

"The Iraq Crisis and Its Impact on the Future of EU-US Relations: An American View"

Hall Gardner (Copyright 2003)

Let me make a few points before I venture into the present state of EU-US relations....

First, the idea of regime change in Iraq was on the official agenda since the October 1998 President Clinton signed into law the Iraq Liberation Act (Public Law 105-338), which had stated "It should be the policy of the United States to support efforts to remove the regime headed by Saddam Hussein from power in Iraq and to promote the emergence of a democratic government to replace that regime."

The question was thus never that of mere "disarmament," but *how* to go about regime change—through support of insurgent forces, *coup d'état* or direct military intervention? The next question was *how* to promote the "emergence of a democratic government."

It is also fairly certain that President Bush Jr. was concerned with regime change from Day One of his presidency, according to outgoing democrats. Once again, the question was *how* to go about it. As the Bush administration was determined to engage in "regime change" regardless of its potential consequences, last minute Franco-German plans for more muscular UN inspections, following the massive build-up of US forces in the vicinity of Iraq, were doomed from the start.

It should also be mentioned that the option of US military intervention to seize oil fields in the Middle East had been circulating in US neo-conservative circles at least since the Arab oil embargo in the 1970s.

The second point is that the idea of "pre-emption" was really initiated by the Clinton Administration but then formalized by the Bush administration. (The Kennedy Administration had discussed pre-emption as an option during the Cuban missile crisis but had ruled it out.)

The problem here, however, is that Bush policy in regard to Iraq must be characterized as *preclusion* or *pre-caution* but not *pre-emption*. This is true as pre-emption implies acting against an immediate threat of attack; the potential Iraqi “threat” was more hypothetical and longer term.

The third point is the issue of unipolarity—or that of seizing the “unipolar moment” as neo-conservative Charles Krauthammer once put it.¹ The breakdown of the bipolar Cold War system meant that there are no longer any checks and balances on US actions. While both the US and USSR unilaterally cracked down within their respective “spheres of influence and security” during the Cold War, they usually could not intervene quite as blatantly in areas outside those respective spheres without incurring the wrath of the other.

The fourth point is that both US and NATO “enforcement” actions and non-Article V actions require a UN Security Council mandate, if such actions are not clearly taken in “self defence” under Article 51 of the UN charter or Article V of the North Atlantic Treaty. (US actions against the Taliban and Al Qaida in Afghanistan had been taken under the rubric of UN Article 51.²)

The debate over enforcement actions has consequently meant that the international decision-making process could only become more and more politicized and that political disputes would come more openly to the forefront than was the case during the Cold War when the Communist “threat” generally kept Allied states from going their separate ways. Seizing the “unipolar moment” has, moreover, implied the option of bypassing regimes such as the UN, but NATO as well—or any organization that might bog US policy down in bureaucratic regulation and “red tape” or make US military actions less efficient and effective.

Germany

In many ways, from a global and regional geopolitical perspective, the Iraq crisis has set back most of the positive steps that had been taken in post-September 11 circumstances in terms of the formulation of a truly concerted and “multilateral” strategy (albeit one strongly led by the USA).³

These setbacks are significant and will be difficult to overcome. First, the crisis has split NATO deeply. While France has always been the

“reluctant ally,” both Germany and Turkey, who represented the most loyal NATO allies during the Cold War, bitterly questioned US policies and actions for very different reasons. The US political elite and population has focused their criticism on France due to its threat to veto preclusive US-UK military intervention against the Iraqi regime in the UN Security Council, but the more fundamental concern is with Germany and Turkey.

For Germany, the issue was not domestic driven pacifism; Berlin had supported NATO efforts in Bosnia (after changing its Basic Law in 1994), in Kosovo as well as in Afghanistan, but the Germans drew the line on Iraq. Berlin opposed the option of “pre-emptive” or “preclusive” intervention.⁴ Unilateral and preclusive intervention would set a dangerous precedent; it would undermine international law and concepts of national sovereignty dating back to Westphalia, with profound consequences for the behaviour of states in the future, opening a Pandora’s box.

Berlin did not share the same threat perceptions of Iraq as did Washington; it did not see Saddam Hussein as a “nuclear Saladin” seeking to revenge himself upon Israel and the world; rather, Berlin regarded Iraq as a state that was near collapse. Moreover, Germany along with France, saw more negative than positive circumstances coming out of military intervention and consequent perceptions of “occupation,” in that there would be greater regional instability and anti-Western backlash; more terrorism, not less. ...

