create a joint parallel military security force with NATO, or another force within NATO (Riddervold & Newsome, 2018).

The sensitivity of Euro-Atlantic relations surfaced in an Anglo-Saxon alliance and shift in the world political scene. The dynamics of international developments with the enormous growth of China and Russia will definitely lead to a new model of cooperation between European and Anglo-Saxon countries (Whineray, 2020).

It is noted that the more active the European peacekeeping mechanisms are, the stronger its relations with the US will be. This would allow the US to concentrate in Asia, the Europeans would take part in many international operations aimed at maintaining peace and restoring order, such as in Syria, Libya. Europeans will also be able to play an active role in China's containment by collaborating vis-a-vis with the Anglo-Saxons. But this may need to be viewed with a dose of skepticism because of the fact that the EU has issued a document entitled "EU Strategy for Cooperation in the Indo-Pacific", which minimizes the confrontation with China. Moreover, an effective Anglo-Saxon strategy for dealing with China requires joint US-EU efforts to improve relations with Russia. And all this is intended to weaken the Russian-Chinese partnership, and the West is to return Russia in order to restrain China more easily (Hellmann & Kupchan, 2021).

### 3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

In this research paper, descriptive, historic, comparative, and analysis methods have been used. Through these methods, politico-military events and situations have been analyzed, as indicators that show the panorama of the world order which has changed from a unipolar world to a multipolar one. In order to explain the evolution of these changes, various ideas of different authors have been taken into consideration which examines the critical political events and decisive momentum in the last three decades. These crucial dilemmas are analyzed in chronological order. All these findings have been researched in scientific journals, various articles, blogs, reports of international institutions, etc. The same data are selected, examined, and interpreted in taking into account the subject that was discussed in this paper.

The indicators of the world order change are explained and analyzed in that manner, linking them in the logical-chronological puzzle with each other, as a kind of chain reaction that has led to the changes in the international system. For this reason, the opinions of various authors on Brexit, as an indicator of changing world order as one of the main amongst others who created the instability on international institutions, especially those of the EU, have been critically discussed before the opinions of other authors, who examines US withdrawal from Kabul or the AUKUS agreement. By analyzing these indicators chronologically, separating them from each other, and further using other elements that affect these indicators, it has been given at the end a clear picture of the subject of research. For instance, by analyzing Brexit separately, then the US withdrawal from Afghanistan, and at the end the AUKUS deal as a fact of world order change, adding to these cultural ties that the Anglo-Saxon countries have between them, it creates a clear political panorama that the world order has shifted completely.

#### 4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This paper finds out that Brexit, at first as the only indicator, although seen as an important actor in international politics, nevertheless was not perceived as a dividing line between the old order and the current world order. This political move by various authors and decision-makers in international relations was interpreted from different perspectives such as the sovereign right of states to enter and exit international organizations, some others balanced the costs and economic benefits of Great Britain, on the one hand, and the EU, on the other. While others were critical of the international legal proceedings that Brexit had caused. Almost everyone without exception was convinced that this indicator will have a chain reaction in political, economic, and legal issues in international relations. However, the change in the world order was not discussed at the time Brexit became visible. However, the indicators analyzed and interpreted jointly are key interesting indications that prove the title of this paper.

Moreover, these indicators have changed the perception of decision-making elites, who represent the policies of the most influential countries in the international system, in terms of the functioning of this structure. The US withdrawal from Afghanistan as an indicator and the AUKUS agreement, which is signed in a very short period after the US withdrawal from Kabul, has convinced the leaders of the states to take various actions aiming at creating security for their own countries in the international arena, which day by day is becoming more insecure.

These indicators jointly are considered the dividing line between the old unipolar world order and the current multipolar one.

All indicators analyzed in this paper have produced instability and uncertainty in the global system. States have begun to think and form different alliances between them. They have begun to line up behind powerful states. For instance, in Asia, security agreements have been reached between Japan, Australia, India, and the US. It is also rumored that Japan will join very soon the AUKUS agreement. These indicators have also influenced Russia's leaders, who are conceptualizing NATO as a divisive organization among Western countries.

