Hall GARDNER

Professor
Department of International and Comparative Politics
American University of Paris

PARIS, 8 December 2005

**REDEFINING THE TRANSATLANTIC RELATIONSHIP
FOR THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY –
WHY THE US AND EUROPE NEED EACH OTHER[1]**

Lecture in the International Seminar for Experts "The European Security and Defence Policy and the Transatlantic Relationship – How to Strike a New Balance?", organised by the Cicero Foundation in the series *Great Debates*, Paris, 8 – 9 December 2005

Introduction

I would like to address the following issues that I believe to be of crucial importance for the future of transatlantic relations and for global peace: The US, NATO, Turkey and the EU Constitution; The New Wave of Multilateralism (with a focus on Iran); the Question of NATO, Europe and Russia; "The Quartet" and the Road Map to Peace. In the conclusion, I will propose the creation of what I call "regional security communities" backed by NATO, EU and Russian security accords, under the general mandate of the UN. My purpose is to explore ways to secure the peripheries of Europe, and consequently guarantee peace, stability and development of Europe and the world in the long term.

I. The US, NATO, Turkey and the European Constitution

It is interesting to note that the Bush administration had tried to keep a very quiet profile during the French constitutional debates, knowing that an official US position on the European Constitution might negatively influence the vote.

The second term Bush administration has been divided between traditional "realists," who support a more multilateral approach, in working with the Europeans and thus building Europe up, and the more ideologically inclined "neo-conservatives" who prefer a unilateral America-first approach, and who seek to keep Europe as weak and divided as possible.

In many ways, the multilateralists have thus far been gaining the upper hand in the second term Bush administration. This appears true following essentially unilateral US intervention in Iraq, which has not at all proved to be the "cakewalk" that the neo-conservatives had claimed it would be. As the neo-conservatives appear to be increasingly under attack, traditional American realists realize that Washington is stuck in quicksand and that the US will ultimately need the indirect, if not direct, assistance of its Allies—if it is ever to withdraw from Iraq "with honor" as Richard Nixon once put it in regard to Vietnam.

I think that traditional American realists understand that a more unified Europe is in the American and world interest, even if the Europeans should oppose US policy on occasion, as the French, Germans (and Russians) did during the Iraq war. Former US Ambassador to France, Felix Royhatyn, for example, did break the silence in supporting the EU constitution just prior to the French referendum with the argument, in very diplomatic terms, "what is good for Europe is good for the United States."

In popularised political science, the American vision of Europe continues to swing between two extremes. On one extreme, the power of Europe is overestimated as becoming a "fortress Europe" that is capable of acting totally independently of the US and that will ultimately be able to threaten American global interests. Here, neo-conservatives have tended to exaggerate European efforts (and capabilities) to become truly "independent." Because they oppose a Europe that can think and act for itself, they tend to exaggerate the *future* EU capacity for *independent* military action. They have thus sought to play upon European policy differences and thus during the 2003 Iraq war, the US was able to play the interests of the UK, Italy, Poland, and initially Spain, against those of France, Belgium and Germany. In many ways, the fears of those Americans elites who oppose a more unified Europe appear to stem from the 1956 Suez crisis in which France and Britain acted in support of Israel, yet without informing the US.

On the other extreme, Europe is also underestimated as being weak and pacifist, as "Venus" in respect to the American "Mars." Europe is thus criticized as being incapable of defending itself and incapable of developing a military apparatus that can intervene abroad. The US will consequently only respect the EU only once the latter truly begins to flex its muscles and take up its responsibilities. These critics, however, generally want Europe to follow in American footsteps: The US does the war fighting; the Europeans do the state and nation building. In a word, Europe picks up the cadavers in the aftermath of the American-led intervention.

Yet I think both perceptions of Europe are wrong. As the new Europe represents a new form of federation, it is dubious that the EU will become a "hard pole" that can wholeheartedly countermand the US in a "multipolar" world. At the same time, however, the EU can certainly can move into neutrality, and not support US policy positions or actions, in a *highly uneven polycentric* global system.[2]

Returning to the European Constitutional debate, I think it is highly ironic that both the "oui" and the "non" arguments tried to strike an anti-American position in order to gain supporters. The "oui" vote claimed that the European Constitution would help Europe battle the US, China and India in political-economic terms. The "non" vote claimed that the proposed Constitution would create a *"libéralisme a l'américain"* and formalize NATO hegemony over Europe.

In many ways, the "non" vote on the European Constitution has played into the hands of American neo-conservatives by weakening efforts to achieve a greater European unity. Contrary to the arguments of those who opposed the European Constitution as implementing a form of *libéralisme a l'américain*, the EU Constitution has relatively little in it that can even compare to the US Constitution and its Madison-Hamilton concept of federalism with a strong executive branch. (The EU Constitution is, in fact, more comparable to the New Jersey Plan and other "Anti-Federalist" plans for the US Constitution, which gave individual states the power to choose the executive, but which likewise limited popular representation).[3]

Certainly, one can find "liberal" elements in both constitutions, such as the "commerce clause" in the US Constitution, which, by the way, was used to end racial segregation in the South through the 1964 Civil Rights Act, and to regulate commerce in other ways as well. Yet the guarantees for citizen and social rights as proposed by EU Constitution, however, are far more extensive than those of the US Bill of Rights, and include rights for employees (including German co-determination), women—as well as for animals! It is important to emphasize that while both the Americans and Europeans claim to hold "common" values that stem from the Enlightenment, the two sides do not necessarily give the same weight to those somewhat similar values. The Equal Rights Amendment, for example, has not yet been ratified by enough states to be added to the US Constitution, although the House and the Senate did pass it. [4]

My point is that as Europe debates the issue, the general European population should be better educated as to the significant differences between the US constitution and the more complex EU Constitution as proposed (or with modifications). Here, I think it is important for the Europeans to emphasize their differences with the Americans in order to strengthen their identity in linking together so many diverse cultures, languages and histories, but, at the same time, without seeking to completely homogenize those crucial cultural differences, as has, to a large extent, occurred in the American context, as essentially a state-nation of immigrants.

The difference between the US and Europe lies not in military capabilities and interests alone (in the stereotyped Mars versus Venus dichotomy), but in the fact that their interacting values, norms, interests, long-term vision and goals all differ. The US and EU may claim to hold "same" values, but do not necessarily place those values in same order and preference. Moreover, the proposed EU constitution (which is, in effect, a form of constitutional treaty between states) can perhaps be ultimately modified so as to permit greater popular participation, much as the American Constitution was only passed as a result of the "Great" or "Connecticut" Compromise, coupled with the decision to tack on the Bill of Rights at the last moment in order to assure passage. I also think the proposed EU Constitution could possibly be modified in some areas as to permit as much national flexibility to deal with specific issues as possible.

