READINGS IN EUROPEAN SECURITY

READINGS IN EUROPEAN SECURITY

VOLUME 2

CHAIRMAN: FRANÇOIS HEISBOURG

EDITORS: DANA H. ALLIN
MICHAEL EMERSON
& MARIUS VAHL

READINGS IN EUROPEAN SECURITY

VOLUME 2

CONTRIBUTORS

DANA H. ALLIN
GORDON ADAMS
HÜSEYIN BAGCI
HENRY J. BARKEY
KLAUS BECHER
CARL BILDT
DIMITRY A. DANILOV
YURI E. FEDOROV
FRANÇOIS HEISBOURG
SABAN KARDAS
ROBERTO MENOTTI
ALEXANDER I. NIKITIN
VLADIMIR A. ORLOV
NATALIA OULTCHENKO
GARY SAMORE
BURKARD SCHMITT
STEVEN SIMON
WALTER B. SLOCOMBE
MICHAEL STÜRMER
BRUNO TERTRAIS
NATHALIE TOCCI
IRINA ZVYAGELSKAYA

Contents

Foreword

This second volume of *Readings in European Security* vividly reflects the continuing changes that profoundly affect the factors shaping the security of the European continent. For a historian in the future, the work undertaken by the CEPS-IISS European Security Forum since 2001 will appear in sharp contrast to the sort of issues that were at the heart of security concerns during the 1970s and 1980s, dominated by East-West confrontation.

Where neutron bombs and Pershing missiles reigned supreme alongside 'approximate parity' and 'launch-on-warning' policies (against the backdrop of the scholastics of deterrence theory), we now have an incredibly broad spectrum not only of issues – from the Greater Middle East to the defence industrial base – but also of levels of analysis. For example, the legitimacy of the use of force, in the form of preventive action, is not precisely of the same make as the specialist questioning of Turkey's strategic position after the attacks of 11 September 2001. It isn't so much that the issues presented in the *Readings in European Security* volumes are intrinsically 'new' in the sense that they never existed before; rather, they simply weren't seen as first-order strategic questions to some extent. The current salience of the issues selected for discussion by the European Security Forum is the mechanical consequence of the disappearance of the overarching East-West conflict with the cold war, which leads to the (re)discovery of so-called 'new' problems. This discovery is notably the case with nuclear proliferation and the spread of ballistic missiles. Such quintessential 'emerging threats' are as old as the Manhattan Project and Operation Paper Clip.[1]

Much more fundamentally, however, two of the terms in the European Security Forum's title have changed profoundly. First, the nature of the threats to international security have changed in their content, not simply by virtue of the disappearance of a set of state actors (the USSR, the Warsaw Pact and the Yugoslavian federation) or the changes involving another set of states (the democratisation of America's East Asian allies, the runaway economic growth of China, etc.). More basically, the empowerment of non-state actors along with the other facets of the broad array of phenomena characterising 'globalisation' forces us to think anew about traditional issues, not least about those concerning proliferation, but also about the pre-emptive use of force and indeed (albeit from a very different point of view) the Greater Middle East. Although, in the latter case, there is little that is new about the topic as such – this is the region Zbigniew Brzezinski dubbed the

---

[1] Operation Paper Clip was the American code name for the transfer of Nazi-era scientists from Germany to the US, France, the USSR and Britain after World War II.

'arc of crisis' a quarter of a century ago – the challenges prevailing in, and posed by, that region are now directly linked to the fraught interaction between the forces of globalisation on the one hand, and the reaction to it on the other, with empowerment of non-state actors (civil society sometimes, and alas, al Qaeda no less) as a common factor. Even a topic such as the European defence industrial base has to be approached in a manner that would have been difficult to conceive 15 or 20 years ago. Not only do military requirements no longer drive technological innovation, but the future of the defence industry is increasingly tied to its ability – and the ability of its customers – to benefit from the galloping pace of the information revolution. Here too, the forces of globalisation tear away at the statist and national protections of Europe's cold war-era defence industrial base. Indeed, the way in which we have to think about security is changing, because of the way the international system is changing. The rules of the game are being rewritten in a manner that can only be compared with the definitions in 16th and 17th century Europe of the extent and limits of state sovereignty.

Second, while the conditions of security have been undergoing dramatic change, Europe has transformed itself no less radically, which has in turn raised new questions. Some of these European transformations are common to all societies, with Europe feeling the impact of globalisation no less than other parts of the world; and although Europe is an important actor of globalisation, the process of globalisation itself is not an intrinsically European product. Many of the changes are the result of an outside event, such as the collapse of the Soviet Union's will to exist. Europe played a contributing role to undermining the Soviet Union's ability and desire to function as an imperial power in the satellite nations of the Warsaw Pact as within its own borders. But ultimately, the processes undermining the Soviet empire, and notably the resistance of the captive nations, affected Europe more than Europe affected them.

Conversely, the countries and the peoples of what is called the European Union were the prime movers of the gradual establishment of the quite unique multilateral construct arising from the European integration process – or, more precisely in its French formulation, *la construction européenne*. Through thick and thin, 25 European states are now part of an entity that is neither a superstate nor a superpower on the world scene (except in the area of foreign trade), yet the EU is much more than an international organisation. It is a sort of hybrid: the EU generates possibly more than 50% of the laws and rules under which its members are governed; however, it has not federalised traditional attributes of sovereignty such as diplomacy or an armed force – though it has created a single currency. It is not surprising that our Russian and American friends sometimes have difficulty in taking stock of this 'neither fish nor fowl' entity. Europeans themselves have trouble

enough figuring it out – and no little trouble agreeing about its future direction. Nevertheless, *eppur si muove,* it not only exists but also moves, even if in an occasionally sideways fashion. The decrypting of the evolving European scene and its place in the international system is possibly one of the most useful roles the European Security Forum can have: these 'readings' will convey some flavour of this particular quality, using its now well-established formula of having each topic introduced for discussion by a European, an American and a Russian analyst.

François Heisbourg
Paris

European and Transatlantic Defence-Industrial Strategies

WITH CONTRIBUTIONS BY

GORDON ADAMS
BURKARD SCHMITT

INTRODUCTION BY

KLAUS BECHER

Introduction

Klaus Becher

The meeting of the European Security Forum on 25 November 2002 was devoted to the analysis of European and transatlantic defence-industrial strategies. The main question was if and how an intensified transatlantic approach to defence research and development (R&D) and procurement would develop or not, and if not, what such a failure to gain some access to US defence dollars for their business would mean for hard-pressed European defence industries.

The overwhelming size of the US defence market and the fragmentation of markets in Europe add aggravating structural dimensions to the difficult business prospects in this sector after years of shrinking or stagnating defence spending in Europe that increasingly leaves European players without the necessary critical mass.

In his presentation, Gordon Adams underlined that the transatlantic gaps in military strategy, capabilities and defence spending are getting wider. In this situation, he was critical of the fact that US attitudes to defence-industrial cooperation are still dominated by the traditional buy-American preference. Adams made the case for more transatlantic cooperation but warned that it was not clear yet if the US or the Europeans would be prepared to draw the consequences from this compelling situation and create the necessary conditions for such cooperation to evolve.

He claimed that not just European nations but even the US, in spite of its huge defence budget, would not in the future be able to afford the required rapid military transformation and modernisation on their own. The desired supply-side competition and multitude of technological approaches would fade away unless it was recreated on the transatlantic level. In addition, both European defence spending and the chance to sell defence-industrial products and services to Europe would shrink even more if European defence firms were not to survive. This required giving them more market access to the US and favouring transatlantic industrial partnerships.

The idea underlying NATO's new Transformation Command conflicted with the existing restrictive technology-transfer rules. The joint response force will depend on interoperable C4ISR (control, command, computers, communications, intelligence surveillance and reconnaissance). This can only be achieved with greater US willingness to share such technologies with European partners, including reforming some of the 'black box' restrictions that have plagued transatlantic technology cooperation for decades.

The allied transformation command will fail in its mission of integrating transformational technologies into European forces if its US staff cannot exchange views and data on key transformational capabilities, owing to US technology-transfer restrictions.

Burkard Schmitt explained that there was no 'European defence industry' as such. We were instead talking about several different sectors with different structures. Therefore the question of whether Europe's defence industry would survive had to be posed differently: in which of these sectors would there be survivors and who? While in the aerospace sector there were some cash-generating programmes in the shorter term, it remained unclear where the money for R&D would come from in the mid- and long term.

Clearly, the low level of defence spending in most European countries was at the heart of the problem, with Germany playing the key role. It was not so much the overall spending level that was to blame but the way in which the available funds were spent. Gordon Adams added that above all, properly coordinated and strategically targeted R&D programmes would be important to halt the demise of European defence industries.

Burkard Schmitt and Gordon Adams both found that after the end of the cold war, the transatlantic defence-industrial scene was driven by industry-led cooperation under the pressure of globalisation toward transnational industrial consolidation; meanwhile governments remained 'behind the curve' and failed to grasp and match this trend, especially by removing bureaucratic and regulatory obstacles. Reasons cited included the lack of harmonisation of national armaments requirements, the persistence of national defence market-protection rules and the traditional desire to minimise reliance on foreign supplies.

In this situation, European defence investment does not render enough value for money. European nations continue to disagree, however, on the strategy to address the problem. On the one side, the UK is determined to always buy the most appropriate equipment even if this often means going to the US, and tries to exploit efficiencies from deregulation, flexibility, smart procurement and public-private partnership models while preserving competition on a transnational level. On the other side, in France and also Germany, to varying degrees, the desire to preserve a national defence-industrial base is still dominant.

The Letter of Intent process in Europe, geared at creating the proper legal and administrative framework for a successful European defence industry after its transnational restructuring, had at first looked encouraging but it does not make up for the absence of actual programmes. In Burkard Schmitt's judgment, the intergovernmental cooperation process in Europe was bound to fail and an institutional quantum-leap was needed. The defence

market should be governed by EU Commission rules but the procurement system should be kept flexible, avoiding a large management agency that would be counterproductive.

Some nations hoped that armaments cooperation with the US, even in a junior partner or mere customer role could help to gain respect and influence in Washington. It was lamentable, though, that such transatlantic cooperation was pursued on a bilateral basis (inherently weak) and not through European institutions. In this context, Gordon Adams's observation was relevant that even under the novel approach to industrial return, taken by the joint defence acquisition organisation OCCAR, there was still no incentive for including additional countries in cooperative projects.

Recent US initiatives that would allow more transatlantic defence-industrial cooperation, including the relaxation of export-control obstacles to defence trade with close allies, equal treatment of qualified foreign-controlled defence firms and harmonisation of related regulations continue to face strong political resistance within the US, both for proliferation fears and national industrial interests. As Gordon Adams stressed, the engagement of the British firm BAE Systems by the US was important as an effort to establish bona fides for overseas defence firms in the US with Congress and the Pentagon.

It remained to be seen whether the Bush administration would show political leadership on this issue *vis-à-vis* opposing forces in Congress and elsewhere. The US tendency to distinguish between 'good' and 'better' allies was bound to create problems for Europe as France and Germany would probably be treated differently than the UK, undermining the basis for multilateralism and transnational companies.

For Europeans, access to US technology is desirable. For European companies, access to a share of the US defence-spending cake is vital. This situation raises the crucial question of whether the US has an interest in preserving and strengthening European defence-industrial capacities through more intense transatlantic cooperation that benefits Europe. Further, would Washington actually be willing to sustain the continued existence of a European defence research and development base in Europe?

In assessing the strength of possible political and military motivations on the part of the US in favour of transatlantic defence cooperation, one obvious argument for such a US interest remains that the cohesion of the North-Atlantic alliance would otherwise suffer. Nevertheless, the need for interoperability as such would not require the nourishing of a European defence industry if the US were willing to sell its cutting-edge products and the Europeans were willing to bankroll such purchases – in spite of the lack

of technological spin-offs, job gains or the political autonomy that are usually associated with those defence products made closer to home.

Burkard Schmitt believed that there was no need for the US to cooperate for industrial, budgetary or technological reasons; Gordon Adams, however, suggested that there were actually some, though not many network-centric warfare technologies in Europe that would indeed provide attractive opportunities for partnering. But the existing mistrust of Europe and European technology in the US defence establishment would have to be overcome and Europeans would have to show enough flexibility to take advantage of the chances offered in the process of network-centric transformation. The US offer to cooperate on missile defence, however, was purely driven by the political desire to offer incentives for allied political support.

The Russian speaker, Ruslan Pukhov, Director of the Moscow-based Centre for Analyses of Strategies and Technologies, did not submit a written paper. In his oral remarks, he underlined that Russia had inherited 80% of the Soviet Union's defence industry while 20% was now outside the country. This inheritance provided Russia with a full, autonomous spectrum of R&D and production capacities. The sector was characterised, however, by pervasive duplication and redundancy and until two years ago the traditional preference for state-run enterprises over more competitive private ones had still been dominant.

After ten years of rather plan-less restructuring and privatisation, there was still no encompassing vision. The government had decided, though, that in the further course of restructuring it would want to create 10-20 defence holding firms as stock companies with 51% state ownership. The war in Chechnya had not only determined the priorities for production but also given new impulses for research and development owing to increased demand for new equipment such as UAVs, night-vision equipment and joint C3I assets.

With regard to international arms cooperation, Russia had a choice between East and West, and it was likely that both orientations would continue to co-exist. In the past, Russia's international defence-cooperation projects had been failures, mainly because they had been driven by political and not economic rationales. There was now noticeable Indian and Chinese influence based on their desire to use the existing, still superior Russian design and development capabilities, e.g. in the Su-30 and Su-27 programmes. For example, India would pay for the R&D in such programmes, while Russia would keep the intellectual property and buy the resulting products for itself.

There was also cooperation with the European Aeronautic Defence and Space Company (EADS), mainly for the manufacturing of spare parts and

fuselage components. The experience was that more ambitious programmes such as the Russian/Ukrainian alternative to the A-400M did not go though. This experience had created the feeling in Russia that cooperation in areas more sensitive than transport, such as missile defence, would also be unlikely to materialise. European cooperation partners, in particular, were seen as no help to Russia in the defence-industrial sector since they had insufficient budgets.

For Russia's defence trade, the most attractive niche was to sell to customers who could or would not buy US or European products, such as the Chinese. Only a few such customers however, provided economically rewarding markets. Iran, where Russia was risking US ire, was also not paying well. In airlift services, Russians and Ukrainians now hold 50% of the world market with the old An-124, good for another 15 years. Thus there would be no new Russian heavy transport plane.

The discussion that followed the introductory speakers' remarks touched on a number of interesting issues with participation of officials from the EU Commission, EU Military Staff and NATO International Staff. One US participant asked why there was not more of an effort among Europeans to "just do it" and concentrate on important niches where the US wasn't ready to share its technology even with close allies, such as Joint Direct Attack Munitions (JDAMs) and Unmanned Aerial Vehicle systems (UAVs). One reason cited why this strategy wasn't being pursued was that the big European firms were above all focusing their efforts on keeping their role as systems integrators.

There was also some discussion about the motivations behind US companies' purchases of smaller European firms. Opinions differed whether this was just 'cherry-picking' made easy by the strong US market power or whether it was part of a deliberate strategic approach for global control of certain strategic technologies. While in many cases, good business opportunities were simply taken, in others, including the purchase of German cutting-edge submarine manufacturer HDW, there were most likely more strategic considerations involved.

On the main questions raised during the meeting in the context of transatlantic defence cooperation, a certain degree of consensus was forming:

- It was obvious that Europe's approach to the issue had so far lacked adequate top-level political guidance and sustained political will based on a defined set of priorities. Gordon Adams suggested that the choices the UK had made in its defence-industrial policy went in the right direction. But doubts remained about whether the matter stood a chance of recognition by politicians and the public in other European countries as important enough to generate sufficient attention and determination.

- It also was apparent that in the future there would be a stronger EU Commission role in this field, including export controls and trade policy. This dimension was not captured by the 'dumb' bilateral approach so far pursued by the US in its negotiations with European governments.

- Much could be gained through a coherent European approach to negotiations with the US. First, the task would be to influence the ongoing US review and debate on defence trade and technology-transfer policies, especially in Congress.

- Essentially, however, the problem would boil down to the need for maintaining a sufficient level of well-directed European spending for defence R&D and procurement.

Transatlantic Defence-Industrial Cooperation and American Policy:

An American View

Gordon Adams

Introduction

Defence industrial cooperation across the Atlantic has fallen on bad days in recent years.

The number of official transatlantic defence programmes has dwindled to a handful, of which the frequently-threatened MEADS air defence system is the most notable.[1] Increasingly, for major defence acquisition programmes, such as air transport and missiles, European governments are showing an inclination to 'buy European', while the US tradition of 'buy American' remains as hardy as ever.

Industry joint ventures such as Thales-Raytheon Systems have yet to generate business growth. Strategic partnerships, such as that between EADS and Northrop Grumman, have yet to bear significant fruit in the form of access for firms on one side of the Atlantic to the defence market on the other side. The most successful transatlantic market access has gone to the few, largely British defence companies (especially BAE Systems and Rolls-Royce) that have established themselves in the only growing defence acquisition market in the transatlantic region – the United States.

Nor is transatlantic defence cooperation being encouraged by growth in the European defence acquisition market. Although the substantial market shrinkage of the past decade has been largely halted, only the French defence acquisition market seems poised to grow; cuts continue in the UK, Germany, Italy, Sweden, Spain and the Netherlands.[2] A reversal of this trend seems unlikely in the near future.

---

[1] Although the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter (JSF) has a number of European participants, it does not qualify as an official transatlantic programme. It is, rather, a US programme with European participants, of which the UK is by far the most important. JSF is, however, a harbinger of things to come – a dominant US programme, whose growth could gradually drive European producers out of the airframe business.

[2] The British defence budget is slated to grow 1.2% a year after inflation through 2005–06; French equipment budgets are expected to grow just below 1.0% a year, after inflation through 2008. German defence budgets will remain flat, which will mean decline in constant euros, though a German budget review is

There are significant and growing obstacles to achieving a more open and flexible transatlantic regime for industrial and technological defence cooperation. Most of these obstacles are the result of government policies, principally in the United States, but increasingly in Europe as well. Despite these negative signs for the transatlantic industrial relationship, the logic of stronger industrial and technological defence cooperation remains compelling. For this logic to prevail, however, the transatlantic obstacles will need to be overcome. Although it is not yet clear that policy-makers are prepared to take the necessary steps, the policy options themselves are relatively clear.

The case for transatlantic cooperation

Strategic divergence and convergence

Over the 1990s, the strategic visions of Europe and the United States began to diverge sharply. The US emerged as the dominant global power and has become a less and less reluctant sheriff in the wake of the terrorist attacks of 11 September 2001. A new, initially hesitant administration is now fully engaged, with forces operating against terrorists on a global basis and a full-scale attack in Iraq is waiting in the wings. In service of this engagement, US forces are being transformed for even more global operations, acquiring network-centric technology that puts them years, if not decades, ahead of any other country's capabilities.

In Europe, with Britain and France each deciding to abandon defence autonomy and fully commit to the EU Headline Goal, there has been more dramatic progress towards a common European security policy and defence capability than in the preceding four decades. Nevertheless, there is still no European strategic vision to accompany the Headline Goal forces. For 50 years the strategic attention of Europe has been focused on European security issues, with declining attention to global security concerns. This focus has left a large 'vision gap' with the United States, which has significant impact on comparative capabilities.[3]

---

currently under way. The Italian defence budget is projected to grow significantly, but much of the additional funding will be dedicated to personnel as a transition takes place to a smaller, all-volunteer force. See IISS, "NATO and non-NATO Europe", *The Military Balance, 2002–2003,* pp. 248–49 and Ministere de la Defence, *Programmation Militaire 2003–2008: Project de Loi de Programmation,* Ministere de la Defence, Paris, September 2002.

[3] See Gordon Adams (2001), "Seeking Strength in Numbers: The European Allies and US Defense Planning", in Cindy Williams (2001) (ed.), *Holding the Line: US Defense Alternatives for the Early 21st Century,* Cambridge, MA: MIT

While French and British forces have undergone significant changes – conventional force personnel reductions, reforms, and in the French case, professionalisation – few other major European countries, especially Germany, have set out on the road of trading personnel for real capability. Shrunken European defence budgets remain heavily focused on personnel spending. Acquisition euros are in short supply and research and development budgets fall very short both of US funding (roughly four times as great) and of a level that would produce network-centric or transformational technologies in Europe.

After the events of 11 September and the emergence of proliferation and terrorism as major security concerns, however, a new common strategic interest is emerging across the Atlantic. The old NATO rationale is gone, but the Prague summit will reflect a new concern, beyond ensuring the continued stability of troubled European regions. Proliferation and the threat of weapons of mass destruction delivered by multiple means concerns Europe as much as it does the United States. And the terrorist threat, while not new, now poses a danger of an asymmetrical nature and a significant magnitude both to Europe and to the United States. Confronting these threats together is clearly preferable to diverging policies across the Atlantic. Even, in fact, especially in coalitions of the willing, the partners continue to need interoperability, particularly as network-centric technologies become central to military operations.

The logic of cooperation is having an impact on governments in the NATO region, as reflected at the Prague summit. The US Missile Defense Agency is explicitly encouraging allied participation in the Ballistic Missile Defense (BMD) programme, a goal underpinned by NATO-funded research efforts in missile defence. The NATO summit has endorsed a reframing of the 1999 Defence Capabilities Initiative that focuses on interoperability investments, especially those that support network-centric warfare, such as secure command, communications and information. The US has proposed creating a NATO Rapid Reaction Force, capable of conducting out-of-area operations, which is likely to be adopted by the Alliance.[4] Such a force will require dedicated funding and interoperable technologies, increasing the incentive

---

Press, pp. 79–117, and Robert Kagan (2002), "Power and Weakness", *Policy Review* 113 (June–July).

[4] A prototype of such a force has been described as "a small, elite, mobile expeditionary force…maintained at high readiness, capable of swiftly projecting power to distant areas outside Europe and then conducting demanding combat operations with US forces in a wide spectrum of contingencies". See Hans Binnendijk and Richard Kugler (2002), "Transforming European Forces", *Survival,* Vol. 44, No. 2 (Autumn), p. 118.

for transatlantic collaboration in these areas. Finally, NATO may, once again, endorse a common air-ground surveillance system (AGS), with a possible transatlantic technological solution that requires transatlantic industry collaboration.

Budgetary pressures

The limited European defence budgets provide a particularly compelling rationale for Europeans to seek a flexible transatlantic industry and technology regime. Limited budgets for defence investment, in particular, could prove to be the Achilles' heel of the EU effort to create a Headline Goal force with effective transportation, air power, precision-guided munitions, unmanned aerial vehicles and C4ISR (control, command, computers, communications, intelligence surveillance and reconnaissance). The NATO summit decisions could add to this budgetary pressure. Europeans will want to be certain that investment dedicated to a new NATO RRF does not compete with investments required for the Headline Goal force.[5] Yet the new joint force and the AGS programme constitute clear incentives to transatlantic industrial cooperation. Access to US defence technologies through transatlantic cooperation could provide substantial cost savings to the Europeans. Combined with reprioritisation of European budgets to focus on transformational technologies, resources could be focused on the most compelling capability needs.

Despite rapid defence budget growth, the US could share this interest. Even projected US acquisition budgets are inadequate, given the dual requirements for equipment modernisation and transformational technologies, combined with growing personnel and operational costs. As the US budget deficit grows, future defence budgets will come under further pressure. Stronger, competitive transatlantic options for defence equipment could be part of the answer to this budget dilemma.

For the US and Europe, a more integrated industry and technology regime that encourages industry collaboration would provide defence policy-makers with enhanced choices, competition and flexibility in defence acquisition. As the industry has consolidated, the number of providers of defence platforms has declined, constraining defence ministry options in Europe and for the DOD. The advantages of competition in pricing, technical capability and timing are slowly being lost. A broader array of technical options could be

---

[5] Binnendijk and Kugler argue that the NATO force will require minimal resources – perhaps 2% of current European NATO defence spending – and will draw largely on existing capabilities (ibid., p. 129).

available for defence planners and costs could be better controlled, representing a significant advantage within constrained investment budgets.

Technology advantages

The communications, information, networking, sensor and satellite technologies that are critical to network-centric warfare and combined operations are widely dispersed and commercial in origin. The capacity to integrate these technologies into military applications is less dispersed, limited largely to American and a very few European companies. European firms, particularly Thales, BAE Systems and EADS, possess the commercial technologies in abundance and are increasingly capable of integrating these technologies in defence systems.[6] There are clearly advantages to greater flexibility in the technology-transfer regimes between these two continents and significant downsides to either side shutting itself off from the technologies available to the other side. A flexible regime across the Atlantic for such technology transfers, combined with more common barriers to its dispersal elsewhere, could be in the interests of both.

An industrial logic

As developments in the European shipbuilding, ground systems and aircraft industries suggest, it is increasingly difficult for European industry to sustain itself on European acquisition spending alone. Given such limits, the incentive for European defence industries to gain access to the US market is growing. Major US defence firms, while less dependent on the international market, are losing their historic access to the European market. Traditional access to Europe through direct sales is no longer acceptable. Only partnerships with European firms will provide future access and these are viable only if there is reciprocity in the policies governments pursue on both sides.[7]

---

[6] See Frost and Sullivan (2001), "European Command, Control, Communications, Computers and Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance (C4ISR) Market", Report B055-16, 2002, and the panel reports of the European Institutes' Interoperability Project.

[7] There is a growing tendency among US prime contractors to focus on the short-term growth in US defence acquisition and to set aside, for now, this transatlantic interest. Changes in European acquisition practices could, however, further constrain access to the European market.

US and European policies create obstacles

The defence industry on both sides of the Atlantic has recognised and responded to these incentives for greater cooperation for a number of years now. The same cannot be said for government policies, which create growing obstacles to a more flexible transatlantic regime.

The United States

The barriers to entry into the American defence market are major obstacles to a more transparent, open and flexible transatlantic defence-industrial relationship. They are largely based on government policies, many of which have existed for decades and are difficult to change. US Defense Department acquisition and defence trade policies are major obstacles. They include a strong and understandable DOD preference for buying US defence technologies, which are seen as significantly more advanced than comparable European technologies. There is also a strong DOD preference to protect US defence technological leadership and carefully restrict European access to US technical know-how. These preferences are reinforced by a guarded DOD approach to technology transfer and direct foreign investment by non-US defence suppliers in R&D and production facilities in the United States.

Beyond the DOD, the State Department, which administers the review of more than 45,000 export licence requests a year, takes a generally conservative view of the export of technologies on their Munitions List to any other country, including members of the EU. Export control rules written during the cold war have been extended since then, with the policy bureaucracies remaining concerned about the risk of the loss of technological superiority and the proliferation of capabilities that could be used one day against the United States.

There are also substantial hurdles in the way of direct non-US investment in the US market. While some firms, notably BAE Systems and Rolls-Royce have succeeded in overcoming these barriers, few other European firms have done so. The system used by the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States (CFIUS) for screening non-US direct investment in the US economy can be a deterrent to entry. The security rules surrounding such investment, controlled by the US Defense Department, essentially cut US operations off from their non-US parents and are a further deterrent.

Executive branch policies in Washington are mirrored by political concern in the US Congress, where defence technology export-licensing and technology transfer issues and direct investment by European firms in the American defence economy have been hotly debated over the past decade.

Substantial effort was invested in the late 1990s in trying to overcome some of the more frustrating obstacles to transatlantic defence industry collaboration.[8] The US Defense Department's system for reviewing export licences was substantially streamlined and a more flexible special security arrangement was negotiated with Rolls Royce's US operations. Secretary of Defense William Cohen negotiated the Declarations of Principle (DOP) on reforms in defence trade relationships with the governments of Australia and the United Kingdom. After considerable struggle, broader export licensing regimes were introduced. In particular, following the May 2000 announcement of the Defense Trade Security Initiative (DTSI), other countries may be eligible to negotiate a waiver for certain trade under the International Traffic in Arms Regulations (ITAR), which govern the process for export licences, provided those negotiations lead to a compatible export control regime in that country.

The US reforms of the late 1990s largely ground to a halt with the arrival of a new administration in Washington, D.C. The Defense Department has not continued the previous administration's effort to further reform its internal licensing process and no new special security arrangements have been negotiated with non-American subsidiaries in the United States. The DOD has been reluctant to release technologies that may tie into weapons of mass destruction or the means of delivering WMD. Although a DOP has been negotiated with Sweden, there appear to be no plans to initiate such talks with other governments. With respect to specific technology transfers, the DOD (and State) has allowed German access to UAV technology, particularly the Global Hawk airframe, and access for Italy with respect to the Predator UAV, but there has been no broader policy decision. In general, the tone of DOD policy with respect to transatlantic defence-industry cooperation has been less forward-leaning than in the prior administration.

The Department of State (DOS) has continued negotiations with the UK and Australia on an ITAR exemption as described in the DTSI, but those talks continue to proceed very slowly. The greatest obstacle continues to be a cautious State Department view about whether the UK must legally enforce US third-country transfer rules and regulations or whether a British government policy with the same effect is adequate. The agreements may come to a conclusion in the next few months, but will face implementation obstacles in the US, given Congressional resistance to any ITAR exemptions. There has been no consideration given to opening a multilateral dialogue on

---

[8] For a discussion of the US reform process between 1996 and 2000, see Gordon Adams (2001), "Fortress America in a Changing Transatlantic Defence Market", in Burkhard Schmitt (2001) (ed.), *Between Cooperation and Competition: The Transatlantic Defence Market* (Chaillot Paper No. 44), Institute for Strategic Studies of the Western European Union, Paris, January.

export controls or technology transfer questions with the leading European arms producers. A part of the State Department Munitions List, which itemises controlled products and technologies, has been reviewed, but there has been little attempt to actually reduce the size of the list itself. Investment rules have not been changed. The DOS bureaucracy that processes export licences has been streamlined and connected electronically to other agencies with equities in the licence decision and has received an increase in personnel. The shape of its underlying task however, has not been changed.

Until late 2002, there has been little attention paid by the new administration to questions of transatlantic defence industrial and technological cooperation. Policy-makers were preoccupied with the war on terrorism, which actually increased concern over the possible release of technology that may be used for weapons of mass destruction or ballistic missiles. In October 2002, the National Security Council finally began a long-delayed review process, issuing instructions to agencies to review the broad agenda of defence trade, technology transfer, transatlantic technology cooperation and US arms transfer policies, export controls and advocacy. Details of the review are not publicly available, though it is said to cover the definition of options for closer cooperation, the changes in policy, regulation and law that may be necessary for such cooperation, and the risks that may accompany cooperation with specific countries.

Western Europe

Although it is not the purpose of this paper to examine European policy closely, it is worth noting that the historically open European defence market may be in the process of closing substantially, as part of the 'Europeanisation' of overall defence policies and defence industrial policies in particular. The EU commitment to the Headline Goal, declining European defence budgets and the consolidation of the European defence industry are having an impact on European defence acquisition decisions and the developing defence industrial and technology base. Gradually, a tendency may be emerging to protect the European defence industrial and technology base from American domination, and to sustain a European industrial and technological capability to support the broader security goals of a uniting Europe.

The 'buy-European' preference may be indicated by the European commitment to the meteor missile and the A-400M transport aircraft. These two decisions could signal a future in which EU members buy major hardware platforms from European suppliers, with smaller procurements

being more transatlantic.[9] European governments have encouraged the creation of European counterparts and competitors to US defence industrial giants to meet these needs and, as the Headline Goals of the European security and defence policy (ESDP) have been more sharply defined, these capabilities are being looked to for the necessary equipment and technologies, including air transport, sealift, precision-guided munitions and unmanned aerial vehicles.[10]

There is also a growing cross-national trend to create European-level institutions and policies to provide the legal setting and road map for European defence acquisition policies and defence-industry behaviour. Such harmonisation is seen as necessary for a healthy, cross-national industrial base, as well as to ensure that this industry does not escape governmental scrutiny and controls.[11] Under the July 2000 Framework Agreement, six countries (the UK, France, Germany, Italy, Sweden and Spain) have undertaken to harmonise practices and regulations on export controls, the security of supply, the security of classified information and industrial security, defence research and development, the treatment of technical information, and defence requirements.[12]

Four of these nations – France, Germany, the UK and Italy – have also created a joint defence acquisition organisation in 1996 – known as OCCAR for its French name (Organisation Conjointe de Cooperation en Matière

---

[9] These decisions are also consistent with a longer European history of creating and subsidising cross-border defence platforms, including the Eurofighter, the NH-90 and Tiger helicopter programmes, and a large number of MBDA missile programmes.

[10] See Gordon Adams (2000), "Convergence or Divergence? The Future of the Transatlantic Defence Industry", in Simon Duke (ed.), *Between Vision and Reality: CFSP's Progress on the Path to Maturity,* European Institute for Public Administration, Maastricht, pp. 161–208.

[11] Author's interviews with government officials in France, Germany and the UK, summer 2001.

[12] The intent of this process is to "create the political and legal framework necessary to facilitate industrial restructuring in order to promote a more competitive and robust European defence technological and industrial base in the global defence market and thus to contribute to the construction of a common European security and defence policy". Preamble to the *Framework Agreement between the French Republic, the Federal Republic of Germany, the Italian Republic, the Kingdom of Spain, the Kingdom of Sweden, and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland concerning Measures to Facilitate the Restructuring and Operation of the European Defence Industry,* signed at Farnborough, United Kingdom, 27 July 2000.

d'Armement) to manage the growing number of collaborative projects among these countries, including, ultimately, the A-400M. OCCAR is increasingly seen as the prototype of a European defence acquisition agency, which may emerge sometime in the future in the EU framework with expanded membership.[13]

As the EU member states protect employment in the defence industry and move to stimulate a European R&D technology base in advanced defence technologies, two tendencies may appear. First, European-level institutions will be increasingly tasked with regulatory responsibilities for this activity.[14] As one EU official has put it: "You cannot have a defence policy for 15 and an industrial base harmonised at six".[15] Second, this emerging European industrial and technology base will be protected from the United States. European governments will be willing to pay a premium for defence equipment and acquire slightly less-advanced technology, more slowly, in order to support this base.

