

Toward a New Euro-Atlantic Euro-Mediterranean Security Community

Copyright 2002 Hall Gardner

A long term and effective war on “terrorism” following the September 11 “attacks” on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon will require a much closer and long term U.S.–NATO relationship with Russia than has previously been considered. Dealing effectively with the new “threats” will likewise require a far-reaching re-structuration of the NATO-EU relationship, and the development of a more concerted NATO-EU-Russian strategy in which the EU could play a greater and more proportional role in both “power” and “responsibility sharing”—along side the United States and Russia.

After more than a decade since the break-up of the Soviet Union, NATO and Russia have belatedly declared a newfound friendship based upon a common enemy—the “scourge of terrorism.” At the May 2002 North Atlantic Council meeting at Reykjavik, NATO opted to meet as “20” (19 NATO members plus Russia) in the new format of the NATO-Russia Council (NRC). It is hoped that the new NRC will prove to be more effective than the previous NATO-Russia Permanent Joint Council—in that Russia will be more directly engaged in NATO decision-making. At the same time, however, the NRC will ostensibly meet only on issues of concern to NATO: Russia will not be permitted to set the agenda or be able to veto NATO decisions.¹ Moreover, due in part to objections by the three new NATO members, Poland, the Czech Republic, and Hungary, the initial agenda of the NRC is to be “fairly modest” in order to make certain that there will be “some quick successes in order to persuade sceptics that the NRC can work, and to avoid disillusionment at an early stage”²—such as cooperation on sea rescue missions.

In the near future, however, the NRC may well be confronted with some rather burdensome security and defence issues: The struggle against “terrorism,” the endeavour to stop the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, problems surrounding civil defence—not to overlook the fundamental issue of NATO-Russian military

cooperation.³ In addition to ongoing cooperation in peacekeeping in the Balkans, the NRC will accordingly need to engage in military cooperation in regard to Kaliningrad and the Baltic region, and examine the necessity for more general NATO-Russian accords in regard to force deployments in central and eastern Europe. It will also need to address the new security concerns arising in the Transcaucasus, central Asia, as well as the Euro-Mediterranean. As NATO enters this new approach with Russia, it is essential that the United States and the European Union both work to develop the defence, political economic, and institutional links necessary to guarantee that Russia remains in a long lasting entente or alliance relationship.

As an integral part of the war on terrorism, NATO, the EU and Russia must soon begin to resolve their differences within the entire Euro-Atlantic and Euro-Mediterranean communities in such a way as to guarantee the legitimate security concerns on all sides. Despite the formation of a new post-September 11 coalition, many of the security issues that have confronted NATO, the European Union and Russia in the past have not entirely faded away. The issues raised by the “double enlargement” of NATO and the EU, as both regional blocs expand their membership but without necessarily coordinating their security strategies, remain on the back burner. There is still a significant risk that unilateral actions *by any one of the major parties involved* may work to undermine collective efforts to establish new political, military and economic institutional frameworks that can sustain the nascent NATO-EU-Russian coalition in the long term—and to ultimately transform it into a viable confederation.

The NATO-EU “Double Enlargement”

For the first time in its history, NATO invoked its Article 5 guarantee of mutual security in the aftermath of September 11, but in response to an attack on the United States, and not on Europe, as had largely been expected during the Cold War. The “war on terrorism” has consequently resulted in largely unprecedented political, military and intelligence cooperation between the NATO allies (albeit largely on a bilateral basis), but also with many other states—with a number of the latter hoping to join on the bandwagon and obtain offers of NATO and/or EU membership. The United States, backed primarily by the UK, may have taken the leading role in the actual combat against Al-

Qaida and the Taliban in Afghanistan, but the important logistical and intelligence support of other states cannot be ignored.

Following the November 2002 Prague summit—which was devoted to the issues of transformation, enlargement, and cementing NATO relationships with states the new eastern members—the new NATO is to incorporate seven of the 10 states of the Vilnius group, for a total of 26 states by the year 2004, a process which may prove difficult to manage, particularly as the United States has no substantial and direct experience with eastern Europe. New members will include the three Baltic states (Lithuania, Estonia and Latvia); Slovenia, and Slovakia (which possess direct lines of communication to Hungary); plus states deeper into eastern Europe and the Black sea, Romania and Bulgaria, which possess direct lines of communication to Turkey (and then Iraq). The three remaining states of the Vilnius group, Croatia, Albania, or Macedonia, could possibly join in a future round, as could states in the Transcaucasus and Central Asia.

The EU has likewise continued its own plans of enlargement with little consultation with the United States. In addition to the three states that have recently joined NATO (Poland, the Czech Republic and Hungary), EU applicants (expected to enter in 2004) include the three Baltic states, Slovenia, Slovakia, Romania and Bulgaria as well as Cyprus—not to overlook the problematic candidacy of NATO-member Turkey.⁴ The possible entry of Romania and Bulgaria in 2007 would bring the EU to the Black sea, while the membership of Cyprus (and ultimately Turkey?) and would draw the EU's geopolitical and economic interests toward Israel and the Middle East.

