

Comparison between Nicholas Sarkozy and Charles de Gaulle's Foreign Policy in Dealing with NATO

Almira Dea Rezkitha

*Mahasiswa Program Studi S1 Ilmu Hubungan Internasional
Universitas Airlangga*

ABSTRACT

Tulisan ini membandingkan politik luar negeri Perancis di bawah Presiden Nicholas Sarkozy dan Charles de Gaulle mengenai kebijakannya terhadap North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). Presiden Sarkozy memiliki politik luar negeri yang jauh berbeda dengan tradisi kaum Gaulle dimana tradisi tersebut telah lama diterapkan selama beberapa generasi di Perancis pasca Presiden Charles de Gaulle mundur. Dalam tulisan ini, dijelaskan faktor-faktor yang menyebabkan Presiden Sarkozy mengambil kebijakan berbeda dengan politik luar negeri sebelumnya dengan mencermati faktor idiosinkretik dan level analisis individu.

Kata-Kata Kunci: *psychobiography, idiosinkretik, Gaullisme, voluntarisme, NATO.*

The article compares the foreign policy of French under President Nicholas Sarkozy and Charles de Gaulle on how they deal with NATO. I assume that President Sarkozy is unique because he abandons the Gaullist tradition practiced for many generations in French after President Charles de Gaulle stepped down. I attempt to explore what factors behind President Sarkozy's decision to take different path of foreign policy by scrutinizing the idiosyncratic factors with individual level of analysis.

Keywords: *psychobiography, idiosyncrasy, Gaullism, voluntarism, NATO.*

On March 2009, France President Nicholas Sarkozy had made a glorious attempt to change France history, he claim that France need to rejoined with NATO once again after 43 years of France dismissal from NATO. This decision has led to a major controversy in France, since not only Sarkozy took a different step from his predecessor, but he also betray the decision from the most honorable France president, Charles de Gaulle. He believed that France needs to fix their relationship with US to get gain from US trade and military umbrella.

For over 43 years, France had quit from NATO according to Charles de Gaulle decision, not one of the Charles de Gaulle successors try to betray this decision. Most of France policy is directed from Gaulle's policy, thus it's named as Gaullism policy. This right-wing policy consists of three main aspects that its preliminary goal is to make a bigger role of France in world politics. Gaullism emphasizing in the historical aspect, it is created during the declining power of France. After WWI, France was financially weak, with the industrial area in western France suffering from four years of battle. The French government had to take out massive loans to pay for the war. The political system in France was also weak, being highly decentralized parliament dominated government with a weak executive branch. After WWII, France also being tested to dealing with two superpowers that is created during the Cold War era, this war result the creation of NATO.

This issue is become problematic because for over 43 years all the successors of Charles de Gaulle had never been dare to denied Gaullism, until during Sarkozy's era. From this problem, it is questioned for what it is the main reason behind Sarkozy's decision? And how this decision compared to Gaullism values, the values of France's policy?

To answer these questions we will need a theoretical frameworks, first is Psychobiography theory from James Barber that divides leadership according to the psychology and biography of the leaders through this theory it differentiate categorization of leadership. To understand the individual level of analysis, there are three things that need to be analyzed, first is the human nature involves the way in which fundamental human characteristics affect decisions. Second is Organizational behavior looks at how humans interact within organized settings, such as a decision-making group. And also the third is Idiosyncratic behavior explores how the peculiarities of individual decision makers affect foreign policy. Furthermore the idiosyncrasy of these two leaders can be analysis by using Jerald Post methodology of anamnesis to give a better understanding. Jerald Post divided political psychology analysis into three parts, first is the psychobiography that compares the timeline of the leader's life to the time line of the events that taking place. Second, is looking into the leaders personality, and

third part is about the substantial belief held by the leader and the fourth part is analysis survey of the leader style include their oratorical skill, ability to communicate with public. (Hudson 2006, 55-56)

It is also important to know whether the foreign policy decision making is voluntary or rather individualist one. Voluntarism in International relations is defined as the decision maker have effective choice and are able to influence the outcome of the reality, the reality is created by human will. Individualism promote the exercise of one's goals and desires, while opposing most external interference upon one's choices, whether by society, or any other group or institution.