With respect to the question of NATO, the proposed EU Constitution would have provided the legal means to accelerate European defense cooperation and integration, making defense procurement easier. It would have also permitted Europe to better coordinate strategy, through the creation of a single foreign minister, and thus enhance the possibility of greater relative autonomy of action. A stronger EU Defense Identity and Common Foreign and Security Policy would accordingly permit greater power and responsibility sharing, either in cooperation with the US, or alone, if deemed necessary. It would have also permitted Europe to back its

diplomacy by force, in case of non-compliance. At the same time, the EU mutual defense clause (Article 1-41 paragraph 7) is much stronger than NATO's article V security guarantee—*which represents an issue that could potentially lead to complications between NATO and EU members if ever tested.*

A Europe that spends more on defense, even if some of those defense systems and technologies duplicate those of the US (such as satellite reconnaissance systems), could engage in greater power and responsibility sharing with Washington. US-European power and responsibility sharing could, in turn, permit the US to focus on the "new threats" emerging in Asia, the Middle East and elsewhere outside the European theatre, but preferably in a multilateral context and with the backing of the UN. At the same time, so that the Americans do not only do the war fighting, thus leaving the Europeans to pick up the cadavers in the aftermath of the conflict, *both* the Americans *and* Europeans need to develop multi-task forces that are capable of *war-fighting*, *counter-terrorism*, *peacemaking* and *peacekeeping*.

Not only does Europe need its own defense capabilities (particularly since it cannot rely entirely on the US in the coming decades!) but it also needs force projection capabilities in order to make its own diplomacy more effective. Diplomacy needs both carrots and sticks; without enough sticks the Europeans might need to fall back on the US for political-military enforcement—in the assumption that European diplomacy should fail to achieve desired results, as could prove to be the case of Iran, for example. (See following discussion on Iran below.)

Now that the European Constitution did not pass the French (or Dutch) referendums, American neo-conservatives can effectively argue that the US and NATO must continue to exert significant political leverage over European diplomacy due to the continuing European inability to build a stronger defense identity and to build adequate defense and force projection capabilities that can truly complement that of the US.[5] Much as the 1954 French rejection of the European

Defense Community, which had been supported by the US, permitted an extension of US and NATO power over Germany and Europe, the French rejection of the EU Constitution likewise augments the US/NATO position in the "new" Europe, but at a time when US and NATO capabilities may well be "overstretched."

Washington can thus at least attempt to play the UK and the "new" eastern Europe against the "old" Europe of France and Germany. The American neo-conservatives have accordingly gloated as the French and Dutch voted "no," expecting the British and Polish to say no as well, in addition to waiting for tensions to erupt between the UK and France over the Common Agricultural Program, in the hope that that dispute might assist US agro-industrial interests. (At the same time, I do not believe the new German Chancellor Angela Merkel will necessarily move as close to the Americans as Germany did during the Cold War despite her strong support for NATO, which has been coupled with her "deep conviction that a strong relationship between Germany and France is both necessary and beneficial to Europe."[6])

The irony is that contrary to the neo-conservative perspective, and its stereotyped "Mars" versus "Venus" perspective, and contrary to the views of those who voted "non" against the Constitution on the basis that it was "too liberal" and that it guaranteed NATO hegemony over Europe, is that the US needs a strong Europe. After the Iraq fiasco,[7] Washington, despite its high tech military capabilities, now realizes that it needs to engage in concerted and multilateral strategies with the Europeans, that permit power as well as responsibility sharing, as in Afghanistan, and wherever possible, with respect to the "war on terrorism."

A third reason for opposing the EU Constitution had nothing to do with the "liberal" American Constitution itself, but fears that the new "liberal" EU Constitution would necessarily open the door to Turkish membership—which has been pressed on the EU by the US at least since the Clinton administration. This is true despite the fact that the framer of

the European Constitution, former French President Valery Giscard d'Estaing, regarded as a strong supporter of a "liberal" economy, and who opened the door to immigration in France, opposed Turkish membership, in the belief that it would "destroy Europe" and that it would be like making Mexico the 51st state of the United States.[8]

In this respect, it is feared that Turkish membership in the EU would permit greater uncontrolled immigration, as has historically been the case for the US, which has been built after historic waves of immigration from differing communities, and which is now confronted with the "Hispanic" challenge (in the eyes of Samuel Huntington), while the Europeans are now confronted with the "Islamic" challenge. The "Clash of Civilizations" school argues that groups of Hispanic background in the US, and those of Islamic background in Europe, have proven more difficult, if not impossible, to assimilate/ integrate than previous groups or immigrants. Riots in the French (and European) *banlieue* in November–December 2005 appeared, at least on the surface, to substantiate the "Clash of Civilizations" thesis. Yet the deeper roots stem not from "Islam" but from a structural and economic crisis relating to lack of social and economic opportunities for a number of social and ethnic groups, a crisis which the EU *as a whole* needs to respond.[9]

In addition to the often mentioned (and in my view exaggerated) cultural and religious differences, another major problem appears to be that Europe fears that it will be dragged into conflicts in the Caucasus, Iraq and the Black sea, if it ultimately draws Turkey into EU membership. Europe sees itself as being pressed by the Americans and does not seem to be prepared for such a new strategic role. The fact that Turkey is not a EU member additionally checks closer strategic coordination between NATO and the EU (NAC-PSC), as have continuing Greek/Turkish tensions over Cyprus.

On the positive side, the entry of Turkey into the EU would reinforce European influence throughout the entire region, and motivate Turkey to follow through on major social

and economic reforms—*in this perspective Turkish membership in the EU would represent a tremendous competitive advantage for Europe vis-à-vis China and India, as well as versus the US.*

EU membership would also help Turkey to ameliorate its relations with the Kurdish populations, and improve its policies with respect to human rights. If not alienated, Turkey could also play a positive role as a mediator between Israel and the Moslem world. If Turkey cannot become a "full" member over the next decade, however, Europe could possibly form a special political economic and defense relationship with Turkey that would reduce fears of excessive Turkish emigration into Europe.

On the negative side, if it appears increasingly unlikely that Turkey will enter the EU in some form of modified membership status any time soon (such a modified status might provide Ankara with limited voting rights on only key issues that directly affect Turkey), Ankara may well turn closer to Russia (exchanging Russian oil for Turkish consumer goods). In addition, Turkish relations with the US have deteriorated in part over the Iraq war and the Kurdish questions. (After Ankara refused to let Washington pass US ground troops through Turkish territory for engagement in Iraq in 2003, popular Turkish literature envisioned a scenario of war with the America!) Most problematically, an isolated Turkey could tilt toward a more radical pan-Islamic outlook, moving further away from secularism; or else, an instable Turkey could become a major source of differing forms of terrorist activities.

The question now is whether the Europeans will be able to find a path toward greater unity. Without exaggerating too much, there is a risk that Europe may begin to divide into different regional groupings: One western group around the UK, one central "core" group around France and Germany, and one eastern group of former Warsaw pact states, which will link closer to the US.[10] Moreover, as Europe enters into a period of intense introspection, in which "left" and "right" wing factions continue to quarrel over Europe's future, there

is an additional danger that Europe as a whole will not be attentive to a number of potential dangers lurking to the east and the south.

II. The New Wave of Multilateralism

The US and Europe do appear to be growing apart on a number of strategic, political, economic, social and ideological levels. This does not necessarily preclude greater US-European policy coordination, *but only if the American leadership can move ultimately closer to that of the Europeans*. Ironically, what is necessary in the post-Iraq intervention/occupation era is *the Europeanization of American diplomacy—in the sense of the development of a more consensual policy of engaged multilateralism, yet still keeping the potential threat to use force in the background.*

The Europeans tend to accept a more "tragic sense" of history; they are generally cautious, prudent, and fear that provocative actions will result in historical repetition of events, *plus ça change, plus c'est le même chose.*

Americans, however, tend to be more pro-active, and are often willing to take significant risks in the belief in transforming the world and humanity through science and technology, plus "social engineering" and "democracy."