Moreover, these factors have produced politico-military actions that undermine security in Eastern Europe, especially in Ukraine. Political instability has also been seen in Central Asian countries, especially in Kazakhstan, as a result of the redesigning interests between Russia, on the one hand, and the West and Turkey, on the other.

Furthermore, this article finds out that the US's most pressing matter in the international arena has definitely shifted from Europe toward Asia as a result of China's economic and military developments and real indicators to challenge and change the current global order. As China is expected to have continued economic growth, this will further divert US interest from Europe, focusing on various economic, political, and military actions with other Asian countries to contain China. While China is expected to increase its own influence, in addition to Asia and Latin American countries, which is also the most sensitive security part for the US.

During the review of the existing literature, it was found that the above-mentioned indicators have caused fear in European countries, at the same time they have made these countries plan new own security policies in the global arena, which in the future will lead to even more clashes between member countries in NATO. The European countries will find it almost impossible to establish common European security without the US. Although compromising the security of European countries is the main focus of these states, still these countries due to various political, historical, economic, and demographic divergences, it will be impossible to establish common European security. This can be argued that, for instance, Germany and France, although the main engines of the EU, have divergences between them in security and foreign policy issues.

In this research, it is found that the AUKUS deal has affected the economic, political, and security interests of France in the international system. The image of an actor with great influence in international relations has been harmed, especially by its own traditional allies. For this reason, France's diplomatic moves, as the leader of the EU, in the case of Ukraine, can be interpreted in a way that is trying to restore the reputation damaged by the AUKUS deal. At the same time, it is trying to establish points of cooperation on security issues in Europe through dialogue with Russia, in trying to accommodate Russia in this regard.

Also, for the US-France relations it will be very awkward to recover as they were before binding the aforementioned agreement. Moreover, this paper has found that the change in world order will have a significant impact on the future of the EU institutions. The skepticism about strengthening the EU institutions will increase even more and the motivation of other aspiring countries to be integrated will decrease significantly.

#### 5. CONCLUSION

Indications such as Brexit, the US withdrawal from Afghanistan, and the AUKUS legal agreement have created a mindset among decision-making elites, various scientific circles to understand wisely that the world order has changed. These facts have also influenced the role of international institutions in maintaining peace and security. Above all, the role of the United Nations in maintaining global peace and security has diminished. This can be confirmed by its faded and ineffective activity in the recent crises in Eastern Europe, particularly in Ukraine, and Central Asia.

The AUKUS legal deal is a turning point where the international order has changed, and that states will redesign their national policies based solely on their national interests. Thus, in order to create global security, the states must organize important comprehensive conferences on how they should behave in this new climate of the international multipolar structure which may further create divisions and added uncertainty in the current global order. Otherwise, naturally, the states will re-create the most diverse alliances and may behave very aggressively and unpredicted.

Furthermore, this agreement may have geopolitical and geostrategic consequences for the Western allies, as states will create alliances

and partnerships hiding behind the North Atlantic Alliance. For example, France and Greece miraculously cooperate in the Mediterranean and are in constant opposition to Turkey. All these are NATO member countries. Germany has good energy relations with Russia, while with China it cooperates in the economic trade aspect. Both countries are major rivals to the US, which along with Germany are also a member of the North Atlantic Alliance.

The norms in this agreement, together with the other indicators, may create a chain reaction for other EU countries in the future. Almost since the end of World War II, when the US managed to become present in Europe and influence the policies of these countries, if we take into account the chronology of relations since then, it can be concluded that the curve which measures these reports has fluctuated from time to time, but not at the level it is today.

The US-EU relations will never be what they have been, particularly, for the last three decades since the fall of the Berlin Wall when a unipolar world existed. Distrust has grown between countries that have interacted for decades.

However, the US could maintain priorities with the countries of the EU balancing China in Asia and Russia in Europe. Any other political strategy, separately between the US and Europe, would not be prosperous for global peace and security. Only a cautious approach between the Anglo-Saxon countries and the EU will be able to save the EU from its partition. Any other security mode may be doomed to fail.

The US, as a country with the highest developed economy and military superiority in a multipolar world, must find solutions jointly with other European countries, with which it has cooperated for almost a century in drafting joint strategies in security and foreign policy.