What is the alternative to the 'two fortresses'?

The goal of a more flexible transatlantic regime would be an industrial and technological relationship that is more reciprocal, integrated and transparent, while ensuring that critical defence technologies leak as little as possible to potentially threatening states. It should be based first on principles including:

---

[13] Interviews in Brussels, Paris, Berlin and London, summer 2001. See also Christophe Cornu (2001), "Fortress Europe: Real or Virtual?", in Adams, Cornu, James and Schmitt (2001), *Between Cooperation and Competition: The Transatlantic Defence Market*, (Chaillot Paper No. 44), Institute for Security Studies of the Western European Union, Paris, January, pp. 77–80.

[14] The European Union does not yet have a coherent defence industrial and technology policy, but there is considerable interest in the Commission in having such a policy and an emerging interest in the Council of Ministers, as well. Current Commission responsibilities for industrial policy, dual-use research and development, public procurement, customs policies and dual-use technology exports controls will inevitably lead to greater involvement in the defence industrial and technology arena. The Council, through its Armaments Policy committee, currently has what responsibility exists at the EU level. See Commission of the European Communities, *Communication from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions on Implementing European Union Strategy on Defence-Related Industries,* COM(97)583 final, Brussels, 4 December 1997, Annex I, p. 2.

[15] Interview in Brussels, summer 2001.

- **A multilateral approach.** Given the evolution of the European market, industries and institutions, it is increasingly important that this relationship take on a *multilateral,* as opposed to a bilateral character. The days of serial bilateral negotiations on defence industrial and technology issues are numbered; a chain of bilateral agreements will be broken by the reality that the Europeans are rapidly evolving a multilateral process for such issues. NATO is not the best forum for such negotiations; the European process will eventually be institutionalised in the European Union. Negotiations should take place directly between the North Americans and a European grouping of four or six member states or the EU, as appropriate.

- **A broad strategic agenda.** The issues in such a negotiation should be approached as a *strategic agenda,* not as discrete parts. All are important to creating the new transatlantic regime; treating them together will provide opportunities for trade offs in negotiations that can lead to a successful outcome.

- **A search for best practices.** The participants will need to *check their superiority at the door.* One key reason for the slowness of the US/UK ITAR negotiations has been the US insistence that the Europeans level-up their export control regimes by incorporating US statutes and practices into British law. Yet there are areas in which the Europeans may have best practices. The parties need to research best practice with each other, not seek extraterritorial enforcement of national legislation.

The negotiations themselves should address a number of issues including:

- **Strategy.** The United States and its European allies should invest in a common discussion of the elements of global strategy that they share – such as shared responsibilities for stability operations in Europe, common approaches to combating terrorism and joint policies on the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. This dialogue needs to take place within NATO, but also needs to be engaged between NATO and the EU as the latter shapes the Headline Goal force and its equipment needs.

- **Military planning.** Strategy review processes on both sides of the Atlantic need to draw the others into their national discussions, with more joint conversations over defence requirements, force planning and hardware objectives to define equipment needs that could be met by consortia or partnerships among industrial suppliers and technology companies on both sides of the Atlantic.

- **Budgets.** European defence acquisition resources need to be increased or seriously reallocated. British and French decisions have already

refocused budgets towards acquisition; further force tradeoffs may not be possible. To ensure continued leadership in the EU and to focus on the technological target, Germany, in particular, needs to make a greater budgetary effort overall and a major internal reallocation. Budget planning cycles among key countries should also incorporate participation from the other countries.

- **Research and development.** R&D will be the heart of the solution to the capability gap. The Europeans need to grow their R&D budgets and undertake much more significant harmonisation than they have to date, if R&D investments are to be cost-effective. There is a need for a more serious transatlantic defence R&D dialogue as well. Today, there is scepticism in the US that the Europeans have much to offer technologically. Among the Europeans there is a sense that the US does not appreciate the technological assets the Europeans bring to the table. A dialogue is urgently needed to identify key technologies on both sides that are advantageous to the other and shape ways by which those advantages can be harvested.

- **Export controls, technology transfers and industrial security.** The American export control system is broken, its technology-transfer rules are increasingly self-defeating, and industrial security is systematically compromised and strained by emerging transnational defence companies. Export control reforms in the United States are imperative, including shrinking the Munitions List to critical items, instituting greater corporate self-governance with government audits of performance and creating a stronger appeals process for disagreements. The European system of controls is going multilateral, a negotiation into which the United States has no input. Bilateral negotiations cannot work without a multilateral level of discussion between the US and the six countries of the Framework Agreement.

- **Direct foreign investment.** There are distinct advantages to the DOD from greater transatlantic defence investment and industry advantage in access to the European market, for partnerships, investments and government sales. There is a clear win/win to be had from shaping multilateral rules of the road. The American process needs streamlining, with more supple rules for firms and countries that do a respectable job of protecting technology flows. The defence security arrangements surrounding non-US-owned assets in the United States need review and reform, building trust, rather than separation, across the Atlantic. Europeans need to be drawn into this dialogue in order to ensure national and EU policies on direct foreign investment and competition do not inhibit reciprocal access to the European market.

- **Dual-use technologies.** US acquisition rules that overburden commercial firms with contracting and reporting requirements currently imposed on defence contractors will ultimately deny DOD access to the technologies it needs. The DOD needs to undertake a 'forced march' through the undergrowth of rules and regulations it still has in place. European rules on dual-use technology appear more flexible and should be part of a dialogue on this subject. That dialogue will inevitably involve the EU, since dual-use rules are within the Commission's competence, as related both to research and development and to export controls.

- **Acquisition rules.** It will be difficult to reshape acquisition regimes among the Europeans, let alone across the Atlantic. This effort should begin, however, as acquisition practices and rules make cross-border procurement difficult and can discriminate against non-national suppliers. No defence contractor will happily engage in a partnership bid if the rules are complex, overwritten or unclear. The US should engage the member countries of OCCAR in a common review of acquisition practices, recognising that no country's system provides a perfect guarantee of on-time, within cost, on-performance military hardware. The OCCAR members need to ensure that OCCAR rules and practices are non-discriminatory with regard to non-member firms; US acquisition regulations need review to ensure the same is true in the DOD.

- **Industry consolidation.** Both Europe and the United States face further rationalisation of a defence industry that is largely consolidated at the system-integrator level. Industry recognises that further rationalisation of capacity will be important in order to procure systems cost-effectively within budgetary constraints. The acquisition systems on both continents should not create incentives for contractors to retain excess capacity, but should encourage capacity shrinkage by allowing some contractor retention of the savings gained by doing so. A transatlantic dialogue would facilitate the exchange of lessons learned in this process.

- **Industry's role.** More than ever before, the transatlantic regime will be shaped by company initiatives and behaviours. Governments are currently behind the curve on industry discussions of joint ventures, strategic partnerships and acquisition opportunities. Rather than discourage such conversations by political intervention or the enforcement of restrictive rules on exports and technology transfers, the governments should be ahead of the curve, stimulating such discussions and encouraging transatlantic initiatives to provide hardware and system options meeting defence requirements. The American industry has a major responsibility here, to take the initiative, lobby for changes in the US rules and processes already discussed and provide transparent

expertise on how a transatlantic regime should be shaped. European industry has a similar responsibility to make certain that the Framework Agreement, OCCAR and EU processes ensure reciprocal access for Americans to the European market. Industry is generally reluctant to step ahead of government willingness to change; in this case, government policies will benefit from industry initiative and can create a multilateral, transatlantic environment in which industry thrives, governments benefit and security is enhanced.

This agenda is daunting. The alternative, however, is the gradual shrinkage of the transatlantic defence market, under political and bureaucratic pressure, the loss of interoperability and a growing technology gap between US and European militaries, and a loss of technological opportunity for the militaries of both sides.

European and Transatlantic Defence-Industrial Strategies:
A European View

Burkard Schmitt

The history of transatlantic armaments cooperation goes back to the beginning of the cold war. Since then, however, the nature of cooperation has changed considerably, from the simple licensing of US systems to Western Europe in the 1950s and 1960s to co-production arrangements in the 1970s, followed by government-to-government joint development in the 1980s and 1990s. In recent years, industry-led cooperation has become the most prominent feature.

The changing nature of cooperation reflects the changing motivation of the two sides. During the first decades after World War II, the US helped to rebuild an exhausted or destroyed Western European defence industry in the face of the Soviet threat. The more that European NATO allies recovered economically, the more they sought a balanced partnership with the US. After the end of the cold war, interoperability became a major argument for enhanced cooperation. Since the late 1990s, the technological and financial consequences of globalisation have pushed industry towards transnational consolidation and closer transatlantic ties, whereas governments have had difficulties matching industry-led initiatives.

In spite of many good reasons for more transatlantic cooperation and numerous initiatives to achieve that objective, the record is rather poor. Arms trade across the Atlantic has remained primarily a one-way street from the US to Europe, with few cooperative projects having actually been set up and even fewer having been considered as a success. There are several reasons for such failure:

- Since the strategic and force-planning processes are conducted independently, harmonisation of military requirements is almost impossible.

- Market access for foreign companies remains difficult: whereas the openness of European defence markets differs greatly from country to country, the US market is well-protected against both foreign investments and sales. Moreover, complex rules and procedures for defence exports represent major hurdles for industrial cooperation.

- In the US, both the political leadership and the armed forces are extremely reluctant to rely to any extent on foreign suppliers. In Europe there is widespread anxiety in many arms-producing countries about the

possibility of US market hegemony. Both attitudes make it very hard to create a positive political climate for transatlantic armaments cooperation.

Even more importantly, transatlantic cooperation is hindered by a fundamental imbalance of power between the US and Europe:

- The US is by far the biggest defence market of the world. In 2001, the DOD spent more than twice as much on defence as all EU members combined. With an increase in US defence spending of $48 billion for FY 2003 and further increases planned from $396.8 billion in 2003 to $469.8 billion in 2007, the transatlantic financing and procurement gap will continue to grow over the next few years.

- There are also fundamental structural market differences. Because of fragmented defence markets and disparate procurement policies, European countries pay a high price for costly duplications and face great difficulties in efficiently combining their resources. As a consequence, the EU as a whole receives less value for its money than the US. Moreover, the investment profiles are different, as the US spends not only in absolute, but also in relative terms more on procurement and R&D than Europeans.

- The US has such enormous financial resources, defence-industrial assets and military capabilities that they simply do not need armaments cooperation or arms imports. From the US perspective, the potential benefit of transatlantic cooperation is, at best, the cohesion of the Alliance. This argument, however, is hardly sufficient to overcome bureaucratic and political resistance. The same is true for interoperability: for many in the US, interoperability within the Alliance could best be achieved if Europeans simply bought US products. The fact that the US can conduct the whole spectrum of military operations without any allied contribution does not help to convince the US administration, Congress or the armed forces that they need to suffer the trials and tribulations of transatlantic cooperation.

- In Europe, the situation is, again, completely different: even the most important arms-producing countries cannot afford to maintain a purely national Defence Industrial Base (DIB). With the exception of certain technological niches, they need international cooperation to develop and produce high-tech weaponry. In this context, access to US technology is in general considered highly attractive. Moreover, there is a strong European interest in interoperability as the prerequisite for coalition-building and therefore for political influence in Washington.

Nevertheless, the lack of financial resources, national industrial interests and the difficulties involved in transatlantic ventures greatly reduces European interest in cooperating with the US.

- Finally yet importantly, the US pursues an explicit and coherent strategy for defence-related industries, aimed at technological superiority in all relevant sectors. European countries, in contrast, do not have the means to implement such a strategy individually and lack the political consensus to develop one collectively. As a consequence, Europeans have difficulties in developing common positions towards the US on armaments issues.

The imbalance between the US and Europe can also be seen at the corporate level. The enormous consolidation process that took place from 1993 to 1997 within US industry reinforced European anxieties about the threat of US market hegemony. Facing competition from giants such as Boeing-McDonnell Douglas, Lockheed-Martin and Raytheon, Europe's national champions and their respective governments (finally) began to accept cross-border integration as the only way to avoid being squeezed out of the market or being forced into unbalanced subordinate partnerships or both. The main result of the restructuring process that followed was the creation of three big groups, EADS, BAE Systems and Thales, each of them linked to each other and to the remaining groups by numerous international joint ventures.

This industrial movement, in turn, triggered the so-called 'Letter of Intent' (LOI) process among the governments of the major European arms-producing countries (France, Germany, the UK, Italy, Spain and Sweden). In July 2000, the six partners signed a Framework Agreement covering 1) Security of Supply, 2) Transfer and Export Procedures, 3) Security of Classified Information, 4) Research and Technology, 5) Treatment of Technical Information and 6) Harmonisation of Military Requirements. In these six areas, the partners committed themselves to create a more homogeneous regulatory framework to improve market conditions for an increasingly transnational industry.

In spite of all its potential virtues, however, the Framework Agreement does not actually establish a common armaments policy. On the contrary, armaments remain in the national domain, with defence industrial interests and strategies still diverging.

- Among the six LOI countries, France is traditionally the most ambitious about Europe becoming an autonomous political actor (although its partners often suspect the real objective is simply to use Europe as a means to achieve national ends). In the 1990s, France accepted both privatisation and internationalisation of its defence industry as indispensable, combining the market orientation of companies with the

politico-strategic objectives of the government. Therefore, France has been a driving force behind the restructuring of Europe's aerospace and defence electronics sectors. Aérospatiale-Matra was brought into EADS and Thales (formerly Thomson-CSF) transformed into an international player with strong links to the UK (through the acquisition of Racal). In the future, the French government will probably try – again – to bring Dassault into a wider European structure and to find a new reference shareholder for Thales. The main challenge, however, will be land armaments and naval shipbuilding, where the privatisation of GIAT and DCN is still pending. The poor shape of the two former arsenals represents not only an important financial burden upon the French government, it is also a major obstacle to greater openness of the French defence market and makes it de facto impossible for Paris to push for European mergers (since both companies are rather unattractive as potential partners).

- The UK's industrial policy is characterised by a 'value for money' policy, which includes the relative openness of its defence market for foreign competitors. This openness also compensates for a growing lack of competition in the national market. In fact, after the takeover of GEC Marconi by British Aerospace and the recent acquisition of Vickers by Alvis, there are only two national firms left, which distorts the market-led approach that the British claim to champion. To counterbalance this dominance and to create a second 'national' defence electronics supplier competing with BAE Systems, London accepted, for example, the takeover of Racal by Thales. Competition may also come from American companies that regularly team-up with British firms for bids in the UK. Transatlantic cooperation in general is welcomed not only for political reasons, but also as a means to benefit from US technology.

- In Germany, the largest part of the aerospace industry is now integrated into EADS. The government has failed, by contrast, to convince land armament and naval shipbuilding industries to follow the same approach – first national consolidation, then European integration. Germany's leading land systems companies – Krauss-Maffei and Rheinmetall – continue to resist any political pressure to merge. In naval shipbuilding, government plans have also failed. Instead of joining forces with Thyssen Krupp Industries, Babcock Borsig sold its 75% share in HDW to the US investment fund Equity One Partners. Since HDW is a world leader in conventional submarines, this deal has stimulated a debate about a sell-out of German key technologies. Many observers now fear that Krauss-Maffei could become the next candidate for a politically incorrect takeover.

- Italy, Spain and Sweden have all tried to integrate their defence industrial assets into wider international structures, without pursuing a clear European preference. The Spanish government has integrated Casa into EADS, but preferred General Dynamic's bid for Santa Barbara over Rheinmetall's offer; the Italian government has pushed Finmeccanica – with more or less success – to integrate its units into European joint ventures, but left the A-400M programme and joined the F-35 programme. In Sweden, certain industrial elements have been linked to European networks (see Saab), while others have been sold to US investors (Bofors).

Industrial policy is only one aspect of largely divergent armament policies in Europe. Another example is the somewhat uncoordinated way in which the LOI countries have embarked on bilateral negotiations with the US on regulatory issues. In fact, industrial consolidation in Europe, together with the LOI process and the development of ESDP, alarmed Washington about the possibility of an emerging 'Fortress Europe'. The perceived threat of a closed European market, combined with the risk of the lack of any true competition in the US market, pushed the Clinton administration to launch two initiatives: a) the Defense Trade Security Initiative (DTSI) aimed at streamlining the US export control system, and b) bilateral negotiations with certain allies on a 'Declaration of Principles' on defence equipment and industrial cooperation (DOP).

Whereas the DOP is de facto a bilateral version of the European LOI, covering a broad range of defence trade issues, the DTSI is comprised of 16 procedural reforms to the US export-control regime. Moreover, it includes the possibility for certain qualified countries to enter into negotiations aimed at granting ITAR-license exemptions for unclassified exports to the governments and companies identified as reliable.

Up until now, the DOPs have been signed with the UK, Australia, Norway, Spain and the Netherlands, whilst negotiations with Italy seem to be well-advanced, whereas discussions with Germany and France are, at best, at an early stage. So far, the UK is the only LOI-country with whom the US has begun to negotiate a binding export-control agreement. ITAR-talks with additional partners are envisaged only after negotiations with the UK have been completed. But under the Bush administration, these transatlantic discussions have apparently lost momentum, their future therefore being unclear. Even with the UK, negotiations on export controls seem to be experiencing difficulties. In general, however, the different stages of negotiations with the partners suggest that Washington still makes a distinction between 'reliable' and 'less reliable' allies.

Sooner or later, this distinction may create problems for the compatibility of the *multilateral* LOI system and the *bilateral* DOP-approach. It remains to be seen how transatlantic arrangements would interact in practice with the LOI Framework Agreement. Nevertheless, at least in certain areas, bilateral agreements with the US may complicate a system whose purpose is precisely to simplify and facilitate European cooperation. For example, could a European transnational defence company qualify for an ITAR exemption if only one of its home countries has an export control agreement with the US? Or would such a company be obliged to create new Chinese walls between its different sites, thereby limiting its internal integration and acting against the philosophy of the LOI process?

To operate in such an uncertain and fluid environment is certainly not easy for European industries. As has been seen, a European armaments policy and a common defence market are still a long way off, and defence budgets in Europe remain flat. The enormous difference between budgets in Europe and the US represents an irresistible incentive for European companies to attempt penetration of the US market. Indeed, access to the US has become a major strategic goal for all big industrial players in Europe.

There are different ways to achieve that objective:

- Given the predominant buy-American policy, direct sales of European products to the US armed forces will probably remain extremely rare exceptions.

- Jointly developed defence systems under a government-to-government agreement will remain exceptions as well; European budget constraints on the one hand, and difficulties to harmonise the military requirements across the Atlantic on the other, will continue to limit the possibilities for intergovernmental projects.

- Teaming arrangements with US prime contractors will be politically easier, in particular if the European contribution is limited to sub-systems and components. Yet the cost-effectiveness of these industrial arrangements depends to a considerable degree on the regulatory framework that governments agree on.

Another possibility to penetrate the US market is to buy an American company and to become a 'national' supplier to the Pentagon. British companies, in particular BAE Systems, have pursued this strategy extensively and with a lot of success. For continental European companies, however, this option has been politically unrealistic so far, and there are no signs that this may change in the near future. What we have seen, by contrast, is a multiplication of joint ventures (Raytheon-Thales) and strategic alliances (EADS-Northrop Grumman).

In land armaments and shipbuilding, the situation is different. By contrast to aerospace and defence electronics, trans-European consolidation has failed in these sectors, leaving European companies in a rather weak position *vis-à-vis* their US counterparts. As the Santa Barbara and the HDW takeovers have demonstrated, US investors therefore have a good chance simply to 'cherry-pick' the European defence industrial base.

To conclude, there are not many reasons to be over-optimistic about the future of transatlantic armaments cooperation. Cooperation will certainly continue, but its intensity will probably remain limited by persistent political obstacles. Moreover, cooperation will be mainly industry driven. If they have a commercial and a technological interest or both, companies can be quite innovative in dealing with bureaucratic and regulatory hurdles. In particular, at the less visible – and therefore politically less sensitive – subsystem and component level, closer ties are indeed probable. Nevertheless, even the big European companies will only be able to cooperate on an equal footing with their US counterparts if they maintain their capacities as system-integrators and if they remain at the cutting edge of technology – not in all, but in specific key areas. These developments, in turn, will only be possible if European governments keep at least a certain level of R&D funding and if they – finally – come to a common European strategy for their defence-related industries.

PRE-EMPTIVE MILITARY ACTION AND THE LEGITIMATE USE OF FORCE

WITH CONTRIBUTIONS BY

CARL BILDT
ALEXANDER I. NIKITIN
WALTER B. SLOCOMBE

INTRODUCTION BY

FRANÇOIS HEISBOURG

Introduction

François Heisbourg

The eleventh meeting of the European Security Forum focused on what is becoming known as the Bush doctrine. The proceedings were underpinned by three particularly penetrating papers, which should be read at leisure, as a brief summing-up will not suffice to convey their full scope.

Walter Slocombe, in his oral presentation, emphasised the need to handle the prevention/pre-emption debate as distinct from the unilateralism/multilateralism discussion: although they intersect, they are analytically separate. Conversely, he tied the prevention/pre-emption debate to the specific requirements of non-proliferation, while noting that prevention/pre-emption tend to be a limited element of non-proliferation policy given the inherent difficulties of implementation: it is easier to assert a policy of pre-emption than to execute it effectively. Mr Slocombe also underscored the elements of continuity of the US National Security Strategy (NSS) with US and international law.

Carl Bildt recalled that prevention/pre-emption could be tied to contingencies other than those mentioned by President George W. Bush, such as heading off a genocide. In his statements, he also made a distinction that turned out to be one of the key elements of whatever conclusion can be drawn from the discussion: the possible war in Iraq should not be considered as prevention or pre-emption but as an enforcement operation. He also questioned the premise that deterrence doesn't work against a rogue state, a premise on which much of the new US doctrine is based. Like Mr Slocombe, he emphasised the difficulties of implementation. Indeed, there was no example where countries had been forcefully deprived of their weapons of mass destruction (WMD) without regime change; the only successes in terms of eliminating WMD had implied regime change (as in South Africa). In other words, pre-emption/prevention without regime change would probably not work and even then, it is possible to wonder about the attitude of a post-Saddam regime in Baghdad towards the renunciation of WMD in the face of persisting efforts by Iran and their possession by Israel. Mr Bildt recalled that one of the favourite examples of the fans of pre-emption/prevention, i.e. the Cuban missile crisis, had not witnessed a forceful pre-emptive strike. This option had deliberately been discarded at the time. In conclusion, he underlined the danger of the pre-emption rhetoric, which could be seen as a licence by others to do the same – or to go nuclear.

Vladimir Nikitin reminded us, inter alia, of the Kosovo precedent, which was presented at the time as an operation destined to prevent human rights

violations, regional destabilisation, etc. and not requiring a specific mandate legitimising the use of force. But Kosovo also demonstrated the importance of regional organisations in legitimising such forceful operations, with NATO in Kosovo (1999) and the Caribbean Community (CARICOM) in Grenada (1983). Mr Nikitin also underlined the Russian reluctance to 'doctrinalise' prevention/pre-emption, with Moscow preferring to use it de facto without formalising it since formalisation could reduce strategic freedom of manoeuvre.

Gareth Evans of the International Crisis Group (ICG), who had been asked to respond to the three paper-givers, kicked off by confirming the Chairman's suggestion that greater care needed to be made in distinguishing between pre-emption (with its elements of time pressure and imminence) and prevention (with the Osirak bombing as a case of prevention and the Six-Day War as an example of pre-emption). He also noted that the anticipatory use of force – a notion covering both prevention and pre-emption does not necessarily imply imminence, notably when the risk of genocide is involved. He concurred with Mr Slocombe's and Mr Bildt's analysis of the difficulties of using force against WMD successfully while stopping short of regime change. As head of the International Crisis Group, he underscored the importance of the notion of consent as a legitimiser. Consent figures in the work of the ICG on the legitimisation of the use of force on the basis of 'just war' principles (although any explicit reference to St. Thomas of Aquinas is avoided, out of deference to Muslim sensitivity).

In the general debate, the Israeli attack against the Osirak reactor in June 1981 was discussed. The view was widely expressed that although the attack may have had the perverse effect of driving the Iraqi nuclear programme deeper underground, it did lead to a substantial gain in the time available before Iraq could go nuclear. Prevention was also mentioned by a Russian participant, who indicated that Russian officials had considered preventive action against the Taliban regime in May 2000. He confirmed the Russian aversion towards making a principle out of what is a strategic option for use in the near-abroad.

Mr Bildt made the point that pre-emption (tied as it is to imminent threat in international law) should not be considered as being somehow more readily acceptable than prevention: there are all too many wars in which the first country to open fire has claimed a right to pre-emption. Anticipatory action thus requires rules and calls were made for its codification. In this respect, humanitarian intervention was yet again cited as an area where anticipatory action could be called for.

On the question of deterrence, the point was made by a number of participants that this continued to be viable *vis-à-vis* state actors, and that

there was a questionable trend in the US of presenting deterrence, if not as a dirty word, but at least as a poor second best against the Soviet threat. This point drew the caveat that deterrence can discourage nuclear attacks, but probably not proliferation; indeed, it was highly unlikely that deterrence would play against the sale by North Korea of its WMD wares on the international market. Furthermore, in the case of North Korea, it isn't only, or maybe not even primarily, Pyongyang's nuclear capability that inhibits us from acting forcefully, but the huge conventional firepower threatening the Seoul metropolitan area.

Indeed, in some ways, the state of reflection for criteria (e.g. in the ICG) on the use of anticipatory force in humanitarian contingencies seemed to be more advanced than its application to non-proliferation, notably in current US thinking. On the reactions outside the US to doctrines based on prevention and pre-emption, the point was made by a European participant that in the EU, the real contention *vis-à-vis* the NSS was not the mention of prevention, but the fact that it was considered to be the basis for a national and not a multilateral strategy.

The use of force for enforcement of international obligations was also discussed, with reference being made to the illegal reoccupation of the Rhineland by the Wehrmacht in 1935. This contingency was one in which the use of force could have paid off handsomely. As the discussion went into historical analogies – with Mr Slocombe drawing a parallel between the Rhineland case and the Iraqi situation – a reminder was made by a participant that it is fine to have criteria for legitimising a military operation, but one still had to ask the question: 'Is it wise?'

In his concluding remarks, Mr Nikitin indicated that there was no clear confirmation in history that the preventive/pre-emptive use of force was the better option, citing in this regard the counterfactual question: what if Kennedy had retained the strike option against Cuba?

Mr Bildt, harking back to the Guns of August 1914, emphasised the need to be careful about making pre-emption a popular concept. Enforcement, including its use in the Iraqi case, is a more fruitful approach. He did not discard the option of prevention, with the building up of an international regime. Mr Slocombe reaffirmed the link between the use of force and WMD proliferation. The non-proliferation regime is in crisis and will collapse if we do not resolve the issue of enforcement.

Mr Evans reminded us that the credibility of the UN system was the strongest case that could be made for war against Iraq – but that is a matter for the UN system to decide upon, not a single member. The question then becomes: what is the evidence and how big is the threat?

Pre-emptive Military Action and the Legitimate Use of Force:

A European View

Carl Bildt

The present debate about the legitimacy of pre-emptive military action was triggered by the new National Security Strategy (NSS) of the United States and it has been fuelled by the discussion concerning the legitimacy of taking armed action against Iraq. This paper will focus primarily on the questions of the pre-emptive use of military force that were brought to the forefront of the international debate.[1]

But it can be debated whether Iraq should really be part of this discussion. It can be argued that the present dispute over Iraq is more a case of securing the implementation of resolutions adopted by the UN Security Council under Chapter 7 of the UN Treaty.

UN Security Resolution 1441 – adopted unanimously – decided that "Iraq has been and remains in material breach of its obligations under relevant resolutions, including resolution 687". It also recalled that "In its resolution 687 the Council declared that a ceasefire would be based on the acceptance by Iraq of the provisions of that resolution, including the obligations on Iraq contained therein". In spite of this, Iraq was given "a final opportunity" to comply, and the Council stated that the country "will face serious consequences as a result of its continued violations of its obligations".

These are tough words. The first serious assessments of whether the country has taken this 'last chance' or not will occur when the United Nations Monitoring, Verification and Inspection Commission (UNMOVIC) and International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) report to the Security Council at the end of this month. Since the resolutions that Iraq could then be declared to be in additional material breach of are resolutions under Chapter 7 of the Charter of the UN, it cannot be described as inappropriate if armed action is then considered to rectify the situation.

Although rhetoric has often sounded different, it remains a fact that in the case of Iraq, the United States so far has acted through and within the framework of the United Nations. It has certainly presented its case with considerable assertiveness, not shying away from saying that the issue is a test for the UN as much as it is for Iraq, but there is nothing that prevents other nations from stating the views they may have with equal assertiveness.

---

[1] "The National Security Strategy of the United States", September 2002.

From the European point of view, there are strong arguments in favour of securing the continued handling of the Iraq issue within the framework of the United Nations. With four major EU members on the Security Council – Germany and Spain in addition to the UK and France – there should be the possibility of establishing a European consensus at the very least on this important point. But it should be recognised that keeping the issue within the United Nations system requires accommodating the very strong views and interests expressed by the US.

European inclination to support an approach through multilateral institutions such as the UN is based on the recognition that neither the European Union, nor any other international actor has the broad-based power or the strategic patience to sort out major and difficult international issues all by itself. Thus, an amount of coalition-building is always called for, and the broader the international consensus that can be established, the greater are the possibilities of bringing the endeavour in question to a successful conclusion.[2]

From the US point of view this is sometimes less obvious. With unrivalled military power and increased relative economic strength, the temptation to think that one can sort out all issues only with US power is strong. Multilateralism and coalition-building can be portrayed as fettering the power of the US in chains and preventing it from taking the action needed to reorder the world in accordance with its values. If the aim is set, coalitions are welcome to assist in their execution. But it's the purpose that defines the coalition – not the other way around.

Although Europeans in most cases are in basic sympathy with the motives driving US actions, there is a fear that if the tentative international regime that exists is jeopardised, the resulting uncertainty may also be used by powers and for purposes with which most Europeans would feel far less sympathy. The short-term advantages of breaking the established order could then rapidly be outweighed by the long-term disorder resulting in other areas and on other issues.

Prior to 11 September 2001 and the renewed attention given to the situation in Iraq, issues of state sovereignty and pre-emptive military action were debated primarily from other points of view. The concept of state sovereignty is generally seen to have been established as the basis of the international order by the Treaty of Westphalia. Orderly states were to be the building

---

[2] In the conclusions of the Copenhagen European Council, the declaration on Iraq stressed that "the role of the Security Council in maintaining peace and security must be respected". While an urge to respect the resolutions of the Security Council would be aimed at Baghdad, it is difficult to read an urge to respect the role of the Security Council as not aimed at Washington.

blocks of the international order. The United Nations isn't really built on nations coming together, but on states doing it. State sovereignty remains the most important building block of the modern international system.

But increasingly state sovereignty had come to be questioned. The debate prior to the events of 11 September centred almost exclusively on the question of when state sovereignty should be set aside in the interest of protecting human rights, preventing humanitarian disasters or, at worst, stopping or preventing genocide. In the wake of the non-intervention in Rwanda and the intervention in Kosovo, a large debate started on which principles to apply and the consequences this would have for the international system as a whole.

This debate had hardly reached any conclusions when the events of 11 September transformed the international scene, and subsequently the issues associated with WMD and terrorism have overtaken the debate.

The action against the non-recognised Taliban regime of Afghanistan was an example of the right of self-defence under Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations. Under the relevant Security Council resolutions, there also seems to be room for military action against other states if these are clearly supporting or protecting the structures of terrorism responsible for the 11 September attacks.

No European government has been able to detect any sign of any clear or even likely link between Iraq and the al-Qaeda terrorist networks. During recent months, occasional US attempts to do so have become increasingly feeble. The link between the issues of terrorism post-11 September and Iraq is thus a highly indirect one.

In more general terms, the link between international terrorism and WMD is described by the US as strong, and it is this that has led to the new prominence given to the possibility of pre-emptive military action. In the words of the National Security Strategy:

> It has taken almost a decade for us to comprehend the true nature of the threat. Given the goals of rogue states and terrorists, the United States can no longer solely rely on a reactive posture as we have done in the past. The inability to deter a potential attacker, the immediacy of today's threats, and the magnitude of potential harm that could be caused by our adversaries' choice of weapons, do not permit that option. We cannot let our enemies strike first.

Each of the three arguments advanced in favour of this position can be debated. Although a terrorist organisation such as al-Qaeda can hardly be dealt with primarily through a classical posture of deterrence, there is far less

to support the notion that so-called 'rogue states' can not be deterred to a significant degree. Even the regimes of the so-called 'axis of evil' have been deterred from pursuing policies of overt external aggression.

In terms of the immediacy of these threats, there is no doubting this when it comes to the threat of international terrorism, nor is there any reason to doubt that these organisations are actively seeking different weapons of mass destruction. Whether there is an immediacy to threats coming from state actors is more doubtful, and again, the issue of whether deterrence works or doesn't needs to be addressed.

As to the magnitude of the harm that could be done by these weapons, there is no doubting the potential of WMD. But the only country capable of destroying most of the US within 30 minutes remains the Russian Federation. It will take decades until even China will acquire a nuclear arsenal with the destructive power and global reach of even the much reduced Strategic Rocket Forces of the Russian Federation of today. As for chemical weapons, their potential for mass destruction remains more limited. Biological weapons have, on the other hand, a potential for mass terror that should in no way be discounted.

Thus, one can see how the doctrine of pre-emption – "we cannot let our enemies strike first" – has developed, although a discussion on the basis for it reveals that the arguments are not always as clear-cut as they are presented. The real difficulties start with how such a doctrine can be implemented in the messy reality of handling the day-to-day challenges of an evolving international situation. Here, it is instructive to look at the different occasions when the issue has been confronted in the past.