Turkey

Turkey feared that US actions would result in a *de facto* independent Kurdistan in northern Iraq. This was probably a wrong assessment from Ankara’s point of view as US forces would have taken the lead in liberating Kirkuk and Mosul, rather than letting Kurdish forces do the dirty work. Letting the Kurds “liberate” northern Iraq, however, now leads at least some Kurdish factions to expect to keep these oil rich regions as a reward in the spoils. While supporting a “democratic” and “federal” Iraq, in accord with the American position, the Kurdish definition of federalism still means a large degree of autonomy.

It should furthermore be noted here that, contrary to some of the criticism from Washington, that France can not be held responsible for Turkey's actions. In what has been dubbed as one of the most serious crises in NATO's history, France was highly criticized for not supporting NATO's decision to provide Turkey with Patriot missiles and AWACs on the basis of Article V. First, France believed that the timing was wrong; the deployment of such systems signalled the advent of war at a time when both France and Germany believed that the inspection system could be strengthened and enforced, and that a diplomatic settlement could be reached (but without regime change). Second, France argued that US military pressures on Iraq and threat to go to war was not covered by NATO's Article V in that the action involved enforcement and not collective defense.

From this perspective, one can argue that France had tried to warn the US that Turkey might seek to intervene unilaterally in Iraqi Kurdistan with NATO backing (as Ankara has repeatedly threatened to do).⁵ The refusal of Turkey to permit the deployment of American forces on Turkish territory was really a failure of US diplomacy and had nothing to do with France...

Turkey is now caught between a rock and a hard place. On the one hand, it is fearful that secessionist movements backed by Kurds in northern Iraq might ultimately undermine Turkish controls over Kurdish populations in eastern Anatolia. On the other, it fears that the EU will not accept Turkey as a member. (The Turkish case is to be reviewed by the EU in 2004). At the same time the United States is still fuming over the lack of Turkish support for the war with Iraq. Ankara has continued to threaten intervention in Iraqi Kurdistan, but probably will not act unless the US ultimately withdraws from the region.

This leads to my next point. *The US expects to sustain a military governorship in Iraq for at least six months to two years, but multinational peacekeeping forces may need to be deployed for a much longer period of time.* The creation of a *relatively autonomous* Iraqi Kurdistan will ultimately necessitate a long term multinational peacekeeping presence—preferably involving NATO-EU-Russian-Partnership for Peace (PfP) forces under a general UN mandate.

These forces would be deployed along the Iraqi borders with Turkey, as well as those of Iran and Syria, to assure that the latter powers do not intervene in the region. Such a peacekeeping force will not, however, necessarily prevent civil war; nor will it keep Iraq from breaking up into essentially three regions, a Kurdish north, a Sunni center, and a Shi'ite south.

A weak Iraq, which is predominantly Shi'ite, will also remain torn between pro-Iraq nationalist Shi'ites and more radical Islamic, generally pro-Iranian, Shi'ite influence. Neither of these basic groups and their conflicting sub-divisions are necessarily pro-western; but key factions will demand US military withdrawal, once basic infrastructure is repaired and functioning.

The war with Iraq may additionally have given a new "lease on life" to the Islamic Republic of Iran, which, until the advent of the war, had steadily been losing the general support of the Iranian population. The US-UK "occupation" of the Shi'ite holy sites of Karbala and Najaf has created a "new Satan" and provided pan-Islamic hardliners with a new cause.

CEFSP

The US intervention in Iraq has set back the Common European Foreign and Security Policy (CEFSP), at least for a few years. Despite expected efforts to patch up relations at the April 2003 EU summit, which will expand EU membership to 25 members, US intervention has driven a temporary wedge in the EU between UK-Spain and most eastern European states versus the Franco-German-Belgium "core."

The US traditionally played the UK and Germany against France during the Cold War, yet this new situation has opened a door in which the US can play the UK, Spain and eastern European states against a common EU foreign policy, backed by what US Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld dubbed the "old Europe" of France and Germany.⁶

The EU states themselves were divided over preclusive intervention in Iraq: the UK moved closest to US, but with some reluctance; Germany most strongly opposed regime change and possible military intervention, even with a UN mandate; France stuck to a position closest to that envisioned by the EU by seeking to work within the UN

framework. France and Germany consequently looked outside the EU to both Russia and China, as members of the UN Security Council, in order to counter US pressures to intervene in Iraq.