The dilemma, however, is that each step of NATO-EU enlargement further risks disturbing the already delicate Euro-Atlantic geopolitical and political-economic equilibrium. As NATO and EU engage in their respective enlargements, it is not clear that either regime has the resources or political will to manage the security ramifications of such extensive commitments. In addition, both regimes appear to vying for the political allegiance of central and eastern European states. (The EU insists that all its members support the International Criminal Court [ICC], for example; Washington demands that U.S. soldiers be exempt from the ICC's jurisdiction.)

The Prague NATO summit did discuss issues relating to the Allied defense burden. The United States spends 3.5% of its gross domestic product on defense and would like to see the allies reach the 2% level. The Europeans counter that they make up some of the difference with aid and development assistance, but they also realize that if they cannot pick up defence spending that they could be left out of the decision-making process. At the same time, in concession to EU demands, the U.S. has promised to open its markets to “fair defense trade.”

The Prague NATO summit likewise called for a 20,000 man NATO Response Force "able to deploy in- or out-of-area, ready for action within 7 to 30 days, and able to sustain itself in the field for up to a month." As US Ambassador to NATO Nicolas Burns put it: “A NATO Response Force, focused on combat missions, will complement and not compete with, the EU's proposed Rapid Reaction Force which will focus on peacekeeping duties. In fact, we see these two forces as mutually reinforcing, as we see the entire range of NATO-E.U. cooperation. We must now follow up to ensure that Allies participate in and contribute to the NATO response force, and get it ready to put planes in the air, ships under sail, and boots on the ground as soon as possible.” At the same time, it is still not clear the Europeans will accept force specialization that could divide the alliance between American “war fighters” and European “peacekeepers.” Issues of duplication will continue to plague the intra-Allied debate.

Most crucially, however, the risk of overextension and loss of political consensus is particularly acute as the United States has now engaged significant forces in the Persian Gulf and Central Asian regions, and as the Bush administration has been contemplating widening the “war on terrorism” to Iraq—without having completely finished off the threat posed by Al-Qaida and other groups or states that are either considered “terrorist” threats, or that are harbouring “terrorists,” or that cannot control “terrorists” operating on their territories, or that are presently developing Weapons of Mass Destruction.

Russia

NATO and EU Enlargement, as well as the deployment of Ballistic Missile Defences, likewise remain issues that can upset the

newfound NATO-Russian entente, in addition to widening the “war on terrorism” to new fronts that affect Russian interests. Moscow has denounced what it calls a “blockade” of Kaliningrad once Poland and Lithuania join the EU (planned for 2004)—in that it has feared the implementation of overly strict visa requirements and a significant reduction of trade advantages for the enclave. While Russia and the EU have reached a general accord over Kaliningrad dealing with the immediate issue of “travel” rights through the creation of “facilitated travel documents”, the larger geopolitical and geoeconomic questions have not yet been resolved.

On the one hand, Russia itself may fear the prospects of immigration from Central Asian states and the Caucasus, thus enacting a visa regime may set a precedent that actually suits Moscow’s interests—not to overlook Russia’s own hyper-bureaucratic visa regulations. On the other hand, Moscow may find itself increasingly unable to sustain the economy of the region: Moscow has argued the issue is not a “corridor” like that through East Germany to Berlin as during the Cold War as often stated in the American and European press, but rather the question that the EU needs to consider “an exception to the Schengen agreement” due to the uniqueness of the situation.⁵ Despite plans for a ferry boat to St. Petersburg, among other proposals, the Russian enclave may increasingly feel itself “isolated” politically, economically and militarily from Russia, and surrounded by EU and NATO members. Such a prospect raises Moscow’s fears that the enclave will demand greater autonomy—or that a potential secessionist movement could develop among Kaliningrad residents.

The membership of the Baltic states in NATO thus remains problematic, in that NATO must soon tackle the difficult question of permitting Russian military access to Kaliningrad through Lithuania. While Moscow seeks cooperation with NATO in matters of security, Russian hardliners continue to see NATO as a military organization with potentially offensive capabilities, despite its claims to post-Cold War “transformation”.

Arms Reduction Issues

As the Bush administration appears allergic to treaties and other inter-state formalities in general, having unilaterally scrapped the 1967 Anti-Ballistic Missile treaty, for example, there is absolutely no

guarantee that Russia will necessarily continue—in the long term—to trust the Bush Administration’s formula that the U.S. and Russian relationship is moving toward the day that “no arms control treaties will be necessary” in the words of Secretary of Defence Donald Rumsfeld.

The latter position appears to ignore the importance of a number of existing arms control treaties, such as the 1990 Conventional Force in Europe (CFE) treaty and 1987 Intermediate Range Nuclear Forces (INF) treaty, if not the 1967 Outer Space Treaty. (Moscow has called for new treaties limiting the militarization of Outer Space.) Bush administration policy has likewise tended to downplay the importance of engaging other states into formal cooperative engagements through binding international treaties, as well as the need to formulate new international accords.