History of NATO

The beginning of making the NATO can be traced back from the making of Treaty of Brussels on March 17th 1948 signed by Belgium, Netherland, Luxembourg, France and the United Kingdom. This treaty created the Western European Union's Defense Organization in September 1948. Furthermore It resulted the creation of North Atlantic Treaty signed in Washington DC on 1949, included the five Brussels states and addition from United States, Denmark, Norway, Iceland, Italy, Canada, and Portugal. This concluded the birth of North Atlantic Organization (NATO). NATO is primarily an organization as collective defense action among the western bloc to prevent the growth of eastern bloc that will be spreading in Europe. This organization acted as collective defense, when once a state is being invaded then the rest of the states should help the invaded states to ensure its security. NATO is an organization that is created as a reaction of the cold war era, whereas two superpowers is spreading their influence in international arena, nevertheless Europe as the buffer zone between two blocs. NATO really had three missions according to NATO's first secretary general, Lord Hastings Ismay; "...to keep the Americans in, the Russians out and Germans down."

After the ending of cold war, NATO needed to restructure its purpose as collective defense organization. NATO interfered during the Balkan conflict to maintain the stability in Europe region. After the September 11th attack, NATO changes its direction not only as a collective defense among states aggression, but also coming from non-state actors such as terrorist.

France joined NATO since 1949 and withdrew from NATO in 1966. De Gaulle really paid important role in the withdrawal of NATO based on

his idealism of Gaullism. De Gaulle wanted an equal authority with US and Great Britain within NATO and formed tripartite directorate. But this proposal is rejected by US. France withdrawal from NATO continually sets back from France withdrew its Mediterranean fleet from NATO command in 1959. In June 1959, de Gaulle banned the stationing of foreign nuclear weapons on France soil. De Gaulle still actively involved during the Cuban Missile Crisis in 1962, but in 1966 De Gaulle decided to withdraw from NATO.

After the end of Cold War in 1990, France show significances to approach NATO once more France's subsequent rapprochement with NATO took place in stages, especially during Chirac's government. By 1992, France had joined the NATO operations in Kosovo, and France troops later participated in military campaigns in Afghanistan. In 1996, Paris said that it would re-establish a permanent military mission to NATO, and in 2004 France military officials were once again part of the NATO command. Since then, the France flag has fluttered in front of NATO headquarters once again, and today more than 4,000 France soldiers are deployed on NATO missions worldwide (Simmons 2009). For example, France commitments to NATO operations in the Balkans stretch back to 1995 and in Afghanistan to 2003. As of early April 2008, France provided 2,000 military personnel to NATO's Kosovo Force and 1,500 military personnel to NATO's International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) in Afghanistan. At Bucharest, Sarkozy pledged 700 more soldiers for ISAF. Meanwhile, only 150 France military personnel serve in the European Union's Operation Althea in Bosnia.

While some 2,100 France troops have been pledged to the EU Force to Chad and the Central African Republic (EUFOR Chad/CAR) for one year, the other principal France military deployments under EU leadership-around 1100 soldiers to the Democratic Republic of Congo in 2003 and some 800 to the same country in 2006 -- lasted about four months. France rapprochement also seen as the fifth largest financial contributor of NATO. Even though France is not a member of NATO but it gave 156 million euros in 2006 for NATO. Moreover, in addition to 90 liaison officers, the current France military representation in NATO includes some 110 officers and non-commissioned officers who work in the two strategic commands in Belgium and Virginia. Another 90 France personnel are in other NATO agencies. Hence, although the combined France military representation at NATO amounts to less than 10 percent of Germany's and the United Kingdom's, it nearly equals the entire EU military staff and European Defence Agency total of about 300 personnel (Michel 2008).