In many ways, the crisis has made the Europeans even more determined to develop their own defense capabilities and rapid deployment force—which is positive. Certainly, France, Germany, Belgium and Luxembourg have proposed a new defense forum to meet later in April 2003. This grouping will need to be joined by the UK to be truly effective.

But here American neo-conservatives are exaggerating European efforts to become “independent.” There will always be a transatlantic link; the problem, however, is to devolve some aspects of defense, including both “power” and “responsibility” sharing to the Europeans themselves, as is now the case in Macedonia, and soon Bosnia....

A stronger, relatively autonomous, Europe is in the American interest in that it can help prevent the US from becoming over extended as it deals with crisis after crisis. US forces are still in Bosnia and Kosovo. NATO peacekeepers have just moved into Kabul (but it is dubious that these forces will be out by 24 July 2004 after elections as expected by the Pentagon.) Washington is also proposing joint US-Pakistani patrols on border between Afghanistan and Pakistan. From this perspective, it appears dubious that the Pentagon will want to engage in long term peacekeeping after the war with Iraq, if it does not want to become overextended. (See discussion of costs of peacekeeping below.)

Moreover, the overt linkage of war in Iraq with peace between Israel and Palestine—so as to prove US-UK “even handedness” in the words of UK Prime Minister Tony Blair at the March 2003 Azores summit—will prove to be a very challenging undertaking.

If the “Road Map for Peace,” as formulated by the “Quartet” of the UN, US, EU and Russia, is ultimately to be implemented, it will most likely require multinational peacekeepers that will guarantee the security of both Israelis and Palestinians. A NATO-EU-Russian peacekeeping mission (plus Partnership for Peace members), under a general UN mandate, may well prove necessary to keep the peace between Israel and

Palestine, once the borders of the two states are defined, so as to assure both sides against renewed terrorist threats.

Russia

Military intervention in Iraq has tended to undermine the new post-September 11 NATO-Russian *entente*—as symbolized by the new NATO-Russia Council. *What is most problematic, in terms of US and EU relations with Russia, is the new US effort to play the eastern European “card.”* At the same time, the turn of France and Germany to Russia may only prove to be temporary due to the fear that closer EU-Russian relations may alienate eastern European states—as both the US and EU compete for east European allegiance.

On the one hand, the Bush administration took steps to appease Russia by downplaying Russian actions in Chechnya, and by designating certain Chechen groups as “terrorist” organizations, in order to gain Russian support in the UN against Saddam Hussein. On the other, the Bush administration stated that it was considering the repositioning of US forces from Germany to Poland, Bulgaria and Romania, so as to better approach Iraq, but apparently did not inform Moscow. Romania permitted the US to fly transport planes from air bases near the Black sea ports; Bulgaria provided a training camp, as did Hungary.

Concurrently, recent F-16 fighter jet sales to Poland, and promises of stronger US defense supports for the Baltic states, represent issues that could further alienate Moscow, as the US tries to play the eastern European card against the EU (and indirectly Russia). In addition to unilateral US withdrawal from the ABM treaty, US-Russian tensions over Russian opposition to preclusive US-UK intervention in Iraq have been accompanied by hints that the US Congress might not forgive Russian debt, that the US might fail to repeal the Jackson-Vanik amendment, and that Congress might not fully support Russian membership in the WTO, and that it might cut Russian (as well as French and Chinese) oil companies out of pending contracts that may have been finalized with the regime of Saddam Hussein.

These kinds of actions and threats have tended to undermine the trust of the new-found NATO-Russian *entente*, and have put into question the “19 plus 1” relationship. Much like the war “over” Kosovo,

US actions appeared to violate NATO promises to Russia not to deploy forces in eastern Europe—although no formal treaty has been signed with Moscow.⁷

Here, despite the formation of a tactical alliance between Germany, France and Russia on the question of Iraq, the European Union itself has been reluctant to assist Russia on WTO; the European Union has also opposed Russia's actions in Chechnya. Russia has hoped to meet with the EU along the lines of the "NATO plus 1," but the EU has thus far downplayed the concept.

On the one hand, both the US and EU need to make modifications in their policies to help Russia into WTO and with debt relief, and to integrate Russia more closely into transatlantic relations.⁸ On the other, developing Russia's oil and gas reserves, as a means to provide the US and the world with a stable alternative to Middle East oil, may conflict with the new imperative to develop Iraqi oil capabilities and reconstruct the country.