The Cuban missile crisis illustrated most of the issues of this debate in 1962. At the time, the US Joint Chiefs of Staff advocated a policy of pre-emption both when it came to dealing with the concrete issue of the deployment of Soviet missiles such as MRBMs and IRBMs in Cuba and, particularly in the case of the Strategic Air Command, overall in its approach versus the Soviet Union and its evolving ICBM force. But the conflict was defused by a more graduated use of a blockade in combination with direct as well as back-channel diplomacy. Although 'regime change' was certainly also a goal of US policy at the time, it had to be downgraded in order to achieve the withdrawal of the Soviet nuclear missiles.[3]

It is highly likely that serious consideration has also been given in the Soviet Union at different times to the possibility of pre-emptive military strikes in

---

[3] The most comprehensive description of the debates over these issues then is to be found in Lawrence Freedman's *Kennedy's Wars – Berlin, Cuba, Laos and Vietnam*, Oxford: Oxford Press, 2000.

order to neutralise perceived WMD threats. The Soviet leadership had every reason to view the appearance of a Chinese nuclear force with deep apprehension. After having failed to block it by withholding technology and assistance in different ways, it is entirely logical that the option of pre-emptive military strikes against Chinese nuclear facilities was seriously studied. In more recent times, the US seriously studied the possibility of pre-emptive military strikes against North Korea in 1993–94, in order to deprive the Pyongyang regime of its possibilities of developing as a nuclear power.

In all of these cases, the final decision not to use pre-emptive military power was in all probability motivated by the extreme difficulty of being certain that a military strike would neutralise all or the overwhelming parts of the nuclear warheads and the corresponding weapon systems. In the Cuban case, plans revealed that there was a high likelihood that some missiles could not be hit during the first wave of strikes, and that there was then the possibility that they could be fired before they could be located and hit by a second wave of strikes. In the Chinese and North Korean cases, the target set must have included not only key parts of the different production facilities for nuclear weapons, but also missile facilities and bomber bases, and must have taken account of the risks that nuclear warheads had been dispersed in different ways that were extremely difficult to detect.

The only case in which a pre-emptive military strike has been undertaken in order to deprive a state of its WMD capability is the June 1981 Israeli attack on the Osiraq nuclear reactor in Iraq. Although undoubtedly a tactical success since the reactor was destroyed, the strategic effects of the strike were more doubtful.[4]

The Iraqi nuclear programme was not stopped, but instead redirected in ways that brought it very close to producing nuclear weapons without being detected either by different intelligence agencies or by international monitoring arrangements. Before the Gulf war, two possible nuclear weapons-related facilities had been detected in Iraq. After the war, United Nations Special Commission (UNSCOM) found no fewer than 21 different nuclear weapons-related facilities, with the air campaign during the Gulf war having had only a very limited effect on them. The Osiraq attack might have delayed the Iraqi nuclear weapons programme, but it certainly did not deter Iraq from continuing its nuclear programmes.

Thus, a look at the practical experience with pre-emptive military strikes against nuclear weapons capabilities of different sorts illustrates the

---

[4] It may be noted that the UN Security Council – including the US – condemned this attack as "a clear violation of the Charter of the United Nations and the norms of international conduct".

difficulties with the concept. In most cases, serious consideration of the option has led to the conclusion that it could not be carried out with a reasonable certainty of success. In the one case where it was carried out, it proved to be a tactical success but with strategic results that were either non-existent or counterproductive. The present situation with both Iraq and North Korea also illustrates these difficulties.

When the old UNSCOM inspection regime in Iraq was given up in 1998, it was said that its aims could probably be achieved as well by a combination of air surveillance and air strikes. There seemed to be the belief that surveillance systems could produce a reasonably accurate picture of on-going activities, and that the facilities associated with these could then be 'revisited' by air power in the way that happened at repeated occasions during the 1990s.

Clearly, this has not proved to be the case. There are numerous press stories circulating in the US on different ways in which Iraqi WMD activities could have been concealed, ranging from mobile vans to floating barges and vast underground complexes. If these stories don't show anything else, they at the least illustrate the great uncertainty, the difficulty of actually tracking activities such as these and the near-impossibility of dealing with them through selective and pre-emptive military strikes.

In the case of North Korea, the difficulties are even more pronounced. While the nuclear facilities that have been under IAEA monitoring are well-known, there are indications that facilities associated with the efforts to obtain highly enriched uranium are far more concealed and protected. In addition, there is the near-impossibility of knowing with any certainty the location of the nuclear weapons that North Korea might already have built. The large number of weapon systems that could carry any of these warheads adds enormously to the complexity of the issue.

The discussion of these cases so far relates only to the question of nuclear weapons. Of the weapons of mass destruction, these are the ones that are by far the most difficult to develop, produce and deploy. Thus, they are the ones that should be the easiest to detect and deal with through selective pre-emptive military strikes. But with the nearly insurmountable difficulties that are there when it comes to nuclear weapons, any serious discussion on the possibility of dealing effectively with chemical or bacteriological weapons capabilities through selective military strikes becomes far more difficult.[5]

---

[5] "Many CW and BW production capabilities are hidden in plants that are virtually indistinguishable from genuine commercial facilities. And the technology behind CW and BW are spreading." Testimony concerning chemical and biological weapons by George Tenet, the US Director for Central

It is thus hard to avoid the conclusion that any preventive or pre-emptive attack trying to deal with a perceived WMD programme in any country in all likelihood will have to be in the form of a military attack aimed at first regime destruction and then the setting-up of a new regime that can give sufficient guarantees that remaining WMD capabilities will not be used to restart programmes. Anything less than this is unlikely to result in more than just a repetition of the lessons of the Osiraq attack.

Experience suggests that a regime determined to pursue a WMD programme is extremely difficult to deflect from that course purely through different measures of coercion – even when those instruments are available and possible to use. In fact, there are no known cases of any country abstaining from WMD efforts of any sort because of different instruments of coercion being applied against them.

In the world today, we are faced with a situation in which different WMD are available to a growing number of states. According to the US State Department, 12 nations at present have nuclear weapons programmes, 13 have biological weapons programmes, 16 have programmes for chemical weapons and 28 have more or less credible capabilities in terms of ballistic missiles. No one could even contemplate dealing with all of them by military means.

Thus, apart from the difficulties of pre-emptive military actions to deal with real or perceived WMD threats in individual cases, the sheer magnitude of the problem that we face when dealing with WMD proliferation makes it impossible to consider pre-emptive military actions as anything more than something that will only be considered in extreme cases.

In spite of the perception created, this is likely to be the de facto policy of the US as well. During more than half a century of struggling with the issue, in the concrete cases the US has never found the arguments for such a course of action more compelling than the arguments against. The urgency of the war against terrorism is unlikely, in the concrete cases, to have fundamentally altered the balance between the arguments.

That notwithstanding, there is reason to be concerned with the recent upsurge in rhetoric about the possibility of pre-emptive military action to deal with WMD or other issues. First, there is a risk that this will be seen as a licence by other powers to take some such action, and second, there is the risk that states that feel threatened by action of this kind will start acting in destabilising ways. North Korea illustrates some of these dangers. And the recent swing in US policy from a rhetoric that talked about the possibility of

Intelligence before the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, 6 February 2002.

war in both Iraq and Korea to a posture that emphasises diplomacy, also through the UN system, and openings for direct talks with Pyongyang should probably be seen as a result of the recognition of these dangers.

Iran is and will remain a major policy challenge in these regards. All indications point to ambitions across the entire WMD range in combination with a ballistic missile programme.[6] [7] Here, it seems unlikely that anyone will seriously contemplate pre-emptive military actions other than in very extreme situations. But the perceived possibility of such action being contemplated against Iran obviously risks complicating efforts to facilitate a dialogue aiming both at facilitating change inside the country and at resolving issues such as Iranian support for terrorism. Thus, the rhetoric of pre-emption runs the risk of becoming counterproductive across a broader range of issues.

The situation between India and Pakistan is a particular case for concern. Here, the rhetoric of pre-emption risks becoming profoundly dangerous. If there is a perception in Islamabad that New Delhi believes that there is an international climate that tends towards tolerating pre-emptive strikes against nuclear facilities, the threshold against Pakistan using its nuclear weapons against India during a crisis or confrontation may be lowered substantially. Thus, rhetoric aimed at reducing the risk of WMD being used may in this part of the world end up increasing the likelihood of this actually happening.

This discussion on the possibility of using pre-emptive military action in order to deal with the threat of proliferation of WMD thus points at the severe limitations, as well as dangers, of such an approach except in isolated and extreme cases.

Although it would be foolish to completely rule out those cases, it must be recognised that pre-emptive military action that does not aim at 'regime

---

[6] In Issue No. 1 of *Russia in Global Affairs*, Major General Vladimir Dvorkin, Head of Research at the Center for Strategic Nuclear Forces, writes on the ambitions of Iran: "In Iran, a missile armament programme has been in the process of implementation since the early 1980s. Currently, the main emphasis is on setting up an infrastructure to produce medium-range ballistic missiles. The aim is to build up a most powerful missile capability by 2010–15. It is an aim that is facilitated also by Iran's cooperation with China and North Korea. The capacity of the assembly line that turns out Shahab-3 missiles (range up to 1,000 km) may reach 100 rockets a year".

[7] In its open assessment to the US Senate last February, George Tenet described Iran's efforts and programmes in far more concrete and worried terms than he used for Iraq: "Iran remains a serious concern because of its across-the-board pursuit of WMD and missile capabilities. Tehran may be able to indigenously produce enough fissile material for a nuclear weapon by late this decade".

change' risks being of little long-term value in such cases. Although this leads into another and no less important debate – it should be recognised that in order for a strategy of 'regime change' to be successful it needs to be able to execute not only the first phase in the form of 'regime destruction', but to be able to master the more complex task of 'regime creation' that has to follow.

Other factors may also be added to this in individual cases. It does not, for example, seem implausible that a post-Saddam Hussein regime in Baghdad, while being ready to honour its commitments to the UN to abstain from WMD capabilities, may seek to link this to more concerted international actions against the existing nuclear weapons capabilities of Israel as well as the WMD ambitions of Iran. Issues of security policy will always have to be addressed in a regional perspective.

With these difficulties thus being obvious, the main thrust of the necessary policies to counter not only the threat of terrorism but also the spread of the weapons of mass destruction should focus on the building of as strong and as broad an international, counter-proliferation legal and political regime as possible. It is when there is a law that it also becomes clear who is an outlaw.

This condition is essential in order to be able to take action, of whatever sort that may be, in individual cases, and assures the broadest possible support for such action. As both Iraq and North Korea illustrate, there is very little that in fact can be done if there is not more or less broad international support. The broad international networks of cooperation that such an international regime constitutes is also the only realistic way of dealing with the risks of WMD technologies being spread to terrorist organisations by theft, smuggling and different transnational criminal networks.

Thus, it seems appropriate to focus attention and activity on the other parts of the strategy for dealing with the threat of WMD outlined in the National Security Strategy:

> We will enhance diplomacy, arms control, multilateral export controls, and threat reduction assistance that impedes states and terrorists seeking WMD, and when necessary, interdict enabling technologies and materials. We will continue to build coalitions to support these efforts, encouraging their increased political and financial support for non-proliferation and threat reduction programmes.

From the European point of view, an appropriate reaction would seem to be to seek to augment support for policies along those lines, thus reducing the likelihood that we will be confronted with the isolated and extreme cases in

which the question of the pre-emptive use of military force will be raised, and strengthening the overall international regime against WMD.

With there being no disagreements in principle among the countries of the European Union on this, one should explore whether there are institutional or other steps that need to be taken to strengthen the common European capabilities in this regard. Such a policy approach is likely to have a more significant long-term impact on reducing the WMD threat than any discussion on pre-emptive military options.

Prior to 11 September, the discussion concerning intervention in other states centred on the issues mentioned initially, triggered most recently by the 1999 NATO air campaign against Yugoslavia over the issue of Kosovo. But the debate was fuelled by the perceived double standard of the intervention against the relatively limited fighting in Kosovo (pre-intervention) versus the non-intervention against the genocide in Rwanda.[8]

This debate will come back. There is also an important connection between the issues of humanitarian intervention, the increasing problem of how to deal with failed states, the enormous challenges in any effort at state-building,[9] the tendency of terrorist organisations to seek 'safe havens' or training grounds in certain areas and the need to deal with the spread of certain WMD capabilities.

Here, the European Union should seek to develop both its policies and its instruments. Often stressing the more all-encompassing nature of its so-called 'soft powers' versus the dominating 'hard powers' of the US, it needs to demonstrate that these powers can indeed be applied to prevent situations from emerging that will call for pre-emptive, hard interventions.

---

[8] An important contribution to this debate is the 2002 report of the Canadian-sponsored International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty entitled "The Responsibility to Protect". For a more specific discussion on the different issues raised by the Kosovo intervention, see paper presented by Carl Bildt, "Kosovo and the Challenge of Humanitarian Intervention" at the UN University in Tokyo, 2003.

[9] As argued elsewhere, the term 'nation-building', which appears often in the US debate, is not really appropriate. It is more relevant to speak about state-building, since what we are trying to help build in the relevant cases are state structures rather than nations. We ought, accordingly, to talk about state-building rather than nation-building, although we should recognise that the distinction between state and nation that is obvious to most Europeans is far less clear-cut from a US point of view. Nevertheless, the term 'state-building' more appropriately describes what it is really about.

Pre-emptive Military Action and the Legitimate Use of Force:

A Russian View

Alexander I. Nikitin

The approach of the Russian political establishment towards legitimate use of military force has significantly changed during the last decade after the creation of the new independent states on the ruins of the Soviet Union. In Soviet times, while supporting international law and the United Nations rhetorically, Communist rulers considered ideological justifications of the use of 'revolutionary' or 'socialist' force as a legitimate excuse for violating some principles of international law.

A new Russia, obviously a weaker power than the former Soviet Union, tends much more to stress and to use (diplomatically) norms of international law and procedures of democratic decision-making in the international community. What Moscow formerly obtained through bilateral 'balance of power' talks with Washington, it tries now to reach in many cases through using the legitimising/de-legitimising mechanism of UN Security Council (UNSC) resolutions, the right of veto, and the requirement of strict observance of international legal procedures. This overplay of the legitimacy issue could be seen in Moscow's stand regarding the 1999 bombings of Belgrade by NATO in the absence of a UN mandate and in current debates around the use of force against Iraq.

The Russian National Security Concept (its current form reformulated and adopted in 2000) names as one of the major sources of external threats to Russian national security "attempts of certain states and inter-state alliances to diminish the role of existing mechanisms of international security, first of all of the United Nations and OSCE". By diminishing the role of international mechanisms, the doctrine means attempts to highlight those forceful actions taken by the US or NATO on the basis of their decisions, which circumvent or ignore the absence of consensus in international organisations.

More than that, the official National Security Concept (formulated soon after the 1999 crisis in Russian-Western relations caused by the use of force against Yugoslavia) openly proclaims "NATO's practice of use of (military) force outside the zone of responsibility of the alliance and without sanction of the United Nations Security Council" as a threat to Russian security in the military sphere. Formally that means that any use of force on behalf of the international community or where there is an absence of consensus at the UNSC will be automatically considered by Russia as a military threat.

At the same time, while the notion of 'pre-emptive military actions' is absent in both the National Security Concept and the Military Doctrine of the Russian Federation, it could be found in both documents between the lines. The National Security Concept, for example, allows the "realisation of operational and long-term measures aimed at *prevention and neutralisation* (author's emphasis) of internal and external threats" and in other contexts it speaks of the necessity for the Russian Federation "to react to [a] crisis situation in as early a possible stage" in the name of national security interests. Criticism of out-of-area operations is somewhat balanced by the justification of the "necessity of [the] military presence of Russia in some strategically important regions of the world", including the deployment of "limited military contingents (military bases, naval forces)".

It is worth mentioning that far before the events of 11 September and the crises over Iraqi and North Korean WMD capabilities, the Russian National Security Concept proclaimed the "commonality of interests of Russia and other states…on undertaking counter-actions against proliferation of weapons of mass destruction…and [the] fight against international terrorism".

During the past decade, Russia started four military operations abroad involving regional and local conflicts in the absence of UN Security Council mandates. Namely, these were the operations of Russian military interference in South Ossetia/Georgia and in Transdnestria/Moldova (both in 1992), which were started on the legal basis of bilateral inter-state agreements with the presidents of Georgia and Moldova, and operations in Abkhazia/Georgia (started in 1994) and in Tajikistan (1992–2000), which were undertaken on the basis of mandates by the CIS (Commonwealth of Independent States), but not the UN. In all four cases, there was sometimes a silent or sometimes a formalised 'blessing' from the UN (and later, even small groups of UN or OSCE observers were stationed in the areas of mentioned conflicts to 'supervise' Russian operations).

Formally Moscow insisted that in all four cases, operations were undertaken with the consent of the legitimate government of the state on whose territory the conflict occurred, and thus, the use of force went under Chapter VI (so called 'soft peace-keeping') or Chapter VIII (use of force by regional organisations) of the UN Charter, and not under Chapter VII, which would require a UNSC resolution as a 'must'.

Legally, this juggling of UN Charter chapters is really important, because, indeed, if use of military force is undertaken by the international community against the will of the legitimate rulers of a state in conflict, then it necessarily requires the consent of the UN Security Council and a formal UN mandate for the use and limits of use of force. Moscow stresses that this has

been and remains a principal difference between the use of force by Russia in Georgia, Tajikistan and Moldova on the one hand (where request for foreign involvement from the state side of the local conflict was present), and, on the other hand, use of force by the Western community against Slobodan Milosevic, the Taliban or Saddam Hussein. In the latter cases, the state leaders of the conflict areas obviously opposed international involvement, and thus such involvement has become subject to strict coordination through the UN Security Council.

The concept and practice of the use of national or international military force outside its own borders is not at all foreign to Russia. In recent years an average of between 10,000 and 12,000 Russian military personnel have been stationed and active outside Russia. Figures varied in different years, but there were rotating contingents of about 1,500 Russian peacekeepers in Bosnia and about the same quantity later in Kosovo. In Tajikistan there were above 7,000 officers and soldiers from the Russian Ministry of Defence plus up to 10,000 Russian border guards on the Tajik-Afghan and Tajik-Chinese borders. Additionally, there were about 1,700 Russian peacekeepers under CIS mandate in Abkhazia, and between 500 and 1,000 Russian military personnel in South Ossetia and Transdniestria.

While the military presence in Georgia and Moldova was reduced after 1999–2000, the geography of the military presence expanded. In 2002; some Russian contingents were relocated from Georgia to Armenia. Further, the creation of the Central Asian Rapid Deployment Forces (under the Organization of Collective Security Treaty, uniting six countries) expanded the presence and military exercises of the Russian military from Tajikistan to neighbouring Kyrgyzstan.

It is worth remembering that Russia opposed the use of military force by NATO against Yugoslavia only during that period of 11 weeks when the UNSC mandate was absent. After such a mandate was finally coordinated and adopted, the Russian military hurried to jump into the NATO-led operation that had become a UN action (Russian troops headed by Gen. Zavarzin rushed at night to capture the airport of Pristina and thus to obtain a role and sector of responsibility within the operation).

From 1996 in Bosnia and later in Kosovo from the summer of 1999 the level of cooperation and inter-operability between Russian and Western (mostly NATO) peacekeepers was positive and high. Russia not only supported the practice of creating ad-hoc military coalitions for dealing with international crises, but tried to practically participate in most of them (one recent manifestation of that tendency was the dispatch of a symbolic contingent of Russian military to support international operations in Sierra-Leone).

Russia's most significant practical role in recent international military campaigns was played in 2001–02 in the course of operations against the Taliban regime, by providing serious military support (armaments, instructors) to the Northern Alliance of Afghanistan and by cooperating with the US military (reconnaissance data, air-corridors, etc.) in the framework of the anti-terrorist coalition. But it should be clearly understood that the short 'brotherhood in arms' between Russia and the US regarding the overthrow of the Taliban was tactical rather than strategic. It was not (or at least not only) caused and cemented by trafficking values and principles of international interference, but rather by a coincidence of geo-strategic and pragmatic interests of two powers regarding the rogue regime in Afghanistan. Russia and the CIS states were seriously concerned about the endless insurgence of armed groups, weapons and drugs from Afghanistan to Central Asia and thus they had their own pragmatic reasons to support US action. Such unanimity would be much more difficult to repeat in the potential case of forceful action against Iraq (or, even more so, against Iran or North Korea).

The very notion of a 'pre-emptive strike' was in past decades widely used and debated in nuclear doctrines and policy. But in that context pre-emption had a much more clear-cut sense. A massive nuclear strike or mechanical preparations for such a strike are clearly located in space and time, and could be attributed to someone's state policy and state decisions. If today pre-emption is embedded in general political strategy on the use of conventional force against growing external threats, then the international community is dealing with the much more amorphous situation of 'strike against a tendency' rather than a 'strike against clear-cut dangerous actions'. And tendency is always hard to estimate, for there is much room for subjectivity and hidden side-interests.

The war against the Taliban was in a sense a pre-emptive action. And the issue was raised at that time as to how proof should be collected and produced for the international community regarding the 'guilt' of a certain political regime? In principle, such proof should be timely and clearly presented to the international community embodied in the UN and its Security Council, but that would still mean a decision behind closed doors, subjected to various lobbying and side-interests of powers, especially of the 'big five'.

A more democratic procedure would require governments, parliaments and, preferably, the general public of major (if not all) states to become acquainted with information that qualifies for the 'death penalty' for certain political regimes and for a significant part of the population with it (Saddam Hussein wouldn't die alone).

Even in the case of the war against the Taliban, that was not done. The limited information about connections (at that time not fully clear) between the terrorist attacks in the US and the political regime in Afghanistan was revealed by US authorities to the heads of states of the big powers (including the Russian president). But it was done in secret, behind closed doors, without the intention to make the information subject to debate in parliaments until the very last moment before prepared and inevitable US military action. This cannot be considered the appropriate way of legitimising the 'death penalty'.

The mechanism for legitimising decisions regarding Iraq (through International Atomic Energy Agency – IAEA – inspections with further presentation of findings to the UNSC and followed by the UN resolution) seems much more formally appropriate from the point of view of most representatives of the Russian political elite. At the same time, there are voices in the Russian (as well as Western European) politico-academic community that a UN mandate as such is very initial and very formal. The UN resolution fixes a temporal (sometimes tactical) consensus of major powers at a certain concrete moment of international crisis, while the political situation and the scene in the war theatre changes constantly.

An analysis of UN peace operations in conflict areas shows that in too many cases a UN mandate (as well as mandates of regional organisations) serves as a carte blanche, justifying the beginning of an operation but lagging far behind events in the course of it. The routine UN practice of renewing mandates for military operations every six months is obviously too slow for mobile campaigns such as another 'Desert Storm' or the Afghan war. But attempts to diplomatically coordinate a new consensus among the big powers every week in the course of dynamic operations will not work for numerous reasons. In 1993, for example, when the Commission for Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) for the first (and last) time in its history coordinated a mandate for CSCE peace-keeping operations for Nagorno Karabakh, consensus among the mandating powers collapsed before troops and finances for operations were collected. As a result, elements of carte blanche are always present in mandates for UN or coalition operations, and the less concrete and more empty the mandate sounds, the easier it is to reach a consensus on it.

The issue of 'pre-emptive use of force' on behalf of the international community requires clarification of *who* exactly uses the force and *on whose behalf* (legally and politically). One of the international tendencies of the 1980s and 1990s was a shift from UN interference in crises towards *interference by regional interstate organisations* on the basis of their own decisions.

In 1983, the Organisation of American States (OAS) mandated military interference in Grenada (in the absence of consensus in the UN). The Organisation of African Unity (OAU) and Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) on the African continent mandated and practically undertook several regional, collective military interventions in crisis areas (including, for example, large-scale joint military operations of military contingents from seven African states on the territory of the Central African Republic).

In Eurasia, the CIS, as mentioned above, mandated and practically undertook the use of military force on behalf of regional organisations in Tajikistan and Abkhazia/Georgia (the Tajik operation lasted for eight years with multiple renewed mandates and the Abkhaz operation is still not finished after eight years). In East Asia, the ARF (Asian Regional Forum – the conflict-resolution 'arm' of Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN) initiated sanctions against Vietnam when it was in conflict with Campuchea.

In Europe, the CSCE/OSCE created a precedent of mandating regionally abortive military operations for Nagorno Karabakh, and NATO (while formally denying the status of regional security organisations under UN Charter Chapter VIII) mandated and performed the use of force against Belgrade. A little bit earlier, the Western European Union (WEU), separate from the EU at that time, retained its doctrine of involvement in conflict resolution, which stated that the WEU could interfere in conflicts using military force not only by UN decision, but on the basis of its own decision of a group of participating states.

Such a tendency to 'regionalise' the use of collective force was not opposed by the UN. On the contrary, the United Nations, over-burdened with unfinished operations in numerous conflict areas applied in the 1990s to regional organisations and ad hoc coalitions of states to volunteer to deal with regional and local crises and conflicts.

The last decade also de facto legitimised the practice of *delegating* the authority to use force on behalf of the international community to ad hoc coalitions of states or strong organisations. The decade of the 1990s started with the Desert Storm operation where the United Nations mandate delegated the lead and command of operations against Iraq to the US military machine. This action culminated in delegating the lead authority in the Bosnian operation to NATO (the International Fellowship for Reconciliation and the Stabilisation Force in Bosnia and Herzegovina) after the collapse of the UN-led Protection Force, and ended with operations in East Timor, where the Australian military received a UN request and blessing for doing the main job on the conflict site. Although in each of these cases, large coalitions of 20 to 30-plus states were formally created, obviously, the chief 'contracted'

power exerted enormous influence (both militarily and politically) on the course, direction and outcome of the operations in the conflict zones.

These visible tendencies (ranging from regionalisation of conflict resolution and the delegation of authority to the use of real force and to strong national or regional military machines and coalitions) mean further distortion of the theoretically neutral United Nations model of interference. In fact, what is now done in the name of the world community, very rarely represents the world community in an operational sense. And in the case of hypothetical 'pre-emptive' strikes, such tendencies create even more concerns. Instead of the democratisation of decision-making regarding such a thin matter as international interference into crises, in reality we observe opposite tendencies: a narrowing of the circle of actual decision-makers and a narrowing (and hierarchy-building) of the circle of executors of the 'will of the international community'.

Currently, three new international actors have been formed in the sphere of the international use of force. First, the European Union is finishing the creation of a Rapid Reaction Force of some 60,000 military personnel representing EU nations. Second, after the reorganisation of the Collective Security Treaty among six CIS nations, the Rapid Deployment Forces for Central Asia were created with the participation of Russia, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan and Kazakhstan. Third, after the Prague summit, NATO started the process of creating a 20,000-strong mobile force to avoid lagging behind the US in out-of-area operations similar to that in Afghanistan or (potentially) in Iraq.

There are very limited attempts to coordinate 'fire brigade' structures even between EU and NATO, and no attempts at all to launch a doctrinal, operational or inter-operability dialogue between them and the CIS. At the same time, it is clear that in case of any military activities around Iraq, all three of them would be brought to high military readiness and relocated to close proximity with each other. How can the international community speak of a 'collective, coordinated pre-emptive action' if the three military rapid reaction machines trained for such actions do not talk to each other? The same problem manifested itself in course of operations in Afghanistan when NATO, as a collective structure, was de facto marginalised by the US military. Most of coordination occurred between the US and the UK, the US and Russia, Russia and Uzbekistan, and Russia and Kazakhstan (on air-corridors and use of bases by Americans) and was done on a 'semi-closed' bilateral basis, without any real involvement of the UN, NATO or CIS channels and mechanisms.

To sum up, how could a potential Russian stance on the pre-emptive use of force in the international arena be modelled? First, at a general political level,

Moscow seems not to welcome doctrinalisation of pre-emptive use of force. Previous 'coding formulas' for the current interference needs of big powers (which was 'anti-terrorist counteractions') was easily and willingly supported by Moscow because it allowed a reconsideration of Western attitudes towards Russian actions in Chechnya. But the pre-emptive use of force doesn't supply Moscow with any extra capabilities in the sphere of its vital interests, while it may pose hard choices regarding former or current semi-friends (North Korea, Iraq, Iran, Cuba, etc.).

Second, at the level of legal decisions and legitimisation, Moscow insists on strictly following procedural formalities: coordination of the essence and wording of UNSC resolutions mandating the use of force by the international community. As in the cases of the operations in Bosnia and Kosovo (and several other less controversial cases), whenever the 'voice of Moscow' was heard and taken into consideration during open and closed debates in the UNSC, and whenever the West and Russia compromised on a certain decision, then Moscow became a loyal partner in the implementation of such a decision. Thus, another period of 'brotherhood-in-arms' tactical alignment starts.

Third, behind the level of formalities and legal principles lays the layer of pragmatic geo-strategic, political and economic interests of the great powers. Having or not having access to WMD is a small matter. The US, Russia and half a dozen other influential states are 'guilty' themselves. Russia does not want to de-nuclearise, and nobody is ready, for example, to 'punish' India, Pakistan or Israel for obtaining access to nuclear weapons. Thus, motivation, time frame, conditions and format for the pre-emption of WMD proliferation remain a matter for political bargaining where nothing is clearly predefined. International law doesn't help much behind the thin fence of the requirement to have a UNSC resolution on any such pre-emptive use of force. And the economic interests of the big powers shouldn't be put aside in the cases of Iraq and Iran, as they were in the case of the Taliban (which was economically irrelevant to almost all states). Thus, the matter of pre-emptive use of force in the international arena against 'unreliable' political regimes becomes an area for serious balance of the pragmatic interests of big powers with all the associated consequences.

Fourth, at the level of internal politics, public opinion, propaganda and the media in Russia, the concept of pre-emptive use of force remains and will remain a source of criticism and contradictions. Public opinion will obviously be split and a significant portion of the public will find in the approach of pre-emptive strikes another manifestation of the 'plot of the West against Russia and developing countries'. But as long as loyalty to the current president and his administration remains high among the political establishment and the majority of the public, voices of criticism are likely to

be deterred or silenced if the Russian political leadership announces an extension of its 'strategic partnership with the US and the West' on this pre-emption matter.

Thus, all discussion is brought back to focus on the third conclusion: the key to any decision on matters of pre-emption lies neither in UN corridors, nor in domestic public opinion, nor even in the behaviour of the 'questionable' states and regimes themselves, but rather in the pragmatic balance of interests of great powers regarding these states and regimes.

Pre-emptive Military Action and
the Legitimate Use of Force:

An American View

Walter B. Slocombe

The United States will do what we must to defend our vital interests including, when necessary and appropriate, using our military unilaterally and decisively.

United States National Security Strategy

No question has more preoccupied discussions of international law and international relations than that of the legitimacy and wisdom of the use of force. From the 'just war' doctrines of the Middle Ages to the Westphalian concept of a sovereign state's 'right' to wage war for whatever ends the sovereign judged right, to the contorted efforts of 19th century legal scholars to avoid the problems of the legitimacy of 'war' by defining all kinds of military operations as something other than 'war' to the futile efforts of the League of Nations and the Kellogg-Briand Pacts to – with various reservations and ambiguities – 'outlaw' war to today's discussion of the distinctions between preventive and pre-emptive use of force and the rise of 'humanitarian intervention' as a politically correct form of warfare, practical political and military leaders, as well as legal scholars and scholars of international relations, have wrestled with the question of when the use of military force is a legitimate instrument of statecraft.

It remains sadly the case that cannons are still the last argument of kings. The sincere efforts of leaders and citizens to substitute international institutions and international diplomacy for military power, the terrible costs of two massive European-based world wars, those of countless smaller internal and international wars throughout the world since 1945, or even the potential consequences of war fought with nuclear, chemical and biological weapons, as well as the massively increased potential lethality of conventional technology, have not fundamentally changed the fact that the threat and use of force are the ultimate instruments of international relations.

Moreover, it is a necessary qualification to the proposition that diplomacy is preferable to force, that where vital interests, or at least conflicts over perceived vital interests are at stake, and where willingness to provide inducements is not unlimited, diplomacy and negotiation are unlikely to succeed unless there is seen to be a real cost to refusal to compromise. The consequences that can be imposed by other means of pressure are puny

compared with those of military force. Those states (not to mention non-state actors) whose actions are the most dangerous and most essential to constrain are the least likely to be much affected by 'international opinion'. In such states, the prospects of affecting regime action by appeals to the good sense or innate caution of the citizenry are minimal, simply because the regime will have been careful to insulate itself very thoroughly from such public pressures. Even the most powerful international instrument of pressure short of military force – economic sanctions – has a very feeble potential for deflecting such states' actions.[1]

Indeed, it is, in some sense too simple even to say that it is an absolute principle that force is a last resort. Certainly, the risks and costs of military force make it both prudent and moral to refrain from its use while there is a reasonable prospect that other means may be effective. But the principle of using force only after exhausting non-military alternatives necessarily implies a willingness to recognise that, at some point, they have been exhausted, and that waiting too long may mean waiting until military options are no longer effective at acceptable costs.

In the limited time and space available, rather than try to cover the whole huge field, it seems appropriate to focus on two specific questions[2] that have come to the fore in the face of fundamental changes in the international security environment since the end of the cold war:

- When is the use of force justified (herein of pre-emption)?

- Who can legitimately decide on the use of military force (herein of unilateralism)?

---

[1] 'Covert' action is similarly not often a viable alternative to military force. In any event, used on a significant scale, 'covert' action *is* the use of force, though perhaps delivered through a different state agency and with different methods.

[2] This limitation leaves out several issues that have in the United States been major elements of the discussion of use of force – including the magnitude of American interest sufficient to justify the use of military force and the degree of popular support required (and the closely related question of the relative roles of Congress and the president in domestic US decisions on the use of force). Suffice it to say, as to the first, that only important interests justify military action, but many interests are 'important' in this sense without involving immediate direct threats to the US homeland. As to the second, no democracy, and certainly not the US, can fight a war on any scale without public and parliamentary support, but where there is clear national interest and a coherent strategy for advancing it and a convincing rationale for using force to do so, the American public is prepared to sustain significant burdens and run significant risks, and Congress is prepared to support the Executive branch, or at any rate to acquiesce in its decisions.