By looking at France track records on the last decades, it is seen that the rapprochement is getting nearer, others officer of the government also

support the reintegration of France to NATO. Sarkozy decision, even though not popular among the Gaullist, is agreed by most of people of France and US. At the February 2008 Munich Security Conference, the US Secretary of Defense Robert Gates aligned himself with calls by the NATO Secretary General and France defense minister for a pragmatic and "complementary" NATO-EU relationship. Later that month, US Ambassador to NATO Nuland surprised France officials with her forceful statement in Paris: "We agree with France: Europe needs, the United States needs, NATO needs, the democratic world needs -- a stronger, more capable European defense capacity. An ESDP with only soft power is not enough. As we look to the France EU presidency this summer, we hope France will lead an effort to strengthen European defense spending, upgrade European military capabilities with badly needed investment in helicopters, unmanned aerial vehicles, special forces, interoperable communications and counterinsurgency-trained soldiers and civilians. Because President Sarkozy is right -- NATO cannot be everywhere." And at Bucharest, President Bush, according to his senior aides, struck a similar chord (Michel 2008). Sarkozy can also celebrate another triumph. The president's decision has met with far less criticism from the public. In fact, 58 percent of the France supports their country's return to the NATO command structures.

Sarkozy's decision to rejoin with NATO mark on the end of Gaullism era, it is known that Idiosyncrasy factors of these two leaders have a big impact for the differences between their foreign policy styles, nevertheless also how voluntary are these two leaders in term of their foreign policy making process. In studying France foreign policy, several interesting aspects appeared that warrant further investigation. The first aspect is an in-depth study of the France economy and how it affects domestic and foreign policy decisions. A second area of that deserves further inquiry is the extent globalization and the large immigrant population, especially Muslims, will shape France policy. Finally, the affect of the reemergence of Germany as the dominate European power should be considered to explore how it will affect France's future policy decisions (Young 2006).

Charles de Gaulle Idiosyncrasies

To understand the idiosyncrasy of de Gaulle, we must use the Jerald Post methodology of anamneses. First is the psychobiography that compares the timeline of the leader's life to the time line of the events that taking place, Charles de Gaulle born during the world war Era, since child until he went to college de Gaulle had a major interest on history. He soon

enriched his characteristic through his military career, his military career boosted up during the World War era, he serve his country with proud and given the title of colonel. He's a nationalistic person that really loves his country, although he grew up in the decline power of France. De Gaulle served his country since World War I until World War II. His performance in military career gave him special attention from the public itself. During his military career in World War, de Gaulle tried to oppose France government, the Vichy regime that wanted to seek armistice with the Nazi. He soon made Free French Force in order to prevent the armistice between French and German. He got support from the Allies, but de Gaulle seen this support means the restriction on de Gaulle's freedom of action, because it means that France will acted on its own will, not by Allies will. Therefore, de Gaulle made a suspicion towards the Allies especially British and US. It also seemed clear that US didn't want to recognize de Gaulle as the representative of France. After this events took place, de Gaulle simultaneously hard to believing the Allies especially British and US.

De Gaulle soon became the president of the provisional government Fourth Republic of France, but after the France-Algerian revolt, the Fourth Republic of France was collapsed, and soon changed into the Fifth Republic. The people of France once more vote for de Gaulle to become their first president of the Fifth Republic. It is shown that de Gaulle's image and personality is really affecting the people of France. From his experiences during the World War, de Gaulle becomes a person who can't trust the US. France economy declined rapidly after World War and made France couldn't be the major player in international arena. De Gaulle vision is to regain glory of France in the old time.

De Gaulle left NATO because of many aspects. First, because de Gaulle wants NATO is formed into Troika, as repetition of the Big Three during the World War II, whereas France also have the same power like US in NATO. Second, de Gaulle has different perspective with US referring to France occupation in Africa, France wants to build consultative forum to deal with this problem, but US want to increase its military power in Africa, US didn't want to approved and give a special position of France in Africa, both AS and France had different argument and they weren't aligned. Third, because disapproval of US in matter of the development on France nuclear, de Gaulle promoted *force de frappe* to gain a real power in international arena through nuclear power. Nuclear power already developed during the Fourth Republic, and in de Gaulle era the nuclear power had become the ultimate weapon to gain power. But, US are strongly disapproved for the development of France nuclear, and this also one of the reasons of Gaulle disappointment on the Allies. US disapproval are caused by US suspicion among the tendency of

communist movement inside the Commissariat à l'Energie Atomique (CEA) (Herpen 2004, 4).