The failure of both the USA and EU to accommodate Russia in areas that are truly legitimate, may not only lead to a refusal to support the "war on terrorism" and other policies on American terms, but a dangerous Russian instability and isolation.

Myth of the Marshall Plan

One of the reasons (but not the primary one) for both France and Germany to oppose the war in Iraq was economic. Both these states have been engaged in deficit spending that exceeds 3% of their GDP. Bonn had helped to pay upfront for the 1990-91 war with Iraq (when it was concerned with the costs of German unification), but it absolutely refused to write a check for the war with Iraq in 2003, in part due to its economic stagnation and burgeoning deficits.

Concurrently, the US is at its legal debt limit at \$6.4 trillion with Republicans trying to raise the limit another \$860 billion and with Democrats opposing! US deficit spending and tax cuts as promised by the Bush Administration may raise additional transatlantic tensions, due to relative weakness of dollar versus the Euro, raising the price of European exports. Europeans fear that US deficit spending could have a

more damaging impact than threatened boycotts on French and German products.

The Iraq crisis is furthermore coming at the same juncture as the time when the US-EU truce over agricultural trade is coming to an end. "Horse trading" over Iraqi reconstruction and oil contracts could work to end the truce and re-open conflicts over agricultural subsidies and the Common Agricultural Program, genetically modified organisms, bananas, subsidies for steel and aerospace industries, trade sanctions on Cuba, Iran, etc. First there is the IMF meeting (April 12-13) that should open the door to international loans for Iraqi reconstruction, but the key event will be G-8 meeting (June 1-3). Behind the scenes economic disputes over Iraqi oil and reconstruction contracts could thus have detrimental effect on transatlantic trade issues.

On April 3rd, the US House of Representatives attached a rider to an Iraq war funding and reconstruction bill that explicitly bars any Russian, Syrian, French or German companies from participating in the US-funded reconstruction of Iraq. The Bush administration has stated that it is against the amendment, but it may not fight very hard to prevent it from passing both the House and the Senate. Here, there is a risk that potential US sanctions on French and German firms may hurt UK firms as well, due to joint ventures among the Europeans. This may be one reason why UK Prime Minister Tony Blair is seeking UN backing for Iraqi reconstruction.

Thus far, the US Agency for International Development (AID) has granted reconstruction contracts only to American firms. From the Bush administration perspective, all countries must help pay for the damage caused by Saddam Hussein that led to war in the first place, but the US is to have primacy for taking the major steps to intervene. (This point tends to ignore significant US support for the regime of Saddam Hussein during the 1980s against Iran.) The US has assured all companies that they can ultimately bid for contracts; but, at the same time, AID claims it has enacted (1) a "fast track" and special exemption to reduce bidding so as to speed up the process; (2) that firms are chosen according to US security clearance; (3) that foreign firms can be chosen for subcontracts.

Any American financing, either through the State Department or Defense Department, requires new appropriations by Congress. Bush

administration officials are hoping that allies, frozen Iraqi funds, hidden bank accounts of Saddam Hussein, as well as future Iraqi oil proceeds might defray future reconstruction and security costs, but many estimates appear to ignore the costs of long term peacekeeping. Congress has pressed to give Secretary of State Colin Powell, and explicitly not Defense Secretary Rumsfeld, control over the initial \$2.5 billion to be spent on postwar reconstruction in Iraq. The two bureaucracies may try to share responsibilities, however, despite their deep and significant policy differences.

Iraqi reconstruction will, however, require significantly more economic assistance, from the World Bank social development assistance, plus aid from international creditors. Reconstruction costs could range from \$25-30 billion to \$100-105 billion per year; one estimate predicts as much as \$600 billion over ten years. Iraqi foreign debt is estimated to be between \$62 to \$130 billion; while Kuwaiti reparation claims, plus other unsettled business claims after 1991, may be as much as \$172 billion. The total financial burden, including foreign debt, compensation claims and pending contracts of \$57.2bn is about \$383bn. It is furthermore dubious that Iraqi oil production *by itself* will support reconstruction: Current annual Iraqi oil revenues are at \$10 billion, with existing production rates dropping at 100,000 bpd annually; it could take 3-5 years and up to \$6bn in investments to get Iraqi oil up to its 1990 production rates. At the same time, however, much of the oil revenue is already being used for humanitarian purposes under the oil-for-food program, which has tended to create a dependence upon imports, undermining Iraqi agriculture. Costs of peacekeeping (plus the effort to search for Weapons of Mass Destruction and to find and secure conventional arms and explosives as well) could reach between \$84bn to \$100bn for over five years, assuming at least 75,000 troops at \$1.4bn a month.⁹ It is also not clear that a stability force made up of peacekeepers and paramilitary police from Denmark, Netherlands, Spain, Italy, Poland and the three Baltic states will prove to be sufficient and can be sustained for a long time due to the high estimated costs.