Unilateralism, multilateralism and international decision-makers

Of the two issues, the second, 'unilateralism', is relatively the easier, because the dichotomy between 'unilateralism' and 'multilateralism' is to a large degree an illusory one.

To be sure, there are today a few in the US who prefer – or at least affect to prefer – unilateral action as a matter of both principle and expediency. They see American military power as so overwhelming that there is no need for the assistance of others. Equally important, they see American purposes as so noble and the perspectives of other governments as so narrow, even craven, that it is not only possible, but necessary, for the US to ignore their views. The conclusion these 'unilateralists by preference' draw is that involvement of other nations in decision-making about American use of force is unwise in that it risks diluting the clarity of American purposes, while involving other nations in actual operations is pointless because they can add nothing significant to American capabilities and including them merely complicates operations.

Conversely, there is a sharply contrary view that decisions on the use of military force must always and only be made on a multilateral basis, and indeed, must be made by international institutions, preferably, and perhaps exclusively, by the United Nations. There are some in the US – and there appear to be many more in other countries – who insist, or at least affect to insist, that only formal approval by the United Nations can legitimise the use of military force, except perhaps in the case of immediate defence by a certifiably innocent victim against direct military attack across a recognised international border by acknowledged forces of a foreign state.

There is, however, in international law – and more in international practice – widespread acceptance of the concept that, in the end, all decisions on the use of military force are unilateral, in the sense of being made by nation states, but those decisions must, for reasons of both prudence and principle, be made in the light of the opinions and interests of others so as to gain their support. The great weight of American opinion takes a view that can fairly be described as 'unilateral if necessary, but multilateral if possible – and multilateral should almost always be possible'.

To begin with the first element – the reservation of the ultimate right of unilateral action – the current US administration is by no means the first to espouse the notion that the US has the right, even the duty, to act alone if the nation's vital interests are at stake, and that, in the end, it is the US and no one else that makes that decision. The quotation at the top of this paper is indeed from a National Security Strategy document, but it is drawn from that of President Bill Clinton in 1999, not that of President George W. Bush in 2002.

Nor is the idea that decisions on military force are ultimately national decisions confined to superpowers. Indeed, it seems very likely that, in extremis, every country would take that position. Certainly, even those, such as the current German government, who are most enthusiastic in theory for multilateral decisions on use of force, insist on reserving the right to make a separate national decision on whether a multilateral approval of military action is sufficiently justified – or sufficiently serves their own nation's goals and principles – as a requirement for actually participating in the action. And there are numerous examples of nations that, in general, regard themselves as adherents of a multilateral approach but have proven nonetheless ready to use their military forces for their national aims without bothering much about international opinion, as Spain did last summer over the occupation of a disputed Mediterranean island. To point this out is not to accuse Germany or Spain or anyone else of hypocrisy or even to call into question the soundness, much less the sincerity, of their general commitment to multilateral decision-making, but only to observe that it has its limits.

But if unilateralism in theory is all but universal, unilateralism in practice is very hard even for a superpower on a matter of any difficulty. First, in most situations, there may not be much of a practical option of truly unilateral action. American military operations are almost always greatly facilitated by having the cooperation and support of others. The US may have overwhelming capability in many, perhaps most forms of military power, but the direct military contributions of other nations remain highly useful. The military capability gap is real, but it is not infinite. Many allies can make very helpful contributions in specialised areas such as special operations forces and in capabilities where cutting-edge technology is not required, and increasingly where other nations are, albeit on a smaller scale, approaching American capabilities in fields such as precision-strike or naval forces. Even setting aside direct military contributions, the US is, in almost all circumstances, heavily dependent on other countries for bases, over-flight rights and access, and usually for even more direct support in the form of intelligence, cooperation in applying economic and political instruments, and, very importantly, in dealing with the aftermath of conflict. Certainly that was the case in Afghanistan. The Bush administration's National Security Strategy may exaggerate a little when it says, "There is little of lasting consequence that the US can accomplish without the sustained cooperation of its allies and friends in Europe", but the basic point is correct – and not just about Europe.

And, of course, there are powerful political and psychological dimensions to international support. America, however patriotic, even jingoistic and ostensibly disdainful of foreigners our popular culture may seem, is far from unilateral by preference when it comes to military operations. Opinion polls

consistently show – in a variety of contexts – that public support for American military operations is far higher where the US has the support of its allies than where it would be alone. In part, this reaction is no doubt the sensible one that Americans like others to share the costs and risks, but it also appears to reflect a more complex judgment about international affairs: the American public has more confidence that the decisions of our government are right if they are shared and supported by other countries, as evidenced both by their formal positions and statements and by their willingness to send their own military forces to join in.[3]

Moreover, in most situations, it is not that hard for the US to garner international support. This is in part the consequence of the obvious fact that the US has a wide variety of levers of influence and persuasion at its disposal. And the US need not shy away from using those levers. Accepting that the use of military force requires – or is at any rate immensely helped by – international support does not require the US to be neutral about whether that support is forthcoming. Forced to choose between the US and its adversaries, most countries will, whatever their misgivings, realise that their interests counsel considering the consequences of opposing the US on an issue so important to it that the use of military force is an issue.

But the proposition that, in the end, the US can usually count on the support of those countries that matter does not rest simply – or, one could argue, even primarily – on the proposition that frustrating the Americans would have a price. At bottom, those interests of the US that plausibly could involve the use of American military force are also the interests of much of the rest of the world. An American diplomacy geared to exhausting non-military alternatives as a means of meeting fundamental challenges will, if non-military means fail after being seriously applied, in most cases, also convince many other countries that resort to military force is not only justified, but required in their own interest, not just that of the US.

Nevertheless, to say that international support for the use of military force is, in most cases, both necessary and obtainable, is not necessarily to say that the only legitimate source of international support is action by the United

---

[3] The political/psychological importance of other countries' direct military participation has an effect that – perhaps fortunately for the US – the contributors may not fully realise: those countries that do provide forces to US-led military operations, however much they may have to defer to US leadership of the overall direction of the military operation, can absolutely reserve a veto over what their own forces do – and at the same time exert an influence on the American military and, still more, on American political decision-making related to the conflict out of all proportion to the objective significance of their military contributions.

Nations. The interesting and much-disputed legal issues of how the UN Charter, in particular Article 51 (reserving the inherent right of individual and collective self-defence against armed attack) should be interpreted – and what, to a practicing lawyer is an equally important issue – who has the legitimate authority to interpret it authoritatively are matters more for scholars than practitioners of international relations.

Of course, formal UN support is desirable, both for its own sake and for its impact on the actions and attitudes of individual countries whose support may be essential. But insofar as the issue is legitimacy, it is hard to make the case that only UN action suffices. In practice, whether 'the United Nations' has given its sanction for the use of military force means, as a practical matter, whether there is a Security Council resolution that can plausibly be read as authorising military force.[4] That, in turn, means whether there is a negative vote by Russia or China. Strictly speaking, of course, the UK or France could also veto, and, in theory, a UN Security Council resolution authorising the use of military force could fail by reason of not having the affirmative votes of a majority of the Security Council, even if no permanent member voted against it. As a realistic proposition, however, it is indeed hard to imagine a use-of-force situation where a resolution to which none of the 'permanent five' objected enough to use a veto could not obtain a majority (even if one or more permanent members abstained) – and it is still less plausible that France – not to mention the UK – would exercise a veto in a situation where Russia or China or both would not (always laying aside the – presumably not very unlikely – case such as Suez in 1956 where the interests of France or the UK were uniquely at issue). It follows that to require United Nations approval as an absolute condition of legitimate use of military force is to say that no military action of which Russia or China (or, in principle, France, the UK, or indeed, the US) strongly disapproves is legitimate, no matter how broadly the action is otherwise supported, or how well justified in other international legal or political terms. To illustrate the point – NATO could legitimately highlight various UNSC resolutions as supporting its intervention to reverse Milosevic-led Serbia's expulsion of the ethnic Albanian population of Kosovo in 1999. There was, however, no authorising action by the Security Council in classic 'all necessary means' words, and it is not clear that had one been sought, Russia (or China) would have withheld

---

[4] During the cold war, when the USSR could be relied on to veto any UNSC resolution it deemed inconsistent with its interest, the US argued that a 'uniting for peace' resolution of the General Assembly (GA) could carry the same UN authority. With the changes in the composition of the GA making it very hard to assemble a GA majority – and the end of the cold war confrontation with Russia making it more possible to get a permanent-five consensus – this doctrine has fallen into desuetude.

a veto. That intervention was, nonetheless, broadly regarded as legitimate, whether as a 'humanitarian intervention' or as a means of forestalling a spreading conflict in a region of Europe that has bred a host of wars in living memory.

Would a failed attempt to get a formal Security Council authorisation really have changed things? For most of the world, the Kosovo intervention was legitimate and would still have been so had a UNSC effort produced a veto.[5] For to say that a UNSC resolution is essential amounts to saying that – not 'the international community' – but Russia, China – and, in principle the other permanent members or alternatively, a majority-blocking group of the non-permanent members – are the absolute custodians of the legitimacy of international force. In these terms, the choice between 'unilateral' action and 'multilateral' action is not between a strictly national decision and a UN Security Council resolution, but one between efforts to garner as much support from other countries as possible, and an insistence, even a preference, for acting alone. In such efforts, the actions of formal regional institutions such as NATO and of informal ad hoc groups such as the coalition that fought the first Gulf war (admittedly with UNSC resolution blessing) and may fight a second one, count for as much as a UN Security Council hamstrung by a veto.

Pre-emption: When does the right to self-defence arise?

The question of 'pre-emption' is a much more difficult issue. The concept that 'defence' is legitimate, while 'offence' – more pejoratively 'aggression' – is not, lies deep in all discussions of use of military force. In practice, the distinction has always been hard to draw. Indeed, a good deal of effort has been spent – without notable success or general acceptance in practice – in attempting to abolish the distinction by aspiring to abolish force entirely as a means of settling disputes, by a sort of 'no fault' renunciation of force. But the principle of 'self-defence' has survived, and is, in fact, formally and explicitly recognised in the UN Charter as an 'inherent' right, not one created by the Charter.

Lurking in the concept of 'self-defence' is the question of at what point the right arises, of where on the spectrum of prevention, pre-emption and response, military action is justified. The American government has, especially but not exclusively since the attacks of 11 September, stressed the

---

[5] To be sure, some take the position that the Kosovo operation was 'proper' because it served legitimate international purposes but not 'lawful', because it was not explicitly authorised by a UN Security Council resolution. That distinction says more about attitudes toward 'international law', than about norms of international conduct.

right of pre-emption in certain circumstances, specifically against terrorists and against rogue states threatening to acquire nuclear and other mass destruction weapons.

So far as the United States striking at terrorists is concerned, the issue is hardly one of pre-emption. Once hostilities have been started by others, it is no longer 'pre-emption' for the victim to seek to destroy the source, not just to frustrate specific attacks in the future from the same source. The United States has already been – indeed was years before September 2001 – the victim of attack by the coordinated terrorist groups that are the targets for American attacks today. And, beginning at least with the embassy bombings in 1998, the United States was prepared to use force to destroy al-Qaeda operations and leadership where there was sufficient intelligence of their location, entirely independent of any indication that a specific new attack was being planned. There are, to be sure, many difficult legal, moral, political and practical issues raised by the 'war' on terrorism, and by the American determination to, in the words of President Bush's National Security Strategy (NSS), "destroy the threat before it reaches our borders". For example, since terrorists are non-state actors, the sovereignty of other countries is, by definition, involved in American attacks on them. Countries in whose territory terrorists are operating have a responsibility to suppress the operations and the US administration has declared that it will regard countries that give sanctuary to terrorists as subject to military attack just as much as the terrorists themselves. The sovereignty questions raised by this position – and other issues of legality and legitimacy – are real and sometimes difficult issues, but they are not about pre-emption, rather they are about the conduct of a 'war' that does not fit traditional patterns.

The Bush administration has, however, squarely relied on pre-emption in also enunciating a potentially more far-reaching doctrine of anticipatory action against rogue states that are in the process of acquiring nuclear, chemical and biological weapons. The NSS says, "We must be prepared to stop rogue states…before they are able to threaten or use weapons of mass destruction against the United States, our allies, or friends". To an important degree, this doctrine is less innovative than either its advocates or its critics profess to believe. Perhaps most importantly, it is, in its terms, limited to the particular issue of rogue states seeking to acquire WMD; it is not a claim to use force pre-emptively (or unilaterally) whenever the American government judges US interests to be at stake.

Critics, however, argue that the administration is claiming that self-defence is not limited to 'pre-emption' in the sense of forestalling an imminent attack, but 'preventive war', in the sense of using military force where the only threat is a vague and uncertain one of possible conflict at some indefinite point in the future. Such 'preventive war', it is argued, is not only in

violation of international law, but an unbounded invitation for the use of force on mere suspicion of the ambitions or intent of another nation, and indeed a negation of the very concept of international law.

Far from ignoring international law, however, the United States government has advanced a sophisticated legal argument for the legitimacy of its position regarding pre-emption against rogue state WMD proliferation that is squarely based on international law principles. The argument begins with the proposition that international law unquestionably recognises a right of self-defence and moreover acknowledges that exercising that right of self-defence does not require absorbing the first blow. As the NSS puts it, under long-recognised international law principles, "nations need not suffer an attack; they can lawfully take action to defend themselves against forces that present an obvious danger of attack".

The classic and widely accepted formulation of that right was stated by Daniel Webster, as American Secretary of State in the 1840s, during negotiations about a British cutting-out operation in American waters in Lake Ontario against the American ship *Caroline* that was being used to supply rebels in Canada. He wrote to the British Minister, Lord Ashburton, stating that a nation has a right to act first where the "necessity of self-defence is instant, overwhelming, and leaving no choice of means, no moment for deliberation". The administration argues that Webster's formulation must be "adapted to the capabilities and objectives of our adversaries". The traditional concept of 'imminence' assumed a context where the need for mobilisation and other preparation meant that there was a realistic prospect of warning of an attack. Stressing that its claim of a right to pre-empt is limited to action "to eliminate a specific threat to the US or our allies and friends", the administration argues for a standard of 'necessity' that recognises that terrorists and rogue states with WMD would have at their disposal "weapons that can be easily concealed, delivered covertly, and used without warning". Accordingly, it is lawful to "take anticipatory action to defend ourselves, even if uncertainly remains as to the time and place of the enemy's attack".

On balance, the administration has the better of the legal argument: Webster's formulation – which was adopted in the course of a protest against, rather than a defence of, a pre-emptive operation and therefore takes a restrictive view – speaks of a "necessity of self-defence" that is "instant, overwhelming," etc. Critics argue that only an immediate prospect of specific attack can meet that standard. But, in Webster's formulation, it is the "necessity" that must have those characteristics, and such a necessity may exist without an immediate prospect of attack. The right of anticipatory self-defence by definition presupposes a right to act while action is still possible. If waiting for 'imminence' means waiting until it is no longer possible to act

effectively, the victim is left with no alternative but to suffer the first blow. So interpreted, the 'right' would be illusory. The administration is accurate when it points out that once a rogue state has achieved a serious WMD capability, effective action to eliminate the capability may well have become impossible. The problem is not so much that WMD could be used with little warning – attacks with conventional weapons have all too often achieved tactical surprise – but that surprise use could be decisive and that the capability can be so successfully concealed that pre-emption is operationally impossible even if warning were available. On this basis, a strong case exists that the right of 'self-defence' includes a right to move against WMD programmes with high potential danger to the United States (and others) while it is still feasible to do so.[6]

The problems with pre-emption, unfortunately, are not lack of legal legitimacy, but operational practicality. A right of pre-emption is one thing; a meaningful capability to pre-empt is quite another. Exercising the right pre-supposes, both logically and practically, that there is some military operation that will achieve the desired result of eliminating the WMD capability that is targeted at an acceptable cost, taking into account the enemy's possible reactions.

The first operational issue with pre-emption is whether the proposed operation will actually eliminate the WMD capability targeted. The problem is not (usually) whether there is a means of executing a pre-emptive attack once targets are identified, but knowing what and where to strike. Precision weapons require precision intelligence, and pre-emption requires that intelligence be comprehensive as well as precise. Too much attention to action movies and too little to the realities of intelligence collection have tended to obscure the difficulty of knowing enough about a nation's WMD programmes to have much confidence of eliminating them by pre-emption. Still more difficult operationally is dealing with what the enemy may do in response, even if his WMD capability has been successfully negated.

The contemporary cases of Iraq and North Korea illustrate the operational problem in some of its dimensions, as discussed below.

In the Korean case, there is no question about the location of the plutonium-production reactor and the re-processing facility at Yongbyon, and, as former Secretary of Defense William Perry has written, the United States military has the capability to destroy them quickly and without causing release of

---

[6] In the particular case of Iraq and North Korea, of course, there may be an entirely independent legal basis for action that each is in breach of its obligations as a party to the NPT (and in both cases also of other commitments not to have or seek nuclear weapons). It is certainly arguable that other states are entitled to resort to force to compel compliance with such obligations.

radioactive materials. Such an attack would block the prospect of North Korea extracting some half-dozen bombs worth of plutonium within the next year. But it would not eliminate the North Korean nuclear programme, much less Pyongyang's ability to respond with devastating force. Even with regard to North Korea's nuclear programmes, the Yongbyon facilities are only part of North Korea's potential. There has been no claim that the United States knows the location of either the plutonium that was extracted in 1991–92 or of the couple of bombs for which that plutonium may have supplied the fissile material. Nor is there a claim that the United States has the detailed knowledge required for high-confidence targeting of other elements of the North Korean programme – notably its incipient uranium-enrichment facilities – much less its extensive chemical weapons capabilities. But the real problem with pre-emption in the North Korean case is that the North Korean capability to respond and escalate does not (so far) rest on its WMD, but on its massive conventional forces – and there is no chance that such capability could be eliminated pre-emptively, even by a massive effort. Of course, the problem will only grow worse if North Korea is able to expand its nuclear potential, and at some point, if diplomacy fails, it may be the wiser course to act militarily, accepting the limits on American capability to pre-empt and rely on deterrence and defence to block or blunt a conventional attack in response. But it is the risks of such a course that have made not just South Korea, but the United States as well, so reluctant to press the case for military confrontation.

In a sense, the case for dealing with the Iraqi WMD programmes by military force now may be said to be the case for not letting Iraq reach the point Korea is at now. Essentially the argument for eliminating Saddam Hussein's WMD by military force if he will not eliminate them himself under UN monitoring is that, despite the real risks, if the capability is not stopped now, it will be too late – and the world and the region will have to deal with a Saddam regime armed with a powerful WMD capability that can neither be pre-empted nor confidently defended against. But it is significant that the military option being considered against Iraq today is pre-emptive only in the strategic, not the operational, sense. The military option is not to strike at the WMD programmes directly but to replace the regime, as the only confident means of eliminating its WMD programmes. This is not the product of over-ambition, but of operational reality. Intelligence of a granularity and comprehensiveness necessary for an effective pre-emption limited to the WMD programmes themselves is no more available in the Iraqi than the Korean case. Indeed, in the Iraqi case there is not even an equivalent to Yongbyon, that is, a single key facility whose destruction is militarily feasible and would at a stroke deeply set back its WMD efforts. It is this lack of a military option able to eliminate the WMD that makes a campaign to oust the regime the only military option if UN disarmament efforts fail.

Happily, Saddam Hussein has less formidable responsive options than does Kim Jong-Il because his military is relatively weak and his ability to strike rapidly at high-value targets is much less. The American assessment is that none of his potential responses are anything nearly as significant as the North Korean potential to wreak immense destruction on South Korea, and that the risks entailed by what he can do can be reduced to acceptable levels – and are in any event better addressed now than faced later when his WMD programmes are far more developed. But Iraq has some potentially very destructive responses and their potential use is a major complication for military planning – and a major source of the reluctance of many to support an invasion.

In short, the contrasting cases of Iraq and North Korea today may be said to illustrate both the conceptual strength of the administration's doctrine of pre-emption against rogue state WMD, and its limitations in practice. There will, unfortunately perhaps, still be plenty of scope for military operations and capabilities aimed at deterrence and at defence if deterrence fails.

THE FUTURE OF THE NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION REGIME

WITH CONTRIBUTIONS BY

GARY SAMORE
BRUNO TERTRAIS
VLADIMIR A. ORLOV

The Future of the
Nuclear Non-Proliferation Regime:
An American View

Gary Samore

T he international nuclear non-proliferation regime is presently under siege from several different directions. Among the litany of pressures and problems:

- The US is considering development of a new class of nuclear weapons that could eventually require the resumption of nuclear testing, which would almost certainly set off a new round of nuclear tests by the nuclear weapons states.

- Despite improvements, Russia's security and control over its vast stocks of nuclear materials, equipment and technology remains vulnerable, and the leak of nuclear assistance to countries such as Iran remains a problem.

- Efforts to begin negotiations on a Fissile Material Cut-off Treaty (FMCT) appear hopelessly deadlocked in Geneva, with little prospect for progress in the immediate future.

- Looking towards the 2005 Review Conference of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), progress to implement the 13 disarmament steps identified at the 2000 Review Conference will be incomplete at best.

- In the wake of its 1998 nuclear tests, India is determined to develop a robust long-range nuclear capability against China, which is itself embarked on a strategic modernisation programme.

- To maintain a credible deterrent against India, Pakistan will continue to expand its nuclear arsenal. Even worse, Pakistan (and at least elements within Pakistan's nuclear establishment) has reportedly provided sensitive enrichment technology to North Korea and Iran, substantially augmenting their nuclear weapons programmes.

- In the Middle East, the collapse of the peace process has pushed even further into the distant future any prospect for creating security conditions conducive to Israeli adherence to the NPT or establishment of a Nuclear Weapons Free Zone in the region.

- Long in violation of its NPT commitments, Iraq continues to resist full cooperation with UN International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and

UN Monitoring, Verification and Inspection Commission (UNMOVIC) inspections as we inch ever closer to a war that may splinter the basis for international cooperation on non-proliferation issues.

- In the meantime, Iran has recently acknowledged that it is developing a programme for uranium enrichment, ostensibly for civilian purposes, but more likely to pursue a nuclear weapons breakout capability under cover of the NPT and IAEA safeguards.

- Finally, in East Asia, North Korea was caught pursuing a clandestine enrichment programme and responded to international pressure by restarting its plutonium production facilities, expelling IAEA inspectors and withdrawing from the NPT.

All in all, it is not a pretty picture. Nonetheless, it is important to remember that the underlying political and technical factors supporting the nuclear non-proliferation regime – the basic judgment that nuclear weapons are not essential for national security and the technical difficulties for acquiring nuclear weapons – remains intact for most NPT parties. The number of countries outside the Treaty remains small, and those inside the NPT that have violated the Treaty in letter or spirit are few. In most regions of the world – the Americas, Europe, sub-Saharan Africa, Southeast Asia – proliferation of nuclear weapons is not a serious threat.

Regional proliferation zones

The Middle East and East Asia are the only regions where the NPT regime is under serious pressure, and in both cases, the danger is long-term erosion rather than imminent collapse. From the standpoint of political and technical barriers to nuclear proliferation, the situations in the Middle East and East Asia are mirror opposites.

In the Middle East, the political barriers to proliferation are low – in the sense that the NPT regime does not enjoy widespread public legitimacy – but the technical barriers to acquiring nuclear weapons remain relatively high for most countries, apart from Israel, which has maintained a nuclear monopoly in the region for several decades. In this respect, Iran now appears to be only a few years away from crossing the nuclear threshold. If the uranium enrichment facility is completed, Iran could seek to divert nuclear material for weapons (in violation of IAEA safeguards) or exercise its right to withdraw from the NPT with a 90-day notice and convert the facility for military uses. In the long term, other countries in the region may try to emulate Iran's example of developing fuel-cycle facilities under the pretext of civilian nuclear energy and research programmes, leading to a domino-

style collapse of the non-proliferation restraints in the Middle East as countries seek to divert nuclear material or to withdraw from the NPT.

In contrast to the Middle East, the technical barriers to proliferation in East Asia are low – given the advanced nuclear capabilities in Japan, South Korea and Taiwan – but the political barriers remain relatively high, including public attitudes (especially in Japan) and the security ties between the US and its East Asian allies, which reduce the security rational for acquiring nuclear weapons. In the long term, however, an unchecked North Korean nuclear weapons programme could pressure an East Asian state to hedge its bets or even withdraw from the NPT, especially if US security relations in the region are weakened. In addition, should North Korea choose to sell surplus nuclear material or provide nuclear assistance, it could dramatically accelerate the pace of proliferation in regions such as the Middle East where the political desire for weapons is great, even if technical capabilities are weak.

Given these circumstances, the most important non-proliferation challenge for the coming years will be how to deal with the nuclear threat of Iraq and Iran in the Middle East and North Korea in East Asia. The success or failure of these efforts will be the most important determinates for the future of the nuclear non-proliferation regime.

The Middle East

The key issue for the Middle East is how a resolution of the Iraqi issue will affect efforts to deal with Iran's nuclear programme. The outcome of the Iraqi drama is near. In the coming weeks, Baghdad will either dramatically improve its cooperation with UN inspectors or Iraq's cooperation will remain tactical, enough to divide the UN Security Council, but not enough to satisfy Washington and London, which have apparently decided that eliminating Saddam Hussein is necessary to eliminate Iraq's WMD programmes. Most likely, the US, the UK and a handful of allies will invade Iraq to overthrow the Iraqi regime, with or without a second UN Security Council resolution.

Either outcome – inspections or invasion – would be a success for international efforts to enforce compliance against a country that has violated the NPT and probably continues to harbour ambitions to develop nuclear weapons, although the status of its nuclear weapons programme is uncertain. It is probable that Iraq has not made dramatic progress to acquire nuclear weapons since the demise of inspections in 1998, and a continuation of current IAEA inspections could provide high confidence in detecting Iraqi efforts to build clandestine facilities to produce nuclear materials. Over time, however, Baghdad's willingness to accept the current level of intrusive inspections is likely to erode if the threat of force appears to fade. From this

standpoint, the replacement of the current Iraqi government is more certain to achieve a decisive and enduring solution to Iraq's nuclear ambitions. For the time being, the new government in Baghdad can be expected to focus on rebuilding its conventional forces under US and UK protection, with less need or opportunity to revive Iraq's nuclear weapons programme.

The credibility of the UN Security Council as an instrument to enforce NPT compliance in the case of Iraq will depend in a large measure on whether the UN Security Council authorises the use of force. Ideally, authorisation of force could be portrayed as a warning that the UN Security Council is prepared to take strong measures against countries that pursue nuclear weapons programmes in violation of their NPT commitments. Unfortunately, at this juncture, the Council appears deeply divided and passage of a second resolution is unlikely. Even in the absence of a second resolution, however, Washington and London will attempt to justify military action against Iraq as enforcement of previous UN Security Council resolutions to disarm Iraq, including its nuclear weapons efforts.

Assuming Iraq's nuclear programme is eliminated by force of arms in the near future, how will it affect Tehran's calculations and subsequent efforts to discourage Iran from pursuing its declared civilian uranium-enrichment programme? On one hand, the elimination of Iraq's nuclear threat will remove one significant Iranian motivation for developing a nuclear weapons option, and Iran may become even more wary of pursuing policies that will attract US hostility and even risk military attack. On the other hand, Tehran is likely to view development of a nuclear weapons capability as even more essential to deter US pressure and efforts to change the regime.

From Tehran's standpoint, the ideal solution to this dilemma is to offer assurances of its peaceful intent, while developing a nuclear weapons capability as quickly as possible; this presumably explains Iran's recent decision to allow IAEA access to its enrichment facility while it is still under construction and to promise IAEA inspections once the plant is operational. Tehran has also signalled its willingness to accept additional safeguard measures to give maximum confidence against the risk of diversion and the existence of undeclared facilities.

Given the status of its nuclear power programme, however, Iran's claim that the enrichment programme is intended for civilian fuel production is not likely to be accepted by Washington. Even if safeguards provide adequate protection against the risk of diversion – an assurance that is doubted in Washington – Iran could still acquire nuclear weapons materials on fairly short notice if it withdraws from the NPT when the plant is operational. To secure minimal Iranian cooperation in the impending war against Iraq, Washington has deliberately avoided making a major issue of Iran's

enrichment programme. Once the war against Iraq is over, however, the US is very likely to turn to its attention to Iran, which presents an easier (though less urgent) proliferation problem than North Korea.

Washington has not yet decided what strategy to pursue, but the usual debate can be expected. Some officials will emphasise the use of threats and pressure to intimidate Tehran to abandon its enrichment programme, including efforts to encourage the emergence of 'moderate' elements in Iran that may be more willing to sacrifice Iran's nuclear weapons option to appease American hostility. As a last resort, pre-emptive military strikes against the enrichment plant will be seriously considered. Other officials will argue that international pressure should be augmented by incentives, such as accepting Iranian access to nuclear power assistance and secure fuel supplies if Iran agrees to forego development of an indigenous fuel production capability.

Critical to the success of any future American strategy to halt Iran's enrichment programme will be whether Washington can enlist the support of key powers with influence in Tehran, including the UK, France, Germany, Japan and Russia (Iran's sole nuclear supplier), which share Washington's interest in preventing Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons. The lingering effects of disagreement over Iraq are likely to obstruct development of a common policy towards Iran, but the need to deal with Iran could also provide an opportunity to help heal wounds among the US, the UK and their allies.

The Far East

Clearly, Washington's efforts to deal with North Korea's nuclear weapons programme have failed. After confronting North Korea with its nuclear cheating last October, the US effectively ruled out either military force or bilateral negotiations, and sought to orchestrate political and economic pressures to force North Korea to abandon its secret enrichment programme. Rather than capitulate, however, Pyongyang retaliated with familiar brinkmanship, seeking to pressure Washington into negotiations or, if that failed, to enhance its nuclear capabilities. Rather than rally international support, the US has found itself at odds with China and its East Asian allies, especially South Korea, which are wary of pressuring North Korea and prefer that Washington negotiate a solution directly with Pyongyang.

For the near term, the situation can be expected to grow worse. With Washington's focus on Iraq, and the divisions between Washington and Seoul, North Korea appears intent on resuming the reprocessing and recovering of enough plutonium for a few nuclear weapons in the coming months. The IAEA Board of Governors has reported North Korea's NPT

violations to the Security Council, but the Council is unlikely to take strong action to deter reprocessing, given New York's focus on Iraq and the refusal of key countries to even threaten sanctions. As much as Beijing opposes North Korea's nuclear programme, it does not appear willing to cut off vital assistance that could precipitate the collapse of Kim Jong-Il regime or trigger a war on the peninsula.

In theory, the US could mount air strikes to destroy North Korea's plutonium production facilities – a threat that North Korea takes seriously – but at the risk of causing a broader conflict and splintering the alliance with South Korea. As a basis for bilateral negotiations with Washington, Pyongyang claims it is willing to re-institute the freeze on plutonium production, but the US continues to refuse bilateral negotiations unless North Korea first agrees to dismantle its nuclear weapons programme. In an effort to break the impasse, US diplomats have tried to organise multilateral talks, which may provide a cover for bilateral US-North Korean talks to begin, but Pyongyang has insisted on direct negotiations with Washington.

Assuming that North Korea proceeds with reprocessing, however, the immediate proliferation threat is limited. For over a decade, North Korea was believed to have enough plutonium for one to two nuclear weapons, and the amount of additional plutonium that North Korea can recover in coming months is relatively small (about 30 kilograms). At least for the immediate future, a few additional North Korean nuclear weapons are unlikely to trigger decisions in Tokyo or Seoul to acquire nuclear weapons, although a North Korean nuclear test could begin to shake confidence in the NPT. Pyongyang will probable require the small amount of additional plutonium immediately available for its own military needs, leaving little surplus for sale. Over several years, however, North Korea could substantially expand its capability to produce plutonium and highly enriched uranium, which would pose a much more serious proliferation threat.

Once North Korea has finished reprocessing (and the Iraq campaign is over), Washington's debate over its North Korean policy is likely to intensify. For some, the US should respond with more concerted efforts to isolate and sanction Pyongyang, in hopes of undermining the regime. For others, the US should respond with more concerted efforts to negotiate a comprehensive and rigorous agreement, in hopes of ending North Korea's nuclear weapons programme. The most effective strategy may need to combine pressure and negotiations: the threat of sanctions are necessary to buttress negotiations to secure North Korean concessions, but support from key Asian powers to impose sanctions will require demonstrating that a negotiated solution has been blocked by North Korean intransigence and unrealistic demands.

Conclusion

The nuclear non-proliferation regime is under the greatest threat in the Middle East and East Asia, depending on efforts to deal with nuclear programmes in Iraq, Iran and North Korea. In the near future, Iraq's nuclear programme is likely to be eliminated by force of arms, creating both opportunities and obstacles to dealing with Iran's nuclear programme. Once the Iraq war is over, Washington will also focus new energy on responding to North Korea's nuclear threat. In both cases, the US will need to resolve internal debates and coordinate efforts with other critical countries to design an approach that maximises pressure and incentives.

The New Dynamics of Nuclear Proliferation:

A European View

Bruno Tertrais

There are two ways to interpret current evolutions on the nuclear non-proliferation scene. One is that proliferation remains limited to a small coterie of rogue or quasi-rogue nations, such as Iran and North Korea. Another is that we are entering a new era of nuclear proliferation and that a new 'wave' of proliferation is taking shape.

Whatever the interpretation, it is clear that a key threshold has been crossed in the evolution of nuclear proliferation. Evidence of 'nuclear for ballistic' trade between Pakistan and North Korea has shed new light on the 'proliferation networks' that have developed since the end of the cold war. The North Korean withdrawal from the NPT, the importance of which tends to be overshadowed by the Iraqi crisis, is a seminal event. The ripple effects are already felt in Japan. Meanwhile, Iran seems to have decided to put its nuclear programme into high gear.