In this regard, Moscow has insisted that all new NATO members sign the 1990 CFE treaty enforcing conventional arms reductions and has threatened to break out of the latter if the Baltic States do not ratify the treaty prior to becoming NATO members.⁶ Russia has argued that the CFE treaty must be signed before the Baltic states join NATO “in order to avoid any possible loophole and gap in Russian state borders.”⁷ Prior to its invitation to join NATO, Lithuania refused to link NATO membership to signing the CFE treaty and argued that this issue should be discussed *after* the states join NATO.⁸

Likewise, the Bush administration’s decision to unilaterally scrap the 1967 Anti-Ballistic Missile treaty (without sincere Russian agreement) has resulted in Russian demands for a new formal “Treaty on Mutual Security” to replace the ABM treaty that would significantly eliminate large numbers of nuclear warheads and place possible limitations *as to what extent* both sides can develop ballistic missile defences.⁹

Russian threats also include dropping out of the 1987 INF treaty. Such a threat (whereby Russia could sell Intermediate Range Ballistic Missiles to third parties despite the risks of that strategy backfiring against Russia itself) could be revived if Russian military-industrial interests are not thoroughly incorporated into new systems of ballistic missile defence (BMD), for example, as proposed by the Bush administration itself, among other geopolitical and economic rationale.

As the new U.S.-Russian interrelationship continues to possess elements of positive cooperation mixed with aspects of mutual suspicion, the new waves of NATO (and EU) enlargement still possess the risk of the permanent alienation of Russia with the concurrent threats to forge a Eurasian alliance with China, India, Iran, and Iraq—if Russia is not fully on board for whatever reason. Russia does not now see entirely eye to eye with the United States, particularly in regard to China, and continues to provide the latter with advanced military-technological supports. Russia sustains strong ties to India, but also to the “axis of evil”—North Korea, Iran, and to a certain extent, Iraq.

Concurrently, new waves of NATO and EU enlargement risk problems for the transatlantic relationship itself. Such problems could result from the inability to forge a concerted strategy and “power” and “responsibility” sharing arrangements with new NATO members as well as with EU members—and particularly with key strategically placed EU member states which are not NATO members, such as Sweden and Austria.

The second crucial issue is the possible overextension of NATO political-economic capabilities and a consequent break down in its political consensus, which critics argue is already strained at a membership of nineteen. Here, NATO’s push to expand NATO has tended to overlook two key questions: The first is how “Article 5” security guarantees will be applied to a membership of twenty-six allies. The second is how NATO will make its decisions in an expanded alliance.

The third issue relates to new potential crises or conflicts caused by drug smuggling, terrorism, economic slump and unemployment, mass migration, ethnic or territorial disputes within the new Euro-Atlantic Euro-Mediterranean region or at its periphery. Such disputes, even if not of the magnitude of conflict in ex-Yugoslavia, could drag in NATO and/or the EU—and overstretch resources.

In many ways, the second post-Cold War wave of NATO enlargement (not including that to include eastern Germany) possesses even greater risks than the first wave—but only if the NATO-Russia Council ultimately fails to address *legitimate* Russian security concerns

and if Moscow consequently believes itself cut out of NATO decision-making that affects its perceived “vital” interests.

Likewise, should EU enlargement result in trade diversion, as opposed to trade creation, in regard to trade with Russia and the other economies of the Commonwealth of Independent States, or if Moscow is ultimately unable to reform its economy substantially so as to enter the World Trade Organization (WTO), Russia could likewise turn against its present, generally positive, acceptance of EU enlargement into former Soviet/Russian spheres of influence and security.¹⁰

Regional Cooperative-Security Communities

What are the implications of President Bush’s decision to engage in a robust NATO enlargement? Under what specific conditions or modalities should this new enlargement take place, given the fact that most of the new entrants are consumers, rather than producers of security? Could a *new* form of NATO membership, that ultimately includes Russia, help stabilize Euro-Atlantic relations as a whole—and hence act as a true barrier against the spread of “terrorist” activities—be implemented throughout the region? It would appear that such a possibility would require a radical re-structuration of NATO-EU relationship—and of Euro-Atlantic Euro-Mediterranean security in general due to the expanding nature of the NATO-EU “double enlargement.”

Since the present NATO-EU-Russian coalition is built upon a commonly perceived “threat,” it is absolutely essential to build new structures of political-economic and military cooperation in the “gaps” or “weak links” between the coalition partners, and to engage in political-economic measures designed to prevent a resurgence of new “threats,” so that once that common “threat” disappears, the coalition will still be willing to cooperate.

Although not a panacea, drawing Russia into a *new* form of NATO membership can help to mitigate the potentially destabilizing effects of NATO enlargement and possible Russian counter-reaction. In addition to more intensive NATO-Russian cooperation through the NATO-Russian Council, a concrete way to bring Russia, Ukraine and the Vilnius Group as a whole into a deeper relationship with NATO

will be to make the Partnership for Peace (PfP) operational—perhaps under the auspices of the new NATO-Russian Commission (NRC).