The examined indicators, especially the AUKUS deal, have increased Russia's ambitions for Eastern Europe, which is looking for its accommodation in the global order. For this reason, more scientific research should be done in this direction in order to give alternative ideas to create security in Europe. It remains to be seen whether Ukraine's ambitions to join NATO contribute to peace in Europe and beyond, or whether Russia's accommodation in common security in Europe will enhance global stability. Also, scientific research in this regard should be done on how the US, China, Russia, and other powerful countries in the international system can behave in the future. All these serious researches will raise the awareness of the leadership of the actors, to take reasonable actions in times of tension and crises in order to maintain peace and stability of international institutions.

At the same time, critical thoughts should be done regarding the drafting and redesign of common global policies, aiming and trying to prevent the division of the world into blocs and the start of another Cold War. For this reason, deep theoretical thoughts and their dissemination to decision-making bodies would influence the creation of the spirit of global cooperation. Holding roundtables, debates, and above all international conferences with the content of specific topics in

finding solutions along with the various dynamics in the field of cooperation on issues of peace and security in the future would be very important for the coordination of joint actions.

The importance of this paperwork stands in creating a clear initial research framework on the impact of the AUKUS legal binding deal on global security issues, linking the relevant and crucial indicators in a logical and chronological manner, as well as focusing on this agreement, which has not been adequately addressed as a result of the topicality of this issue.

Furthermore, this article creates a basic and modest theoretical mindset regarding the indicators of reshaping the world order and international institutions, where at the same time it promotes critical thoughts on the security field, and it will raise pros and cons critical questions in the future. The relevance of this paper topic consists in the fact that it will help in the future to examine similarities and differences to the situations in comparison to the AUKUS legal agreement.

Taking into consideration that the focus of the problem addressed in this paper is a current and very sensible security issue, the study limits remain very obvious. There is a lack of existing literature to address more deeply this topic and give a critical opinion on various authors' perspectives on this matter. Due to the sensitivity of this legal agreement in the field of security, it is almost impossible to analyze directly the factors that have led to the conclusion of this agreement, as well as there are obvious difficulties to analyze the draft agreements that preceded this deal, made as an offer and acceptance of the bid by the parties concluded the deal.

It would be very useful for this study to supplement the research methodology. Given that, in this article, there is a scientific gap regarding the opinions of the stakeholders that have concluded this agreement, and in order to have a clearer picture of the critical problem, in the future, the interviews, surveys, or questionnaires with various target groups should be conducted, such as actors dealing with security law issues, which would include different questions directed at the impact of the AUKUS legal agreement on global security and international institutions. In order to add value to future works, it is recommended to take into account the opinions arising from debates, various roundtables of students and academics, analysts, and public figures on this issue.

Furthermore, hereafter, it is necessary to collect and analyze financial data related to the AUKUS agreement along with other important data in this article. This would more clearly reflect the situation and the impact of this deal in the interrelation of the stakeholders from an economic and financial perspective. From this point of view, the cost and benefits of this agreement should be assessed, the losses that France has suffered from the termination of the previous agreement signed with Australia, and the profits that the US and Great Britain have made. All these data should be collected together and after analyzing and discussing them, deep conclusions and recommendations will be given on this issue.