The current evolution stems from developments both on the demand side and on the supply side. On the supply side, some states or entities have confirmed their readiness to engage in nuclear cooperation and trade without full guarantees that the recipient will not engage in military nuclear programmes. 'Cooperative proliferation' is hardly a new issue. But today it increasingly concerns states or entities that are opposed to Western policies. In the best case, commercial interests are the overriding motive. In the worst case, nuclear proliferation is seen as a positive.

On the demand side, it seems that US policies have become an encouragement to nuclear proliferation. One way to see the current preoccupations of Mr Mohammed El-Baradei, Director-General of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), who recently had to deal with three cases: Iran, Iraq and North Korea, is that President George W. Bush's 'axis of evil' concept is being vindicated by this year's evolutions. But there is another way to look at it. Even paranoids have enemies: US policies and rhetoric cannot but encourage North Korea to develop its nuclear programme.

The legitimate priority given to the war on terrorism has led the US to adopt a more benign attitude towards traditional nuclear non-proliferation instruments. The lifting of sanctions against Pakistan and India (the second U-turn in a decade in Washington's attitude towards the Pakistani nuclear

programme) give the impression to some that nuclear non-proliferation is not a general principle in US policy, but just a tool in support of other policy goals. And the discussions about nuclear assistance to Pakistan, when added to previous US statements about the NPT, raise doubts about the long-term commitment to its multilateral nuclear non-proliferation commitments.

There is also the following paradox. The US perceives the nuclear threat as the most important issue for its security and probably believes that it acts accordingly. But at the same time, nuclear weapons are increasingly seen as the trump card to resist US 'imperialism' and 'aggressiveness'. The US Nuclear Posture Review, the massive increase in the US defence budget and the US National Security Strategy tend to reinforce the belief that only nuclear weapons can guarantee security in a militarily unipolar world. After the first Gulf war, many in developing nations concluded that one should not fight the US without nuclear weapons. Guess what conclusions the same people will draw from the forthcoming Iraqi war?

Finally, US policies may lead to a resurgence of nuclear rhetoric as a way for states to express their opposition to Washington. It is extremely revealing that while Brazil had become a champion of nuclear disarmament in the last decade, the new team in Brasilia has chosen to refer again to the nuclear option. There is no immediate risk that a few ambiguous statements will translate into a policy. But they may contribute to a 'de-legitimisation of non-proliferation'.

The current scene is indeed an interesting one for would-be nuclear proliferators. What they see is the US dealing with North Korea very differently from the way it does with Iraq. Some will undoubtedly conclude that if one has to decide between cheating the regime and leaving the regime, it is better to altogether leave it. (Whether we like it or not, they will also use the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty 'precedent' as an excuse.)

There are two possibilities for the future. One scenario is that of limited opaque proliferation, with a handful of states coming closer to the threshold without admitting it. We will have several other 'Irans' or 'Japans'. Another scenario is the unravelling of the regime. It will happen if there is a 'second withdrawal'. In such a case, there is a good chance that in 2015 we will have no less than ten new nuclear or quasi-nuclear nations.

The NPT Review Conferences may not be the key to the future of the regime. It would be interesting to see a convincing demonstration that the full implementation of the 'Thirteen Steps' agreed upon in 2000 would have any significant impact on the decision of a country to go or not go nuclear.

The policies of the US, and the way the UN Security Council manages proliferation crises, will be much more important. In this regard, the

hesitation shown by some UN Security Council permanent members to treat the North Korean problem at the United Nations level is not reassuring.

The US, Europe, Russia and other responsible nuclear-capable nations still have many cards to play to influence the dynamics of proliferation. We need to continue working on both the supply side and the demand side. On the supply side, all nuclear-capable nations need to show restraint on the way they manage their nuclear assets. Others still need further enhancement of their export controls. One particular note on the Iraqi case: it will be most useful to set up a robust, cooperative, threat-reduction programme for that country after it is disarmed, including a small centre to finance nuclear scientists, akin to the International Centres for Science and Technology created in Russia and Ukraine after the cold war.

The role of positive security guarantees in the prevention of nuclear proliferation is well-known. The confirmation and reinforcement of existing security guarantees is a key to the maintenance of barriers against further nuclear proliferation. This will leave us with some very unpleasant choices. Do the US, the UK and France prefer to continue securing the existence of the unsavoury Saudi regime or would we rather have an isolated nuclear Saudi Arabia?

We need to find new incentives for states to agree to enhanced safeguards. The European Union has a key role to play here and should make full use of the 'conditionality' principle. Access to European assistance, markets and cooperation should be conditional on the full and verified compliance with existing non-proliferation norms. As far as dialogue with nuclear-threshold nations is concerned, the EU can also play a useful role provided that it fully coordinates its initiatives with those of the US, for rogue countries have mastered the art of exploiting our differences. Nevertheless, we also need to be realistic: lecturing the Indians about membership in the NPT is not the most certain way for the Europeans to play a useful role in managing South Asia's nuclear problems.

We need to continue to work on the full implementation of the Chemical and Biological Weapons Conventions. The chemical and biological threats have become, in the past decades, one of the primary rationales for maintaining nuclear deterrence policies. To those states who want more nuclear disarmament, we need to say 'help us first get rid of chemical and biological weapons'. When all else has failed, deterrence and protection will remain our best chances to manage nuclear proliferation.

'Regime change' is often good for non-proliferation but the case of Iraq is a specific one in legal terms and will not be a model. Also, we must have no illusions as democratisation is far from being tantamount to de-nuclearisation. Let us state the obvious: among known nuclear-capable

countries, six out of eight are democracies. Those who believe that a democratic Iran will be a non-nuclear Iran need a booster-shot of realism.

'Preventive strike' options are increasingly likely to fail given the efforts that countries make to disperse and conceal their nuclear infrastructures. States have drawn the lessons from the 1981 Osirak bombing and can benefit these days from the immense progress of drilling techniques. Also, the fundamental dilemma of preventive strike, recognised and epitomised by the 1962 Cuban missile crisis, remains intact: Will a party strike if there is a chance of retaliation or escalation?

As far as missile defences are concerned – those who still see them as 'destabilising' should now think of the following: Which would be preferable, missile defences in East Asia or nuclear weapons in Japan and Taiwan?

A final word on Pakistan, as it is fast becoming the number one nuclear problem in the world. A quasi-failing nuclear state, Pakistan is also unable or unwilling to become a responsible nuclear actor. Pakistani actors have shown their willingness to transfer nuclear expertise to several state and non-state entities. Pakistan is the missing link between a nuclear Asia and a nuclear Middle East. If things do not change, there will come a time when the de-nuclearisation of that country one way or the other will become an option to be seriously considered.

The Future of the
Nuclear Non-Proliferation Regime:

A Russian View

Vladimir A. Orlov

It is not a well-kept secret that the international nuclear non-proliferation regime is now in crisis. The optimism and expectations that followed from the indefinite extension, without a vote, of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) in 1995 and, later, from the Final Document adopted at the 2000 Review Conference have evaporated.

The 2003 NPT Prepcom will face enormous challenges. Among them are:

- contradictory approaches on decision-making on the use of force against Iraq;

- non-compliance of North Korea, which is leaving, if not yet left, the NPT;

- speculations about the intentions of some state-parties to the NPT, primarily, Iran;

- failure to make any progress towards the universality of the regime;

- failure to make any significant progress towards the implementation of 'the thirteen steps' of nuclear disarmament agreed by consensus at the 2000 Review Conference and, in certain cases, steps by nuclear-weapons states (NWS) exactly in the opposite direction; and

- new challenges, coming primarily from non-state actors (international terrorist organisations and organised crime communities) in the form of nuclear terrorism.

Iraq

Every day it is more likely that the military solution will be chosen in the crisis over Iraq without asking for the mandate by the UN Security Council. If – or better yet, when – it happens, the whole architecture of the non-proliferation regime will be shaken and damaged. Whether it will be able to survive, at least in its current form, is not certain.

The 2003 United Nations Monitoring, Verification and Inspection Commission (UNMOVIC) and International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) inspections in Iraq, so far, should be considered a success by the international community. Inspections, executed under the UN Security Council (UNSC)

Resolution 1441, have generally proved to be an efficient tool in investigating Iraqi weapons of mass destruction (WMD) capabilities.

As far as a nuclear-weapons component of inspections is concerned, it is obvious that Iraq does not have problems with meeting UNSC requirements, nor does it have any nuclear-weapon-oriented programme. Yet it is critically important to continue inspections and, in the future, provide permanent monitoring of Iraqi facilities, because this country has been in violation of the non-proliferation regime in the past. The inspections and monitoring, if not interrupted by military action, would provide a good example for such internationally approved actions in other regions of the world, if necessary.

If, however, the military option finally prevails, and if it is not authorised by the UNSC, it would clearly demonstrate (for those who still have doubts) that the real question about Iraq is not terrorism or non-proliferation concerns, but the geopolitical and economic interests of a single superpower. Non-Proliferation values and principles, in such a scenario, would be used only as a pretext. This would question the whole non-proliferation regime and may lead in the near future to a revision by some NPT non-nuclear parties of their nuclear policy. Iraq will be a checkpoint for the international community and for the UNSC, whether it is able to act efficiently – aggressively but peacefully – in tracking and preventing non-proliferation violations.

In the Iraqi crisis, Russia's position is very close to that of France and Germany. At the same time, it is also true that there are many common points in Russian and US views on Saddam Hussein's Iraq. Both seem to have very similar data (if not the same) on Saddam's WMD and systems of delivery: in both capitals, government experts simply would not buy rumours that Saddam, after his defeat in the Gulf war and the subsequent sanctions, succeeded in his unconventional military programmes and possesses such weapons. But, experts on both sides of the ocean continue, Saddam is the *enfant terrible* in a region equally important and sensitive for the US and for Russia, and yes, he continues to maintain an active interest in developing his WMD programmes, as time and circumstances permit. He is a cheater, and it is impossible to deal with him and reach compromise agreements.

In implementing President Vladimir Putin's directives and dealing with this issue, however, some concerns remain for the Russian government:

1. What sort of country will Iraq be after Saddam is removed? Who will replace him? Will Iraq disintegrate or not? It looks like Russian experts, as well as their US counterparts, are yet unable to respond to these crucial questions.

2. Do Russia's American counterparts recognise that there are major differences in Russia's approach to Iraq and to Iran? Russians definitely

do not want their message to be read in Washington that Russia has its whole foreign policy for sale and that, after a check for silence in the Iraq war is endorsed, both parties could exchange price and wish lists with regard to Iran.

In recent months it looks like the Americans failed to see the nuances in the Kremlin and mechanically added Russia to the list of full subscribers to US-led anti-Saddam plans. Such a simplification significantly offended Moscow foreign policy-makers. Moreover, worries about the political consequences of the military solution for Iraq, including erosion of the non-proliferation regime, have increased in Moscow and have made its position even less sympathetic to the US war strategy.

North Korea

North Korea is a classic case of non-compliance of the NPT regime. It has been a timely and correct decision by the IAEA to submit the case to the UN Security Council. Given North Korean capabilities in the nuclear weapon and missile areas, it has become a serious factor of instability in Northeast Asia and in the world. Nevertheless, a resolution of the North Korea crisis is quite possible. It should be implemented on a multilateral basis and simultaneously on two levels.

The first level is the UNSC, which should take the North Korea case seriously and examine it closely. The first stage should not involve sanctions against Pyongyang but should indicate that, at some further stage, sanctions are considered as an option.

The second level should be a six-party mechanism (both Koreas, US, China, Japan and Russia) that should result in a document (probably non-legally binding, using examples of the Agreed Framework or the 1994 Trilateral Statement on Ukraine) having two key elements: 1) non-withdrawal of North Korea from the NPT and its readiness to open the whole territory for unconditional IAEA inspections; and 2) providing US security assurances to North Korea.

These two elements should go in a package. Then, a bigger package can be negotiated, including economic and energy assistance to North Korea by the above-mentioned states as well as by the EU and, possibly, some other issues, such as missile non-proliferation. The non-nuclear-weapon status of North Korea and security assurances to that country can be, simultaneously or later, strengthened by the revival of the agreement between the two Koreas of a non-nuclear-weapon status of the Korean Peninsula, and assurances provided by nuclear weapon states (NWS).

Russia is well-positioned to play a positive and active role in bringing resolution of the crisis, if joined in its efforts by the US, China and Japan, at a minimum. If such an agreement is achieved, Russia is also well-positioned to play its role in providing North Korea with different energy sources. One of the solutions may be the construction of a nuclear power plant in the Russian Maritime region, close to the Russian-North Korean border, and the export of Russian nuclear energy to North Korea under a multilaterally developed mechanism.

The next few months will be decisive in dealing with North Korea and its nuclear-weapon programme (regardless of how much this programme is of an imitative character, there is little doubt that such a programme exists). This situation is a field of opportunities for talented diplomats. If, however, the North Korean crisis is mismanaged, it may lead to a disaster – a chain reaction. After North Korea develops at least a couple of primitive nuclear bombs, the whole balance of power in the region will be destroyed and Japan will be the first to start rethinking about its own nuclear-weapons option. This may open a door to a real catastrophe for the entire non-proliferation regime.

Iran

Iran is considered by Russian foreign policy strategists as an important political partner in the region, with whom dialogue is sometimes very difficult but may finally bring concrete results. Iran is considered as a stabilising, rather than a destabilising player. At the same time, many in the Russian government are concerned about Iran's potential clandestine nuclear weapons programme, without even mentioning its missile programmes. A general assessment in Russia of the level of Iran's nuclear weapons programme, however, contains the following observations:

1. The programme is at a very initial stage.

2. It lacks financial and intellectual resources.

3. It will not become successful without massive outside support, which is unlikely.

4. There has not been a political decision made in Tehran on 'joining the nuclear club', and it is not clear whether it will ever be taken.

5. Even if such a decision is taken, with its own resources Iran will need at least eight years before its first nuclear test.

The policy implications of this assessment are as follows:

1. There is no reason why Russia should stop completion of the Bushehr nuclear power plant, taking into account that this is a light-water reactor and that spent fuel will be taken back to Russia.

2. There are some possibilities for expanding peaceful nuclear cooperation with Iran, though each of them should be carefully examined before any decision is taken and no future joint project should go beyond construction of light-water reactors.

3. The situation in Iran and its intentions should be carefully monitored, and in this context, an active Russian presence in Iran should be considered as an important facilitating factor.

4. It is highly desirable for Iran to join the IAEA Additional Protocol and, in any case, IAEA involvement in monitoring Iranian nuclear activities should be a priority.

5. If, however, this does not happen and if there are signs of progress in such a programme, Russian-Iranian cooperation in the nuclear field should be frozen.

After my trip to Iran in December 2002, my own assessment is that there are influential forces in Iran that are interested in 'playing by the international rules' and making every effort possible to prevent a 'nuclear-weapons' scenario from materialising in Iran. They see Iran as a responsible member of the NPT and the IAEA. At the same time, these same forces strongly advocate dynamic technological development of Iran (in parallel with democratisation of the society and more openness towards the West), including development of the full nuclear cycle. It is important to take into consideration that, under any scenario of Iranian domestic politics, Iran plans to be an active and strong player in nuclear issues in the 21st century.

In this situation, it is imperative that the IAEA continues its efforts with scheduled inspections in Iran. It may also be a productive idea to use the Nuclear Supplies Group (NSG) in providing clear rules for nuclear imports to Iran by all NSG members, not only Russia. It is critical that there is an agreement in place between Russia and Iran on returning the spent nuclear fuel back to Russia. And it is highly desirable, though not politically easy, to bring Iran to the Additional Protocol requirements.

Universality

American, Russian and British plans, immediately after the 1995 NPT Extension Conference, to take specific steps to bring India, Pakistan and Israel to the nuclear non-proliferation regime, at least in a long-term future, have never been activated. To the contrary, with the Indian and Pakistani

1998 nuclear tests, the possibility of taking steps towards bringing these two nations to the international regime has become close to zero. The euphoria of the 1995 indefinite extension of the NPT has become unproductive.

The failure to take any practical steps towards bringing Israel to the NPT is potentially the mostly dangerous 'time bomb'. The NPT's indefinite extension without a vote was possible thanks to a 'big package', which included a resolution on the Middle East aimed at bringing Israel, one day, to the regime.

If the Iraqi crisis is resolved with the use of force and if the international community fails to prevent North Korea's departure from the NPT, others, particularly from the Islamic world, will likely examine, among other options, withdrawal from the NPT before or at the 2005 NPT Review Conference using as an explanation the failure to implement the Middle East resolution from the 'big package' of 1995.

State depositories of the NPT, as well as others interested in survival of the NPT regime, such as New Agenda Coalition states (NAC) should start making efforts to resolve the 'universality' problem. Realistically speaking, however, in the current political climate practical ways to move forward are not clear.

Nuclear disarmament

The 2000 NPT Conference decision on the 'thirteen steps' on nuclear disarmament could have become practical working steps for NWS. Nevertheless, the opposite has happened. To name just a couple of examples: the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty has not entered into force, and, primarily with the US position in mind, the Treaty looks more dead than alive; even a moratorium on nuclear tests has been questioned. The US has increased the role of nuclear weapons in its policy and the Conference on Disarmament is now more dormant than ever before in its history. Further sub-strategic nuclear weapons have not been yet included on the US-Russian arms control agenda.

Is this the end of the multilateral nuclear disarmament process and the beginning of an era of unilateral steps? This is unlikely to happen, but it is definitely a profound crisis of multilateral diplomacy.

Russia is currently in an awkward position, balancing between its view of multilateral disarmament diplomacy as an important tool in a changing world and its frustration with the inefficiency of existing multilateral instruments. There has been a growing temptation in the Kremlin to make deals with Americans, simply ignoring multilateral fora. But it would be also accurate to mention another trend, competing with the US-centric one, towards re-

evaluating the role of multilateral arms control mechanisms and finding ways to revive in them.

Nuclear terrorism

For Russia, nuclear terrorism is not a Hollywood-style scenario. According to the January 2003 statement by General Igor Valynkin, who is in charge of nuclear weapons security and head of the 12th Main Directorate of the Defence Ministry, "the information we have obtained indicates that international terrorists have been looking for opportunities to get unauthorised access to [Russian] nuclear facilities and to provoke acts of terrorism and sabotage using nuclear devices".

Nuclear terrorism is considered as a major threat to Russia's national security. It could take a number of forms: unauthorised access to nuclear devices (weapons); sabotage of nuclear installations, primarily, nuclear power plants; unauthorised access to weapons-grade fissile materials; or the use or threat to use radioactive sources. In each case, the consequences (casualties among the population and psychological effects) would be disastrous. Russian government experts have implemented a detailed analysis of possibilities and consequences of acts of 'mega-terrorism' and came to the conclusion that nuclear terrorism, at least in one of its faces, is a real and present danger.

In our assessment, the most threatening trend is cooperation (or coordination) between various non-state actors, particularly between international terrorist organisations and organised crime communities, which is a new phenomenon. With a tremendous increase in their financial power in recent years, non-state actors have become more aggressive in their attempts to gain access to (or to develop by themselves) WMD including a 'dirty bomb' scenario. To achieve the most impressive psychological effect, mega-terrorists would most likely try to combine 'traditional' terrorism with use of some WMD components (like chemical weapons) with a cyber terrorist act, aimed at paralysing computer networks of ordinary users or financial markets. The extent to which non-state actors enjoy support, directly or indirectly, from some 'states of concern' is not clear. There are indications that several links existed in the past and a possibility that such links have not disappeared. They should not be ignored, but further investigated.

In 1995, after the NPT Extension Conference, a colleague made a juicy statement at a seminar that "the surgery went well, the patient is alive, but he is in the emergency room". In 2003, the patient is again in the emergency room (if of course he has ever left it). It is unlikely that he will need further surgery. What he really needs is everyday treatment based on already prescribed medicines.

TURKEY'S STRATEGIC FUTURE

WITH CONTRIBUTIONS BY

NATHALIE TOCCI
HENRI J. BARKEY
NATALIA OULTCHENKO
HÜSEYIN BAGCI AND SABAN KARDAS

INTRODUCTION BY

FRANÇOIS HEISBOURG

Introduction

François Heisbourg

The European Security Forum's meeting about Turkey's strategic future took place shortly after the end of combat operations in Iraq, against the backdrop of redefined US-Turkish relations. To set the stage, we had four papers: "Anchoring Turkey in Europe", by Nathalie Tocci (Research Fellow at CEPS); "A US View", by Henri J. Barkey (Head of the Dept. of International Relations, Lehigh University); "A Russian View" by Natalia Oultchenkov (Head of the Turkey Desk, Institute of Oriental Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences); and "Post-11 September Impact: The Strategic Importance of Turkey Revisited", by Hüseyin Bagci and Saban Kardas (both are Professors at the Middle East Technical University, Ankara).

In her oral presentation, Ms Tocci recalled that it was 'old Europe' that had been the most sceptical towards Turkey's membership in the EU. Conversely, the Turkish Parliament's vote on 1 March 2003 (rejecting the agreement to provide transit rights to US ground forces through Turkey to Iraq) was widely seen in 'old Europe' as a decision whereby Turkey asserted its democratic credentials. In this new context, Turkey's continued support for internal reform and resolution of the Cyprus issue could be central to its accession prospects to the EU (facilitated by the fact that the US is no longer pressing Turkey's case). Furthermore, the EU could probably pick up in economic terms where US support is now diminishing.

When presenting his paper, Professor Barkey underscored that the events of March 2003 had exploded the myth of Turkey's strategic importance to the US, although America would continue to value strategic stability in Turkey, given the US fear of radical change there. He underlined the deep impact of the March events on the military-to-military relationship between the two countries, which could reduce the military component in overall US-Turkish relations and, as a consequence, weaken the military role of Turkey itself. Like Ms Tocci, he highlighted the importance of Cyprus in shaping Turkey's future relationship with the EU.

Ms Oultchenko reminded participants that Turkey's European orientation is not a predetermined result of its foreign policy. Further, she pointed out that democratisation could have the consequence of eliminating the traditional processes that Turkey has used to prevent radical Islam from moving into policy. As a result, there is a real possibility of "turning an old and well-known ally into a new antagonist". She noted, however, that the ruling Justice and Development Party (AKP) had been pragmatic rather than

populist in its handling of the US troop transit issue, as it had genuinely tried to obtain parliamentary approval for the agreement to support US troops.

Professor Bagci drew three lessons from the Iraqi crisis:

- Turkey is a functioning democracy;
- the client-patron relationship between Turkey and the US has disappeared; and
- the military no longer controls politics.

Turkey is moving towards Europe and the US will have to accept it. A new optimism has emerged in Turkey about joining the EU, fuelled by Commissioner for EU Enlargement Günter Verheugen's recent remarks about dates for accession (2011–12). Turkey's strategic importance should continue to be considerable, particularly as issues relating to Syria and Iran come to a head.

In the initial round of discussions, several points were made:

- Turkey's chances of joining the EU have been substantially enhanced as indicated by one European participant, because we now have proof that Turkey is a living democracy. This point drew a response from an American participant that the decision taken by parliament on 1 March 2003 was not democratic simply by virtue of having been directed against the US, but because it allowed for Turkey's disengagement from the military: "The real losers are not Turkey or the US, but the Turkish military". On this issue, a Turkish participant noted that the army's distancing from the US had begun before the crisis in Iraq, with their refusal to seek US funding for Turkey's involvement in the Kabul International Security Assistance Force (ISAF). The same participant noted that continued army resistance to reform in Turkey had been largely driven by the suspicion that the EU isn't really going to let Turkey in, ever. Hence, statements such as those made recently by Mr Verheugen as well as those made by the President of the European Commission, Romano Prodi, were most helpful.

- The ability of the EU to replace anything as large as the US economic contribution (the 'strategic rent') to Turkey was seriously questioned. Historically, EU transfers to an accession state did not readily exceed 1% of GDP. Yet the same European participant also suggested that it is healthier for Turkey not to receive the sort of massive windfall proposed in the rejected US/Turkish agreement, which distorts macroeconomic policy. Turkey would be better off exercising a virtuous fiscal policy. At this point, a Turkish participant added that assets are not the issue – $60 billion of Turkey's assets are based abroad; Turkey needs good government more than new money. Nevertheless, another participant

mentioned Turkey's massive foreign debt, just in case anyone got carried away with an over-optimistic a view of its economic prospects.

- Subsequent to Professor Bagci's expression of scepticism as to the desirability of Turkey serving as a role model for others, another Turkish participant agreed that this was probably appropriate *vis-à-vis* the Arab world. Things could be different, however, in Central Asia and even more so in the case of Europe, where as a member of the EU, Turkey would have great integrative virtues, leading to a more diverse, 'non-Christian' EU.

- The Cyprus issue drew some debate, with a Turkish participant suggesting that this should be seen as a process and not as a window of opportunity that would slam shut in May 2004. This idea drew the retort from a European that the EU would lose all leverage *vis-à-vis* Cyprus once it was a full member in late 2004; therefore, Northern Cyprus would do well to work hard on the UN Annan plan.

- US policy in Turkey drew questions and discussion. Whereas Turkey used to know what the US policy was during the years of former President Bill Clinton (the 'bear hug' policy of working with Turkey on all aspects plus constant pressure on the EU for Turkey's membership), it is less clear today, all the more so since some of the American Enterprise Institute (AEI) 'neo-cons' don't really want Turkey in the EU. This discourse drew the remark that the administration under President George W. Bush is divided into two camps, but not along the lines of the 'neo-cons' versus 'the others': Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz tends to believe in democracy in Turkey and in Turkey's membership in the EU, whereas this view has little traction in the White House (and even less with Richard Perle, Chairman of the Defense Policy Board).

In the final round of discussions, one participant suggested that the general flow of the meeting had been too optimistic, given that relations over Northern Cyprus remain tricky and tensions in Northern Iraq could become ugly, not to mention the risks for Turkey attendant to a crisis involving weapons of mass destruction in Iran! Another participant wondered about Turkey's role in a 'brave new Middle East order' subsequent to the Iraq war and what would be the implications of a 'clean-up' in the Caucasus, where a 'post-Aliev' Azerbaijan goes to war to liberate Nagorno-Karabakh?

On the subject of post-war Northern Iraq, the panellists tended to concur that the risks were still there: provocations can occur and Turkey continues to see 'autonomy' as a bad word, given the Ottoman-era experience of autonomy as a first step to independence. But none discounted the possibility of evolution, nor the idea that 'surprises can happen'.

Regarding Azerbaijan, no objection was raised when one of the panellists indicated that the Azeris wouldn't start a new war. As far as Iran is concerned, problems could no doubt arise for Turkey, but for the moment, Iran is not hostile towards Turkey joining the EU.

Northern Cyprus truly remains a problem: all has not been well since the army and the 'deep state' used their veto to block the UN Annan plan. Further, the deep state views the government of Prime Minister Recep Erdogan as an abomination. Notwithstanding these sobering notes, the overall feel of the meeting was neatly captured by one of the individuals who contributed a paper: "Anything can happen, but so far, so good!".

Turkey's Strategic Future:
Anchoring Turkey to Europe
The Foreign Policy Challenges ahead

Nathalie Tocci

Since the foundation of the Kemalist Republic, Turkey has sought to associate itself with the West, i.e. with Europe and the US. Although the end of the cold war strengthened Turkey's ties with the Caucasus and Central Asia, the dominant position in Ankara never advocated a turnaround in Turkey's foreign policy orientation. On the contrary, Turkey presented its strategic importance to the West precisely in view of its bridging role to the Middle East, the Caucasus and Central Asia.

Turkey's European orientation has remained a cornerstone of its foreign policy. Since 1987, this has taken the form of aspiring to become a full member of the EC/EU. After December 1999, its prospects of full membership were accepted by the European Council, although these remain in the distant and uncertain future. Scratching beneath the surface, however, there is not yet a consensus either in Turkey or in the EU concerning the desirability of a fully European Turkey and the necessary transformation that this would entail. As such, while Turkey's European orientation is likely to persist, its depth and the ensuing levels of integration in the EU remain unclear. Developments in Turkey, in Europe and the wider international system will determine the evolution of EU-Turkish relations. At this particular juncture, developments in Cyprus and Iraq are critically affecting the relationship.

As noted by several Turkish analysts, 'there are many Ankaras'. The multifaceted nature of the Turkish foreign policy establishment became particularly evident in the aftermath of the December 1999 Helsinki European Council. Turkey's candidacy meant that it was no longer sufficient to pay lip service to the goal of membership. If Ankara was serious in its aspirations to join the European Union, it had to demonstrate that it was equally committed to the Copenhagen criteria. As European demands for reform rose, the concerns and resistance against change in Ankara emerged more clearly.

Effective opposition to EU membership, or rather to the reform necessary to attain it, existed in most groups within the Turkish political system. Those resisting change included circles in the nationalist right and in the nationalist left, as well as in both the civilian and the military establishments. Some right-wing nationalists preferred to establish closer links to Turkic Eurasia

than to see Turkey's full integration with Western Europe. Traditional Kemalists objected to the erosion of sovereignty within the EU. Others opposed the comprehensive internal reforms demanded by Brussels and were more inclined to pursue Turkey's Western orientation through closer ties with the US.

Often spurred by the US, conservative elements within the Turkish establishment argued that Turkey should be admitted to the Union on laxer conditions, given its strategic importance. For example, the Nationalist Action Party (MHP) leader Devlet Bahceli argued that "we need to have a just and honourable relationship with the EU. We strongly oppose the notions that we should fulfil every demand of the EU to become a member or that we have to enter the EU at any cost."[1] Turkish national pride was used as a major weapon, as Turkish Eurosceptics accused pro-Europeans of displaying a "lack of confidence in the nation, the Republic, the institutions…everything called Turkish".[2] Turkey's alternatives to Europe were also cited. On 6 March 2002, National Security Council (MGK) Secretary General, General Tuncer Kilinç stated that given EU demands, Turkey should start looking for alternative allies such as Russia and Iran.

The landslide victory of the Justice and Development Party (AKP) at the November elections tilted the balance within the party political system in favour of the pro-European reformists. In AKP's rhetoric, commitment to EU membership, as well as the reform path necessary to attain it, is crucial. The AKP refuses to define itself as a religious party but rather calls for greater religious freedoms. In order to carry a consistent political message, it advocates personal freedoms in other spheres as well, including cultural and linguistic freedoms. Its support for EU membership is not only viewed as an end to be attained through painful reforms, in the AKP's rhetoric, the EU anchor is portrayed also a means to attain the objectives of reform, which are as important as membership itself. But while the balance within the party political spectrum tilted in favour of the reformists (the only opposition party, Deniz Baykal's Republican Peoples' Party 'CHP' also declares its strong support of reforms and EU membership), this is not necessarily the case within the wider establishment, which includes the civilian administration, the presidency, the intelligence community and the influential military.

Pro-European reformers in Turkey have been weakened internally by the lack of credibility of EU policies towards Turkey. EU actors, particularly those who are of a conservative/Christian-Democratic leaning, have

---

[1] Devlet Bahceli is quoted in "Bahceli Toughens on EU and Its Domestic Supporters", *Turkish Daily News*, 3 April 2002.

[2] See Gunduz Aktan, "New Consensus", *Turkish Daily News,* 3 April 2002.

frequently indicated their reluctance to accept Turkey as a full member, irrespective of its compliance with the Copenhagen criteria. Religion, geography, demography, economic development as well as the legitimate concerns over democracy and human rights have been cited as the impeding factors to Turkey's EU membership. One of the most recent expressions of European exclusionism were the comments by Convention Chairman Valery Giscard d'Estaing just prior to the 2002 Copenhagen European Council, when he stated that Turkey has a "different culture, a different approach, a different way of life…Its capital is not in Europe, 95% of its population live outside Europe, it is not a European country…In my opinion it would be the end of the EU."[3]

In several instances in the recent history of EU-Turkish relations, 'anti-Turks' in Europe and 'anti-Europeans' in Turkey reinforced each other in a vicious circle of antagonism and lack of reform in Turkey, together with European distancing from Turkey. On the one hand, the more sceptical the member states were about Turkey's future in Europe (and thus the less forthcoming were EU policies towards Turkey), the more credible the Turkish nationalists and conservatives appeared (who claimed that Turkey would never be admitted to the EU and thus it should be cautious in pursuing domestic reforms and foreign policy changes). In other words, as Turkey's mistrust of Europe grew, its own process of Europeanisation slowed. On the other hand, as and when hardliners in Ankara gained prominence in the determination of domestic and foreign policy, EU actors became less forthcoming in their decisions concerning Turkey.

Until December 2002, an important example of Turkish mistrust of European countries was the dispute over Turkey's participation in European security and defence policy (ESDP). Turkey's veto threat over the ESDP's use of NATO assets and capabilities was not simply driven by what the civilian-military establishment deemed as broken European promises. These simply served to create the legal context through which Turkey articulated its claims. What lay behind these claims was Turkey's fundamental mistrust of the EU and its strong preference for NATO, in which it is a full member. Turkey did not trust an independent European involvement in crisis areas, many of which are likely to be around Turkey. Turkey feared a European defence involvement in Cyprus in particular. Indeed, the final decision taken in December 2002 in Copenhagen excluded Cyprus (and Malta) as possible locations of ESDP operations, as these countries were not participating in NATO's Partnership for Peace.

---

[3] "Giscard Remarks Cause Uproar in Ankara, Brussels", *Turkish Daily News,* 11 November 2002.

On other occasions the vicious circle was broken, opening the way to virtuous interactions. The event of 3 August 2002, in which the Turkish parliament (despite acute domestic political turmoil) succeeded in passing fundamental constitutional reforms, added credibility to Turkey's requests for a date to launch accession negotiations. Without these reforms, the European Council's decisions in Copenhagen in December 2002 would have been far less forthcoming.