De Gaulle didn't agreed on the idea of France being under US, France should be independent and become the leader of nations, All of those events leads to the dismissal of France in NATO. De Gaulle said in 1961 (Howord n.d., 27):

Europe can have no political existence if it does not exist at the level of defense....What is NATO?...It is not the defense of Europe by Europe, it is the defense of Europe by the Americans. We need another NATO. Above all, we need a Europe which has its own defense. That Europe must be allied to the United States. I propose that our joint commission put in train proposals for a European defense: command structure, action plans, means.

From de Gaulle statements, it shows that de Gaulle strongly believes the importance to create European Defense organization that is independent from the involvement of external states, he then made European Security and Defense Policy (ESDP). Although ESDP seems to be a great idea, in the reality, European defense didn't have any clear direction. The partners of France were unwilling to discuss defence matters in the framework of the European Community, which, for them, was predominantly an *economic* organization (Herpen 2004, 6).

Second, is by looking into the leaders personality, Charles de Gaulle is a proud person, he's continuously effort to regain France's power showed that Charles de Gaulle is a powerful and influential man, he had a idealistic views to create a better circumstances for France. His personality is stern and discipline because he grew up on military values.

Third part is about the substantial belief held by the leader. Charles de Gaulle belief is relied on his ideals of Gaullism. The main aspect of Gaullism is the major belief on France history role. Gaulle sets back on his romance of the glorious day of France, this country has contributed to the world the most essential values of democracy based on their slogan of *liberte*, *egalite*, and *fraternite* that inspired many of nations in the world. Gaullism emphasize on three values. This view is rooted by the domestic condition after the World War on the declining power of French, whether on politic, and economy aspects.

Charles de Gaulle framework of foreign policy consists of four philosophical foundations. First is the the international actors are the nation-states, Second the nation-states are led by self-interest and are in permanent competition for power. Third, is the skeptical view of the role

Global & Strategis, Juli-Desember 2010 217

of international law and international organization. For the De Gaulle International organizations—the UN included—are artificial ‘constructs’. Fourth, nations-states act on the basis of geopolitical interests which are permanent and are not affected by changing ideologies. Ideologies are only temporary epiphenomena (Cerry 1980, 9). De Gaulle’s worldview was deeply rooted in an almost Hobbesian, geopolitical realism. It is not difficult to recognize similarities with the thinking of Henry Kissinger. With him De Gaulle shared not only a distrust of idealist world visions, but also a deep *historical* understanding of the political realities of his time (Herpen 2004, 2).

Gaulle’s prescription on Gaullism stand on voluntary cooperation, and the international hierarchy of nation-state, means that leading nations of international system will need a type of leadership based on nation-state, because this type of leadership can unite Europe. De Gaulle was opposed on bloc system which was the global phenomenon on bipolar international system. Gaulle sought on more flexible bloc system, because he felt that bloc system made limited nations interaction. The nations will not act on its national interest, but based on the interest of the bloc party that it followed.

Gaullist foreign policies are characterized both active and reactive. Active means that Gaulle actively involved in international politics and collective action, de Gaulle involved in many kind of organization starting from United Nations, NATO in its earliest stage, he also signed the Common Agricultural Policy. Reactive means that Gaulle acted behalf on his reaction to the international system, he really reactive with the international politics during cold war era, Gaulle refused to be obliged with United States as the leading nations on the west bloc. The relationship between active and reactive of Gaullist characteristic leads to its dismissal from NATO (Cerny 1980, 12).

Gaulle foreign policy direction is running towards on three different areas. First is international system during the Cold War era. Second is regionally in Europe, Gaulle seeks the opportunities to remake Franco-German alliance again, the disadvantages of the separation between East and West Germany made this dream is difficult to achieved. Third is among Third World Countries, such as countries in Africa regions like Algeria, South America etc. In conducting his foreign policy, de Gaulle sets on two basic principles, first is the complete independence of France vis-à-vis the two super powers. Second is France policy had global reach. During his speech referring to France dismissal on NATO, de Gaulle sets a famous Phnom Penh speech, he spoke on the favor of the independent Vietnam and criticized US military intervention in Vietnam, whereas at the beginning it was France occupation. It is shown that France step up to against US will, against superpowers. France foreign policy had global

reach is indicated by de Gaulle visited to many countries especially the one who is involved with communism such as China, South America, and Soviet Union.