On the one hand, the Pentagon needs to secure the territorial integrity of Iraq itself at the same time that it seeks to utilize its military presence as leverage against Syria, Iran and Saudi Arabia; on the other hand, it will want to “minimize” its presence so as not to be accused of “occupation” and thus will need to build up Iraqi forces and devolve

peacekeeping to third parties, if at all feasible. Yet the Pentagon's ability to devolve responsibilities to the Iraqis themselves or to multinational forces (preferably under a UN mandate) depends upon the nature of the assessment of both internal and external threats to Iraq itself, as well as the nature of tensions in the region itself that might, at some point, require military intervention.

These estimates thus appear to indicate that such costs will need to be spread out among as many countries as possible, if Iraq is truly to be sustained as a "democratic-federal" republic in the long term and not fall into civil chaos or civil war, or break-up. In this respect, "punishing" European allies is not at all in the US interest.

Vultures versus Owls

The key debates between US policymakers are not those of "hawks" versus "doves" as was the case during the Cold war, as depicted by the international media, but a debate between "vultures" and "owls." It is my view that the "vultures" (who stressed the need for preclusive intervention) have had their day for the moment, but the "owls" (who stress diplomacy backed by force) will now have theirs, that is, at least until the next Presidential elections, despite not-so-veiled threats to Syria and Iran. (Hawks, who would have preferred to have engaged in long term containment or *coup d'etat*, have largely been sidelined. Doves are vocal, but their anti-war protests have not been effective.)

US neo-conservatives (the vultures) have argued that forceful intervention in Iraq will now provide credibility to US diplomacy, that states such as Iran, Syria, Saudi Arabia, Pakistan, North Korea (among others) will now bend to US policy in fear of being next on the hit list. Furthermore, the establishment of a "democratic" Iraq in the heart of the Middle East will provide a demonstration model for other Middle Eastern states to follow and thus they will begin to adopt political-economic reforms.¹⁰

Vultures argue that a bridgehead in Iraq will provide pressure throughout the entire region which will, in turn, convince Syria, Iran, and Saudi Arabia not to support terrorism, and which will help provide a platform from which to threaten war against terrorist organizations and states that are developing weapons of mass destruction. According to this argument, having eliminated one of Israel's major enemies, Iraq, as the

major pan-Arab spoiler of Middle East peace talks, it will be easier to press Israel to accept a Palestinian state (and likewise impel the Palestinians to accept Israeli terms). It is expected that Iraq will now join Egypt and Jordan and Saudi Arabia in supporting the March 2002 Arab Peace initiative that could lead to Arab state recognition of Israel.

From the owls' perspective, having engaged in war, and having shown US resolve, the US should now engage in "diplomacy" but hold off on military intervention. Making Bush and Blair meet in Belfast was intended to send a signal that "reconciliation" between feuding factions and "even handedness" were now the general goals of US policy. Hence the "Road Map to Peace" is ostensibly be unveiled shortly once the new Palestinian Prime Minister sets up his ministry.

Along with the Middle East peace initiative, the US is also to push for India-Pakistani reconciliation, as announced by Colin Powell in late March; the Bush administration is also hoping to achieve a settlement with North Korea. Both Israel and India, however, have both denounced American meddling in their affairs. Israel has disagreed with at least fifteen points of the Road Map for Peace. India has sent mixed signals to Pakistan: On the one hand, it has threatened pre-emption; on the other, it has opened the possibility of talks over Kashmir. North Korea continues to threaten to develop a nuclear weapons capacity.

Toward Multilateralism?

Although advocating what was a minority position within the Democratic party against US intervention in Iraq, Senator Byrd, and other congressional critics of the Bush administration, have argued that it is in the enlightened US interest to support multilateralism.¹¹ In order to regain world confidence—and the confidence of those who suspect US goals are to seize the oil fields and to establish military bases so as to conquer the region—the US will consequently need to demonstrate to that its preclusive intervention in Iraq was truly "even handed" and truly for the "benefit" of the Iraqi people themselves.