In recent months, EU-Turkish relations have been critically affected by both the Iraqi crisis and the Cyprus impasse. In March 2003, the Turkish parliament rejected the government's proposed motion to allow 62,000 American troops to be deployed in Turkey for a second-front attack against Iraq. After weeks of uncertainty, the American troops were re-routed to Kuwait. The rejection led to a temporary setback in US-Turkish relations, as well as new tensions on the EU-Turkey agenda. Many criticised the government for its inexperience in handling the situation. The government's indecisiveness and its failure to invest sufficient effort to ensure an approval of the motion could have caused severe political and economic losses.

By rejecting the motion, Turkey lost the $6 billion war compensation grant and the $24 billion package of cheap long-term loans offered by the US, negotiated by Turkish policy-makers who had recalled the considerable economic costs of the 1991 Gulf war. The incident plunged US-Turkish relations to their lowest ebb since the 1974 arms embargo on Turkey. In the aftermath of the rejection of the motion, tensions rose as the US administration strongly warned the Turkish establishment not to intervene in Northern Iraq independently of American command. EU member states also cautioned Turkey not to intervene in Northern Iraq. Several analysts warned that the setback in US-Turkish relations within a wider context of an expanding transatlantic rift could harm Turkey's EU bid, by the reduction of American support for Turkey's accession process.

Ensuing events, however, gave rise to greater optimism. In the context of the Iraqi crisis, the Turkish government strengthened its relations with the Arab world and Iran, without straining its relations with Israel or hinting at a reversal in its Western orientation. Indeed, the AKP government had mishandled the passing of the motion. But the new and inexperienced government did so under extremely complex circumstances, owing to the widespread public opposition to the war, the ambivalence of the military and the uncertainty concerning whether a second UNSC resolution mandating war would have been passed. Since the start of the war, Turkey has to date refrained from sending additional troops to Northern Iraq, which could trigger clashes with Iraqi Kurdish forces. Turkey's conduct from the beginning of the war has allowed an improvement in its relations with the US. More importantly it added a positive impetus to EU-Turkish relations, as

evidenced by the recent visit of French Foreign Minister Dominique de Villepin to Ankara. Despite mistakes, the independent and democratic decision taken by the Turkish government concerning the war, while at the same time showing restraint in Northern Iraq, sent positive signals to Western European countries, especially those that have been historically sceptical of Turkey's EU membership and were also opposed to the war in Iraq.

Yet perhaps an even more fundamental challenge in EU-Turkish relations concerns Cyprus, particularly in view of the forthcoming accession of the island. Because of the obstacles posed in Turkey's European path by the accession of a divided island, there has been an essential overlap between the hardliners on the Cyprus conflict and the most nationalist and Eurosceptic forces in Turkey. To the most conservative forces within the Turkish establishment, the EU accession process is viewed as a threat to Turkey's policy on Cyprus. Furthermore, an intransigent position on Cyprus added another obstacle in Turkey's EU path and thus dampened the momentum in favour of what some viewed as threatening domestic reforms.

At the same time, the lack of a credible EU policy towards Turkey strengthened the arguments of nationalist and Eurosceptic forces in Ankara and Lefkoşa, which argued against an early settlement within the EU. Moderates and reformists in Turkey accepted that because of Turkey's own shortcomings, EU membership would occur for Cyprus prior to Turkey. Nevertheless they could not accept that owing to allegedly unchangeable features of the Turkish state and society, Cyprus should mark the borders of the united Europe, keeping Cyprus and Turkey on opposite sides of the European divide. As long as Turkey's fundamental scepticism of European intentions persisted, a settlement in Cyprus would be viewed by Ankara as 'losing Cyprus' rather than sealing a win-win agreement.

In anticipation of the Copenhagen Council meeting, the new AKP government displayed a fundamental shift from earlier administrations concerning Cyprus. It declared openly that it did not regard a continuation of the status quo as a solution and it appeared willing to recognise the link between EU-Turkish relations and a Cyprus settlement. On the eve of the Copenhagen meeting, the government effectively argued that if the European Council gave Turkey an early and firm date to begin accession negotiations, the government would support a Cyprus settlement on the basis of the comprehensive UN Annan plan.

Judging by events, the Copenhagen offer was insufficient to induce Turkey and the Turkish Cypriots to sign an agreement on 13 December 2002 or thereafter. This ultimate failure was caused not only by the miscalculated Turkish bargaining tactics, but was fundamentally linked to Turkey's

mistrust of Europe. Whether a deal would have been reached if Turkey had received an earlier and firmer 'date' or if the EU-15 had formulated a more resolute and coherent policy towards Turkey before the European Council will remain unknown. But what was clear was that the Turkish government considered these conditions as the minimum assurance to hedge against a prevailing mistrust of the EU. Pressure alone would be insufficient to clinch an agreement.

After the Copenhagen Council meeting, trends continued to oscillate as the by-products of an ongoing battle between elements pushing for and pushing against a settlement. Different positions and logics were continuously aired. Those sceptical of Turkey's future in Europe persisted in their effective opposition to Cyprus's EU membership, and consequently, in their opposition to the UN Annan plan. Those in favour of Turkey's EU membership, but unsatisfied with the Copenhagen decision, proposed a postponement of a settlement until Turkey's EU prospects became more clear. Other pro-Europeans pushed instead for an early settlement based on the UN Annan plan, as they appreciated the difficulty of reaching an agreement following Cyprus's EU membership and understood that in future the international burden would be placed predominantly on Turkey's shoulders. The most evident manifestation of this flux of ideas was the effective rift between the AKP government and the Turkish Cypriot leadership.

With the failure of The Hague negotiations, for which the Turkish Cypriots were primarily blamed, the conservatives in Turkey and Northern Cyprus appeared to win the day. Although The Hague meeting temporarily sealed the fate of the UN Annan plan, it did not entail the end of the debate in Turkey. The Cyprus challenge remains on the table and will have to be tackled if Turkey is to progress along its path to the European Union. There are strong reasons for Turkey to pursue a settlement prior to the effective accession of Cyprus in May 2004. The scope to do so exists, as evidenced by the recent opening of the border point and the huge flux of people crossing the frontier. Politically, the opportunity for change could emerge with the December 2003 parliamentary elections in Northern Cyprus. The extent to which this opportunity will be seized will depend on the extent to which, by the end of the year, the Turkish establishment will have reached a consensus concerning an early settlement on the island – a consensus that had not been achieved in March 2003.

The battle to reach this consensus goes far deeper than Cyprus and deals with the very nature of the Turkish nation-state and its strategic future. In the coming months and years, decisions taken in both Brussels and Ankara are set to determine the extent to which Turkey's historic European orientation will translate into slow but steady progress towards full EU membership.

Turkey's Strategic Future:
An American View

Henri J. Barkey

This paper looks at the change effected by the Iraq war upon Washington's perceptions of Turkey's strategic future. The first section analyses the pre-war stake held by Washington in Ankara. The failure to open up a second front in the north against Saddam Hussein's regime has surprised, if not shocked, US decision-makers. As a result, US-Turkish relations are likely to experience a period of change and re-evaluation. This paper shows that this is more likely to occur through the change in the Iraqi regime than through a parliamentary vote. In recent years, Turkey was a pivotal state in Washington's containment strategy of Iraq. The US air operations over Northern Iraq that protected the Kurds and constrained the Baghdad regime also created an uncomfortable dependence on Ankara. The change will enable the US to approach Turkey with a more realistic, and in the long term, tension-free manner.

A pre-war view: Washington's stake in Turkey[1]

US interests and objectives in Turkey have steadily expanded since the end of the cold war. The cold war's straightjacket has given way to many new considerations. The primary US foreign policy vision after the cold war was based on preventing regional disputes from threatening its own and its allies' interests and on expanding market reforms, democratic principles and practices. Without a serious Russian threat to European security, US attention shifted to mid-level powers that have had ambitions to acquire non-conventional weaponry and the means to deliver it, such as Iran and Iraq. This policy vision lacked the simplicity of containment, but it would impact Turkey significantly. Turkey's proximity to many of the regions in flux or conflict, together with Ankara's long-standing adherence to the NATO alliance, helped Washington to re-interpret this country's geo-strategic importance. The war in Iraq, however, is likely to alter these calculations further.

Simply put, on the eve of the Iraq war, Turkey's strategic importance for the US could be summarised along the following four dimensions.

---

[1] This section draws on Henri J. Barkey (2003), "The Endless Pursuit: Improving US-Turkish Relations", in Morton Abramowitz (ed.), *The United States and Turkey: Allies in Need,* New York: Century Foundation.

- First of all, it served as a potential platform for the projection of US power. Saddam Hussein's resilience in the aftermath of the 1991 Gulf war had made Ankara essential to sustain the UN sanctions regime and more importantly, Washington's containment policy. From the Incirlik base in Turkey, American and British airplanes (as part of Operation Northern Watch) routinely patrolled the no-fly zone over Northern Iraq in an effort to keep Saddam Hussein's forces away from Kurdish-controlled parts of Iraq. It is difficult to see how the US could have sustained its policy of sanctions, regime isolation and the protection of the Kurdish population without Turkey's cooperation.

- Second, Turkey was a bulwark standing in the way of revisionist regimes such as Iran's, intent on changing the regional landscape. Turkey's strong links to the US, NATO and the West were in direct opposition to some of the Iranian regime's regional preferences (if not designs). Hence, even in the event of cordial relations with Ankara, no Iranian government can ignore Turkey's reaction in its regional calculations. The improving relations between Turkey and Israel throughout the 1990s has changed the strategic setting in the Middle East – although much exaggerated by Arab countries – and served to change the perception of Ankara in Washington as a more balanced regional player.

- Third, what also made Turkey different and valuable is that it is a NATO ally, which takes security seriously; its need for military modernisation notwithstanding, Ankara has a large number of troops under arms that are deployable and is committed to maintaining its spending on defence. Even if the economic crisis has put a dent in its modernisation plans, Ankara intends to continue along this path as the April 2003 decision on purchasing AWACS aircraft demonstrates.

- Finally, Washington's perception of Turkey represented an alternative and successful path for many countries in the Middle East and Central Asia. It is a model to be emulated as NATO's only Muslim member and candidate EU member. In addition to its historical ties to the West, Turkey has a vibrant, albeit flawed, democratic political system and in the 1980s embraced economic liberalisation – well ahead of Latin America; save for Israel, it is the only one to do so in the Middle East.

Ankara's actual contribution to Washington's challenges went well beyond the Middle East. Turks collaborated with the allies in both Bosnia and Kosovo. Turkey steadfastly improved relations with Bulgaria and Romania, took the lead in organising Black Sea regional institutions and thus proved to be a source of stability in the Balkans. Successive US administrations in the early 1990s encouraged Turkey's efforts to reach out to the Turkic Central Asian countries and the Caucasus, to provide them with technical and

economic know-how (not to mention political leadership), all designed to counter the growing Iranian and Russian influence in the region. At Washington's request, Turkish forces also took part in the ill-fated Somalia operation. Similarly, in April 2002, Washington prevailed upon Ankara to take over the leadership of the Afghan peacekeeping force in Kabul, the ISAF.

It was Prime Minister and later President Turgut Özal who, after a decade of turbulence, solidified Turkey's image in Washington. He made himself a valued interlocutor during the Iran-Iraq war, and decisively manoeuvred his country in support of US and allied action against Iraq in 1990. Although often drawing attention to his Muslim identity and Turkey's unique role in NATO, Özal nevertheless succeeded in convincing Washington of his deep commitment to the West and its values. Despite his traditional upbringing and religious roots, Özal was by far the most pro-American leader Turkey has ever had. He shared none of the suspicions of the US held by his left- and right-wing contemporaries. Having engineered the most far-reaching restructuring of the Turkish economy, he strongly believed in Turkey's ability to become an economic powerhouse of its own, allied with the US. With Mr Özal, Washington could envisage in Turkey a more democratic, stable and prosperous ally and, as a result, a better commercial partner.

Turkey's growing strategic value made its internal stability an even more important concern for US policy-makers. Instability in Turkey can potentially lead to the ascendancy of anti-Western forces, be they Islamic or nationalist in orientation, which could then lead to the denial of access to critical military facilities and change the whole environment in the Middle East. The emergence of the twin challenges to the regime in the last two decades of the 20th century in the form Kurdish and Islamic political activism has deeply undermined Turkey's self-confidence. Not only has the state gone out of its way to prosecute citizens for the most minor infractions, the civil war against the insurgency led by the Kurdistan Workers' Party (PKK) and the rise of the Islamic movement have resulted in greater military interference in Turkish domestic political matters. The combination of domestic instability and the military's resurgence has worried Washington decision-makers, in part because the tactics used by the state could end up making matters worse. In addition, the mismanagement of the Turkish economy by successive governments has resulted in the worst economic crisis of the post-World War II period, provoking a US-initiated $31.5 billion IMF rescue package.

It is not surprising, therefore, that Turkey's EU aspirations have corresponded well with what the US wanted to see develop in Turkey. What the EU process provided Turkey was a path to greater affluence and most importantly, to greater democratisation. In part, it was because of Turkey's

inability to implement reforms on its own that made the European Union accession process such an attractive option. Indeed, Washington has genuinely seen Turkey as an integral part of the European security architecture and the European continent. In addition, EU candidacy also offered the prospect of resolving some of the thorniest problems, such as the Cyprian and the Aegean ones. Hence, the EU membership process, even if it is to be realised a decade or more down the road, is more than just a device to improve domestic political conditions. In reality, as far as Washington could see, Turkey as a member of the EU would be fully integrated into the West as a democratic and prosperous country, very much emulating Greece's path.

After Iraq: The future of US-Turkish relations

On 1 March 2003, the Turkish Parliament narrowly defeated a government motion that would have allowed up to 62,000 American soldiers to be based on Turkish soil for combat operations against Iraq. The loss of the northern front shocked Washington. No one in Washington had expected that Turkey would refuse the US request, because it was understood that Turkey would not leave its primary ally in the cold. This expectation was driven home even more by recent US assistance to Ankara at critical junctures, ranging from help against the PKK insurgency and the capture of its leader in Kenya (effectively putting an end to it), to the 2001 IMF rescue package. The new pro-Islamic Justice and Development Party (AKP) government of Turkey mishandled the parliamentary vote. It had reluctantly concluded that its commitments to the US would take precedence over the overwhelming public opposition.

In reality, the negotiations over basing the troops in Turkey lasted much too long, which in turn allowed for opposition to build up. While the focus appeared to be on the economic compensation package that Turkey was going to be offered in exchange for its cooperation, what most observers failed to notice was the difficult nature of the negotiations relating to Northern Iraq. The Turkish military was intent on not only entering Northern Iraq to prevent the creation of a Kurdish state there, but perhaps even preventing the evolution of a federal arrangement in Iraq that could allow the Kurds to win control of the oil-rich cities of Keokuk and Mogul. As part of this strategy, the Turkish General Staff wanted to make sure that Turcomans, a Turkic-speaking ethnic minority in Iraq, would be able to have their own regional government, preferably controlling these same cities.

Hence, the entry of Turkish troops there potentially presented the US with a nightmare scenario, because Iraqi Kurdish groups had promised to confront them, militarily if necessary. Furthermore, Washington also understood that both the hard bargaining over Northern Iraq and the lukewarm public support

by the Turkish officer corps for the government's parliamentary motion was essentially designed to weaken the AKP government both domestically and internationally, even at the expense of the immediate needs of the US.

Ironically, the failure of the parliamentary vote meant that Ankara dealt itself out the Northern Iraq game. Its warnings that it would enter Northern Iraq irrespective of an arrangement with US troops fell largely on deaf ears; the US and many European Union members warned Ankara of dire consequences. Ankara, therefore, has few good options left in Northern Iraq. It has for the most part been reduced to the role of an interested observer. In some ways, as far as the US is concerned, this has been the silver lining in the failure of the second front. Had the war lasted longer and caused more casualties, the political picture would have been different. US Congressional unhappiness with Ankara would have manifested itself in many different forms. Should Ankara attempt to enter Northern Iraq once again to support the Turcomans, against the wishes of the Kurdish groups there, it is likely that US-Turkish relations would suffer terribly.

Barring such an eventuality, US-Turkish relations will remain strong. Of the four dimensions outlined above, only the Iraqi one has been removed. Yet the other issues remain salient, though not with the same sense of significance. With the US shutting down its Operation Northern Watch, which had helped contain the regime in Baghdad, an important source of friction between the two countries will be eliminated. Moreover, Washington's disappointment with Turkey is different this time. In previous disputes, the US always had the Turkish military to fall back upon, but in this instance, the Turkish high command failed the US. Given that the Iraq war was driven by the US Department of Defense (the bastion of pro-Turkey sentiment in Washington), this is likely to have an enduring effect.[2] This will also have repercussions for the Incirlik air base, the mainstay of US forces in Turkey, which is now likely to be severely downgraded. Still, this does not mean that Turkey will not be important to Washington for the foreseeable future. Despite Washington's disappointment with Ankara over the second front, the Bush administration signalled its desire to harmonise relations by disbursing $1 billion in aid and grants. The package was clearly aimed at making sure that Turkey does not fall off the economic recovery process. What it also means, however, is that the days of ample strategic rents are over.

---

[2] According to one reporter with excellent contacts, in the negotiations leading to the war on Iraq, US Joint Chief of Staff General Myers was reported to have thrown his telephone in anger and frustration after a discussion with his counterparts in Ankara – see Yasemin Çongar, "Savasin Arka Cephesi", *Milliyet,* 31 March 2003.

One potential ramification of these developments is the civilianisation of the Turkish-American relationship. This result, however, depends very much on the performance of the new AKP government and does not mean that Turkey's military significance within NATO will be diminished. The AKP administration came to power promising first to focus on improving Turkey's chances with Europe, which in turn meant the furthering of the democratisation process, improving the economy and dealing with Cyprus. Such a development – especially when compared with the Islamic Welfare Party's discourse after its first-place finish in 1995 – was welcome news to Washington. Should the AKP succeed in pushing forward on these fronts, then the Turkish-American relationship could improve significantly. For Washington, Turkey's EU aspirations are important because they represent the shortest route to long-term stability, based on a working democracy and economic prosperity. So far, however, the AKP government has allowed itself to be checkmated (albeit temporarily) on Cyprus by the hard-liners in the country and has made little progress, if any, on the other issues. It has wasted its precious time on foreign and domestic policy.

In short, with the disappearance of Saddam Hussein, Ankara lost an important part of its leverage in Washington. Nothing of the same import is out there to replace it; Central Asia, the Caucasus and Iran are important, but Turkey's influence and abilities are not as vital as they were with Saddam's Iraq. Of course, if the Iraqi experiment turns foul for the US and a pluralistic regime does not succeed in taking root in Baghdad, Turkey will once again loom large in the American imagination. For the time being, however, the re-evaluation of Turkey's contribution to the US will open new opportunities in the relationship. Perhaps what the US hopes from this new government is that it tries to emulate Turgut Özal's approach.

Turkey's Strategic Future:
A Russian View

Natalia Oultchenko

In an article with a symptomatic title: "Turkish-Russian relations in the shadow of the relations of the two countries with the West", a well-known Turkish scholar, Gulten Kazgan, states that from the 18th century to the present, Turkish-Russian relations have been governed by the relations that each country has held with the leading Western nations. In other words, their mutual relations are derived from their relations with the West. In the same article, Kazgan described some scenarios for the possible development of Turkish-Russian relations in the first quarter of the 21st century. One of the scenarios is that if relations with its main Western allies (the US and the EU) are not effective and relations with Russia become more so, then Turkey may become more active in regional policy. Consequently, Turkey would develop closer political and economic ties with Russia, while its cooperation with the US in these areas would diminish.

To understand the possible changes in Russian-Turkish relations in the post-war period, this chapter first reviews the latest developments in US-Turkish relations. It argues that the reason for differences between the US and Turkey is not the alternative positions taken by their leaders on the Iraqi problem. The main issue is that close cooperation with the US is a question that generally divides Turkish society. An analysis of relations between Europe and Turkey follows, concluded by the impact that the ties between Turkey and the West have upon relations with Russia.

The new Turkish government, formed by the pro-Islamic Party of Justice and Development, has shown a rather pragmatic character. That explains the government's lack of hesitation in supporting the war operations in Iraq. Because the government is also responsible for the success of its economic policy, it may ultimately find that the price of Islamic solidarity is too high for the new cabinet. The problem is that the government inherited a weak economy, showing few and dim signs of recovery after the crisis in 2001. As the Turkish State Minister Ali Babacan has recognised, options for the government's economic policy are highly limited by the huge state debt and its servicing. According to Minister Babacan, Turkey has to repay $82 billion in 2003, most of which will be re-borrowed internally and abroad. Thus, any extra financial assistance lightens this exhausting burden.

Before the government's request to send Turkish troops abroad and station foreign troops in Turkey, the US had agreed to grant $6 billion in aid to Turkey, along with $24 billion in credit. On the eve of the vote, Prime

Minister Recep Erdogan said that "Those who are against the war today will speak another way after [a] three-day salary delay". Nevertheless, the request was rejected by the parliament, which is mainly composed of a ruling party for whom justice is more of a party slogan than an area to develop. Meanwhile, there had been mass demonstrations in Ankara that reflected public opposition to the war.

To understand the anti-war spirit in Turkish society, it is important to consider it alongside the desire for independence from the US and the West in general. This spirit greatly intensified during the more recent economic crises, when a large part of Turkish society blamed the crises on faulty IMF policy. As the public viewed the situation, the IMF was attempting to supplant Turkey's national government. Parliament's decision proved that Turkish society is divided in its thinking about cooperation with the West as a whole and with the US in particular.

The government did not expect the rejection of its request. Afterwards, the government had to resort to putting economic pressure both on the parliament and on society to argue its case effectively. Mr Erdogan cautiously said that the government could not criticise the will of the parliament and that they respected the hesitation of the deputies and the people on this question. Yet he stressed that they should have considered the situation from all sides and that the country's problems could not be solved by a simple vote of yes or no. "The choice made by the parliament is an alternative one", Mr Erdogan explained. That was the government's way of warning about an impending crisis. The inevitable fall of some macroeconomic indicators ensued. As the Russian newspaper *Commersant* noted, the Turkish parliament had effectively voted for a crisis.

The next day, the government announced a package of new fiscal measures. The government intended to obtain additional funds by increasing taxes and rejecting some social programmes. The Turkish press commented that as the government had lost the American aid, it was going to take it from the pockets of the people.

As for the position of the government towards the US, Mr Erdogan pointed out that the government wanted the US to understand the sensitivity of regional policy for Turkey and to reduce its political demands. At the same time, he reminded the US of the deep political roots of their bilateral relations, based on mutual respect. The US pointed out its disappointment at the outcome of the vote, but at the same time the US expressed appreciation for the government's readiness to cooperate. On this basis, the two sides were ready to re-start their negotiations on Iraq. Just before the war started, the Turkish parliament passed a motion allowing American armed forces to use Turkish air space. Thus, it would appear that the economic pressure

exerted by the government, together with the diminishing political demands from the US, convinced the Turkish parliament to comply with the government's request.

Immediately afterwards, Turkey sought discussions with the US about economic aid. It was quite clear by then that the $6 billion aid package was out of the question. By the end of March, however, the US announced their intention to support Turkey with a grant of $1 billion. US Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz persuaded the Senate committee on appropriation (which viewed Turkey as having escaped cooperation) that, "indeed Turks were not cooperating as much as we had expected. It is also wrong, however, to say that they do not cooperate with us [at all]. Making use of Turkey's air space is of great importance for us…When the war crisis is over it would be in our interest [for] Turkey [not to] face economic difficulties. We hope for more cooperation and we consider Turkey our valuable ally."

At the beginning of April, US Secretary of State Colin Powell paid a short visit to Ankara. In his meeting with the press, Mr Powell said that the US expected Turkey to support US military action in Northern Iraq. Mr Powell promised that after the visit, if the US obtained the support they hoped for, the Senate would vote through the aid package for Turkey.

To calm the public debate after Mr Powell's departure from Ankara, the Turkish Republic President Necdet Sezer made a statement, stressing the importance of Turkey's strategic partnership with the US. He emphasised that nothing was going to change in this important relationship between the two countries. Nevertheless, he pointed out that both the Gulf war in 1991 and the new crisis in Iraq had had a negative impact on Turkey, resulting in economic losses. He went on to say that Turkey understood the demands of the US given the circumstances; Turkey was already supporting its ally and would continue to do so. Nevertheless, he said that Turkey also hoped for a similar understanding of its needs. One could, however, gather more insight into Turkey's needs in Sezer's discussion about how important Iraq's future is to Turkey and Turkey's readiness to take part in its determination. Thus, Turkey was ready to aid the US in Northern Iraq, but on condition of receiving the $1 billion aid package and guarantees on the Kurdish issue as well.

The US recognised Turkey's worries over Northern Iraq from the beginning of the military campaign in the region. Northern Iraq had become de facto independent 12 years ago and it was possible that it would try to use the war as an opportunity to declare its independence officially. For these reasons, the US remained quiet when Turkish troops went to Northern Iraq, despite the fact there had not been any prior US agreement with the Turkish government regarding this action. Some days later, the Chief of Turkish Staff

General Hilmi Ozkek commented on the situation, saying that the territorial integrity of Iraq and the Iraqi ownership of its oil sources were the main foreign policy principles guiding Turkey. General Ozkek rejected any links between the presence of the Turkish troops in Iraq and Turkey's possible attempts to revise the Mosul question. At the same time, he stressed the fact that Turkey was hardly ready to accept any other territorial changes.

At the beginning of April, the US Congress voted through an aid package of $1 billion for Turkey. The Turkish newspaper *Milliyet* paid special attention to the speech by one member of the group that had supported Turkey – Congressman Robert Wexler – who said that as a democracy, Turkey was a model for Muslim world. He added that cooperation with Turkey is not a topic for debate but an essential condition for stability in post-war Iraq.

Meanwhile, American officials claimed that they were working with Turkey to prevent any developments in Northern Iraq that would be worrying for Turkey. Thus, it would appear that the two sides had reached some compromise on Iraq after all.

In summary, the important points are:

- The Iraqi crisis proved once again that Turkish society is divided in its views about cooperating with the West, especially with regard to the US. In other words, Turkish society is bipolar in its desire for and ideals of westernisation.

- The ex-President of the Turkish Republic Suleyman Demirel viewed the government's request to station foreign troops in Turkey as provocative and commented that the US should not have made such unrealistic demands.

- Compromise is vital for further development of US-Turkish relations. The prospects for relations will improve when these are based on strategic partnership and mutual interests, rather than a perception of Turkey as just a tool to serve American interests.

- When the US is ready to accept such a foundation for relations with Turkey, it will gain additional flexibility and stability in the complicated conditions of the Middle East.

There is a rather influential lobby in the US that believes US-Turkish relations are strategically important to US interests in the region and is ready for compromise. Nevertheless, until this view is more widely shared, there are not many reasons to continue discussions on the crisis in bilateral relations.

Another important dimension in Turkish foreign policy is its relationship with the EU. Turkey is still far from reaching the EU's criteria for

membership in economic or political terms. On several occasions, the government has declared its intention to decrease inflation to a single figure in three years. For this purpose, it actively uses its IMF credits. Nonetheless, after another economic failure, the country has been burdened with a high level of inflation and is even more heavily in debt.

Numerous unsolved political questions remain. It was hardly a coincidence that the European Commission renewed the so-called 'Partnership Agreement', outlining the membership requirements for Turkey – including the rights for national minorities – just after Turkish troops were stationed in Northern Iraq. Bearing in mind that Turkish society is already divided in its attitudes towards the West, the EU should consider taking greater account of Turkey's situation. Postponement of Turkey's membership in the EU allows those parts of Turkish society that do not support Europeanisation to exert more influence.

Although it is not possible to prevent international integration, it is possible to regulate it. The EU membership process offers effective influence for the economic and political development of Turkish society. To maintain such influence, it is necessary to make Turkey's progress towards membership more evident to Turkish society. The most recent elections showed that a large part of the Turkish population have begun to think that inefficient policy was the result of the absence of Islam (or traditional values). Even if the newly elected pro-Islamic party fails, this section of society may attribute the failure to the overall lack of Islam in public policy. As the democratisation process advances under EU pressure, Turkey is losing the traditional mechanisms that have prevented radical Islam from seeping into policy. Attempts to improve Turkey from a Western point of view and criteria – without enough support for its transformation – could have the unexpected result of turning of an old and well-known ally into a new antagonist.

There is an understanding of this inter-relationship within the EU. Professor J. Luchiani of the European Institute (Florence) noted that Turkey's orientation towards Europe is not a predetermined effect of Turkish foreign policy; it is just a strong (if unsteady) tendency that needs constant support from both Turkey and the EU. This view suggests that Turkey's prospects are promising. Nevertheless, the former US Ambassador to Turkey, Morton Abramowitz pointed out in his interview with *Defense News* magazine that, "It is not clear where Turkey is going to move now, if it [is] going to become a country like Iran or Syria or if it is going to stay in the Western bloc". This is not, however, the moment of choice for Turkey alone. It is also the moment of choice for the US and the EU. The Turkish government has already responded clearly: Deputy Prime Minister and Foreign Affairs Minister Abdullah Gul said that a change of Turkish foreign policy is out of

question. It remains to be seen whether the majority of Turkish society will share the conviction of the government. The future also depends largely on Turkey's Western allies to revise the outline of their mutual relations.

As there are still no definite changes in the course of Turkish foreign policy, there are likewise no serious expectations of dealing with Russian-Turkish relations. Moreover, if there is any balancing activity in Russian foreign policy it is mostly a balancing between the Western policy centres. Like Turkey, Russia still considers regional policy as a second-rank vector.

In the short term, Turkey's Western-oriented foreign policy is beneficial for Russia. Turkey's regional outlook has resulted in closer relations with Central Asia and some regions where the Turkic population prevails, more than with Russia as a whole. Despite the fact that bilateral relations these days are not classified as confrontational but as regulating competition, Russia's apprehension of pan-Turkism is still alive. In addition, Russia is the main gas supplier for Turkey – with a minimum market share of 40%, it already has an efficient control lever. Rem Vyahirev, the former head of the Russian gas company Gasprom, was right when he said that whoever started first in Turkey would win. Now Russia's two gas pipelines are preventing alternative gas projects from development and keeping the Turkish gas market under control. Turkey's dependence on Russian gas offers some guarantees of Turkey's political loyalty.

In the long term, Russia and Turkey are both losing out because of their weak regional policies. Both countries are missing the opportunity to become the two leading countries within the new Eurasian centre of world policy. Moreover, the Western approach to problems in the region (over which it already exercises much influence) may not always match the interests of either country. But until the advantages of strategic, regional partnership are clearly recognised, neither of the two sides should expect any visible changes in Russian-Turkish relations.

Turkey's Strategic Future
Post-11 September Impact:
The Strategic Importance of Turkey Revisited

Hüseyin Bagci and Saban Kardas

The aim of this paper is to analyse the debate surrounding Turkey and its increasing strategic importance in the wake of the 11 September 2001 terror attacks on Washington and New York. Traditionally, Turkey has been considered important because of its geographic location between Europe, the Middle East and Asia, which gives it easy access to strategically significant regions and major energy resources. Further, thanks to its character as a modern Muslim country, culturally Turkey stands as a bridge between Western and Islamic civilisations. Turkey's strategic value became more visible following the events of 11 September 2001, and consequently, Turkey has come under the spotlight. As a result, Turkey and Turkish foreign policy started to receive great interest and the mood in discussions about the country and its strategic worth was usually optimistic. The discourse was, however, mainly historic, temporal and isolated from reality, which led to a narrow focus. It was often lost in the debate that, seen in a wider perspective, there are a number of other factors that indicate the necessity of taking a more cautious and balanced approach. In this sense, the tone of this paper is rather critical. First, we briefly summarise the main arguments used to emphasise an enhanced strategic role for Turkey in the new era. Each argument is approached critically and the shortcomings of the argument are underlined. The paper concludes with an attempt to develop a more balanced interpretation of post-11 September developments upon Turkish foreign policy.

Growing acceptance of Turkish theses on the fight against terrorism – 'you-see-we-were-right!' syndrome

The first effect of the 11 September attacks that contributed to Turkey's current position was the alleged growing acceptance of the Turkish approach to the fight against terrorism in international relations. Turkey itself had long struggled against separatist terror and political Islam in a domestic context. Since the 1970s, Turkey has been engaged in fighting against terrorism and continues to be one of the major targets of terrorist activities at home and abroad. Turkey's first encounter with international terrorism was the political assassinations carried out by ASALA (Armenian Secret Army for the

Liberation of Armenia) against Turkish diplomats abroad in the 1970s. During the last two decades, the Kurdish issue in particular and the terrorist activities of the PKK (Kurdistan Workers' Party) involved cross-border aspects and became an international concern.[1] Therefore, one part of the Turkish strategy to deal with this problem was to seek international cooperation in fighting terrorism. In this regard, successive Turkish governments endeavoured to generate international concern about terrorism in general. They worked hard to convince European countries to limit the activities of various separatist, leftist and Islamic organisations. As part of its activities, Turkey even tried on some occasions to bring the terrorism issue onto NATO's agenda.[2]

Along with trying to raise the terror issue in several political and diplomatic fora, Turkey did not hesitate to resort to military instruments as well. To meet the rising challenge of separatist terror in the south-eastern Anatolian region, Turkey employed a stubborn and at times harsh policy based on heavy reliance on military measures. The policy sought to stop the terrorist activities carried out by the PKK, then root out the formation of terrorist groups and their support bases. In a similar vein, emphasis on the use or threat of force outside its borders as part of the fight against terrorism was a logical extension of this policy. Numerous instances of Turkish incursions into Northern Iraq are cases in point. The authority vacuum that emerged after the imposition of a no-fly zone in Northern Iraq enabled the PKK to use the region as a rear base to conduct terrorist attacks inside Turkish territory. Based on a somewhat complicated mix of the notions of 'hot pursuit' and self-defence, Turkish armed forces were dispatched into Northern Iraq to destroy PKK guerrillas, training camps and to prevent PKK from planning or executing subversive attacks on Turkish soil. Although some of those operations were limited in scope, some were large-scale, involving thousands of troops – at times the number of Turkish soldiers crossing the border reached 35,000 – backed by tanks, artillery and helicopters.