Fourth part is analysis survey of the leader style include their oratorical skill, ability to communicate with public. Charles de Gaulle's most popular speech is the Phnom Penh speech that marks the end of France's involvement in NATO.

Sarkozy Idiosyncrasies

First is the psychobiography that compares the timeline of the leader's life to the time line of the events that taking place. Different from de Gaulle, Sarkozy is the first France president to have been born after World War, he grew up during the Cold War era, and the beginning of Europeanization. Sarkozy is being raised by his grandfather, Benedict Mallah, a loyal Gaullist. From the beginning, Sarkozy like not to follow mainstream idea and follow the radical one. When he was in college he joined right-wing student organization where among that time it was the time of stronghold leftist movement. He likes controversies and radical changes, this attitude he brought to his presidency until this day.

Sarkozy is the sixth president of the fifth Republic of France, he become the successor of the former president Jacques Chirac. Sarkozy political career began in the age of 22, he was one of the member of Neo-Gaullist party. His good performance in political arena made Chirac appointed him to become his minister of state during Chirac's term. Sarkozy had become one of the person that Chirac's trusted, therefore his action came from the continuously of Chirac's idea. On 21 March, President Jacques Chirac announced his support for Sarkozy. Chirac pointed out that Sarkozy had been chosen as presidential candidate for the ruling UMP party. Chirac and Sarkozy have a strong relationship, therefore it's no doubt that Chirac approved for Sarkozy's presidency. Before Sarkozy is appointed to become the president of UMP party, he used to joined RPR party, famous party among the Gaullist

Second, is by looking into the leaders personality. Different with de Gaulle, Sarkozy is more likely to become an ultra-liberal person, pragmatist, opportunist, and also rational thinker. Many judged him also impulsive because of his image in the media, not like his predecessor, Sarkozy is really famous among the media not only because of his government achievement but because of his life story that made

many controversies such as his divorces and unusual marriage with France's model and singer.

Sarkozy's radical changes can be seen during his position in the government, when he was appointed as Minister of Interior, he made some radical changes which are supported the foundation in May 2003 of the private non-profit *Conseil français du culte musulman* ("France Council of the Muslim Faith"), an organization meant to be representative of France Muslims (*The Economics* 2008). He made changes on economic and social policies that had been stable for over 30 years. During the beginning of his presidency he also reformed the structure of his ministry, including the controversies making of new ministry, Ministry of Immigration, Integration, National Identity and Co-Development and Ministry of Budget, Public Accounts and Civil Administration. He also is being considered more pro-Israeli and pro-US than his predecessor.

Third part is about the substantial belief held by the leader. Sarkozy is more Atlanticist rather than Gaullist. Sarkozy defend himself when people started to asking about his betrayal on de Gaulle, he claimed that he is actually following in Gaulle footsteps and continuing his tradition of innovation. On the announcement of France return to NATO he said that he act based on the early time decision, de Gaulle won't acted based on the policies of 1923 when he made the decision of 1966. It's just the current phenomena that forced them both to make a radical move. In the modern world, one has to be able to change decisions taken half century ago (Zimbardo 2009). Sarkozy says that there are three conditions for continuing French cooperation in NATO. First, NATO must not evolve, as the Americans appear to want, into an organization carrying out humanitarian missions or international police operations. Second, NATO must be clearly anchored in Europe and have a strictly military orientation. Third, NATO must not substitute itself for the UN and in the context of Berlin Plus, the EU must be able if necessary to have access to the planning and command chains that the Alliance is setting up (MacShane 2007).

Sarkozy decision doesn't mean that he would be under the power of US. Sarkozy sees this opportunity to strengthened France power, in the declining era of US after the economic crisis that hit it. Sarkozy seek the same position of Chirac proposition to make France the South Commander of NATO. He wants France to have a higher position during the declining time of US. Sarkozy sees the reintegration is part of "responsibility for the nation's strategic decisions"

As Sarkozy began to approach the NATO once more, it is predicted that Sarkozy will linked "reintegration" to creating space for France

representatives in NATO decision making. But it is important to note that France should not list its desired position in NATO as the "price" for France's returns. France participation will contribute to NATO's strategy, reforms, capabilities, and operational effectiveness, not to mention facilitating its still difficult relations with the European Union. In a positive move in late 2007, Paris advanced practical suggestions to improve NATO-EU cooperation (Simons 2009).