The problem, which must ultimately be overcome by Washington itself, however, is that Americans tend to swing from hyperactivity to disengagement and manic depression. While the essentially unilateral US intervention in Iraq (dragging the UK along with it) was characteristic of American hyperactivity, the problem now is the potential counter-swing to isolation and manic depression. The danger is that, in historical terms, "isolationism" represents *a more traditional foreign policy option and general world outlook that can only be countered by an enlightened American leadership that understands the necessity to engage more systematically in concerted and multilateral efforts and policies.*

The second term Bush administration (which is largely made up of a mix of *traditional realists*, *neo-realists* and *neo-conservatives*) has realized that a more multilateral approach to a number of international conflicts and crises has become absolutely vital. This fact is due, in part, to the recognition that even security related problems, such as linking trade sanctions to non-proliferation, or cracking down on the financing of terrorism, can not be handled by the US or NATO alone, and that these kind of issues require political and financial coordination between the US, EU and other governments, such as Russia, and a number of international institutions.

Perhaps even more crucially, the Bush administration has begun to realize that the US is stuck in quicksand in Iraq and that Washington will ultimately need the indirect, if not the direct, assistance of its Allies—if it is ever to withdraw from Iraq "with honor" as Richard Nixon had put it in regard to the Vietnam war, and without permitting the region to descend into further chaos.

In regard to the real possibility that instability in the east can begin to afflict an expanding Europe, by potentially drawing in NATO and European Union states, there is the need to coordinate US and EU strategy vis-à-vis Russia in such a way so as to ultimately bring the latter closer into the Euro-Atlantic community, along with Ukraine, Moldova, and ultimately, Belarus.

In addition to efforts to cooperate in the "war" or "fight" against terrorism in Afghanistan, and despite some differences in tactics, the US has accordingly adopted a new multilateral approach with respect to Teheran's demands to control its uranium enrichment cycle, for example.

The US has thus far backed the diplomatic efforts of the *troika* of the UK, France and Germany (plus Russia in late 2005). It may be interesting to note that this new multilateral approach with respect to Iran did not arise from the initiative of President Bush's neo-conservative advisors, but that it purportedly originated from individuals associated with an

influential Washington "think tank" who were able to float the idea into the National Security Council, where it was then supported by Condoleezza Rice and President Bush.

In regard to Iran, the US appears to be letting the Europeans "talk softly" through diplomacy, but, at the same time, the US is preparing, if necessary, to use the "big stick" behind the scenes by *threatening* the use of sanctions, if not the possible use of force—and making those threats appear as credible as possible. From this standpoint, *the Bush administration intends, largely behind the scenes, to hold America's position of global hegemony as leverage over European diplomacy with respect to any policy formulated in a multilateral context. At the same time, however, the uncoordinated nature of US (and Israeli) threats to Iran have tended make the European job even more difficult with the result that the already hard line Iranian regime has become even more recalcitrant.*

Although some major differences remain between the US and European positions, I think both Washington and the European *troika*, are in agreement that if Iran shows signs of verifiable deceit, then the matter could be taken to the UN Security Council. Differences may remain over the question of the use of force; here, however, the US may be softening its position in the realization that the destabilization of Iran would cause even more instability and acts of terrorism in Iraq, and throughout the region (if not the world). Moreover, a politically instable Iran would result in yet another rise in world oil prices. On the other hand, credible US *threats* to use direct force, but keeping Israel as far out of the picture as possible, coupled with stealthy acts of sabotage, cannot be entirely ruled out.[11]

Here, US intervention in Iraq was (at least unofficially) intended to reduce world oil prices, if not break the OPEC cartel; but has thus far failed to do so. American strategic planning appeared not to take into account the effects of the intervention upon the global petroleum market. Ironically, the failure to get Iraqi oil pumping has resulted in skyrocketing prices: Oil prices have probably averaged about $10-15 dollars

higher per barrel due to speculation and sabotage—than they would have if Iraqi oil had come pouring onto the world market after the US military intervention in 2003.[12] The significant rise in world oil prices since the Iraq war has additionally permitted a number of oil producing regimes, including Russia, Saudi Arabia, Venezuela, as well as Iran, to toughen their stance against American pressures.

If the crisis is ever to be abated, Washington will ultimately need to enter into a more direct dialogue with Teheran. Here, hardliners, however, on both sides have worked to prevent the real possibility of a diplomatic breakthrough. The electoral victory of Islamic fundamentalist Mahmood Ahmadinejad, has furthermore blocked the possibility of an immediate opening at this point, particularly after his threat to "wipe Israel off the map," among other remarks. (While this statement must be strongly condemned by the international community, it should be recognized that the comment was also made in the general context of US and Israeli threats to destroy Iran's *presumed* nuclear weapons program). On the other hand, it may not be entirely wishful thinking to hope the hard line stance of Mr. Mahmood Ahmadinejad (coupled with allegations of major human rights abuses by members of his cabinet) has worked to discredit his rule from the perspective of a number of powerful domestic Iranian factions, including those who initially supported him.

The historical irony is that US-Iranian dialogue has been made more possible by the fact that the Bush Administration has swiftly eliminated the two major enemies that confronted Iran, the Taliban and Iraq of Saddam Hussein —despite the fact that both of these regimes were initially given support by the US, in part to contain Iranian influence. The further irony is that US now needs Iranian assistance to stabilize Iraq—if the US is to ultimately withdraw. *Much as Washington was impelled to recognize Beijing in the effort to withdraw from its military engagement in Vietnam, US interests in withdrawing from Iraq may represent the crucial factor in the American determination to grant Iran conditional security assurances, ultimately leading to security guarantees.*

Despite the flip-flops and tough stance in Iran's bargaining positions, I believe that a deal can ultimately be worked out with Iran, but it will still be up to Washington to move toward the diplomatic recognition of Iran at the proper moment (assuming Teheran will accept), and once the appropriate conditions are met. Such a deal could possibly include: Giving up the claims to the national control over Iran's uranium enrichment program and putting that program in charge of a third party under IAEA supervision (Teheran, however refused to accept Russian offers to enrich Iranian uranium in December 2005)[13]; curtailing Iranian relations with *Hizb'allah* (as a *military* organization); and ultimately recognizing the state of Israel as the latter in turn recognizes an independent Palestinian state with agreed borders and once a general settlement is framed—in addition to working to stabilize Sunni-Shi'ia relations in Iraq. (In regard to Palestine, Iran has ostensibly stated that it will accept whatever settlement the Palestinians themselves will accept.)

Such a US "deal" with Iran could be somewhat comparable to the breakthrough that has occurred in US-Libyan relations, in which Tripoli agreed to give up its nuclear weapons program. Another breakthrough occurred with Ukraine, when the latter gave up its nuclear weapons in 1994 in exchange for UN security accords, under joint US-Russian pressures, but with the understanding that the Iranian affair is much more complex. Thus, in the case of Iran, rather than engaging in *regime change* by force, as threatened throughout the first term Bush administration, the US should consider *regime recognition* coupled with UN *security assurances* leading to *security guarantees*, but without ruling out the prospects for far reaching *regime reform* led by the very active Iranian civil society.