This prospect, however, will require a long term commitment to state and society building (including justice and law enforcement), and to general development and job creation goals, at a time when the US track record has not been stellar in regard to post-war Haiti, Bosnia, Kosovo, and Afghanistan, among other states, and in regard to development goals

in general. Already, there has been a failure in Iraq to deploy civilian police fast enough to prevent foreseen looting, and to provide sufficient medicinal services, among other major problems. Shi'ite militants may have also been precluded US efforts to build “democratic-federalism” from the “bottom-up” in some communities and regions.

The manner in which US handles post-Iraq war reconstruction, plus the way that it phases in the UN, and precisely how the UN then begins to lift multilateral sanctions, will be major factors that will determine whether the fissures in the US-EU-Russian relationship will deepen or begin to heal.

UN approval will open the door to international financial assistance from the EU, World Bank and other organizations, and work to restructure foreign debts (ranging from \$62 to \$132 billion) through the Paris Club and the IMF; it can help settle claims and reparation payments resulting from the 1990-91 Persian Gulf war. It can also help to determine as fairly as possible the legality and legitimacy of pending contractual arrangements made by the regime of Saddam Hussein in the oil and telecommunications sectors. All these financial obligations could significantly limit funds available for reconstruction.¹²

Most importantly, the UN can help provide legitimacy to the Iraqi Interim Authority, and then to the new Iraqi government, which otherwise may increasingly be regarded as a lackey of the US and UK. The Bush Administration might claim that its intent was not to “occupy” the country, but it may well be drawn into an “occupation” by domestic Iraqi, as well as regional, circumstances—particularly if Washington does try to go it alone, with only limited coalition assistance.

Washington will accordingly need to phase in its European Allies, the Russians and the UN, in order to help reconstruct Iraq—and to help re-construct its own legitimacy. Here, however, it will be difficult to square the circle: How is it possible to bring back the UN (going beyond humanitarian assistance) without indirectly legitimizing the preclusive US-UK military intervention, an action which was taken without a clear UN Security Council mandate? This issue may continue to exacerbate inter-Allied tensions if and when the US threatens preclusive intervention in the future without the strong support of the UN.

Zbigniew Brzezinski, former National Security Advisor under President Carter, has argued, pessimistically:

“Due to a lack of support of the Iraqi people for their ‘liberators,’ the establishment of a new political order in Iraq will be more difficult. Due to the lack of a serious effort to resolve the Israeli-Palestinian problem, the stabilization of the Middle East will be even more difficult to realize. Due to the lack of an international consensus in regard to Iraq, the nuclear disarmament of North Korea will be impossible. Due to the lack of an authentic reconciliation between the US and Europe, the organization of a more effective global system will not move forward.”¹³

From this perspective, the US will thus need to regain the support of its major allies in rebuilding Iraq as fairly as possible, and by devolving its military presence. NATO-EU-Russian peacekeeping in Iraq, under a general UN mandate, should be truly multilateral, with Islamic countries such as Egypt and Pakistan as partners. A similar multinational peacekeeping force, with its nationalities determined by both Israel and Palestine, may be deployed primarily on Palestinian territory, but help to guarantee the security of both states and to deter terrorism on both sides.

In addition to rebuilding Iraq, the US thus needs to more strongly engage in concerted UN-EU-Russian efforts to work to resolve conflicts between Israel and Palestine as well as between India and Pakistan—not overlook engaging in all possible efforts to reach an accord with North Korea that would guarantee the latter’s political and economic security in exchange for *not* developing nuclear weapons. These steps should help set the stage for a series of political-diplomatic settlements to the crises presently emanating from the Middle East, Persian Gulf, and South Asia that have been linked to the Far East by the “axis of evil.”

Washington must ultimately recognize that a concerted and multilateral approach to each of these regional conflicts is fundamentally in the US interest; but even then, it will not be very easy to prevent this truly global crisis from going from bad to worse.

Notes

¹ Charles Krauthammer, "The Unipolar Moment," *Foreign Affairs: America and the World* (1990/91). See also, Charles Krauthammer, "The Unipolar Moment Revisited" *The National Interest* Winter 2002/2003.

² It was France that defined September 11 as a threat to international peace and security and referred to the inherent right to self-defence in UN SCR 1368 Sept 12, 2001.