Sarkozy addressed his rapid movement to NATO as the consequences of his predecessor moves that exclaimed on the rapprochement of NATO. Sarkozy seen this opportunity to gain even closer relationship with NATO. Addressing the US Congress some ten years later, in November 2007, President Nicolas Sarkozy said: "I wish to see France, a founding member of the alliance and one of its leading contributors, take its full place in the effort to renovate its instruments and means of action and, in this context, evolve (France) relations with the alliance in parallel with the evolution and reinforcement of European defense." At the recent Bucharest summit, he even specified that the process of transforming France's relationship with NATO would "conclude" at the alliance's 60th anniversary summit in 2009 (Michel 2008) Sarkozy idea of reintegration with NATO is not far from the idea of Chirac on NATO. Both of them has the same vision of the power of France as the South Commander on NATO. Sarkozy also made the turning point by making a close relationship between him and US President Barack Obama, an even bolder move rather than Chirac moves regarding to cooperating with Tony Blair as the *Trojan horse* of US.

Sarkozy rapprochement is merely because of not about settling historic grudges, but rather helping the alliance and European Union work well together in the face of huge and constantly evolving challenges-from Afghanistan and Kosovo to international terrorism and the increasing risks of proliferation of dangerous weapons technologies. Sarkozy looks that is significance for France rejoined NATO rather than in the position of half-in. Sarkozy is an opportunistic and pragmatic person, therefore the reintegration with NATO seems like a common sense thing that he can do.

Sarkozy action actually based on Gaullism, although from the Gaullist point of view his action are not popular. He sees the EU as a 'reincarnation' for France, and envisions 'a multipolar world in which the European Union could progressively come to be one of the most active poles'. He believes that the EU should be not just a peaceful trading bloc, but a power in world affairs. Sarkozy's goal is that of French independence, influence and grandeur. He has already promoted

weapons sales abroad in order to secure not only French economic interests, but also French technological independence. And he is the first president since de Gaulle to have opened a military base outside of France's traditional zone of influence, in the United Arab Emirates (UAE).

There are many reasons why Sarkozy breaking Gaullist tradition and become more Atlanticist, the first reason is Sarkozy want to breaking the history from the past and start fresh. Second, Sarkozy action are not merely that he intended to get closer to US but in fact because of his assessment of the post-Iraq War. Sarkozy believes the West will find it harder to achieve its goals and control world politics in what he calls "an era of relative power".

Perhaps the most interesting part of Sarkozy's engagement with the world is what could be called his 'AREVA diplomacy' (after the French nuclear giant). For the French president, promoting civilian nuclear energy in the Arab world such as Algeria, Morocco, Libya and the UAE serves many purposes. It demonstrates that there is no clash of civilizations and no exclusion of Arab countries from the benefits of high technology. It shows to all countries the very concrete benefits of playing by the non-proliferation rules. It helps global warming. And, of course, it is good for AREVA, as well as for Total, which is also a participant in some deals. Because in Sarkozy's eyes, the biggest fragility of today's world, is the threat of a clash of civilizations. This reflects Sarkozy's view of religions and cultures as fundamental units of both French society and the international system As de Gaulle did, Sarkozy has acted to prop up French firms and national industrial champions; he has called for a strong 'préférence communautaire' (trade preference for EU member states), most notably for agriculture; and he has come out strongly against the dollar and unfair exchange rates. He also believes that international institutions should be adapted to current realities, advocating, for example, that the G8 be turned into a G13 by including China, India, Brazil, Mexico and South Africa. He also advocates inducting Germany, Japan, Brazil, India and 'a major African country' into the UN Security Council (www.tehrantimes.com 2009).

Fourth part is analysis survey of the leader style include their oratorical skill, ability to communicate with public. Sarkozy is really famous and unique as a person, many judged him controversial but because he's an unique people of France loves him.