Russian “membership” in NATO would involve NATO-EU-Russian nuclear-strategic cooperation and NATO-EU-Russian military-technological participation in developing Ballistic Missile Defence systems for the entire Euro-Atlantic and Euro-Mediterranean community. It would also involve the formulation and implementation of *overlapping* NATO-EU-Russian security guarantees to PfP states throughout eastern Europe. (These accords would need to be stronger than the overlapping security guarantees granted Ukraine by the UN Security Council members, the U.S., UK, France, Russia and China, accorded at the time when Kiev gave up its nuclear weapons in 1994).

While NATO would nominally retain “Article 5” security guarantees, the concept of “full” membership could be radically altered, particularly as *Article 5 is no longer regarded as the ultimate and automatically binding accord that it was during the Cold War, and as it would most likely be implemented under more ambiguous circumstances.*

Three basic types of NATO states (and their “associate” EU and Russian partners) would be recognized:

- 1) Those states with nuclear capabilities willing to engage in strategic nuclear cooperation and provide security guarantees for other members or partners in coordination or association with the other nuclear states;
- 2) Those states willing to engage in “coalitions of the willing,” and who would back up new NATO “members” or “partners” with conventional force security guarantees;
- 3) Those states willing to engage in “*conflict prevention* deployments” and “peacekeeping” missions.

These concepts imply a fundamental restructuring of NATO that could permit greater flexibility in regard to both EU members and Russia. As decisions could be made at each of the three levels it would appear that the decision-making process could be weighted in accord with the extent of the participation and financial contribution of each

participant at each of the three levels. (Some states, of course, would be willing to play two or three roles.)

One way to *prevent* the rise of terrorism in the long term is thus for NATO, the EU, and Russia to work toward the development of “regional cooperative-collective security communities” as a means to fill the gaps of uncontrolled space between potentially conflicting states or partisan movements and “terrorist” organizations.

Rather than thinking in traditional terms of the expansion of large blocs of military power, NATO should think more in terms of “customizing” approaches of security and deterrence and dissuasion to specific regions and situations and threats through the creation of a number of “regional cooperative-collective security communities” that would be integrated with the armed forces of each of the states of a particular region and which, in turn, would receive development and state building assistance from the U.S. and EU primarily. These communities can be built through the mechanism of the Partnership for Peace—and in *general* cooperation with the UN and the OSCE.

More intensive Russian political-military involvement in multinational peacekeeping and “*conflict prevention*” deployments through multinational Combined Joint Task Force (CJTF) and PfP forces can ultimately help draw Russia closer to NATO (and the EU) at the same time that such forces guard against potential regional political instability and threats in central and eastern Europe and central Asia—and possibly the Transcaucasus. Potential socio-political tensions in non-NATO non EU states of Belarus, Moldova, and Ukraine,¹¹ for example, could lead to problems of immigration or domestic violence that might require external diplomatic and “peace keeping” intervention.

Potential and actual tensions in these areas (as well as those now stirring in Central Asia, the Middle East, Persian Gulf and Far East) will ultimately require greater policy coordination between NATO, the EU, and Russia through the NATO-Russia Council and Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council or other institutional mechanisms, such as the UN or OSCE, so as to prevent major states from being drawn into potential conflict in support of opposing sides, and to assure the formation of concerted strategies. Likewise, as a means to clamp down on terrorism,

“out of area” conflicts may also require NATO-EU-Russian military intervention or else peacekeeping—if initial disputes cannot first be quelled by concerted and preventive diplomacy.

Making the Partnership for Peace (PfP) initiative *operational* could thus provide the political-military means to help to stabilize states throughout the Euro-Atlantic and Euro-Mediterranean regions as these states continue to engage in potentially destabilizing socio-economic reforms intended to modernize their outmoded economies. Rather than deploying such forces *after* conflict breaks out, as has been the case in Bosnia, Kosovo, and now Macedonia, PfP “*conflict prevention*” forces—which would form integrated systems of defence—could be deployed throughout the Euro-Atlantic and Euro-Mediterranean community with NATO, Russian and EU oversight—but *before* the potential for conflict breaks out.

Here, EU states would play a key role. Some EU states would deploy “conflict prevention” peacekeepers; others would participate in “coalitions of the willing” that would be ready to intervene in the case that conflicts do develop. EU members Sweden and Austria in particular would be key to the building of cooperative-security communities in their respective regions. The deployment of PfP “*conflict prevention*” forces could be initiated in the Baltic States, as a means to concretise overlapping NATO-EU-Russian security guarantees. Making Kaliningrad an NATO-Russian Council headquarters could likewise help stabilize the Baltic region and would likewise help draw Russia closer to NATO and the EU and NATO and the EU closer to Russia.