## REFERENCES

1. Anghel, S., Immenkamp, B., Lazarou, E., Saulnier, J. L., & Wilson, A. B. (2020). *On the path to 'strategic autonomy'*. Retrieved from <https://op.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/e57e652a-084a-11eb-a511-01aa75ed71a1/language-en/format-PDF/source-214267660>
2. Ash, T. G., & Bayrasli, E. (2021). *The post-Brexit world order*. Retrieved from <https://www.project-syndicate.org/podcasts/the-post-brexit-world-order?barrier=accesspaylog>
3. Bergman, M., Lamond, J., & Cicareli, S. (2021, June 1). The case for EU defence. *Center for American Progress*. Retrieved from <https://www.americanprogress.org/article/case-eu-defense/>
4. Bulmer, S., & Quaglia, L. (2018). The politics and economics of Brexit. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 25(8), 1089-1098. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13501763.2018.1467957>
5. Coffey, D. (2021, September 3). Paris perspective #14: The fall of Kabul and new world order — Gérard Chaliand. *RFI*. Retrieved from <https://www.rfi.fr/en/podcasts/paris-perspective/20210903-paris-perspective-14-the-fall-of-kabul-and-new-world-order-g%C3%A9rard-chaliand>
6. Cormaic, R. M. (2021, September 4). Little sign of revived relationship between US and EU. *The Irish Times*. Retrieved from <https://www.irishtimes.com/opinion/little-sign-of-revived-relationship-between-us-and-eu-1.4664335>
7. European Commission. (2006). *The European Union and the United States: Global partners global responsibilities*. Luxembourg: EUR-OP.
8. European Commission. (2021). *Countries and regions*. Retrieved from <https://ec.europa.eu/trade/policy/countries-and-regions/countries/united-states/>
9. European Parliament. (2018). *The Impact of UK's withdrawal on EU integration*. Retrieved from [https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2018/604973/IPOL\\_STU\(2018\)604973\\_EN.pdf](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2018/604973/IPOL_STU(2018)604973_EN.pdf)
10. Geiger, J. (2021, September 25). AUKUS: Recalling legacies of Anglo-Saxonism and muffling the voices of Island nations. *E-International Relations*. Retrieved from <https://www.e-ir.info/2021/09/25/aukus-recalling-legacies-of-anglo-saxonism-and-muffling-the-voices-of-island-nations/>
11. Gold, J. (2020). *The five eyes and offensive cyber capabilities: Building a 'cyber deterrence initiative'*. NATO CCDCOE. Retrieved from <https://ccdcoe.org/uploads/2020/10/2020-Josh-Gold-Five-Eyes-and-Offensive-Cyber-Capabilities.pdf>
12. Gordon, M. R., & Lubold, G. (2020, June 5). Trump to pull thousands of U.S. troops from Germany. *The Wall Street Journal*. Retrieved from <https://www.wsj.com/articles/trump-directs-u-s-troop-reduction-in-germany-11591375651>
13. Hellmann, G., & Kupchan, C. A. (2021, September 17). The Atlantic alliance after Afghanistan. *Project Syndicate*. Retrieved from <https://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/atlantic-alliance-strategic-priorities-after-afghanistan-by-gunther-hellmann-1-and-charles-a-kupchan-2021-09>
14. Henley, J., Rankin, J., & O'Carroll, L. (2020, January 27). Brexit explained: How it happened and what comes next. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/news/2020/jan/27/brexit-explained-how-it-happened-and-what-comes-next>
15. Ikenberry, J. G. (2018). The end of liberal international order? *International Affairs*, 94(1), 7-23. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ia/iix241>
16. Jaishankar, D. (2016, June 29). Brexit: The first major casualty of digital democracy. *Brookings*. Retrieved from <https://www.brookings.edu/blog/order-from-chaos/2016/06/29/brexit-the-first-major-casualty-of-digital-democracy/>
17. Karbassi, S. (2021, September 24). Legal mechanisms of AUKUS explained. *The Lawfare Institute*. Retrieved from <https://www.lawfareblog.com/legal-mechanisms-aukus-explained>
18. König, F., & Trauner, F. (2021). From Trevi to Europol: Germany's role in the integration of EU police cooperation. *Journal of European Integration*, 43(2), 175-190. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07036337.2021.1877694>
19. Mauro, F. (2021). *Europe's strategic autonomy: That obscure object of desire*. IRIS. Retrieved from <https://www.iris-france.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/EN-ANALYSIS-13-EUROPE%E2%80%99S-STRATEGIC-AUTONOMY-October-2021.pdf>
20. Mearsheimer, J. J. (2001). *The tragedy of great power politics*. W. W. Norton & Company. Retrieved from <https://samuelbhfauredotcom.files.wordpress.com/2015/10/s2-mearsheimer-2001.pdf>
21. Mearsheimer, J. J. (2019). Bound to fail: The rise and fall of the liberal international order. *International Security*, 43(4), 7-50. [https://doi.org/10.1162/ISEC\\_a\\_00342](https://doi.org/10.1162/ISEC_a_00342)
22. Morcos, P., & Ellehuus, R. (2021, August 27). Fall of Kabul: Inconvenient truths for NATO. *CSIS*. Retrieved from <https://www.csis.org/analysis/fall-kabul-inconvenient-truths-nato>
23. Morillas, P. (2021). *Afghanistan, AUKUS and European strategic autonomy* (JOINT Policy Brief No. 4). Retrieved from [https://www.cidob.org/en/publications/publication\\_series/project\\_papers/joint/afghanistan\\_aukus\\_and\\_european\\_s\\_strategic\\_autonomy](https://www.cidob.org/en/publications/publication_series/project_papers/joint/afghanistan_aukus_and_european_s_strategic_autonomy)
24. Riddervold, M., & Newsome, A. (2018). Transatlantic relations in times of uncertainty: Crises and EU-US relations. *Journal of European Integration*, 40(5), 505-521. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07036337.2018.1488839>
25. Sampson, T. (2017). Brexit: The economics of international disintegration. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 31(4), 163-184. <https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.31.4.163>
26. Scully, R. (2018). *Brexit and public opinion, the UK in a changing Europe*. Retrieved from <https://ukandeu.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/Public-Opinion.pdf>
27. Smith, J. (2019, March). The EU-US relationship is in crisis. *The German Times*. Retrieved from <https://www.german-times.com/the-eu-us-relationship-is-in-crisis/>
28. Szczepanikova, A., & Van Criekinge, T. (2018). *The future of migration in the European Union: Future scenarios and tools to stimulate forward-looking discussions*. EU. <https://doi.org/10.2760/274425>
29. Taylor, R. (2019, July 17). If it wants to survive the EU must think more strategically. *LSE*. Retrieved from <https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/brexit/2019/07/17/if-it-wants-to-survive-the-eu-must-think-much-more-strategically/>
30. Thissen, M., Oort, F., McCann, P., Argilés, R. O., & Trond, H. (2020). The implications of Brexit for UK and EU regional competitiveness. *Economic Geography*, 96(5), 397-421. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00130095.2020.1820862>