---

[1] For more information on the PKK, see the extensive analysis provided in Nihat Ali Özcan (1999), *PKK (Kürdistan Isci Partisi): Tarihi, Ideolojisi, ve Yöntemi* (PKK: Its History, Ideology and Methodology) Ankara: ASAM Yayinlari; for the international dimension of the PKK's emergence and operations, see Michael Radu (2001), "The Rise and Fall of the PKK", *Orbis,* Vol. 45, No. 1, Winter, pp. 222–325 and Kemal Kirisci and Gareth Winrow (1997), *The Kurdish Question and Turkey,* London: Frank Cass, pp. 47–63.

[2] It must be underlined, however, that to avoid making the PKK issue an international one and to keep the PKK from becoming an interlocutor, Turkey was cautious in these endeavours. Therefore, it focused on including terror as a whole into NATO statements.

In its relations with Syria (as far as its support for PKK terrorism is concerned), Turkey offers another example where it resorted to essentially military means. By mid-1998, the PKK had come to rely almost entirely on Syrian support. The PKK's leader, Abdullah Ocalan had been given sanctuary by the Syrian government and Syrian territory was a safe route for PKK militants in their journey between the PKK training camps in Lebanon's Syrian-controlled Bekaa valley and the Turkish border. Indeed, during the Turkish-Syrian crisis of October 1998, Turkey used coercive diplomacy, backed by a credible threat of force, against the Syrian regime to end its support for the PKK and cease providing shelter to Ocalan. It is worth noting that, in the meantime, Turkey had already strengthened its military ties with Israel to exert pressure on Syria from the south. Turkey's threat of force accompanied by military manoeuvres undertaken close to the Syrian border bore fruit. Faced with the overwhelming power of the Turkish military, the Syrian government complied with Turkish demands: it asked Ocalan and the PKK to leave the country, which constituted the first step in a chain of events leading to the capture of Ocalan in Kenya. Following their expulsion from Syria, PKK forces relocated to Northern Iraq. Yet a subsequent Turkish incursion into the region dealt a severe blow to their military capabilities causing the PKK's military collapse.[3]

As experience shows, Turkish activities to this end (be they diplomatic or military) were hardly welcomed by its neighbours or by its Western partners; as a result, Turkey could not raise the necessary international support in its own fight against terrorism. Indeed, these issues have constantly been a point of tension and disagreement in Turkish foreign policy throughout the 1990s and Turkey came under severe international criticism. Assertive Turkish foreign policy towards the Middle East region added to the already troubled relations with its Arab neighbours. Similarly, Turkey's relations with its Western partners deteriorated from time to time owing to the problems stemming from Turkey's struggle with terrorism.

Issues surrounding its battle against terrorism have been a major impediment to Turkey's prospects for closer integration into the European Union. In particular, charges were often raised against the country at several international platforms that Turkey's approach to tackling terrorism was a major source of human rights violations as well as a limitation of individual rights and liberties at home. Therefore, Turkey has always been under European pressure to undertake domestic reforms to ameliorate the situation. As far as foreign policy is concerned, with its principally military-oriented security strategy (in stark contrast to the 'civilian' European approach),

---

[3] Svante E. Cornell (2001), 'The Kurdish Question in Turkish Politics", *Orbis,* Vol. 45, No. 1, winter, pp. 31–46.

Turkey's assertiveness in the region was seen as an indication that Turkey was 'security consumer' or an 'insecurity provider' to European security, and thus an actor to be treated with a certain reservation.[4]

Against this background, it is obvious that Turkey was one of the main beneficiaries of the new atmosphere. At last, the threat of terrorist activities was formally recognised as an international concern and a consensus on the issue seemed to emerge. The challenge posed by terrorism to international security was considered so acute that it was enough justification for the North Atlantic Council to invoke NATO's Article 5 for the first time. From the UN to the OSCE and down to regional organisations, the prevailing mood was captured; similar revolutionary decisions were adopted to express the willingness to respond to terrorism on an international level.

It did not take long for Turkey to grasp this golden opportunity: the president, the prime minister, the foreign minister and other officials gave their full support to those international initiatives.[5] This diplomatic move was more than an expression of international solidarity with the US and the victims of those startling attacks. In each speech, they emphasised that the events of 11 September proved the validity of Turkish arguments, reminding their audience that Turkey itself had suffered under terrorism. They went on to express their hope that Turkey's European partners would also realise their past mistakes in criticising Turkey and eventually readjust their policies *vis-à-vis* Turkey in the face of the new realities out there, which proved Turkey's position had been correct. President Ahmet Necdet Sezer said the attacks should be a lesson for the European countries and called for a change in their attitude towards terrorism. After pointing out that terrorism was a crime against all humanity, he said, "That's why we have always repeated in all international platforms that international cooperation in the fight against terrorism should be improved. The attacks on the US have shown how correct Turkey is in its stance against terrorism. I guess the attitudes of European countries have begun to change too."[6]

---

[4] This critical interpretation of Turkey's place in European security architecture can be found in Dietrich Jung (2001), *Turkey and Europe: Ongoing Hypocrisy?*, Copenhagen Peace Research Institute, Working Paper No. 35, September, pp. 1–21; for a counterview, see Melthem Müftüler-Bac (2000), "Turkey's Role in the EU's Security and Foreign Policies", *Security Dialogue,* Vol. 31, No. 4, pp. 489–502.

[5] See several Turkish daily newspapers from 12–13 September, 2001; also, for a collection, see *Newspot,* No. 29, September–October 2001.

[6] "Sezer: I reckon Western countries are going to view terrorism differently from now on", *Turkish Daily News*, 13 September 2001 and *Cumhuriyet,* 13 September 2001.

In the Turkish view, the European countries misinterpreted the balance between the concepts of human rights and terrorism, a point emphasised by a senior Turkish foreign ministry official: "The US was very well aware of the concerns raised by Turkey regarding terrorism. Nevertheless, Europeans did not understand this and the concept of human rights was raised by our European colleagues when we referred to terrorism at international gatherings. And now, it is clearly seen that a balance between the concepts of terrorism and human rights is necessary."[7] Further, in a similar line, Turkey stressed that terrorism is a global issue and thus must be fought globally. This point was repeatedly emphasised by government officials, as well as columnists and civil society organisations. Foreign Minister Ismail Cem, in his address at the Organisation of Islamic Countries Summit, underlined the argument: "Terrorism does not have geography, it is the same terrorism, which manifests itself in several countries, in the West and in the East, in all geographies, all over the world…Therefore, terrorism is a global phenomenon that crosses borders and the fight against it requires effective international cooperation."[8] In this sense, NATO's decision to invoke Article 5 was a welcome development for Turkey, as expressed by Ambassador Onur Öymen, Turkey's Permanent Representative to NATO: "We have always called for terrorist activities to be included within Article 5…We have always stated that an attack does not only mean a country's intrusion into another country's territory but it also covers terrorist attacks which [are] an international problem. That's why NATO's invocation of Article 5 is very important for us."[9]

---

[7] "Shifting of International Perceptions on the Agenda: A New Role for Turkey", *Turkish Daily News*, 13 September 2001; for more on the initial Turkish position, see Baki Ilkin (2002), "Combating Terrorism and Rebuilding Afghanistan: The Turkish Perspective", *Foreign Policy-Ankara,* Vol. 27, Nos. 3–4, pp. 3–9.

[8] Ismail Cem (2001), *Statement to the Press at the Organisation of the Islamic Conference* (Doha, 10 October 2001), reprinted in *Newspot,* No. 29, September–October; see also "Turkish Top Officials Call for Increase in International Cooperation against Terrorism", *Turkish Daily News*, 13 September 2001; and Mustafa Balbay (2001), "Terör Sinir Tanimiyor (Terror Recognises no Borders)", *Cumhuriyet,* 12 September; the Turkish Industrialists and Businessman Association (TUSIAD) also stated that the terrorist attacks exposed the dimensions of international terrorism and that there is a need for international cooperation and solidarity to fight against international terrorism, in *Milliyet,* 13 September 2001.

[9] "Ankara backs Activating Article 5", *Turkish Daily News*, 14 September 2001 and *Cumhuriyet*, 14 September 2001.

Furthermore, some Turkish analysts did not hesitate to announce the advent of a 'global 28 February'.[10] In challenging the rise of political Islam on 28 February 1997, secular elites used the particular conditions of Turkey as a justification to limit individual rights and democratic freedoms, backed by the powerful military. After the 11 September attacks, it was argued that the US and Western countries may embark on a similar policy on a global scale, so as to wipe out several international networks (irrespective of whether they are moderate or radical) that were supposedly behind the attacks. As part of this new strategy, the US would be less willing to criticise non-democratic practices in the Islamic world for the sake of assuring their cooperation in the global war against terrorism. That could (the argument goes on) hint at the emergence of a new 'precedent' justifying the Turkish way of dealing with terrorism, and in effect, relieve Turkey of some of the external pressures it had encountered in the past.

The first observation about these arguments is that they were, to a large extent, propaganda. It was not possible to hear, from the outside, a corresponding appreciation of the Turkish theses, except from some American commentators.[11] Notably, Michael Radu was a very vocal supporter of the Turkish position on this issue. He argues that "Europeans, at least before 11 September, were playing games in the name of 'human rights' – particularly for terrorists, who were protected at home even against the vital security of non-EU countries…Let us hope that once the US and Turkey, to mention just two cases, are finally seen as equally victimised, the EU response will be similar…That revision also includes a new look at Turkey's anti-PKK and anti-Islamist policy – not as anti-democratic, but as protective of the Muslim world's only truly secular democracy".[12] This optimistic mood and Turkish discourse, however, largely remained wishful thinking.

The main problem with this argument was that Turks chose to interpret these developments in such a way that this new 'precedent' justified whatever Turkey did in the past to fight against separatism and political Islam. This point was very well-illustrated by Ismail Cem: "For years, Turkey has kept on explaining to the international community what terrorism is, the consequences of it, the importance and the need for international cooperation in struggling against it, and have kept on making proposals at international platforms for methods of a collective struggle against terrorism. The events

---

[10] Rusen Cakir, "Global 28 Subat Süreci Basladi" (Global 28 Subat Process has Taken a Start), *Hurriyet*, 15 September 2001.

[11] For a similar view, see Murat Belge, "Jeopolitik", *Radikal*, 22 January 2002.

[12] Michael Radu (2001), "The War on Terrorism is not an American War", *Insight Turkey*, Vol. 3, No. 4, October–December, pp. 52–54.

of 11 September have proved how right Turkey's sensitivity on this issue was. What everyone is trying to do collectively today is no different from that which Turkey has strived to achieve for years."[13]

Nevertheless, it is unlikely that the Turkish arguments will be entirely accepted by the West in general or by Europeans in particular without any reservations. For instance, Turkey warmly welcomed NATO's activation of Article 5, but one has to bear in mind the particular conditions in which NATO took that decision and the unique position of the US in shaping NATO decisions; thus its value as an almost automatic precedent remains an open question. Even if one accepts that Article 5 could be activated against terror attacks, what is less clear is whether it will be applicable to the threats or attacks coming from an organisation established in one's own country. Finally yet importantly, when the time comes to implement Article 5, there could be differences over identifying the concrete sources of a terrorist threat or how to respond to that particular threat.[14]

Another limitation to Turkey's optimism is exerted by differing views on terrorism. Concerning the Kurdish issue, the European view is broadly that it cannot be simply confined to fighting against terrorism. Official Turkish discourse preferred to view the Kurdish issue as originating from socio-economic conditions in south-eastern Anatolia, aggravated by the problems posed by terrorist activities that are supported by external actors trying to undermine Turkey. In European eyes, however, the issues are more related to political and cultural rights, and democratisation.[15] Thus, the well-known analogy is applicable here: one person's 'terrorist' may be another person's 'independent fighter'. Further, there is reason to expect that this will remain the case, despite initial Turkish optimism to the contrary.[16] Large Kurdish

---

[13] "Cem: Turkish Model is Paradigm of Civilisation", interview of Ismail Cem by the *Turkish Daily News*, 7 January 2002.

[14] For an early sceptical approach by Sadi Erguvenc, see Lale Sariibrahimoglu, "Turkey Should be Cautious on Article 5", *Turkish Daily News*, 14 September 2001; however, Ümit Özdag underlines that although it may not act as an automatic trigger, NATO's invocation of Article 5 could be used as a precedent, as noted in "Interview with Ümit Özdag", *2023*, No. 6, 15 October 2002, p. 23.

[15] For more information on different perceptions of the issue in Turkey and Europe, see Cornell, op. cit., p. 31; for an analysis of the Kurdish issue through a human rights and democratisation perspective, see H. Ayla Kilic (1998), "Democratization, Human Rights and Ethnic Policies in Turkey", *Journal of Muslim Minority Affairs*, Vol. 18, No. 1, pp. 91–110.

[16] For an optimistic view that after 11 September, the PKK issue would no longer be considered within the context of an ethnic conflict or independence movement, see Rana S. Sezal (2001), "Kimlik Politikalari, Terör ve Etnik

populations in Europe are acting as a strong pressure group and limiting the manoeuvrability of Western governments. As it is rightly claimed, the Kurdish issue has also been a European one, as it affects the Turkish and Kurdish migrants living in Europe and the host countries.[17] There is a fundamental difference between the EU and Turkey in regards to the problem of terrorism. Even after one accepts the reality of terrorism, the ways to tackle this problem are perceived differently. The Turkish approach is closer to that of the US than the EU.[18] As we observe, the EU and the US differ on many issues, including the question of how to identify the causes and sources of terrorism as well as the means to be used in fighting against it. The EU has stressed the importance of preventive measures and prioritising political and economic instruments; it has questioned the effectiveness of punitive military measures. Considering that the Europeans were even critical of the US, an expectation that they would welcome Turkish activities without any reservations is hardly tenable.[19]

Therefore, it is hard to be very optimistic and expect a major breakthrough in Western responses to Turkey's approach to combating terrorism.[20] In addition, Turkey's hope that the new emerging consensus on terrorism will relieve it of European pressures on the Kurdish issue is difficult to sustain. The Europeans will likely resist subsuming this wider problem under the rubric of terrorism and maintain their demands for Turkey to continue with the necessary domestic reforms in political and cultural aspects, even after the attacks of 11 September. Thus, the Kurdish issue will not cease to be one of the hurdles Turkey has to face in its journey towards the European Union. The discussion about the list of terrorist organisations prepared by the EU

Catisma Kavramlari: 11 Eylül Sonrasi Türkiye'nin Terör Sorunu", *Stratejik Analiz,* Vol. 2, No. 20, December, p. 100.

[17] See for instance: Gülistan Gürbey (2000), "Die Europaesierung des Kurdenkonflikts", *Blaetter für Deutsche und Internationale Politik* (4:99), p. 404.

[18] Ali L. Karaosmanoglu (2001), "Afganistan Savasi'nin Transatlantik Iliski Boyutu" (The Transatlantic Relations of the Afghanistan War and its Consequences with Regard to Turkey), *Zaman*, 27 November, p. 10.

[19] For an argument to the effect that Turkey could capitalise on the US interpretation of terror and thus solve its own PKK problem, see Damla Aras (2002), "Minareyi Calan Kilifi Hazirladi: Bir Baska Acidan 11 Eylul", *Stratejik Analiz,* Vol. 2, No. 24, April, p. 39.

[20] Ali Nihat Özcan, a Turkish expert on terrorism, also points out that the selective response to terror in Europe would limit Turkey's utilisation of the new conditions in "BM Karari ve PKK", *NTV: Arka Plan*, 3 October 2001; for a transcript of this television interview, see http://www.ntvmsnbc.com/news/110594.asp (news portal).

(briefly outlined below) within the context of forging an international coalition against the sources of terrorism was illustrative of this point:

> Turkey started an intensive diplomatic initiative in the wake of the 11 September attacks to use the international environment to convince EU members to include ten Turkish organisations on its list of terrorist organisations. The inclusion of an organisation on the list means that its assets will be frozen, its offices closed and its activities traced. Nevertheless, this may not automatically translate into the extradition of its members to their country of origin, particularly if the country is a non-EU member and still practices the death penalty. Despite Turkey's efforts, the EU included none of the terrorist organisations on its list, which was published on 27 December 2001. The exclusion of the armed militant groups from the first version of the list, such as the outlawed PKK and the Revolutionary People's Liberation Party-Front (DHKP-C), which are active in some European countries under different banners, especially drew Turkish reaction and left a problem on the agenda for some time.[21] Turkish diplomacy and lobbying worked; thus on 2 May 2002, the two organisations were finally added to the modified EU list. This decision was seen by many as a victory for Turkey.[22] Yet, to see the effectiveness of these measures, one has to take into consideration a couple of other factors.

> First, the PKK announced in April that it would cease all activities and regroup under a new name, the Kurdistan Freedom and Democracy Congress (KADEK).[23] KADEK said it was ending its armed struggle to campaign peacefully for greater rights for Kurds in southeast Turkey, but without disbanding its armed wing. The Turkish government has termed the name change as meaningless.[24] Yet despite Turkey's demands, KADEK is not included on the EU list. The EU countries prefer to suspend their judgement on whether to include it.

---

[21] Selcuk Gültasli (2002), "The Opportunity and the Principle", *Turkish Probe,* Issue 479, 31 March.

[22] "Türkiye Brüksel'de Zafer Kazandi" (Turkey won a victory in Brussels), 3 May 2002 (retrieved from the news portal at http://www.ntvmsnbc.com.tr).

[23] Mehmet Ali Birand, "PKK or KADEK", *Turkish Daily News*, 2 April 2002.

[24] Ali Nihat Özcan and Ö. Rengin Gün (2002), "PKK'dan KADEK'e: Degisim mi Takkiye mi?", *Stratejik Analiz*, Vol. 2, No. 25, May, pp. 5–20.

Second, these EU norms need to be transformed into national legal orders. That being said, in some of the EU member states, the national legal norms are not enough to limit the activities of these terrorist organisations effectively, a point that has been used by the operatives of those organisations. This is especially true as far as Belgium is concerned.[25] Third, most of these organisations have been active in Europe for decades and they know the ways to circumvent such legal barriers. For instance, a spokesperson for the DHKP-C has claimed that these decisions will not substantially affect their activities.[26] What the EU member states can do, however, is freeze their bank accounts – yet they have no money in banks. The same source further claimed that the name DHKP-C is on the EU list, but that the registered name of their organisation is the DHKP and DHKC; further, the source mentioned the fact that they have been working in the United Kingdom for many years, even though the DHKP-C is outlawed there. They may have more ways to find loopholes in European legal norms. Therefore, Turkey still has to work hard in order to ensure the effectiveness of this initiative.

One can expect similar divergences between Turkey and the EU in the future.

Caught between Islam and terrorism: Turkey as a role model for the Islamic world?

The second development regarding Turkey's growing strategic importance is the increasing reference to Turkey as a model for the Islamic world. The war against the Taliban and al-Qaeda was, in a political and intellectual sense, also a war against a militant, reactive, anti-Western (or anti-American) interpretation of Islam. The protests against American operations and support for Osama bin-Laden in some parts of the Islamic world created fears that the developments could lead to a so-called 'clash of civilisations', or a 'Christian-Muslim confrontation'. Thus, the American administration strived to use every opportunity to prevent such a negative interpretation of the American role and to deliver a message that this was not a war against Islam. As proof of this policy, the inclusion of certain Muslim countries into the international coalition appeared to be necessary, especially when it later

---

[25] "DHKP-C and PKK on EU Terrorist List", *Turkish Daily News*, 3 May 2002; "Belgian Judicial Officials: There is not much to do against the PKK and DHKP-C", *Turkish Daily News*, 6 May 2002.

[26] "DHKP-C: The List did not Affect Us", *Turkish Daily News*, 10 May 2002.

came to using force in Afghanistan.[27] When viewed in this light, Turkey came to be seen as a valuable asset for American strategic policy in the region.

No doubt, Turkey offered the all assistance within its capability to the international coalition from the very beginning, through allowing the use of its territory and air space for logistical support and through its contribution to the international peacekeeping force in Afghanistan. Nevertheless, this was more than a practical military/strategic contribution in the long-term war against the forces of terrorism and fanaticism. Hence, the fact that Turkey is the only Muslim country with a secular system of governance, which is also member of NATO and other European institutions, was repeatedly expressed not only by the Turkish policy-makers themselves, but also by the international observers and US officials. As such (the argument goes), Turkey would be a perfect role model for the Islamic world.

The 21st conference of the American-Turkish Council (ATC) held in Washington in March 2002 was an important venue where those arguments were often heard. A few days before the conference, Deputy Defense Secretary Paul Wolfowitz underlined that supporting moderate Muslims who abhor terrorism and extremism was central to winning the war on terrorism: "To win that war against terrorism, we have to reach out to the hundreds of millions of Muslims who believe in tolerance and moderation…By helping them to stand up against terrorists, we help ourselves". Therefore, the anti-terrorism campaign was not just a military fight but also "a battle for hearts and minds as well"; within this context, Turkey "can be an example for the Muslim world" of a country that reconciles Islam with liberal democracy.[28] According to US President George W. Bush, Turkey was a hope-provoking alternative against radicalism and religious intolerance. In the message he sent to the ATC conference, he stressed that Turkey, with its Muslim beliefs and its embrace of the democratic ideals of Atatürk, set an example.[29] In his address at the conference, US Undersecretary of State Marc Grossman also

---

[27] "With Turkey's Pledge, US Coalition Gets its First Muslim Troops", *International Herald Tribune,* 2 November 2001.

[28] Matt Kelley (2002), "America Must Support Moderate Muslims to Win War on Terror, No. 2 Pentagon Official Says", *Turkish Daily News*, 11 March; see also US Department of Defense (2002), "Bridging the Dangerous Gap between the West and the Muslim World", remarks prepared for delivery by Deputy Secretary Paul Wolfowitz at the World Affairs Council in Monterey, California, 3 May.

[29] "Turkey a Model Secular Country: Bush", 18 March 2002 (retrieved from the news portal at http://www.ntvmsnbc.com.tr); see also "21st ATC conference held in Washington", *Turkish Daily News*, 19 March 2002.

underlined one of the few things that had not changed after 11 September: "Turkey is once again highlighted as a model for those countries with an Islamic heritage who choose to be – and work to be – modern, secular, democratic, and true to their faith simultaneously. Those of us who have admired Turkey for this vision for years now find we are not so alone in wishing that your great endeavour succeeds."[30]

Yet the very fact that the terrorist activities were undertaken by an organisation justifying its actions by reference to Islam was a serious moral challenge to which many Muslim countries had to respond.[31] There was a considerable effort on the part of the political leaders and intellectuals in the Islamic world to stave off linking terrorism in general, and the 11 September terrorist attacks in particular, to Islam and Islamic groups. Nowhere was this concern more visible than in Turkey, as a country that, while orienting itself towards Western norms and values, maintained its ties with Islam and the Islamic world. Indeed, it was this duality that put enormous pressure on Turkey to call upon the world to draw a distinction between Islam and terrorism. Turkish political leaders and intellectuals, like their counterparts in other Islamic countries, took pains to emphasise that Islam was a religion of peace and a distinction between Islam and terrorism must be drawn. The prime minister declared that equating Islam with terror was unjust,[32] and Foreign Minister Ismail Cem said that, "Terrorism does not have a religion [or] geography and there can be no justification for terrorism under any circumstances…To identify terrorism with any religion is an insult to all religions. We strongly condemn those who have used the name of our holy religion to define some terrorists. Following the tragedy in the US, Turkey conferred with some fellow members of the OIC [Organisation of Islamic Conferences] and urged its NATO allies as well as EU members to avoid such misuse."[33]

---

[30] US Department of State (2002), "Grossman: Change in the Value of Enduring Alliances", remarks to the American Turkish Council by US Undersecretary of State for Political Affairs Marc Grossman, Washington, D.C., 19 March.

[31] See Anas Malik (2002), "Selected Reflections on the Muslim World in the Aftermath of 9-11", *Alternatives: Turkish Journal of International Relations*, Vol. 1, No. 2, Summer, pp. 201–225.

[32] "Ecevit'ten Teröre Karsi Dayanisma cagrisi", *Hürriyet*, 12 September 2001; see also "ABD'nin Yanindayiz", *Hürriyet*, 13 September 2001; for the response by several Turkish intellectuals, see "Linkage to Islam rejected", *Turkish Daily News*, 14 September 2001.

[33] Ismail Cem (2001), "*Statement to the Press*"; see also US Department of State, "Remarks with Turkish Minister of Foreign Affairs Ismail Cem", 27

In this regard, the OIC-EU summit, which was held in Istanbul on 12–13 February 2002, was an expression of Turkey's determination to assume its role of bridging the East and the West, calling for harmony, rather than conflict between the two civilisations. The forum turned out to be a useful platform for an intensive exchange of views among representatives of international organisations, high-ranking politicians, opinion-makers, intellectuals from EU-member countries, OIC-member countries and observers. Mutual compliments filled the air, although it remains to be seen what it will bring about in concrete political terms.[34] Nevertheless, organising such a conference and bringing together EU member states and Muslim countries around the same table had a symbolic meaning, which was seen as the start of the new Turkish role.[35] Ismail Cem's views on the conference were reflective of this: "An example of what Turkey could do [to play a bridging role between the Islamic world and the Western Christian world] can be seen in the forthcoming meeting of the OIC and the EU. For the first time these two organisations will be coming together for a political exchange of opinions. Besides, in the aftermath of 11 September we are strongly opposed to the wrong perception of placing terrorism and Islam side by side. I had spoken with many of my Western colleagues [to] draw their attention to the sensitivity of the wording used…In correcting such mistakes and in establishing some sort of a harmony, Turkey has a pioneering place that is provided to it by its history, culture and modern identity. We have to act in awareness of that responsibility."[36]

This argument implied at least two inter-related aspects: first, Turkey's support for the coalition was instrumental in defusing the charge that the war was a Muslim-Christian confrontation.[37] Foreign Minister Cem expressed this point was very well when he said, "This is the fight between democracy and terrorism, and the struggle between the wise and fanatic. We believe that this fight will be won by our side. Turkey will be the biggest obstacle before those who want to divert this [fight] to a wrong path such as a fight between

---

September 2001 (retrieved from the news portal at http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2001/5089.htm).

[34] The coverage of the forum in the Turkish press was retrieved from http://www.byegm.gov.tr/on-sayfa/oic/oic.htm; see also the information provided on Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs (retrievable from http://www.mfa.gov.tr/OIC_EU_cdrom/index.htm).

[35] Elif Ünal (2002), "West and East Attempt to Bridge Differences in Turkey", *Turkish Probe*, No. 473, 10 February.

[36] "Cem: Turkish Model is Paradigm of Civilisation", interview of Ismail Cem by the *Turkish Daily News*, 7 January 2002.

[37] In a sense, this was Turkey's duty – see Karaosmanoglu, op. cit.

the religions."[38] Second, the Turkish model was offered as an alternative to a Taliban version of Islam. Thus Islam and modern values are compatible with each other and it is possible to reconcile Islam within a Western-style, democratic and secular system. In the words of Dale F. Eickelman: "Turkey can only offer the world an example of a nation in which Western democratic values and Islam converge in an increasingly strengthened civil society, in which the state and religion are not seen as adversaries. 'Western' societies, like Islamic ones, have no place for either militant secular extremism or militant religious extremism."[39] In practical terms, Turkey's decision to take part in the Western-led coalition was expected to facilitate other countries adoption of a counter-terrorist stance and cooperation with the US.[40] Seen from another perspective, it was also argued that this geo-cultural dimension, in addition to the geo-political position, could constitute another asset for Turkey in its relations with the Western world, particularly as far as its quest to become a full member of the European Union.[41]

Yet the argument that Turkey could be a role model for the Islamic world is also controversial in some aspects. First, Turkish ambitions in this direction are not new and we have enough evidence to judge how they are perceived in other parts of the Islamic world. Turks themselves are proud of being the only secular country in the Islamic world. Yet, it is also equally true that Turkey's perception of itself as a model may not go beyond being an illusion; the Western ideas promoted by Turkey have hardly penetrated into other Muslim societies. Arab countries' criticism of the secular Turkish model (along with other problems dominating Turkish-Arab relations) are no secret. In this sense, any fundamental shift in the perceptions of other Muslim societies, which would ease the objections to adopting a Turkish-style system, cannot yet be observed. On the contrary, in view of the growing anti-American feelings, it is hard to expect that such a role for Turkey would be welcomed. The American way of dealing with terror, through primarily military means or through supporting the existing non-democratic regimes in the Islamic world may hinder the burgeoning reformist movements in those

---

[38] "Bu, Demokrasi ile Terörizmin Kavgasi", *Hürriyet*, 14 September 2001.

[39] Dale F. Eickelman (2002), "Turkey between the West and the Rest", *Turkish Probe*, No. 474, 17 February.

[40] Ilter Turan (2001), "Short Term Pains for Long Term Pleasures", *Private View*, Spring, p. 10.

[41] Orhan Gökce and Birol Akgün (2002), "Degisen Dünya Politikasinda Türkiye'nin Rolü: 11 Eylül'ün Getirdigi Firsatlar, Riskler ve Tehditler" (Turkey's Role in the Changing World Politics: Opportunities, Risks and Threats Brought about by 11 September), paper presented at the first METU International Relations Conference, Ankara, 3–5 July, p. 14.

countries. Such an approach may result in setbacks to the natural transformation of Islamic societies, giving radicalism in the Islamic world a new impetus. In this sense, Turkey's attempts to carry Western values into the region may even widen the existing gap between Turkey and other Islamic societies.

Second, the main problem with this argument is the question of whether it is possible at all to transform a society from the outside. As long as domestic enthusiasm for reform is lacking, international pressures to change a society's culture or its legal, political and economic structures to conform to certain models have limited effect. To influence a society from the outside, international actors must have strong links that enable them to stimulate changes in the behaviour of domestic actors. For instance, if we remember Turkish-EU relations, despite the existence of strong connections, there is still a resistance to change by the Turkish establishment. Considering the lack of connections, societal differences and geographical distances between Turkey and other Muslim societies, prospects for Turkey's influence over other Muslim countries remain limited. Similarly, democratic regimes and other practices cannot be established overnight, nor can they be taken granted. It took Turkey decades to reach its current position and this was no doubt a painful process. Turkey's particular journey also dictates against transplanting its experience into other societies that have not followed a similar path. Nevertheless, even if one assumes that the Islamic world wants and needs change, there is nothing to suggest that this model would be the one imposed from Washington, given that Turkey has its own political agenda.

A Turkish zone of influence in Central Asia and the Caucasus?

This section reviews the third area where Turkey's influence is supposedly growing and Turkey is expected to play a role. The war against Afghanistan and terrorism brought the Central Asian, Caspian and Caucasus regions once again into the focus of interest. Some countries in the region, which are mostly ruled by former Communist leaders in an authoritarian manner, were also under pressure from domestic opposition. Since this opposition was mixed with some elements of Islamic radicalism, particularly in the case of Central Asian states such as Uzbekistan, the regimes became active supporters of the international coalition against the Taliban and al-Qaeda. Moreover, the prospect of American involvement in the region offered a good chance to those countries for balancing the Russian dominance with the assurance of American support. Consequently, they did not hesitate to respond to American demands and provided the US with access to their air

space and military bases.[42] US willingness to widen the international coalition against terrorism diminished concerns for human rights and democratisation; as a result, human rights violations and anti-democratic practices by these governments could be overlooked. The disappearance of human rights considerations in effect facilitated the US cooperation with the Central Asian countries and US engagement in the region.

In developing this relationship, Turkey's special ties with the region again appeared to be an important asset for US policy. Turkey had a lot to offer: not only did Turkey have strong political, cultural and economic connections to the area, but it had also accumulated a significant intelligence capability there. In addition, the large experience Turkey had gathered in fighting terrorism could help to expand the global war on terrorism to this region.[43]

As the focus of interest shifted to a possible operation against Afghanistan and then to assuring the collaboration of Central Asian countries, Turkish analysts soon discovered that Turkey's geo-strategic importance was once again on the rise. It was thought that, thanks to the easy access to the region offered by its geography and its strong ties with the countries there, Turkey could play a pivotal role in the conduct of US military operations in Afghanistan, along with general reshaping the politics in Central Asia. As noted by one analyst, Osman Nuri Aras, "Turkey is situated in a critical geographic position on and around which continuous and multidimensional power struggles with a potential to affect the balance of power at world scale take place. The arcs that could be used by world powers in all sorts of conflicts pass through Turkey. Turkish territory, airspace and seas are not only a necessary element to any force projection in the regions stretching from Europe and Asia to the Middle East, Persian Gulf and Africa, but also make it possible to control its neighbourhood…All these features make Turkey a centre that must be controlled and acquired by those aspiring to be world powers…In the new process, Turkey's importance has increased in American calculations. With a consistent policy, Turkey could capitalise on this to derive some practical benefits…Turkey has acquired a new

---

[42] For more on the motivations and contributions of these countries, see Alec Rasizade (2002), "The New 'Great Game' in Central Asia after Afghanistan", *Alternatives: Turkish Journal of International Relations*, Vol. 1, No. 2, Summer, pp. 132–134; for more on Uzbekistan, see Nermin Güler (2001), "Özbekistan Dis Politikasinda Dönüm Noktasi: 11 Eylül", *Stratejik Analiz*, Vol. 2, No. 20, December, pp. 59–65; for the contribution of these countries to the US operations, see US Department of Defense (2002), *International Contributions to the War Against Terrorism*, Fact Sheet, 7 June.