In 1999-2000, Russia had offered to provide “security guarantees” to the Baltic states in a regional treaty or charter as an “alternative” to NATO membership, an offer similar to the 1998 U.S.-Baltic charter. Latvia and Lithuania stated that Russia must accept the NATO membership of the Baltic states before they accept Russian security guarantees. But here, it seems the United States and Russia, along with the EU, could offer *overlapping* guarantees—as part of a *new* form of NATO membership that brings the Baltic states and Russia “into” NATO simultaneously by May 2004. The Baltic states could also sign a revised 1990 CFE treaty at roughly the same time that they formally join NATO (assuming the CFE treaty can be updated by May

2004). Concurrently, if Russia should ultimately drop out of any accords, NATO and the EU “*conflict prevention*” forces would already be there—with a physical military presence on the ground—to defend Baltic state sovereignty or that of other states backed by such overlapping accords.

If NATO-EU-Russian confidence can subsequently increase, then these regional systems of cooperative security can be expanded. Security supports for these states would accordingly require the backup of “coalitions of the willing” that could include NATO, EU members, as well as Russia and other states. These systems of regional cooperative security can ultimately be built out of NATO peacekeeping units in the Balkans—once and if the ex-Yugoslavia states can ultimately put aside their differences. Regional systems of security can also be built out of the Partnership for Peace program in central Asia and possibly the Caucasus, in the effort to prevent the spread of pan-Islamic movements in that region.

Looking South to the Euro-Mediterranean

As NATO begins to expand its membership further into the eastern Europe, possibly providing strategic lines of communication through Romania and Bulgaria across the Black Sea to Turkey, and as EU may bring in both Cyprus (and possibly Turkey) as members, it appears that the new Euro-Atlantic community must also begin to examine more closely the security of its southern periphery in the Euro-Mediterranean and Middle East/Persian Gulf. In addition to dealing with the questions of NATO enlargement to the east, the Prague summit also dealt with the questions of the “war on terrorism” and Iraq. *While both NATO and the EU have traditionally looked east, it is time, with Russian supports, to look south toward the Euro-Mediterranean/Persian Gulf regions as a whole.*

In addition to taking steps to pressure Iraq, NATO, the EU and Russia should also take more decisive diplomatic action to prevent the Israeli-Palestinian conflict from spiralling out of control and to help prevent the acts of blind terrorism that have been escalating between Israelis and Palestinians—and that could result in wider regional instability, playing into the hands of pan-Islamic partisans. NATO, the EU and Russia should consider the deployment of multinational Partnership for Peace (PfP) forces in this region in an effort to truly play “honest broker” between both sides.

The firm promise of multinational PfP force deployments backed by NATO, the European Union and Russia to protect both sides against indiscriminate acts of “terrorism” could hopefully help both sides to reach a political settlement. Such a settlement could perhaps be based on a modified version of the Saudi/ Arab peace plan that was proposed at the March 2002 Beirut Summit. Such an agreement would look toward the formation of a viable “democratic” Palestinian state that cooperates peacefully with its neighbour, in what, in actuality, would be the basis of a very loose confederation. This proposal assumes that the major Israeli and Palestinian political factions can ultimately recognize the need for mutual cooperation and compromise (in regard to trade, water, exchange of labour, policing, joint controls over Jerusalem, the rights of the Israeli and Palestinian Diasporas to return, among other issues) and that they would ultimately accept such multinational PfP

peacekeeping deployments primarily in those areas in the West Bank and Gaza that are to be handed over to the Palestinians.

Trained and backed by NATO, multinational PfP peacekeepers could also help to guarantee Israel's security against potential threats from its neighbours, Syria and Iraq, or other states, such as Egypt, if not Saudi Arabia, that might ultimately be destabilized by pan-Islamic movements. Most importantly, by indirectly *restraining* the possibility of *unilateral* Israeli military actions against Iraq or other states in the region (as was the case during the 1990-91 Persian Gulf war)—it is possible that concerted diplomacy could then provide NATO, the EU and Russia with the diplomatic leverage necessary to pressure Iraq into giving up its quest to deploy weapons of mass destruction—without necessarily engaging in full-scale military intervention as has been threatened by the Bush administration. In this respect, President Bush's September 12, 2002 demand that Iraq accept all UN resolutions, and that it truly begin the process of radical disarmament—or risk major U.S. military intervention—should be *tacitly* accompanied by renewed UN-US-EU-Russian “Quartet” efforts to engage in the Middle East peace process.¹²

On the other hand, should Iraq fail to accept UN inspectors or refuse to disarm in accord with UN or US demands,¹³ and should the United States (along with United Nations?) then decide to engage in a major military intervention in Iraq, going beyond limited strikes and efforts to stage a *coup d'état*, Washington will still need to follow up its intervention in Iraq by seeking a thorough resolution of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict along the lines outlined above—if U.S. military intervention in Iraq is not to continue to alienate the populations of much of the Arab and Islamic worlds, setting the groundwork for renewed acts of terrorism and counter-terrorism, and the possible destabilization of a number of the regimes in the region. While most Arab/Islamic states are not at all friends with Iraq, many are afraid that unilateral American military intervention will tend to destabilize the region and cause more problems than it will resolve.