31. U.S. Embassy and Consulates Relations in the United Kingdom. (2018). *Policy & history*. Retrieved from <https://uk.usembassy.gov/our-relationship/policy-history/>
32. Varma, T. (2021, September 22). After AUKUS: The uncertain future of American and European cooperation in the Indo-Pacific. *European Council on Foreign Relations*. Retrieved from <https://ecfr.eu/article/after-aukus-the-uncertain-future-of-american-and-european-cooperation-in-the-indo-pacific>
33. Vej, G. K. (2019, June 6). British visions of identity and geopolitics after Brexit. *Danish Institute for International Studies*. Retrieved from <https://www.diis.dk/en/event/british-visions-of-identity-and-geopolitics-after-brexite>
34. von Hippel, F. N. (2021). The Australia-UK-U.S. submarine deal: Mitigating proliferation concerns. *The Arms Control Association*. Retrieved from <https://www.armscontrol.org/act/2021-11/features/australia-uk-us-submarine-deal-mitigating-proliferation-concerns>
35. Wallace, W. (2017). European foreign policy since the Cold War: How ambitious, how inhibited? *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 19(1), 77-90. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1369148116685297>
36. Wheatley, J. (2021, November 9). Fear, honour, and AUKUS in the Indo-Pacific. *The Strategy Bridge*. Retrieved from <https://thestrategybridge.org/the-bridge/2021/11/9/fear-honour-and-aukus-in-the-indo-pacific>
37. Whineray, D. (2020, January 16). 5 reasons why US-Europe tensions will grow in the 2020s — And how to stop it. *Carnegie Endowment for International Peace*. Retrieved from <https://carnegieendowment.org/2020/01/16/5-reasons-why-u.s.-europe-tensions-will-grow-in-2020s-and-how-to-stop-it-pub-80831>
38. Wright, T. (2017, December). A post-American Europe and the future of U.S. strategy. *Brookings*. Retrieved from <https://www.brookings.edu/research/a-post-american-europe-and-the-future-of-u-s-strategy/>
39. Yardley, J., Smale, A., Perlez, J., & Hubbard, B. (2016, June). Does Brexit foretell a new New World Order? *The Boston Globe*. Retrieved from <https://www.bostonglobe.com/news/world/2016/06/25/does-brexite-foretell-new-new-world-order/wTmf1ahE23U15vsbn3yrWO/story.html>