I would also argue that the US should not use Iran's lack of western style democracy as a pretext not to deal with the Iranian regime; the US, along with other permanent members of the UN Security Council granted Ukraine security guarantees in exchange for giving up its Soviet era nuclear

weaponry in 1994, only for the latter to more thoroughly "democratize" a decade later with its "orange" revolution. Iran will ultimately reform, but only following *domestic* demands for thorough reform (for example the abolition or neutralization of the much criticized Guardian Council and for improving human rights).[14] Factions of Iran's large exile community may attempt to set the agenda, but the main actors must be those living within Iran itself.

To some extent, US-EU relations with Iran will be affected by what happens in both Syria and Iraq. In the new wave of multilateralism, the US additionally has begun to work with France in the UN Security Council with respect to Syrian withdrawal from Lebanon, which will, in turn, affect relations with *Hizb'allah,* which appears to have gained some legitimacy in the recent elections, at least in the south of Lebanon.

Ironically, much as the US needed good relations with the People's Republic of China to withdraw its military forces from Vietnam, the US needs to obtain more positive relations with Iran before it withdraws from Iraq. Perhaps just as problematically, the US will also need to reach accords with Turkey to prevent the latter from intervening after US withdrawal. Here, US support for Turkish membership in the EU represents one of the levers the US would use to assure Turkey's compliance in the northern Kurdish areas of Iraq. How the Europeans will react to this American demand remains to be seen, and depends upon whether they see Turkish membership in their long-term interest, particularly with respect to the rough economic competition with India and China (as well as with the US itself), as previously argued.

A more stable, non-threatening Iraq should likewise benefit Iran and all other regional parties. In regard to Iraq, the US has been hoping that concerted international pressures will make the new Shi'ite dominated Iraqi government more inclusive, so that Sunni factions and former *Ba'ath* party members (those not guilty of war crimes or significant acts of terrorism most directly linked to Saddam Hussein) will

ultimately be able to play a renewed and positive role in the Iraqi government and society. This will permit the Iraqi government to *co-opt* some factions of the Iraqi resistance—and thus separate Iraqi Sunni nationalists from pan-Islamic militants.

The problem remains the training of Iraqi police and security forces. EU recognition of the new government of Iraq should hopefully result in more positive cooperation with respect to US-EU-Iraqi affairs. At the same time, it is dubious that Europe will deploy significant numbers of peacekeepers or police any time soon, essentially leaving Washington stuck in the quicksand of its own making. This means Washington needs to move forward on training Iraqi forces, which, unfortunately, may not be proving as effective as hoped, in part as Washington cannot guarantee the loyalty of these forces to the present US backed Iraqi government.

This leaves the possible option of the ultimate withdrawal US ground forces from Iraq (but not necessarily the removal of air and naval power from the region), that would impel the major Iraqi factions to *either* reach a compromise *or* else to intensify the present civil war. If, however, a government with perceived legitimacy, and thus accepted by each of the major factions, can ultimately be established, it may then be necessary to reinforce Iraqi police and military with international peacekeepers under a UN authority, so as to minimize the risks of Iraqi disaggregation.

III. The Question of NATO, Europe and Russia

The Europeans have largely focused on the political-economic aspects of EU enlargement, and are now engaged in "damage control" following the French and Dutch rejection of the EU Constitution. Largely self-absorbed and engaged in intensive introspection, they have barely begun to focus on the geostrategic and security issues involved in the creation of a new Europe.

The possibilities of significant political economic instability, involving secessionist movements, or demands for radical political-economic change in a divided Ukraine, and in Russia itself (for example, Kaliningrad, among other regions), coupled with the rise of a repressive and authoritarian Belarus, if not a more authoritarian Russia itself, are real and may grow over time, and may represent a largely self-fulfilling prophecy.

In general, I do not have the impression that the Europeans (or the Americans) have thought very deeply about the pessimistic scenario in which the largely uncoordinated NATO-EU "double enlargement" might result in significant social and political tensions along the borders of EU and non-EU member states—in terms of illegal immigration, trade in contraband, narcotics and prostitution, etc.

A crackdown in Belarus, at least since May 2005 seems to be taking place—in effort to preclude a Georgian or Ukrainian-style "orange" or "democratic" revolution—as Belarusian President Lukashenka seeks to retain power for as long as possible. We also saw how the Presidential elections in Ukraine in December 2004 not only divided the Ukrainian population, but also bitterly divided the US and the Europeans (both "old" and "new")—from the Russians, leading pro-Russian hardliners among the latter to fear potential "isolation," like a bear trapped in a iron cage.

As there is a real possibility for political, social and economic instability in the east to aggravate problems with NATO and EU members, there is a vital need to coordinate US and EU strategy vis-à-vis Russia and to ultimately bring the latter into the Euro-Atlantic community, along with Ukraine. Ultimately, the problematic state of Belarus must be dealt with in a concerted fashion as well—and in such a way that the US and EU do not press Moscow and Minsk even closer together. *In this respect, the path to the reform of Belarus is through Moscow.*

Here, with respect to Belarus, as well as other so-called "outposts of tyranny", among other states, Washington is

claiming to support democracy and "democratic" values and "human rights" (albeit rather selectively). What has been called the "export of democracy" is being further refined as support for "civil society development," much as Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice indicated in her speech at Science Po in February 2005.[15]

The problem, however, arises: At what point do the demands for "democratic" and "civil society" change become positive and result in far reaching and long lasting reforms? Or, at what point does support for "democratic" movements become destabilizing and result in even greater insecurity? Or when do such demands result in repressive measures, as in China at the time of the Tiananmen Square repression in 1989, or perhaps Belarus today, at least since May 2005? Or what if democratic procedures provide greater legitimacy for groups such as *Hizb'allah*, *Hamas* or the Moslem Brotherhood in Egypt? If the US begins to more openly support "democratic" and "civil society" movements in Iran, will Teheran engage in reform or repression?

To prevent non-EU member states in eastern Europe, as well as Russia, from becoming instable, both the US and EU need to reach out to this region, particularly by forging power sharing arrangements, security accords, as well as trade enhancing economic agreements, with both Russia and Ukraine, in particular. In this regard, Moscow and Kiev should be brought into a close *qualified* membership with both NATO and the EU. In security terms, this can be accomplished by engaging in joint NATO-EU-Russian-Ukrainian operations. The signing of the NATO Status of Forces Agreement (SOFA) with Russia and other NATO members appears to have opened the door to greater military cooperation with Russia.[16] At the same time, in a quest for geostrategic *parity* with NATO, Russia intends to press NATO to interact more closely with the new Collective Security Treaty Organization (CSTO), incorporating Armenia, Belarus, Kazakhstan, Tajikistan, Kyrgyzstan, and Russia (as indicated at December 2005 NATO-Russia Council meeting).

To follow up on the possibility of greater cooperation with Russia, as well as with Ukraine, I am proposing the creation of a *NATO-EU-Russian Peacekeeping and Defense Against Terrorism Headquarters (HQ)* that would be located in Kaliningrad or in another location. Such a HQ would represent a means to solidify the growing security relationship between Russia, Europe and the United States, as well as Ukraine, and would work to coordinate peacekeeping efforts (as in Moldova) and counter-terrorist strategy in conflict regions, throughout the former Soviet Union and elsewhere, and possibly in the Caucasus and Chechnya, as well as in the Middle East.