Psychobiography

By looking this type of leadership on their psychobiography we can divide Charles de Gaulle and Sarkozy into two different categorization of leadership proposed by James Barber. Sarkozy can be categorized into active-positive leader, whereas this type of leaders are not driven by twisted dark motives and are willing to work hard to effect improvement. They are also willing to reverse course when things do not turn out well, it is showed in Sarkozy rapid changes for improvement of his presidency. Not constrained with rigid ideology but rather motivated by the sense that they should search for policies that actually produce the result they desired, Sarkozy is a pragmatist person therefore his policies is based on what he perceived and what France's need right now (Hudson 2006, 55). Sarkozy are very open to changes and he presented his idealism on a flexible way, try to figure out what is best to implemented during the current condition. Innovation and changes are crucial in the present world, because not all prescription during the high politics era is still relevant today. The emerging of soft power is more affecting in the current political situation.

De Gaulle is being categorized into active-negative in orientation. These leaders are compelled to power by deep-seated feelings of inadequacy and fear of ostracism, de Gaulle feared of the less powerful France. They become rigid in thinking and in action. They may be feared, and they also may be willing to circumvent convention or even rules and laws in order to maintain or increase their power (Hudson 2006, 55). De Gaulle are very rigid person, and he is also stern and holding to his believe, the military characteristic is building most of his personality, and resulted the rigid way of leadership. De Gaulle avoiding the changes during his leadership, he goes by what he beliefs. Although he was feared by France people, many still love him and keep loyal to him because of his dedication and his charisma.

Voluntarism of the Decision Makers

Both Sarkozy and de Gaulle are influential persons; they are full of controversies and being the main attention of the political arena. They reform the former system and made new differences in the current situation. They are also very influential on the decision making process. These two leaders are really strong individual that can affect the outcome of the policy that they are created. In voluntarism view, the decision maker have effective choice and are able to influence the outcome of the reality, the reality is created by human will, in this part

are de Gaulle's will. According to his ideals on Gaullism, he successfully created the reality of France policy and still continuously being used until now. De Gaulle's policy is voluntary, because through his idealism of Gaullism France approved and continually uses his idealism as the direction of France policy. The reality that de Gaulle created still outlasted even until now. Many people of France see de Gaulle as their true personification of France itself.

Conclusion

Through the psychobiography of both leaders we can see that both of leader's idiosyncrasies had a major impact for the outcome of their foreign policy especially regarding to NATO's problem. De Gaulle lived during the cold war era, whereas the declining power of France in the international arena, de Gaulle wanted to regain its long time glory and made France as the leader of the nations. De Gaulle understand the France position in the political arena especially after the World War II ended and resulted the winning position of Allies, in this term refer to US. France wasn't one of the Big Three that resulted the winning of World War, therefore to regain its position France must actively engaged with cooperation with US but the proposal of tripartite directorate between France, British and US was rejected and this concluded the withdrawal of France in NATO because de Gaulle thought it is not significant anymore.

It is true that de Gaulle and Sarkozy is separated almost four decades away. Along the way there were many changes had been made and adjustment according to the present trend and current situation. The main reason behind the Sarkozy's decision is the rapprochement for NATO is being a hidden agenda for Gaulle predecessor, but to honor de Gaulle legacy none of them are willing to extremely turn their back from the mainstream view of Gaullism. Sarkozy is the first president that willing to take that action, because he sees that reintegration to NATO is an important thing to do according to the current situation. Sarkozy's predecessor already made a step by step attempt to approach NATO once more, but nobody ever been so bold to make a statement of rejoining with NATO. Unlike de Gaulle, Sarkozy leader personality are more affecting the result of his decision, Sarkozy track records always being furnished with controversies and changes, he want to revitalize and make innovation in France government to strengthen France position in the international arena. Sarkozy is mostly influenced by the Europeanization, and the importance to make this cooperation a lot stronger. Sarkozy sees that NATO is the most rational thing to strengthen the defense in Europe area. Through many changes, Sarkozy

hoped that the changes will boost France position as one of the leading country in the declining power of US.

Although Sarkozy already made a bold moves of changing, we must questioned whether this movement are effective and giving any result in order to compete with US power, this decision is volatile and can be resulting into nothing also. Sarkozy action, like many other European states, had highly caused by the Europeanization, therefore Sarkozy acted not only by French will but also because of Europe will, although somewhat this view implicating for more nationalization rather than regionalism, because more and more Europe lost their collective willingness and want to compete to become the next leader.