³ By US-led "multilateral" policy, I mean that Washington needs to formulate and engage in policies that permit "power" and "responsibility" sharing among as many of the major centers of geopolitical and economic power (UK, France, Germany, Russia, China and Japan)—as are truly interested in engaging in a particular issue.

⁴ In August-September 2002 Chancellor Gerhard Schroeder stated in reaction to an August 2002 speech made by Vice President Dick Cheney, that "it would be a mistake to intervene militarily in Iraq" and ruled out the use of German forces—whether under UN mandate or not.

⁵ In fact, even after Germany had reluctantly gone along with NATO's decision to deploy four AWACs aircraft, German Foreign Minister Joschka Fischer threatened to bring back all AWAC's German personelle (one-quarter to one-third of the staff)—if Turkey unilaterally intervened against the Kurds. *Financial Times* March 24 2003

⁶ Johns C. Hulsman and Nile Gardiner have argued that the US will take a more aggressive role in Europe and that the US will call, together with Britain, for a new division of Europe centered around those nations that have supported the US over the Iraq question: "With the support of the Spaniards, Poles and other nations of Eastern and Central Europe about to enter the European Union, America and Britain must present a new vision for Europe. The grandiose dream of a united federal Europe, so beloved of French and German strategists, must be firmly rejected. In its place, Washington and London must call for a flexible Europe, united by a common heritage and culture, but which maintains the principle of national sovereignty at its core." *The Bush-Blair Summit: Iraq, the U.N., and the Future of Europe* by Nile Gardiner and John C. Hulsman, Heritage Foundation WebMemo #239 March 26, 2003
<http://new.heritage.org/Research/MiddleEast/wm239.cfm>.

⁷ "Russia's Shifting Allegiance Toward the European Union" www.stratfor.com (7 March 2003). This is at least the third time the US has violated Russian trust by first moving NATO forces into eastern Germany and then bringing eastern European states in NATO as well, after promising verbally in both cases, not to do so. See also Hall Gardner, *Dangerous Crossroads* (Westport, CT, 1997).

⁸ Russia has now completed a draft agreement to create a "unified economic zone" encompassing Ukraine, Kazakhstan, Belarus, and Russia (with 219 million people), which Moscow sees as a step to WTO status.

⁹ See Baker Institute Working Papers “Guiding Principles for U.S. Post-Conflict Policy in Iraq” December 2002 <http://www.rice.edu/projects/baker>. See also Frederick D. Barton and Bathsheba Crocker, “Winning the Peace in Iraq” *The Washington Quarterly*, Spring 2003.

¹⁰ Assistant Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz has stated, to his credit, that this approach does not represent a new version of the “domino theory”; he expects that reforms may take place differently in states in the region and that democratic states may differ with other democratic states, as has been the case with “democratic” Turkey, which refused to accept US forces on its territory. Interview, *Meet the Press NBC* 6 April 2003.

¹¹ “This Administration has split traditional alliances, possibly crippling, for all time, international order-keeping entities like the United Nations and NATO. This Administration has called into question the traditional worldwide perception of the United States as well-intentioned, peacekeeper. This Administration has turned the patient art of diplomacy into threats, labeling, and name calling of the sort that reflects quite poorly on the intelligence and sensitivity of our leaders, and which will have consequences for years to come. We may have massive military might, but we cannot fight a global war on terrorism alone.... We need the cooperation and friendship of our time-honored allies as well as the newer found friends whom we can attract with our wealth. Our awesome military machine will do us little good if we suffer another devastating attack on our homeland which severely damages our economy. Our military manpower is already stretched thin and we will need the augmenting support of those nations who can supply troop strength, not just sign letters cheering us on.” Senator Byrd, *Senate Remarks: We Stand Passively Mute*, February 12, 2003. http://byrd.senate.gov/byrd_newsroom/byrd_news_feb/news_2003_february/news_2003_february_9.html.

¹² Frederick D. Barton and Bathsheba Crocker, “Winning the Peace in Iraq” *The Washington Quarterly*, Spring 2003.

¹³ Zbigniew Brzezinski: « La victoire risqué de coûter très cher politiquement » *Le Figaro* 3 April 2003 (translation mine).

¹ Charles Krauthammer, "The Unipolar Moment", *Foreign Affairs: America and the World* (1990/91). See also, Charles Krauthammer, “The Unipolar Moment Revisited” *The National Interest* WINTER 2002/2003.