If such as HQ were to be placed in Kaliningrad, it would also help to anchor the *oblast* within the Russian Federation, as the former is presently "isolated" from Russia by the largely uncoordinated NATO-EU "double enlargement" to Poland and the Baltic states. It would seek prevent Kaliningrad from trying to "secede" from Moscow by giving it a new "internationalized" status, linked to Russia.

Here, however, in my conversations in Moscow, Brussels and Paris, it became that clear that Moscow might demand prior steps, such as joint NATO–Russian patrols over Baltic airspace, before accepting such a HQ in Kaliningrad. With respect to this issue, the three Baltic states, as new NATO members, have refused to permit Russian jets (even along side NATO fighters) to pass over (or near) their territory. In this regard, Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia seek even tighter integration with NATO air defense systems—as protection against a potential Russian threat as part of NATO Article V security guarantees.

One way to alleviate legitimate Baltic state concerns might be to deploy international peacekeepers (neither Americans nor Russians) as a kind of defensive trip wire between NATO, the EU and Russia, while still backing the Baltic States with NATO and EU security guarantees. Due to the fact that St Petersburg and Moscow are within a quick potential striking range from the three Baltic States, and

particularly if their air defense systems are further integrated with NATO, it seems imperative that some form of strong confidence building measures between NATO and Russia need to be implemented as soon as possible.[17]

Wherever it might be located, a *NATO-EU-Russian Peacekeeping and Defense against Terrorism Head Quarters* would help start the long process of framing the appropriate security conditions for the political-social-economic development of eastern Europe, the Caucasus, central Asia, and perhaps the Middle East as well (Israel/Palestine and possibly Iraq). Such a HQ could also help to provide greater autonomy (or even independence) for various states and regions throughout the former Soviet Union, preferably under a general UN mandate.

These goals could, in part, be accomplished by formulating overlapping NATO, EU and Russian security guarantees for what I call confederated "regional security communities" and through the deployments of multinational peacekeepers in areas of potential (or actual) conflict, in the effort to resolve the geo-political disputes that continue to fuel acts of terrorism and counter-terrorism, while simultaneously engaging US-European-Russian special force units against immediate threats wherever deemed mutually necessary and appropriate.

In the near future, the key dilemma is for the US and EU to balance the interests of both Russia and Ukraine. Tensions that erupted into an open (and potentially dangerous) dispute in December 2005-January 2006 between Russia and Ukraine over the pricing of natural gas at world market levels, and the flow of Russian gas to European states through Ukraine, among other security and economic issues, have at least opened the door to EU mediation while concurrently revealing to Europe the absolute necessity to reduce dependence upon any one oil or gas supplier and to move rapidly to develop alternative energy resources.[18]

The Russian-Ukrainian dispute is not, however, entirely a question of the rise of gas prices to market levels

alone (which threatens to destabilize the new Ukrainian government), but is, at least in part, related to Russian opposition to closer Ukrainian ties to NATO. The dilemma is consequently to find a way to bring both Russia and Ukraine into a closer form of associated membership with NATO and the EU, while simultaneously preventing the isolation of an instable Russia or else the formation of a Russian-Belarusian-Chinese "Eurasian" alliance.

IV. "The Quartet" and the Road Map to Peace

In regard to the Euro-Mediterranean, there is the need for the US and Europe to work more diligently and effectively toward a resolution of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict through the multilateral Quartet process, involving the US, EU, Russia and the UN.

Finding a way to end the ongoing conflict between the Israelis and Palestinians would represent a significant step in helping to put an end to one of the major issues that helps to inflame the pan-Islamic movement. While the continuing Israeli-Palestinian conflict is not the only focus of pan-Islamic propaganda (other pan-Islamic causes include the situations in Kashmir, Chechnya, Saudi Arabia, and Chinese-controlled Xinjiang province), the Palestinian issue represents one of the most significant causes that precludes better relations with the Arab/Islamic world and that helps to turn more "moderate" Arab/ Islamic opinion against the US and Europeans. Progress in this tense region would consequently represent a major diplomatic step toward the winding down of the "war on terrorism"—thus eliminating one of the major issues that continue to plague American and European relations with the Arab and Islamic worlds.

Israel's decision in late August 2005 to unilaterally pull out of Gaza has consequently opened a debate as to whether the withdrawal will set the ground for a greater peace settlement involving the West Bank and Jerusalem, or whether it will further exacerbate tensions. The fact that the withdrawal had not been well coordinated with the

Palestinians, nor with the Quartet powers (the US, EU, Russia and the UN) as part of a larger diplomatic settlement, does not augur well for the future, and has resulted in intra-Palestinian conflict, coupled with intermittent Israeli military intervention. (Here, a better controlled Israeli withdrawal from Gaza, with a peaceful transfer of assets, which should have been coordinated with the Palestinian authority and the UN, would have been in Israeli and international interest.[19])

In the immediate aftermath of the Israeli withdrawal, it has already proved difficult for the Palestinian Authority to effectively police Gaza (or other areas) given its limited means and capabilities, while the Palestinians themselves appear increasingly divided, as factions feud for power before the January 2006 legislative elections, further splintering the governing Fatah party. The danger is that Gaza could well be in the process of becoming a hot bed of pan-Islamic radicalism, in that *Al-Qaida* in addition to *Hamas*, *Islamic Jihad* (as well as the *al-Aqsa* Martyrs Brigades) or other groups can augment their presence in the region. The fact that the European Union agreed in November 2005 to monitor the Gaza-Egypt border at the Rafah terminal crossing represents a step in the right direction, but it is not sufficient.

The unilateral Israeli withdrawal from Gaza has likewise put the international community in a quandary as to whether the deployment of international peacekeepers in Gaza, and perhaps ultimately in the West Bank, would prove positive and beneficial. Or, on the contrary, would international peacekeepers create even more tensions and conflict, hence exacerbate tensions among Palestinian factions —and with Israel as well?

My view is that an international peacekeeping force— that possesses the support of both Israel and the present Palestinian Authority—can be a positive stabilizing (and hopefully "democratizing") force. As it is the United States that has the greatest power and influence over Israel, it is really up to Washington to begin to fully enforce the Road Map to Peace and work more effectively to nudge Israel, and

not only the Palestinians, toward reconciliation, and toward a real peace settlement in the West Bank and Jerusalem that may involve the deployment of multinational peacekeeping forces. Yet to be effective, such a peacekeeping force must be able to work with all Palestinian factions (including *Hamas* and *Hizb'allah*), and it should be incorporated as part of an overall framework for a general Israel-Palestinian peace settlement, including the West Bank and Jerusalem.