Although many had viewed that Sarkozy is not a Gaullist, the fact appointed that he is still a Gaullist in a new way. Sarkozy's decision is still in the term of Gaullism values. Sarkozy made the differences in term of which actor that he promoted first. De Gaulle emphasized it in France, but Sarkozy think differently by emphasize Gaullism in European Union. Sarkozy are very influenced by Europeanization, therefore he thinks in the early reality where France now is part of Europe Union. France is longing for new changes especially during the decline of US power after the economic crisis. France population nowadays are not the same "France" culture but "European" culture, the nationalism during this Europeanization is not cultivated enough like in the era of Charles de Gaulle. A new generation of France leaders will think of themselves as more European than France, which will result in a eroding of a key element of Gaullism; the primacy of the state (Young 2006) Most of Sarkozy decision making style are opposing the mainstream views, and this resulted him as become individualist in decision making process. But because Sarkozy are very influential person, he got many followers to support him. During this multipolar world, European Union will have a great opportunity to become a strong polar in the international arena. He believes that European Union can be more than just a trading bloc but also have a power in international world.

Bibliography

Books

Cerny, Philip G., 1980. *The Politics of Grandeur: Ideological Aspects of De Gaulle's Foreign Policy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Howorth, Jolyon and John TS Keeler, eds., 2003. *Defending Europe: The EU, NATO, and the Quest for European Autonomy*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hudson, Valerie M., 2006. *Foreign Policy Analysis: Classic and Contemporary Theory*. Rowman & Littlefield.

Young, Marcus, 2006. *France, De Gaulle, and NATO: The Paradox of French Security Policy*. Alabama: Maxwell Air Force Base Air University.

Online Article

BBC News International Version, 2008. Profile: Nicolas Sarkozy. [online]. dalam <http://www.w3.org/TR/REC-html40/loose.dtd> [diakses 3 Mei 2009].

Grunstein, Judah, 2009. Sarkozy's Power Play Foreign Policy Online. [online]. dalam http://www.foreignpolicy.com/story/cms.php?story_id=4760 [diakses 7 Mei 2009].

Hicham, Ghizlane, 2009. France's Distinctive President: Nicholas Sarkozy. [online]. dalam www.opednews.com [diakses 7 Mei 2009].

Kempa, Amanda, 2008. Why NATO Should Embrace Sarkozy with Open Arms. [online]. dalam <http://www.spiegel.de/international/world/0,1518,544619,00.html> [diakses 30 April 2009].

MacShane, Denis, 2007. An A-Z Guide to the Foreign Policy Thinking of Nicolas Sarkozy and Ségolène Royal. [online]. dalam www.europaeum.org/files/programmes/Transatlantic/Washington_2007/MacShane.pdf [diakses 7 Mei 2009].

Michel, Leo, 2008. France's Return to NATO Can Complement EU Security. [online]. dalam <http://www.spiegel.de/international/0,1518,559304,00.html> [diakses 30 April 2009].

Simons, Stephen, 2009. Sarkozy Breaks with De Gaulle and Tradition. [online]. dalam <http://www.spiegel.de/international/europe/0,1518,612840,00.html> [diakses 30 April 2009].

Tehran Times, 2009. Nicolas Sarkozy's Foreign Policy: Gaullist By Any Other Name. [online]. dalam http://www.tehrantimes.com/index_View.asp?code=166168 [diakses 7 Mei 2009].

Van Herpen, Marcell and Chirac's Gaullism, 2004. Why France Has Become The Driving Force Behind an Autonomous European Defense Policy. *The Romanian Journal Of European Affairs*, 4 (1): 67-81, dalam http://www.ier.ro/revista_rjea/rjea_vol4no1_mai2004.pdf.

Wallerstein, Immanuel, 2007. France: The End of Gaullism. *International Herald Tribune*. [online]. dalam www.ihco.com/articles/2007/05/15/opinion/edwaller.php [diakses 3 Mei 2009].

Zimbio Inc., Analysis: De Gaulle's Shadow Finally Recedes in France. [online]. dalam <http://www.zimbio.com/Nicolas+Sarkozy/articles/300/ANALYSIS+De+Gaulle+shadow+finally+recedes> [diakses 29 April 2009].