President Bush's September 12 2002 speech at the UN was intended to put Iraq on notice, to gain a stronger UN Security Council mandate to enforce disarmament measures, as well as obtain popular international support for a possible military intervention against Iraq,

but it was also intended to counter perceptions that the Bush administration is averse to working multilaterally through international regimes and in accord with international treaties. Despite the Bush administration's decision to seek UN legitimacy for its policies, however, Washington will still need to counter perceptions that the United States only works with the UN when it is in American interests to do so. (The Bush Administration has continued to threaten to act unilaterally if the UN fails in its mission—in order to assert further pressure on Iraq.)

If the United States does ultimately intervene in Iraq with or without a UN Security Council mandate, Washington will still need to make amends with its allies who may have to pick up the pieces after such an intervention, as has largely been the case in Afghanistan. (The UK has largely supported the American stance on Iraq; France has supported action only through a UNSC mandate; Germany has generally been reluctant to support military intervention. It should be noted that Germany bore an estimated \$11.5 billion of the costs of the 1990-91 Persian Gulf war at a time when it was initially allocating \$50 billion more for German unification. It is dubious that the Allies will pick up the tabs of a renewed war with Iraq that could cost between \$100-200 billion, not to overlook more indirect costs, and depending upon how much damage the war causes.¹⁴)

Coupled with war against Iraq, the burgeoning number of fissures within the transatlantic alliance—given disputes over trade relations (steel and agriculture), military spending and defence, ecological issues (global warming and genetically modified organisms), socio-cultural differences and human rights (capital punishment and the International Criminal Court), among others, that have emerged in the aftermath of the Cold War—may make issues involving “power” and “responsibility” sharing more difficult to implement. The US and Europeans still need to determine the appropriate European role in “out of area” operations, the development of NATO and European Union rapid deployment forces, the sharing and duplication of NATO assets, as well as questions surrounding both the decision to intervene and to engage peacekeeping forces in the aftermath of conflict.

Conclusion

It must be admitted that neither nuclear weapons nor conventional forces deterred the “suicidal” attacks upon the World Trade Center and the Pentagon. And had Ballistic Missile Defence (BMD) systems been operating, such systems would not have stopped those attacks either. Certainly, placing air marshals on commercial flights, as has been proposed for years by terrorist experts prior to September 11, would have represented a simpler and far more effective deterrent than BMD.

The concept of developing “regional cooperative security communities” backed by overlapping NATO, EU and Russian security guarantees is as simple as placing air marshals on airplanes. It is a commonsense *on the ground* deterrent against all possible forms of threats. It is designed to create cooperative forms of regional security with the backing of the states and populations involved. Its political-military purpose is to negotiate between actual and potentially conflicting factions so that all sides can live side by side without fear. Although peacekeeping in general has thus far been downplayed by the Bush administration, this concept requires a strengthening of the U.S. commitment to the Partnership for Peace—and not a retraction of that support.

Let me end with an observation and warning. On the one hand, we need leadership and courage to fight the “war on terrorism” effectively, but also justly. We must minimize what has become known as “collateral damage”; we need to properly take care of the innocent victims of this tragedy, provide for their basic human needs and political rights, and assist the process of state building in Afghanistan, and other areas afflicted by this conflict, in general cooperation with the UN.

On the other, we need concerted leadership and wisdom to prevent this war from opening up too many fronts that could overstretch U.S. and European resources and political will—and potentially carve a deep fissure within the Alliance that may be increasingly difficult to heal. The United States and European Union need to work cooperatively and on the basis of rough equality to establish the long-term socio-political-economic and geopolitical bases for global peace—even in the midst of conflict.

¹ R. Nicholas Burns, U.S. Permanent Representative to NATO, Speech, "New World, New Europe New Threats: NATO and the EU in the New Millennium," Paris: The American University of Paris, 8 December 2001.

² U.S. Ambassador Alexander Vershbow, "Russia, The United States and the Challenges of the 21st Century" Johnson's Russia List #6369 25 July 2002. www.cdi.org. Tasks of the NRC are to include: Assessment of the terrorist threat; Crisis management; Non-proliferation; Arms Control and Confidence-Building Measures; Theater Missile Defense; Search and Rescue at Sea; Military-to-Military Cooperation; Defense Reform; Civil Emergencies; New Threats and Challenges (including scientific cooperation and airspace management).

³ The Polish national security council, for example, has "endorsed cooperation between Russia and NATO, on the condition NATO retains its identity and structure.... Three areas have been identified for cooperation: the fight against terrorism, against proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and ensuring civil defense. Poland additionally proposed "to add military cooperation, notably with the Kaliningrad region" as an additional issue to be discussed in the new NATO-Russian Council. While Russia's participation in the anti-terrorism coalition is a "new development," military cooperation between NATO and Russia "remains very limited." National Security Advisor, Marek Siwiec (Warsaw: Agence France Press, 11 January 2002).