If it is then agreed that an international force should be deployed, what kind, and who should command it? The UN, NATO, or the EU? In many ways, this question returns us back to the advent of the Bosnian crisis when the EU (Jacques Delors) asserted that the EU should handle the crisis—and then President George Bush, Sr., agreed.[20]

In the case of Israeli-Palestinian conflict, I would argue that the response must be a concerted US-EU-Russian effort. Yet rather than deploying the blue helmets of the United Nations, as was the case for Bosnia, peacekeeping in Palestine should be under a joint NATO-EU command—in coordination with Russia, and under the general umbrella of the UN. Here, it will be up to the Quartet to work out the nature and number of the peacekeeping forces to be deployed, in order to achieve the goals of the largely moribund Road Map for Peace, and to gain the confidence of both the Israelis and Palestinians.[21]

Diplomatic steps to resolve tensions in the West Bank and Jerusalem could ultimately open the doors to a multinational peacekeeping force (better sooner than later), which can serve as a buffer so that acts of vengeance on both sides will not escalate out of control. A multinational peacekeeping force, coupled with close Israeli-Palestinian cooperation with respect to trade issues, workforce, water rights, return of refugees, as well as joint rule in Jerusalem, would take much of the fire out of the propaganda of pan-Islamic groups.

Multinational peacekeepers backed by United States, the EU and Russia, could be deployed in Gaza, and then in the

West Bank, for a period of time acceptable to both sides. This situation would be somewhat analogous to the case in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia where UN, then NATO, and now EU peacekeeping forces, have been deployed to provide a buffer between Albanian insurgents and the Macedonian government.

Both Israel and the Palestinian Authority can jointly determine the nature, number and nationality of these peacekeepers. These troops could include American, European, Russian, or other peacekeepers from Arab or Islamic states, such as Turkey, or even from Central Asian states of the Russian-led CSTO. NATO, the European Union and Russia could then provide overlapping security guarantees to help guarantee Israel's security, as well as that of a newly independent Palestine, vis-à-vis many of their highly instable and volatile neighbors—including Syria and Iran.

By deploying NATO-EU led joint peacekeeping forces in the Middle East, the purpose is:

- To help put an end to the long term Israeli-Palestinian conflict;
- To eliminate one of the major conflicts that inflames pan-Islamic propaganda in the "war on terrorism";
- To better protect both Israel and a newly independent Palestine from the potential threats caused by the proliferation of WMD—particularly if this issue cannot be resolved diplomatically, with Iran and other states. (It should be emphasized that Iranian threats to "wipe out" Israel likewise threaten Moslems and Palestinians in the general region.)

It is this third point—to protect both Israel and Palestine—that makes the salient difference between this plan and other previous proposals—which generally focused only on peacekeeping and not on the wider regional security issues involved.

A joint NATO-EU led multinational peacekeeping force, along side the Russians, under a general UN mandate, would represent a bold and visionary step in working to find a diplomatic settlement to the continuing "war on terrorism"—a leap toward peace in the volatile Middle East. I do not believe this goal to be utopian, but a practical step intended to draw Russia closer to the US and EU, and to help put an end to a much larger and more dangerous conflict that could easily widen to include more states and actors.

V. Conclusion

Looking to the future, it is essential not to let the European backyard slide into anarchy. It is crucial to begin the process of bringing Russia, Ukraine and Turkey into a closer association with both the US and EU, while at the same time, seeking to put an end to the "war of terrorism" and likewise preventing the possible proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction to Iran and other powers, through multilateral diplomacy.

Four major tasks thus await the Euro-Atlantic community. First, is the re-construction of European unity after the French and Dutch "non" vote. Here, the Europeans should underscore the significant differences between the European Constitution and that of the Americans, so as to gain popular European support for that extremely complex document, which is really more of a Constitutional treaty than a traditional Constitution, while seeking to improve or emphasize aspects of the European Constitution that permit greater popular European participation in the decision-making process.

The second point is that both the US and Europeans, along with the Russians, need to develop concerted multilateral strategies in regard to the war/fight on terrorism, the question of the Iranian nuclear program, and well as the question of Iraq, among a number of other crucial issues.

Here, however, significant *political* difficulties have resulted in defining "terrorism," and in determining how to most effectively deal with a number of differing groups, as well as how to best deal with Iran and the question of nuclear proliferation. Despite the evident tensions, which could well enter into a new phase of *covert* conflict, I believe that a "deal" can be ultimately worked out with Iran, but it will largely be up to the US to move toward the diplomatic recognition of Iran at the proper moment, and once the appropriate conditions are met. At the same time, however, those conditions may well be determined by any future American timetable to leave Iraq!

The fact that the EU has decided in early June to open relations with the new Iraqi government despite previous EU opposition to US intervention in Iraq can only be welcomed by Washington. Once again, the possible deployment of European troops in Iraq looks unlikely; yet the option of NATO-EU-Russian peacekeeping forces does appears plausible in the case of Palestine, that is, if the US can really begin to push both Israel and the Palestinians into a general agreement. If the US really wants to start winding down what will prove to be a very long term "war on terrorism," this would represent a major step in that direction.

In addition to the number of significant internal problems facing the EU, I believe that both the US and the Europeans need to address the major external issues to the east and the south—before those problems begin to fester and aggravate disputes among the Europeans themselves. Here, I once again draw attention to the necessity for the both the US and EU to engage with, and mediate between, Russia and Ukraine, particularly as these two former Soviet bloc states continue to engage in mutual imprecations over gas pricing, NATO membership, boundaries, among other issues. It is crucial to prevent the possible isolation of Russia, while likewise preventing Ukraine from shifting toward Russia, or more likely, breaking up. Here, in order to bring all sides together in a common cause, I have proposed the formation of

a joint *NATO, EU, Russian Peacekeeping and Defense against Terrorism Head Quarters*, which could include Ukraine, as well as any other interested parties.

In the not so long term, confederal regional "security communities" could be implemented throughout central and eastern Europe, and in the Middle East (Israel/Palestine), and possibly in Iraq, that would seek to defuse tensions in areas of actual or potential conflict. Depending upon the situation, the stability of these regional security communities would be guaranteed by multinational peacekeeping and by overlapping multilateral security guarantees involving the EU and Russia—as well as the US and NATO, under general UN mandates.[22]

Endnotes

 An earlier abridged version of this paper, entitled *"L'Avenir des Relations Transatlantiques"* was presented at the *Forum du Futur*, conference, "*Valeurs européennes, valeurs atlantiques*", held at l'Assemblée Nationale of France, June 21, 2005. Much of the paper is based upon Hall Gardner, *American Global Strategy and the 'War on Terrorism'* (Ashgate, 2005).

[2] I argue that the concept of *uneven polycentrism* better describes the contemporary global constellation of differing power centers than does "multipolarity" which implies hostility and tension between rival "poles." See, Hall Gardner, *American Global Strategy and the 'War on Terrorism'* (Ashgate, 2005).

[3] New Jersey Plan: The current Congress was maintained, but granted new powers. For example, the Congress could set taxes and force their collection. An executive, elected by Congress, was created - the Plan allowed for a multi-person executive. The executives served a single term and were subject to recall based on the request of state governors. A judiciary appointed by the executives, with life-terms of service. Laws set by the Congress took precedence over state law.

[4] Equal Rights Amendment: *Section 1.* Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any state on account of sex. *Section 2.* The Congress shall have the power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article. *Section 3.* This amendment shall take effect two years after the date of ratification.