² It was Paris that defined September 11 as a threat to international peace and security and referred to the inherent right to self-defence. UN SCR 1368 Sept 12 2001.

³ By US-led “multilateral” policy, I mean that Washington needs to formulate and engage in policies that permit “power” and “responsibility” sharing among as many of the major

centers of geopolitical and economic power (UK, France, Germany, Russia, China and Japan)—as are truly interested in engaging in a particular issue.

⁴ In August-September 2002 Chancellor Gerhard Schroder stated in reaction to an August 2002 speech made by Vice President Dick Cheney, that “it would be a mistake to intervene militarily in Iraq” and ruled out the use of German forces—whether under UN mandate or not.

⁵ In fact, even after Germany had reluctantly gone along with NATO’s decision to deploy four AWACs aircraft, German Foreign Minister Joschka Fischer threatened to bring back all AWAC’s German personnel (one-quarter to one-third of the staff)—if Turkey unilaterally intervened against the Kurds *Financial Times* March 24 2003

⁶ Johns C. Hulsman and Nile Gardiner have argued that the US will take a more aggressive role in Europe and that the US will call, together with Britain, for a new division of Europe centered around those nations that have supported the US over the Iraq question: “With the support of the Spaniards, Poles and other nations of Eastern and Central Europe about to enter the European Union, America and Britain must present a new vision for Europe. The grandiose dream of a united federal Europe, so beloved of French and German strategists, must be firmly rejected. In its place, Washington and London must call for a flexible Europe, united by a common heritage and culture, but which maintains the principle of national sovereignty at its core.” *The Bush-Blair Summit: Iraq, the U.N., and the Future of Europe* by Nile Gardiner and John C. Hulsman, Heritage Foundation WebMemo #239 March 26, 2003
<http://new.heritage.org/Research/MiddleEast/wm239.cfm>.

⁷ “Russia’s Shifting Allegiance Toward the European Union” www.stratfor.com (7 March 2003). This is at least the third time the US has violated Russian trust by first moving NATO forces into eastern Germany and then bringing eastern European states in NATO as well, after promising verbally in both cases, not to do so. See also Hall Gardner, *Dangerous Crossroads* (Westport, CT, 1997).

⁸ Russia has now completed a draft agreement to create a "unified economic zone" encompassing Ukraine, Kazakhstan, Belarus, and Russia (with 219 million people), which Moscow sees as a step to WTO status.

⁹ See Baker Institute Working Papers “Guiding Principles for U.S. Post-Conflict Policy in Iraq” December 2002 <http://www.rice.edu/projects/baker>. See also Frederick D. Barton and Bathsheba Crocker, “Winning the Peace in Iraq” *The Washington Quarterly*, Spring 2003.

¹⁰ Assistant Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz has stated, to his credit, that this approach does not represent a new version of the “domino theory”; he expects that reforms may take place differently in states in the region and that democratic states may

differ with other democratic states, as has been the case with “democratic” Turkey, which refused to accept US forces on its territory. Interview, Meet the Press NBC 6 April 2003.

¹¹ As Senator Byrd put it: “This Administration has split traditional alliances, possibly crippling, for all time, international order-keeping entities like the United Nations and NATO. This Administration has called into question the traditional worldwide perception of the United States as well-intentioned, peacekeeper. This Administration has turned the patient art of diplomacy into threats, labeling, and name calling of the sort that reflects quite poorly on the intelligence and sensitivity of our leaders, and which will have consequences for years to come. We may have massive military might, but we cannot fight a global war on terrorism alone.... We need the cooperation and friendship of our time-honored allies as well as the newer found friends whom we can attract with our wealth. Our awesome military machine will do us little good if we suffer another devastating attack on our homeland which severely damages our economy. Our military manpower is already stretched thin and we will need the augmenting support of those nations who can supply troop strength, not just sign letters cheering us on.” Senator Byrd, *Senate Remarks: We Stand Passively Mute*, February 12, 2003. http://byrd.senate.gov/byrd_newsroom/byrd_news_feb/news_2003_february/news_2003_february_9.html.

¹² Frederick D. Barton and Bathsheba Crocker, “Winning the Peace” *The Washington Quarterly*, Spring 2003.

¹³ “Brzezinski: La victoire risqué de coûter très cher politiquement” *Le Figaro* 3 April 2003 (translation mine).