⁴ In November, Giscard D'Estaing, head of the European Union Convention, an institution responsible for shaping the EU's future and its constitution, was quoted in *Le Monde* as saying that "Turkey's capital is not in Europe, 95 percent of its population lives outside Europe, it is not a European country," and that letting non-European countries join the 15-member club would be "the end of the European Union" as it would lead to a Moroccan demand for membership of the union. He added that "Those who have pushed enlargement most strongly in the direction of Turkey are the enemies of the European Union" with probable reference to the UK and USA. The official Turkish response: "Our attitude should emulate the French saying: Les chiens aboient, la caravane passé [The dogs bark, but the caravan moves on]. OFFICE OF THE PRIME MINISTER, DIRECTORATE GENERAL OF PRESS AND INFORMATION. Here it seems a possible solution might be to seek an integrated free trade association of states in North Africa and Turkey that is more closely linked to the EU.

⁵ Russian Foreign Minister, Igor Ivanov, cited in "Foreign Minister says Russia more accepted, respectable to Western Eyes" *BBC Monitoring Former Soviet Union* (July 10, 2002).

⁶ Russia might radically reconsider its position towards the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe (CFE) if Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia enter NATO without first joining the CFE. New states will be able to join the CFE only after an agreement on adapting the Treaty is ratified, for the acting CFE is a closed treaty, which makes it impossible for new states to enter it. See "Russia Might Reconsider its Position Towards CFE if Baltic States Join NATO" Moscow: Interfax, 11 Jan 02.

⁷ "Moscow Won't Take Military Steps in Response to Balt's Entry—Defense Minister" Baltic News Service, 29 July 2002.

⁸ "Lithuania Won't Sign CFE Pact Before NATO Entry In Spite of Russia's Pressure" Baltic News Service 29 July 2002.

⁹ Michael Binyon, "Moscow Demands a New Arms treaty with U.S." *The Times* (UK) 14 January 2002

¹⁰ See, for example, Nils Iohansen "ROBBED BY EUROPE? Expansion of the EU at the expense of countries of the former socialist camp will cause damages to Russia" *Itogi* November 19, 2002. WPS

Monitoring Agency, www.wps.ru/e_index.htm. Russian efforts to enter the WTO, if successful, could, on the other hand, bolster Russian trade with the EU.

¹¹ In November 2002, accusations of sales of radar and military technology to Iraq by Ukraine, for example, have put NATO-Ukrainian relations on hold.

¹² It is interesting, on the one hand, that President Bush emphasized the Iraqi threat and Iraqi violations of UN resolutions in his September 12 speech at the UN but mentioned at the outset the need to establish an “independent and democratic Palestine, living side by side with Israel in peace and security.” The address of UN Secretary General Kofi Annan, on the other hand, while mentioning the need for Iraq to accept UN inspectors and eliminate weapons of mass destruction, tended to give primacy to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Hence the two speeches tended to counter-balance Arab/Islamic and Israeli perspectives. It thus appears that both the Iraqi and Israeli-Palestinian questions must be *tacitly* addressed *together* if the Middle East is ever to find a lasting peace and if the “war on terrorism” is ultimately to come to an end. President Bush has not appeared to follow up on the Palestinian question, however. Israel itself has attempted to block such an initiative, ostensibly in response to terrorist attacks by late November 2002.

¹³ On September 16 Iraq agreed to allow the unconditional return of U.N. weapons inspectors. The White House dismissed the offer as “a tactical step by Iraq” and argued that “This is not a matter of inspections. It is about disarmament of Iraq's weapons of mass destruction and the Iraqi regime's compliance with all other Security Council resolutions.” The United States demanded a “new, effective U.N. Security Council resolution that will actually deal with the threat Saddam Hussein poses to the Iraqi people, to the region and to the world.” Associated Press, September 16, 2002. The Iraqi “tactic” represents an effort to play members of the U.N. Security Council against each other (particularly France versus the USA) and undermine international support for a threatened U.S. military intervention. As such, it represents an effort to throw the ball back into the US court, to make the U.S. look like the aggressor in case of military intervention.

Concurrently, attacks against Israeli targets in Kenya in late November 2002, for example, appear to be designed to impel Israel to more directly intervene in the “war on terrorism” outside its territory—if not ultimately in Iraq, or elsewhere—so as to inflame Arab/Islamic opinion.

¹⁴ “U.S. facing Bigger Bill for Iraq war,” **Washington Post**, December 1, 2002.

¹ R. Nicholas Burns, U.S. Permanent Representative to NATO, Speech, “New World, New Europe New Threats: NATO and the EU in the New Millennium,” Paris: The American University of Paris, 8 December 2001.

² U.S. Ambassador Alexander Vershbow, “Russia, The United States and the Challenges of the 21st Century” Johnson’s Russia List #6369 25 July 2002. www.cdi.org. Tasks of the NRC are to include: Assessment of the terrorist threat; Crisis management; Non-proliferation; Arms Control and Confidence-Building Measures; Theater Missile Defense; Search and Rescue at Sea; Military-to-Military Cooperation; Defense Reform; Civil Emergencies; New Threats and Challenges (including scientific cooperation and airspace management).