[5] In 2004, the EU announced the formation of a EU defense ministry and foreign ministry (EU-Consilium) in embryo, which was to be strengthened following ratification of the European Constitution. The French believe that a joint European command center could then be established in the next 5-10 years. EU countries spend about $232 billion a year on defense as a whole; only the UK, France and Greece spend over 2% of GNP. Yet even here, the Europeans have been handicapped by a lack of integration among their armed forces, and by reliance upon obsolete equipment. The EU needs transport, airlift, naval ships, and air-to-air refueling capabilities. If Germany were to augment its defense spending, it could transform overall expenditure levels in Europe radically, but Berlin is presently absorbed in the costs of German and European unification, and in domestic social reforms.

[6] BBC, "Merkel calls for stronger US ties" http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/europe/4462056.stm

[7] It appears that the US will be stuck in Iraq (and NATO in Afghanistan) for quite a while. The Pentagon has been planning fourteen "enduring bases" with a drain on manpower resources (over 100,000 troops through 2006)—at

least until Iraqi oil fields can be developed and the country can be stabilized with a self-confident Iraqi police and military force. My guess is a decade— or more—unless some form of political settlement can be found that permits a partial, leading to a near complete, withdrawal. It is, however, also possible that the *threat* of a US withdrawal could be used to help negotiate a political settlement among *some* Iraqi factions. In addition to domestic American opposition to the occupation, the problem is that if a crisis develops elsewhere, and if the US needs to engage ground forces, there will be big trouble—as the all volunteer force and reservists are already stretched too thin.

Due to the excessive US defense burden, which has been augmented by the "war on terrorism" and by largely unexpected military peacekeeping presence in Iraq, the US has begun to cut its defense costs by eliminating bases throughout the USA and world—while simultaneously seeking to deploy in bases that are closer to actual and potential threats. Following its March 2003 intervention in Iraq, the US began to downsize 70,000 forces in the "old" Europe and build more cost effective bases in the "new" Europe**:** Poland, Hungary, Romania and Bulgaria. Some 5,000 to 10,000 troops are to be deployed in Poland, combined with the upgrading of Polish bases. The Pentagon has begun to shift bases from the UK and Germany (except Ramstein Airforce base in Germany, a major site of US nuclear weapon storage) to Italy. The "old" Europe is thus becoming more of a "logistical center," with Italy at the center, for action in the South rather than a Cold War encampment prepared for an "imminent" Soviet invasion to the East.

[8] Interview, *New Perspectives Quarterly*, Valery Giscard d'Estaing http://www.digitalnpq.org/global_services/global%20viewpoint/11-11-02giscard.html. *Le Monde*, 8 November 2002.

[9] For European efforts to deal with the migration/ integration question, see Prof. Dr. Monica den Boer, "Ins and Outs of an EU Migration Policy: The Position of Migrants in the Era of Security." Cicero Foundation Lecture (10 June 2005).

Confronted with a mounting debt crisis which has cut back on public expenditure for social welfare (debt at 2 trillion Euros, including 900 billion for the retirement of public servants), France has been promised funds from the European Union to help initiate the long process of better integrating residents of the *banlieue* (which include both Muslims and non-Muslims) into the mainstream of French society, following riots in November-December 2005. This step could potentially strengthen the hand of the EU over the domestic affairs and immigration policies of European states.

[10] Marcel H. van Herpen, "The Coming French No Vote - A Disaster For Europe?" http://www.cicerofoundation.org/lectures/vanherpen_apr05.html

[11] Hall Gardner, *Thèses sur Iran et l'Electronucleare,* Géostratégiques, No. 10 (December 2005) http://www.strategicsinternational.com/10_Gardner.pdf.

[12] See Juan Cole, *Informed Comment, 6/22/2005 04:12:00* http://www.juancole.com/2005/06/kos-discussion-of-un-option-many.html.

[13] In late 2005, the US and European Union supported Russian efforts to play "honest broker" with Iran; yet, in January 2006, Teheran has apparently rejected a Russian offer to provide enriched uranium for the Iranian nuclear program, although it would still be willing to consider conducting certain phases of the process outside Iran. The Iranian rejection of the Russian offer took place at the same time that the German press stated that the US has been engaging in extensive planning to launch an attack against Iranian nuclear facilities. See "Iran rejects Russian uranium enrichment offer" *Christian Science Monitor* January 2, 2006.
http://www.csmonitor.com/2005/1230/dailyUpdate.html

[14] See critique of Iranian governance by Morteza Ansari, "Paradoxe de l'exercice pouvoir en Iran : le Président est élu, le Guide décide" in *Géostratégiques*, No. 10 (December 2005).
http://www.strategicsinternational.com/10_Ansari.pdf

[15] Condoleezza Rice, « Remarks at the Institut d'Etudes Politiques de Paris - Sciences Po » http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2005/41973.htm

[16] In April 2005, important steps were taken to forge the NATO Status of Forces Agreement (SOFA) with Russia and other NATO members. This has opened the way for joint exercises and other projects, and provides a legal basis for granting NATO troops transit rights through Russia, including the temporary deployment of armed forces on foreign territory for peacekeeping exercises, anti-terrorist training operations, and emergencies, in accordance with the Partnership for Peace program.

[17] I discussed the problems involved in bringing in the Baltic states and Poland as "full" members of NATO in Hall Gardner, *Dangerous Crossroads*: *Europe, Russia and the Future of NATO* (Praeger, 1997).

[18] See Dr. Federico Bordonaro, "Intelligence Brief: Russian Gas Dispute*"* *Power and Interest News Report* 3 January 2006. http://www.pinr.com.
Andrew E. Kramer, "Russia Restores Most of Gas Cut to Ukraine Line"
New York Times (3 January 2006).

[19] Amitai Etzioni, "On giving your cake—and enjoying it too" Update #69: A Communitarian Letter. http://www.gwu.edu/~ccps/index.html

[20] I will not go into the history, but I believed at the time that as the Bosnian crisis affected all the major powers, regardless of their geographic location

and cultural identity, the response to the crisis should have resulted in a *concerted* US, EU, and Russian project from the outset. A more concerted relationship did ultimately begin to develop once the Contact Group for ex-Yugoslavia was established, as the latter engaged the diplomacy of all the major powers involved (the US, UK, Germany, Russia, France and later Italy).

[21] In late May 2005, NATO granted observer status to the Palestinians at its Parliamentary Assembly. Providing the Palestinians observer status, and possibly participant status in the November 2005 NATO Parliamentary Assembly, will accordingly provide a voice for Palestinian views in the expanding NATO Assembly. Moreover, NATO's Mediterranean dialogue permits six Arab states, plus the Palestinians, to speak with Israel.

[22] See Hall Gardner, *American Global Strategy and the 'War on Terrorism'* (Ashgate, 2005)

[1] An earlier abridged version of this paper, entitled *"L'Avenir des Relations Transatlantiques"* was presented at the *Forum du Futur*, conference, "*Valeurs européennes, valeurs atlantiques*", held at l'Assemblée Nationale of France, June 21, 2005. Much of the paper is based upon Hall Gardner, *American Global Strategy and the 'War on Terrorism'* (Ashgate, 2005).

[2] I argue that the concept of *uneven polycentrism* better describes the contemporary global constellation of power centers than does "multipolarity" which implies hostility and tension between rival "poles." See, Hall Gardner, *American Global Strategy and the 'War on Terrorism'* (Ashgate, 2005).

[3] New Jersey Plan: The current Congress was maintained, but granted new powers. For example, the Congress could set taxes and force their collection. An executive, elected by Congress, was created - the Plan allowed for a multi-person executive. The executives served a single term and were subject to recall based on the request of state governors. A judiciary appointed by the executives, with life-terms of service. Laws set by the Congress took precedence over state law.

[4] Equal Rights Amendment: *Section 1.* Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any state on account of sex. *Section 2.* The Congress shall have the power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article. *Section 3.* This amendment shall take effect two years after the date of ratification.

[5] In 2004, the EU announced the formation of a EU defense ministry and foreign ministry (EU-Consilium) in embryo, which was to be strengthened following ratification of the European Constitution. The French believe that a joint European command center could then be established in the next 5-10 years. EU countries spend about $232 billion a year on defense as a whole; only the UK, France and Greece spend over 2% of GNP. Yet even here, the Europeans have been handicapped by a lack of integration among their armed forces, and by reliance upon obsolete equipment. The EU needs transport, airlift, naval ships, and air-to-air refueling capabilities. If Germany were to augment its defense spending, it could transform overall expenditure levels in Europe radically, but Berlin is presently absorbed in the costs of German and European unification, and in domestic social reforms.

[6] BBC, "Merkel calls for stronger US ties"
 http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/europe/4462056.stm
[7]

[*] It appears that the US will be stuck in Iraq (and NATO in Afghanistan) for quite a while. The Pentagon has been planning fourteen "enduring bases" with a drain on manpower resources (over 100,000 troops through 2006)—at least until Iraqi oil fields can be developed and the country can be stabilized with a self-confident Iraqi police and military force. My guess is a decade—or more—unless some form of political settlement can be found that permits a partial, leading to a near complete, withdrawal. It is, however, also possible that the *threat* of a US withdrawal can be used to help negotiate a political settlement among *some* Iraqi factions. In addition to domestic American opposition to the occupation, the problem is that if a crisis develops elsewhere, and if the US needs to engage ground forces, there will be big trouble—as the all volunteer force and reservists are already stretched too thin.

Due to the excessive US defense burden, which has been augmented by the "war on terrorism" and by largely unexpected military peacekeeping presence in Iraq, the US has begun to cut its defense costs by eliminating bases throughout the USA and world—

while simultaneously seeking to deploy in bases that are closer to actual and potential threats. Following its March 2003 intervention in Iraq, the US began to downsize 70,000 forces in the "old" Europe and build more cost effective bases in the "new" Europe: Poland, Hungary, Romania and Bulgaria. Some 5,000 to 10,000 troops are to be deployed in Poland, combined with the upgrading of Polish bases. The Pentagon has begun to shift bases from the UK and Germany (except Ramstein Airforce base in Germany, a major site of US nuclear weapon storage) to Italy. The "old" Europe is thus becoming more of a "logistical center," with Italy at the center, for action in the South rather than a Cold War encampment prepared for an "imminent" Soviet invasion to the East.

[8] Interview, *New Perspectives Quarterly*, Valery Giscard d'Estaing
http://www.digitalnpq.org/global_services/global%20viewpoint/11-11-02giscard.html
Le Monde, 8 November 2002.

[9] For European efforts to deal with the migration/ integration question, see Prof. Dr. Monica den Boer, "Ins and Outs of an EU Migration Policy: The Position of Migrants in the Era of Security."
Cicero Foundation Lecture (10 June 2005).

Confronted with a mounting debt crisis which has cut back on public expenditure for social welfare (debt at 2 trillion Euros, including 900 billion for the retirement of public servants), France has been promised funds from the European Union to help initiate the long process of better integrating residents of the *banlieue* (which include both Muslims and non-Muslims) into the mainstream of French society, following riots in November-December 2005. This step could potentially strengthen the hand of the EU over the domestic affairs and immigration policies of European states.
[10] Marcel H. van Herpen, "The Coming French No Vote - A Disaster For Europe?"
http://www.cicerofoundation.org/lectures/vanherpen_apr05.html

[11] Hall Gardner, *Theses sur Iran et l'Electronucleire*, Geostrategiques, No. 10 (December 2005) http://www.strategicsinternational.com/10_Gardner.pdf.

[12] See Juan Cole, *Informed Comment*, 6/22/2005 04:12:00 http://www.juancole.com/2005/06/kos-discussion-of-un-option-many.html.

[13] In late 2005, the US and European Union supported Russian efforts to play an honest broker with Iran; yet, in January 2006, Teheran has apparently rejected a Russian offer to provide enriched uranium for the Iranian nuclear program, although it would still be willing to consider conducting certain phases of the process outside Iran. The Iranian rejection of the Russian offer took place at the same time that the German press stated that the US has been engaging in extensive planning to launch an attack against Iranian nuclear facilities. See "Iran rejects Russian uranium enrichment offer" *Christian Science Monitor* January 2, 2006.
http://www.csmonitor.com/2005/1230/dailyUpdate.html

[14] See critique of Iranian governance by Morteza Ansari, "Paradoxe de l'exercice pouvoir en Iran : le Président est élu, le Guide décide" in *Geostrategiques*, No. 10 (December 2005)
http://www.strategicsinternational.com/10_Ansari.pdf

[15] Condoleezza Rice Remarks at the Institut d'Etudes Politiques de Paris - Sciences Po http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2005/41973.htm

[16] In April 2005, important steps were taken to forge the NATO Status of Forces Agreement (SOFA) with Russia and other NATO members. This has opened the way for joint exercises and other projects, and provides a legal basis for granting NATO troops transit rights through Russia, including the temporary deployment of armed forces on foreign territory for peacekeeping exercises, anti-terrorist training operations, and emergencies, in accordance with the Partnership for Peace program.

[17] I discussed the problems involved in bringing in the Baltic states and Poland as "full" members of NATO in Hall Gardner, *Dangerous Crossroads: Europe, Russia and the Future of NATO* (Praeger, 1997).

[18] See Dr. Federico Bordonaro, "Intelligence Brief: Russian Gas Dispute*" Power and Interest News Report* 3 January 2006. http://www.pinr.com.
Andrew E. Kramer, "Russia Restores Most of Gas Cut to Ukraine Line"
New York Times (3 January 2006).
[19] Amitai Etzioni, "On giving your cake—and enjoying it too" Update #69: A Communitarian Letter. http://www.gwu.edu/~ccps/index.html

[20] I will not go into the history, but I believed at the time that as the Bosnian crisis affected all the major powers, regardless of their geographic location and cultural identity, the response to the crisis should have resulted in a *concerted* US, EU, and Russian project from the outset. A more concerted relationship did ultimately begin to develop once the Contact Group for ex-Yugoslavia was established, as the latter engaged the diplomacy of all the major powers involved (the US, UK, Germany, Russia, France and later Italy). See Hall Gardner, Dangerous Crossroads (Praeger, 1997).

[21] In late May 2005, NATO granted observer status to the Palestinians at its Parliamentary Assembly. Providing the Palestinians observer status, and possibly participant status in the November 2005 NATO Parliamentary Assembly, will accordingly provide a voice for Palestinian views in the expanding NATO Assembly. Moreover, NATO's Mediterranean dialogue permits six Arab states, plus the Palestinians, to speak with Israel.

[22] See Hall Gardner, *American Global Strategy and the 'War on Terrorism'* (Ashgate, 2005)