³ The Polish national security council, for example, has “endorsed cooperation between Russia and NATO, on the condition NATO retains its identity and structure.... Three areas have been identified for cooperation: the fight against terrorism, against proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and ensuring civil defense. Poland additionally proposed “to add military cooperation, notably with the Kaliningrad region” as an additional issue to be discussed in the new NATO-Russian Council. While Russia's participation in the anti-terrorism coalition is a “new development,” military cooperation

between NATO and Russia "remains very limited." National Security Advisor, Marek Siwiec (Warsaw: Agence France Press, 11 January 2002).

⁴ In November, Giscard D'Estaing, head of the European Union Convention, an institution responsible for shaping the EU's future and its constitution, was quoted in *Le Monde* as saying that "Turkey's capital is not in Europe, 95 percent of its population lives outside Europe, it is not a European country," and that letting non-European countries join the 15-member club would be "the end of the European Union" as it would lead to a Moroccan demand for membership of the union. He added that "Those who have pushed enlargement most strongly in the direction of Turkey are the enemies of the European Union" with probable reference to the UK and USA. The official Turkish response: "Our attitude should emulate the French saying: Les chiens aboient, la caravane passé [The dogs bark, but the caravan moves on]. OFFICE OF THE PRIME MINISTER, DIRECTORATE GENERAL OF PRESS AND INFORMATION. Here it seems a possible solution might be to seek an integrated free trade association of states in North Africa and Turkey that is more closely linked to the EU.

⁵ Russian Foreign Minister, Igor Ivanov, cited in "Foreign Minister says Russia more accepted, respectable to Western Eyes" *BBC Monitoring Former Soviet Union* (July 10, 2002).

⁶ Russia might radically reconsider its position towards the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe (CFE) if Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia enter NATO without first joining the CFE. New states will be able to join the CFE only after an agreement on adapting the Treaty is ratified, for the acting CFE is a closed treaty, which makes it impossible for new states to enter it. See "Russia Might Reconsider its Position Towards CFE if Baltic States Join NATO" Moscow: Interfax, 11 Jan 02.

⁷ "Moscow Won't Take Military Steps in Response to Balt's Entry—Defense Minister Baltic News Service, 29 July 2002.

⁸ "Lithuania Won't Sign CFE Pact Before NATO Entry In Spite of Russia's Pressure" Baltic News Service 29 July 2002.

⁹ Michael Binyon, "Moscow Demands a New Arms treaty with U.S." *The Times* (UK) 14 January 2002

¹⁰ See, for example, Nils Iohansen "ROBBED BY EUROPE? Expansion of the EU at the expense of countries of the former socialist camp will cause damages to Russia" *Itogi* November 19, 2002. WPS Monitoring Agency, www.wps.ru/e_index.htm. Russian efforts to enter the WTO, if successful, could, on the other hand, bolster Russian trade with the EU.

¹¹ In November 2002, accusations of sales of radar and military technology to Iraq by Ukraine, for example, have put NATO-Ukrainian relations on hold.

¹² It is interesting, on the one hand, that President Bush emphasized the Iraqi threat and Iraqi violations of UN resolutions in his September 12 speech at the UN but mentioned at the outset the need to establish an "independent and democratic Palestine, living side by side with Israel in peace and security." The address of UN Secretary General Kofi Annan, on the other hand, while mentioning the need for Iraq to accept UN inspectors and eliminate weapons of mass destruction, tended to give primacy to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Hence the two speeches tended to counter-balance Arab/Islamic and Israeli perspectives. It thus appears that both the Iraqi and Israeli-Palestinian questions must be *tacitly* addressed *together* if the Middle East is ever to find a lasting peace and if the "war on terrorism" is ultimately to come to an end. President Bush has not appeared to follow up on the Palestinian question, however. Israel itself has attempted to block such an initiative, ostensibly in response to terrorist attacks by late November 2002.

¹³ On September 16 Iraq agreed to allow the unconditional return of U.N. weapons inspectors. The White House dismissed the offer as "a tactical step by Iraq" and argued that "This is not a matter of inspections. It is about disarmament of Iraq's weapons of mass destruction and the Iraqi regime's compliance with all other Security Council resolutions." The United States demanded a "new, effective U.N. Security Council resolution that will actually deal with the threat Saddam Hussein poses to the Iraqi people, to the region and to the world." Associated Press, September 16, 2002. The Iraqi "tactic" represents an effort to play members of the U.N. Security Council against each other (particularly France versus the USA) and undermine international support for a threatened U.S. military intervention. As such, it represents an effort to throw the ball back into the US court, to make the U.S. look like the aggressor in case of military intervention.

Concurrently, attacks against Israeli targets in Kenya in late November 2002, for example, appear to be designed to impel Israel to more directly intervene in the "war on terrorism" outside its territory—if not ultimately in Iraq, or elsewhere—so as to inflame Arab/Islamic opinion.

¹⁴ "U.S. facing Bigger Bill for Iraq war," **Washington Post**, December 1, 2002.