[43] Afghanistan is discussed more fully in the next section.

opportunity to enhance its role in Central Asia."[44] Indeed, growing international interest in the region had further implications on the energy resources in the Caspian basin and Central Asia. Even before the 11 September events, there had been much talk about a new 'great game' in the making on the chessboard of Central Asia and the Caucasus.[45] After the war in Afghanistan, there was an increasing belief among many analysts that the centuries-old great game was entering a new phase.[46]

According to this line of reasoning, the US military operations in Afghanistan were not simply a reaction to the attacks of 11 September. Rather, "The plans for the American offensive in Afghanistan were not formulated in response to 11 September, but existed prior to the terrorist attacks in the US. Therefore, it could be argued that the attacks on 11 September provided the US with the opportunity to enter Afghanistan to further extend a project that had already started months, if not years, earlier."[47] This interest was attributed to the special geo-strategic significance of Afghanistan: "Afghanistan occupies a strategic position in the geo-political landscapes in general and the geo-politics of the oil and natural gas resources in particular. Afghanistan has been in an extremely significant location spanning South Asia, Central Asia and the Middle East…The US administration has significant political, military and economic reasons to try to turn Afghanistan into a base for American military operations in the region. There can be no doubting of Afghanistan's strategic importance to the US."[48] One analyst goes so far as to claim that "The hidden stakes in the war against terrorism can be summed up in a single word: oil".[49]

This reading of post-11 September developments in the region found large support among many Turkish analysts. A number of studies raised the same

---

[44] Osman Nuri Aras (2001), "Yasanan Yeni Surecte Avrasya Enerji Kaynaklarinin Yeri ve Önemi" (The Place and Importance of Eurasian Energy Resources in the New Process, *2023*, 15 November, No. 7, p. 38.

[45] M. E. Ahrari and James Beal (1996), *The New Great Game in Muslim Central Asia*, McNair Paper 47, Washington, D.C.: National Defense University, Institute for National Strategic Studies; see also Zbigniew K. Brzezinski (1997), *The Grand Chessboard: American Primacy and Its Geo-strategic Imperatives,* New York, NY: Basic Books.

[46] Rasizade, op. cit., p. 125.

[47] Bülent Gökay (2002), "The Most Dangerous Game in the World: Oil, War, and US Global Hegemony", *Alternatives: Turkish Journal of International Relations*, Vol. 1, No. 2, summer, p. 48.

[48] Ibid., p. 49.

[49] Ibid. (quote by Frank Viviano, which was reported in the *San Francisco Chronicle*, 26 September 2001), p. 61.

argument, with the implication that those developments further contributed to Turkey's strategic position.[50] The construction of alternative pipelines to transport oil and gas from the region to the world markets is the crux of the issue, because the Caspian resources are landlocked. The methods and the routes through which the oil and gas are carried to world markets have direct geo-political effects. But it has long been on the agenda without a definite answer. Turkey had been pressing for the Baku-Tbilisi-Ceyhan pipeline project. The developments in the wake of 11 September turned out to strengthen Turkey's hand in this issue. The US threw its weight on Turkey's side and the construction of the pipeline was scheduled to start around September 2002 and finish by the end of 2004.[51]

Against this background, within Turkey there is a growing optimism that the cumulative effect of these developments will strengthen Turkey's position within the region and promote a Turkish zone of influence. But this argument has the following limitations. A proactive Turkish engagement with Central Asia and the Caucasus is not a new concept.[52] After they gained independence with the collapse of the Soviet Union, the newly emerged Turkic states looked towards Turkey as a model. There was also a corresponding great enthusiasm in Turkey for closer relations with the region, as well as Western support to promote the 'Turkish model' that embedded secularism in a predominantly Muslim society, adopted a capitalist-market economy, a multi-party system and prioritised Western orientation. For Turkey, this region was to offer a new area to expand Turkish influence and boost Turkey's geo-strategic value to the West. Turkish ambitions, however, remained largely unrealised and soon that model started to decline in the face of the political realities of the region and changes in Western perceptions over time.[53] The demise of the Turkish model was mainly because of internal constraints: Turkey lacked enough financial and economic resources to meet the expectations of these countries.

---

[50] See for example the editorial, "Türkiye, Hazar, ve Afganistan Ekseninde Petro-politik (Petro-politics at the Axis of Turkey, Caspian and Afghanistan)", *2023*, 15 November 2001, No. 7, pp. 8–15; see also Nadir Biyikoglu (2001), "Afganistan Gercegi ve Büyük Oyun'a Dönüs" (The Reality of Afghanistan and Return to the Great Game), *2023*, 15 November, No. 7, pp. 16–21; and also Aras, op. cit.

[51] "Bush Voices Support for Oil and Gas Pipelines Leading from Caspian to Turkey", *Turkish Daily News*, 5 June 2002.

[52] E. Graham Fuller and Ian O. Lesser (1993), "Turkey's New Eastern Orientation", *Turkey's New Geopolitics: From the Balkans to Western China*, Boulder, Colorado: Westview/RAND, pp. 37–97.

[53] Idris Bal (2000), *Turkey's Relations with the West and the Turkic Republics: The Rise and Fall of the 'Turkish Model'*, Aldershot: Ashgate.

Given that the structural obstacles to Turkey's influence in the region, such as the compatibility of the Turkish model, the receptivity of the target governments, the role of other players (particularly Russia) and the constraints domestic problems put on Turkish foreign policy, expectations of expanding Turkey's role post-11 September are difficult to sustain. Considering that Turkey continues to struggle to overcome its own economic and financial problems, the question arises as to how it will be able to engage in an active new role in the region.

Yet the developments so far imply that in the new era Turkey is viewed differently in the region. Previously, Turkey was perceived as a model for the economic, social and political transformation of these countries. This time, the role expected from Turkey is limited to military and strategic fields. Turkey has concluded several new military cooperation and education agreements in the region in addition to the existing ones. After 11 September, Turkey stepped up its military assistance to Uzbekistan[54] and Kazakhstan[55] (and to a lesser extent to Kyrgyzstan),[56] by supplying arms, military equipment and military training to modernise the capabilities of these nations. Further, after those countries allowed the US to use their airspace and military bases prior to the military campaign in Afghanistan, Turkish Air Force Command personnel conducted site surveys for possible airfields in Tajikistan, Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan to be used in air operations.[57]

Similarly, post-11 September developments and the ensuing US interest in the region had spillover effects in the Caucasus, which provided an added impetus to Turkish activity in the region. Positive steps were taken on pipeline projects, and Turkey's close relations with Azerbaijan along with Turkish-Georgian cooperation in the military field accelerated remarkably. Turkey had already started providing military assistance to Georgia in 1997. After the decision taken by the US to establish a military presence in Georgia,[58] Turkey's efforts to cooperate with Georgia became especially important.[59]

---

[54] "Turkey Equips, Trains Uzbek Military", *Turkish Daily News*, 7 March 2002; "Kivrikoglu Visits Uzbekistan; Signs Deal for Military Assistance", *Turkish Daily News*, 19 March 2002.

[55] RFE/RL *Central Asian Report*, Vol. 2, No. 11, 21 March 2002.

[56] "Turkey, Kyrgyzstan Aim at Strategic Partnership", *Turkish Daily News*, 22 February 2002.

[57] US Department of Defense (2002), *International Contributions to the War Against Terrorism*, Fact Sheet, 7 June, p. 12.

[58] "US Military in Georgia Will Increase Baku-Tbilisi-Ceyhan Pipeline Security", *Turkish Daily News*, 7 March 2002; for the effects of this new development on the region, see Kamil Agacan (2002), "ABD'nin Gürcistan'a

Aside from these military contributions, Turkey tried to raise a common concern for terrorism in the region through bilateral visits and on multilateral platforms. From 29 to 30 April 2002, the presidents of Turkey, Azerbaijan and Georgia held a summit in the Turkish city of Trabzon and signed an agreement to work together against terrorism, along with promising cooperation on pipelines to bring the energy-rich region's resources to the West. The summit was completed by a joint press conference with the three leaders after signing the agreement on "The Struggle against Terrorism, Organised Crime and other Important Crimes" (Trabzon, April 2002).[60] Similarly on 4 June 2002, a summit for "Cooperation and Confidence-Building Measures in Asia" was held in Kazakhstan's capital Almaty, which brought together heads of state of Turkey, China, Russia, India, Pakistan, Palestine, Israel, Egypt, Iran, Mongolia, Tajikistan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Uzbekistan, Afghanistan and Azerbaijan. The leaders signed the "Declaration Aimed at Eradicating Terrorism and for Supporting a Dialogue between Civilisations" (Almaty, 2002), as well as an accord that included regulations, principles and commitments for establishing a comprehensive security mechanism.[61] The celebration of the tenth anniversary of the Black Sea

---

Asker Göndermesi: Terörle Mücadelede Üçüncü Cephe mi, Yoksa Köprübasi mi?", *Stratejik Analiz*, Vol. 2, No. 24, April, pp. 69–76.

[59] "Turkey Donates Vehicles, Communications Equipment to Georgian Military", *Turkish Daily News*, 7 March 2002; see also "Turkey Gives Military Aid to Georgia", *Turkish Daily News*, 12 June 2002; it should further be noted that the US policy towards Azerbaijan has also changed: in December 2001, Section 907 of the Freedom Support Act (preventing US from giving direct US government assistance to Azerbaijan) was revoked.

[60] "Caucasus Cooperation Agreement against Terrorism Signed", *Turkish Daily News*, 1 May 2002; an agreement was reached on holding the summit regularly in the coming years, as noted in *Disisleri Güncesi*, April 2002; it was criticised, however, because it failed to include some key players of the region, notably Russia, Armenia and Iran – see Yusuf Kanli (2002), "A Summit with Missing Key Players", *Turkish Daily News*, 1 May; for more on the impact of the summit on the region, see Hasan Kanbolat (2002), "Türkiye-Azerbaycan-Gürcistan Zirvesi ve Bölgedeki Ortak", *Stratejik Analiz*, Vol. 3, No. 26, June, pp. 52–57.

[61] *Newspot*, No. 33, May-June 2002; in his address at the summit, President Sezer re-emphasised Turkey's experience in fighting terrorism and the importance of international cooperation in tackling this issue – see President's Press Office (2002), *Asya'da Isbirligi ve Güven Artirici Önlemler Konferansi Zirve Toplantisi'nda Yaptiklari Konusma*, 4 June.

Economic Cooperation organisation (BSEC) on 25 June 2002 in Istanbul was another occasion where terrorism was discussed at a regional scale.[62]

All of these events imply that what is actually required from Turkey is for it to play a 'subcontractor' role in the region, to facilitate an American presence there within the wider context of the war on terrorism, rather than create a genuinely independent Turkish zone of influence or promote the Turkish model once again. Therefore, Turkey's ambitions and manoeuvrability are very much limited by international interests in the region. A policy based primarily on limited contributions in the military field but lacking an economic dimension would be flawed. It is bound to remain temporary and once the conditions have changed, and the region returns to normalcy, the underlying realities may re-surface, leaving Turkey at a disadvantage in political and economic terms.

This observation is strengthened by a parallel development in the way this region is treated by the international power centres. These countries are geographically landlocked with no direct connections to open seas. Furthermore, they are also far from the prosperous Western markets. In the short term, they may not be able to attract significant foreign capital, except energy investments. They will probably be seen as 'raw material suppliers', rather than as 'emerging markets'; in other words, they will not be viewed as 'Asian tigers' or just Central and Eastern European countries, but new 'Gulf states'. For this reason, in the foreseeable future, the prospects for these countries to be part of the global market economy and move towards democratic, pluralistic regimes are limited. They will be approached from a strategic perspective, and therefore, it is against this background that Turkey's pivotal role in the region can be better understood. In this context, as far as the optimism surrounding the construction launch of the Baku-Ceyhan pipeline is concerned, it must be noted that a number of other developments could diminish the benefits of the pipelines to Turkey. High construction costs, possible developments concerning alternative routes (such as Afghanistan)[63] and the tactics to be employed by other players could have adverse affects on the feasibility of the project.

A more concrete reality, which speaks against Turkish ambitions in this region, is the changing shape of US-Russian relations. Under President

---

[62] "Black Sea Economic Cooperation Tackles Energy and Terrorism", *Turkish News*, 26 June 2002.

[63] "Afghanistan is on Agenda Again as Energy Route", *Turkish Daily News*, 24 May 2002; for an analysis on the impact of the war on the BTC pipeline, see Cenk Pala (2002), "Afganistan Savasi'nin Hazar Boru Hatti Projelerine Etkisi: 'Kirmizi Kalem' bu Kez Kimin Elinde?", *Stratejik Arastirmalar Dosyasi*, Vol. 3, No. 11, pp. 17–24.

Vladimir Putin, Russia has chosen a non-confrontational style of relations with the US. Meanwhile, Mr Putin has made great progress towards restoring Russian power and influence in the region (and cementing Moscow's primacy) without being opposed by Washington.[64] In this regard, following 11 September, Russia cooperated with the US and did not resist US military deployment in Central Asia and the Caucasus. At the same time, partially in return for its concurrence with US engagement in the region, Russia also tried to use the international atmosphere and the discourse of fighting against terrorism to justify its own activities in the region, thus strengthening its position.[65] Based on these developments, there are some arguments that a US-Russian rapprochement may provide better security and stability in the region; thus, the US should also recognise Russian interests there. If events follow such a course, problems will ensue for Turkey, since Turkey and Russia have been competing with each other in this area.[66] Nevertheless, it must be noted that many analysts refer to prospects for cooperation between the countries. Throughout the 1990s, contrary to earlier expectations, both sides had prioritised economic interests and Turkish-Russian relations developed cooperatively.[67] Similarly it is argued that cooperation, rather than competition, will continue to characterise relations after the events of 11 September 2001. Such cooperation could be extended beyond bilateral relations and include a multidimensional partnership in Eurasia.[68]

---

[64]Stephen F. Larrabee (2001), "Russia and its Neighbors: Integration or Disintegration", in Richard L. Kugler and Ellen L. Frost (eds) (2001), *The Global Century, Globalization and National Security, Volume II*, Washington, D.C.: National Defense University Press, pp. 859–874.

[65] For an analysis of the new developments, see Elnur Soltan (2001), "Bush-Putin Zirvesi: Soguk Savas', in Ikinci Bitisi", *Stratejik Analiz,* Vol. 2, No. 20, December, pp. 5–24; however, Ozdag notes that rather than willingly consenting to US deployment in Central Asia, Russia had to bow to US pressure, see Ümit Özdag (2001), "Terörizm, Küresel Güvenlik ve Türkiye", *Stratejik Analiz,* Vol. 2, No. 19, November, p. 8.

[66] For an early warning that Turkey's 'bridging role' may shift to Russia, see Mehmet Binay, "Ankara Köprü Rolünü Devrediyor" (Ankara is Handing over its Bridging Role), 5 October 2002 (retrieved from the news portal at http://www.ntvmsnbc.com.tr).

[67] Duygu Bazoglu Sezer (2001), "Turkish-Russian Relations a Decade Later: From Adversary to Managed Competition", *Perceptions,* Vol. 6, No. 1, March-May, pp. 79–98.

[68] This is justified by referring to a document called the Eurasia-Action Plan, signed in November 2001 by the foreign ministers of the two countries (see Karaosmanoglu, op. cit.). In his New Year's address, Foreign Minister Cem also underlined that Turkey perceived Russia more as a partner than a competitor in

What role does Turkey have in Afghanistan?

As has been made clear so far, Turkey emerged as one of the leading actors in the fight against terrorism, hence it rigorously supported the international coalition against the Taliban and al-Qaeda. When it became clear that the 11 September attacks had originated from Afghanistan and a military campaign was inevitably going to take place, the government was quick in obtaining a parliamentary authorisation in October 2001 to contribute troops to the US campaign. The bill, which met with public opposition,[69] also authorised the government to allow the stationing of foreign troops on Turkish territory and permit the use of Turkish airspace and airbases.[70] Yet the military Chief of Staff General Hüseyin Kivrikoglu and other top officials expressed their hope that the scope of the conflict and Turkey's direct contribution would be limited. Reflecting the overall ambivalence of the Turkish elite, Mr Kivrikoglu maintained that Turkey could not remain aloof to the developments in Afghanistan, yet at the same time called for a *limited* Turkish role – which left out an active Turkish contribution to combat operations.[71]

The Turkish government, however, decided to contribute to the campaign by sending special forces to work with US troops in humanitarian operations and train Northern Alliance fighters. Turkey also hinted that it could make its experience in guerrilla warfare available and help carve out a coalition among various Afghan factions against the Taliban. Additionally, the US benefited from Turkish airspace, used the Incirlik airbase as a transport hub for the campaign, and according to some reports, received intelligence from

---

Disisleri Güncesi, January 2002. Similarly, Turkey's reaction to US-Russian rapprochement was positive, see "Turkey Pleased with US–Russian Rapprochement", *Turkish Daily News*, 29 May 2002, where even a change in Russia's attitude towards Baku-Tbilisi-Ceyhan pipeline is noted. For the evolution of the Russian position, see Sinan Ogan (2002), "Kremlin ve Lukoil Arasinda Rusya'nin Baku-Ceyhan Politikasi", *Stratejik Analiz*, Vol. 3, No. 26, June, pp. 68–76.

[69] "Majority Opposes Attack on Afghans", *Turkish Daily News*, 4 October 2001.

[70] Turkey had already provided the US with overflight rights in September shortly after attacks: "Turkey opens Airspace to US", *BBC News Online*, 22 September 2001.

[71] See Turkish daily newspapers from 3 October 2001; for different reactions, see "Asker Gönderme Icin ne Demislerdi?", 2 November 2001, http://www.ntvmsnbc.com.tr (news portal); this initial ambivalence and 'passivism' was, however, criticised by some analysts, see Umit Özdag, *Terörizm, Küresel Güvenlik*, pp. 10–11.

Turkey.[72] But the rapid collapse of the Taliban rule made the possible role of Turkish soldiers in the actual combat phase unclear and a new rationale emerged. When the Taliban rule in Afghanistan came to an end, it became possible to launch international initiatives to rebuild the country and the role of Turkey was again undeniable. Although it was not able to make a significant contribution in terms of financial reconstruction aid, Turkey actively participated in the International Security and Assistance Force (ISAF), charged with helping the newly formed interim Afghan authority and with providing order and stability in the capital, Kabul. Within the framework of the ISAF, Turkey contributed to the training of national Afghan police and military forces, provided military aid and equipment, and patrolled Kabul and its environs. In June 2002, when the British mandate was over, Turkey assumed the lead-nation role and took over the command of the ISAF.[73]

Based on these developments, it is claimed by most analysts that Turkey is going to become a more assertive power, not only in its immediate neighbourhood, but also 'out of area'. In Turkish reasoning, its active support for the US military campaign was a logical corollary of its position on fighting international terrorism. According to Prime Minister Bülent Ecevit, it was natural that Turkey joined the war against terror because the US had always stood behind Turkey. He emphasised that the war had to be fought to the end, until the Taliban regime was wiped out.[74] For Turkey, at the same time, capitalising on the US-led war on terrorism was a useful instrument to enhance its influence in Central Asia. By taking strategic decisions and an active part in the military realm, Turkey sought to have a say in the future political landscape of not only Afghanistan, but in Central Asia overall.

As regards to Turkey's active participation in ISAF, this was in line with its policy on peace operations, as it had evolved in the post-cold war era. Turkey has been involved in several UN and NATO peacekeeping missions, from Somalia to Bosnia and Kosovo. This time, through participating actively in the ISAF and commanding a multinational force, Turkey could demonstrate

---

[72] "Analysis: Turkey's Pivotal Position", *BBC News Online*, 18 October 2001.

[73] For the Turkish debate on ISAF, see Saban Kardas (2002), "Dilemmas of Peacebuilding: Reflections on Turkey's Drive for ISAF Command", *Turkish Daily News,* 19 April.

[74] "Basbakan Sayin Bülent Ecevit'in TBMM'de Yaptiklari Konusma", *Disisleri Güncesi*, 10 October 2001; see also "Basbakan Sayin Bülent Ecevit'in CNN International Televizyonu'na Verdikleri Mülakat", *Disisleri Güncesi*, 12 October 2001.

its military strength and ability to project power abroad, thus expanding the overall Turkish sphere of influence in the politics of the region.[75]

More concretely, Turkey sought compensation for its military support in the economic domain.[76] The Turkish economy, already undergoing a severe crisis and under an IMF programme, was hit by the 11 September shock badly. Turkish Economic Minister Kemal Dervis, after claiming that Turkey must support the international fight against terrorism because it had suffered greatly from similar threats, hinted that there could be a price. According to him, "Turkey's strategic importance for the European Union and NATO is increasing and within this strategic framework Western allies should consider the cost that Turkey will have to bear".[77] A similar reasoning was used by Prime Minister Ecevit for justifying assistance to the US.[78] In practical terms, that meant the delay of loan repayments, and when necessary, the provision of new IMF loans as well as direct US assistance.[79]

In the same vein as the general arguments about Turkey being an example to the Muslim world, it was also claimed that Turkey could become a model for Afghanistan as well. The war against Afghanistan offered the possibility to replace the fundamentalist Taliban regime to which Turkey had been consistently opposed and was an important reason behind Turkey's support for the American war. Prime Minister Ecevit was one of the vehement supporters of this view, and during his correspondence with President Bush he underlined that a military operation in Afghanistan should include the

---

[75] "Leadership to Test Turkish Military Might", *Turkish Daily News*, 3 May 2002.

[76] For more on Turkey's motives, see "Afganistan Politikamizi Ulusal Cikarlarimiz ve Tercihlerimiz Belirliyor", interview with Huseyin Bagci, *2023*, No. 7, November 2001, pp. 22–27; see also Mehmet Seyfettin Erol (2002), "Firsatlar ve Zorluklar Ikileminde Türkiye-Afganistan Iliskilerinde Yeni Dönem", *Stratejik Analiz*, Vol. 2, No. 23, March, pp. 77–85; see also Alan Makovsky (2002), "Turkey's Unfinished Role in the War on Terrorism", *Insight Turkey*, Vol. 4, No. 1, January-March, pp. 44–45; and also Hugh Pope, "Turkey's Role in Afghanistan Presents Opportunity", *Wall Street Journal*, 6 June 2002, p. A16.

[77] "Turkey Rattled by Conflict Fears", *BBC News Online: Business*, 17 September 2001.

[78] "Turkey Promises Troops for Afghan Campaign", *Insight Turkey*, Vol. 3, No. 4, October–December 2001, p. 180.

[79] "US Delegation Suggests Rethink of Turkey's $5 Billion Military Debt", *Turkish Daily News*, 2 October 2001.

toppling of the Taliban regime.[80] He went on to say that the model to be introduced had to be one similar to Turkey's secular democratic model to ensure peace, stability and tranquillity in Afghanistan. At times the discussions became emotional. The deep historical ties between the two countries have been continuously repeated to underline the 'necessity' of Turkey's support for the Afghan people: Afghanistan was the first country to recognise the new Turkish Republic; Turkey had helped Afghanistan in its modernisation efforts; Ataturk – the founding father of the modern Turkish Republic – had put special emphasis on Afghanistan, and so on.[81] Some proponents of a proactive Turkish foreign policy went on to suggest that "The first country to recognise Kemal Atatürk's revolution and adopt the Turkish model was Afghanistan in 1921. Under the right political reformulation, to which Turkey will undoubtedly contribute, Afghanistan could be the first model in the post-cold war period to rehabilitate itself through the methods and means provided in the historic Turkish national experiment."[82] Foreign Minister Cem, while acknowledging the universal validity of the Turkish model, called for caution as the Turkish model "is not one that could be forced from the outside. What kind of a model they want, what kind of a model they need, and what kind of a model they are ready for [should] be decided upon by the Afghan people themselves."[83]

From an American perspective, as discussed above, Turkey's support and participation in the coalition was useful to rebut allegations that the US was engaged in a war against Islam. Therefore, similar to Turkish arguments, there were extensive US references to Turkey constituting a model for Afghanistan as well.[84] Along with the military contributions previously noted, Turkey had important links in the country and the region that could facilitate the US presence there. As for the peacekeeping phase, Turkey has a

---

[80] Fikret Bila, "Ecevit'ten Bush'a: 'Taliban devrilmeli'", *Milliyet*, 26 September 2001.

[81] See for example the Prime Minister's address at a party group, as reported in *Hürriyet*, 11 September 2001; for coverage of Foreign Minister Cem's visit to Kabul on 17 December 2001, in which he made extensive references to historical ties as a facilitating factor of cooperation, see Turkish daily newspapers from 18 December 2001.

[82] Paul M. Wihbey and Sule Kilicarslan (2001), "A Turkish Strategic Window of Opportunity", *Insight Turkey*, October–December, Vol. 3, No. 4, p. 21.

[83] "Cem: Turkish Model is Paradigm of Civilisation", interview of Ismail Cem by the *Turkish Daily News*, 7 January 2002.

[84] "Powell: Atatürk Afganistan Konusunda Hakliydi", *Hürriyet*, 6 December 2001.

large standing army with accumulated experience in special operations and peacekeeping; thus, it could spare its troops for such a mission.[85]

Yet the heightened expectations regarding the region are difficult to substantiate.[86] First, Turkey's interests in Afghanistan are similar to the sudden discovery of Central Asia and the Caucasus after the collapse of the Soviet Union. Therefore, because of the lack of any previous strategic perspective towards the country and the region as a whole (except for those in the Atatürk era), raising expectations conjecturally is highly problematic. Second, as was discussed earlier, Turkey's potential for becoming a model to the Muslim world is highly limited. In the case of Afghanistan, this is further limited by the particular characteristics of this war-torn country: the people of the country are illiterate and very closed-off from the world; the society is very fragmented and its economy has collapsed. Since Western liberal values are not welcomed by the people in relatively more-developed Muslim countries, one may wonder how Turkey would be able to carry these values to Afghanistan?

With regard to military contributions and the assumption of the ISAF command, these actions will certainly give an important impetus to Turkey's role in the region and its international standing. Nevertheless, such actions are not backed by other economic and political incentives in the medium and long-term, and the practical benefits could be severely limited. Past experience of Turkey's earlier expectations regarding Central Asia and lack of means could further limit the transformation of this engagement into political influence. The effect of geographical distance and the global reach of the US should therefore be carefully evaluated. As the empirical evidence about Central Asia suggests, although Turkey sees itself as a bridge to open up these countries to the West, the West has in fact been able to establish direct contacts in the region. In the military domain, during the preparation and conduct of Operation Enduring Freedom, the US was able similarly to gain the support of other regional powers, notably Pakistan, and thus minimised the role of Turkey in the overall operation.[87] Finally yet

---

[85] See Makovsky, op. cit., pp. 42–44.

[86] For a critical account, see Kardas, op. cit.; for a careful approach, see Erol, op. cit.

[87] There were even speculations that in the planning and conduct of the military campaign in Afghanistan, US central command could be situated in Turkey, yet they turned out to be unsubstantiated exaggerations of Turkey's role. Based on this prospect, some analysts had even gone so far as to argue that moving the central command to Turkey could revitalise Turkey's strategic importance and create a counter-balance against the growing influence of the EU/Germany in the eastern Mediterranean, in view of the accession of Cyprus into the EU (see the

importantly, the dynamism of US foreign policy in the new era (and whether Turkey can keep pace with it) should be taken into consideration when evaluating the impact of the Afghanistan engagement on Turkish foreign policy (i.e. how many other such engagements Turkey can sustain?). Following this argument, any shift of international interest away from Central Asia, especially if one considers the US intentions to expand the war on terrorism, could also result in a situation where the novelty of the 'strategic importance of the region' may wear off. In this scenario, the out-of-area role could lose the wider political context in which it takes place and turn out to be another sporadic, short-term engagement.

A breakthrough in Turkish-EU relations?

Another active area in Turkish foreign policy after the 11 September attacks is Turkish-EU relations. The basic Turkish argument could be summarised as follows: because the events of 11 September have proven Turkey's value, not only to the Americans but also to the Europeans, Turkey should now anticipate a warmer West.[88] Turkey therefore tried to use this opportunity to cement its relations with the US and Europe, by emphasising its role as a significant pro-Western power at such a critical juncture. Furthermore, there was a strong Turkish belief that in the new era created by the events of 11 September wherein the concern for fighting international terrorism was going to be the major *leitmotiv*, the international system would be increasingly dominated by security-oriented considerations. Following this line of argument, the role of powerful security actors (such as the US and NATO) would be enhanced at the expense of less powerful ones (EU members and the common foreign and security policy – CFSP). In this manner, the urgency of Turkey's relations with the EU on the CFSP and the European security and defence policy (ESDP) was expected to diminish.[89] Along with the hope that Turkey's renewed importance would boost Turkish-EU relations, there was an additional impetus behind the Turks' viewpoint: in the context of the growing American-Turkish strategic partnership, the Turks felt confident that the US would not abandon Ankara and would press the EU to satisfy Turkish demands. Therefore, according to Turkey, the EU should

article "Prof. Osman Metin Öztürk'le Söylesi", *2023,* No. 6, October 2001, pp. 18–19).

[88] Volkan Bozkir, Vice Secretary-General for European Union Affairs, "Turkey Can Anticipate a Warmer West", *Turkish Daily News*, 3 October 2001.

[89] For an assessment of the effects of the war in Afghanistan on the EU's CFSP and ESDP, see Saban Kardas (2001), "Afganistan Operasyonu'nun AGSP'ye Olan Yansimalari", 25 November (retrieved from http://www.liberal-dt.org.tr/guncel/Kardas/sk_afganistan.htm).

appreciate the Turkish position in some of the problems that have dominated relations between the European Union and Turkey for some time.

Turkish expectations that the EU and European countries would be more receptive to Turkey's position on fighting terrorism have already been elaborated upon. Other issues that were supposedly going to be solved in a manner favourable to Turkey's interests included the Cyprus conflict, the deadlock on the ESDP and Turkey's troubled EU membership process. There were indeed some initial positive steps in all those areas that led to a sense of optimism.[90] There appeared to be a chance to overcome the squabble over the ESDP-NATO relations and over the role Turkey would have in the development of the ESDP. On the eve of the Laeken Summit in December 2001, a consensus, called the 'Ankara Document' was reached between Turkey, the UK and the US. After a long pause, the dialogue among the leaders of the two communities on Cyprus resumed. Both of these achievements were viewed as a success by the Turkish politicians[91] and the US was said to have given stimulus to these developments.[92]

At the risk of simplifying the situation, we suggest that there are some fundamental challenges to Turkey's arguments that limit a sudden breakthrough in EU-Turkish relations. The main weakness of the Turkish discourse could be identified as follows. The initial rhetoric seemed to perceive the West as a monolithic bloc.[93] Although this appeared to be true in the immediate aftermath of the 11 September terror attacks, when all the European powers expressed their solidarity with the US against the dangers of terrorism, after the novelty of these slogans faded away the underlying divergences in transatlantic relations over a wide range of issues resurfaced. These differences were exacerbated by another feature of Turkey's approach to the EU, in which it relied on US pressure in its dealings with the EU. These developments slowly put Turkey in an awkward position for several reasons.

---

[90] "Rays of Light: For the First Time in a Year, Turks are Seeing Some Flickers of Hope", *The Economist*, 15 December 2001, Vol. 361, No. 8252.

[91] "No Concessions on ESDP and Cyprus: Ecevit", 7 December 2001 (retrieved from the news portal at http://www.ntvmsnbc.com.tr).

[92] Colin Powell's visit to Ankara was the particular indicator of US support: "Powell to Push for Cyprus Settlement", *Turkish Daily News*, 3 December 2001; see also Jim Kapsis, "Beyond Geopolitics for Cyprus", *The Washington Times*, 5 December 2001; for a Turkish view, see Cengiz Candar, "11 Eylül Jeopolitigi ve Kibris'ta Son Tango", 6 December 2001 (retrieved from the news portal at http://www.haberturk.com).

[93] See the quotation from Economy Minister Dervis in the above example.

First, because EU-US relations were increasingly characterised by disagreements over several issues and transatlantic relations were more occupied with how to find a solution to these problems than relations with Turkey, the sense of urgency within the US about Turkey's problems was far from meeting the Turks' expectations.[94] Even if one assumes that the US was inclined to support Turkey, it would approach EU-Turkish relations from a strategic perspective. Yet the US approach may not be compatible with the actual realities of EU-Turkish relations and Turkey's expectations of the EU. This reasoning applies largely to EU democratisation and human rights priorities *vis-à-vis* Turkey – illustrated by the famous analogy of a 'democratic and stable Turkey versus a stable and democratic Turkey'. That could in turn lead to the next problem. This 'tactic' of using its relations with the US as leverage *vis-à-vis* the EU is likely to cultivate a mood of distrust between Turkey and the EU, as well as friction between the EU and the US. Instead of creating a healthy dialogue with the EU, Turkey's use of its strategic ties with the US (and US lobbying as a stick against the EU) was increasingly perceived as a kind of low-intensity threat against Brussels. In the long term, Ankara itself hinders the creation of a strong channel of trust with the EU and is thus isolated. Against such a picture, it was no surprise that the Turkish elite soon began to question Turkey's membership in the EU. This debate was paralleled by another one on whether Turkey should make a choice between EU membership and a strategic partnership with the US.[95]

The Turkish political elite's perception of the country as an indispensable actor to the West, particularly in the political and strategic realm, is a cause for further problems. It is true that Turkey's role in the European security architecture is vital, but the security-dominated basis of Turkey's perceptions of its relations with Europe impacts not only on the way Turkey values itself,

---

[94] It suffices in this regard to remember that during a US-EU summit in May 2002, Turkey was barely on the agenda (see "EU-US Summit Starts Today: Turkey's EU Membership is not on the Agenda", *Turkish Daily News*, 3 May 2002).

[95] Secretary-General of the National Security Council, Tuncer Kilinc, shocked observers with his statement on 7 March 2002 and stimulated an intense discussion by maintaining that Turkey would never be accepted by the EU, hence it should seek alternative allies (see "Turkey Will Never be Accepted by the EU: Kilinc", 7 March 2002, retrieved from the news portal at http://www.ntvmsnbc.com.tr; see also Ihsan Dagi, "Kritik Karar: ABD ya da AB", *Radikal*, 12 March 2002; and Ihsan Dagi, "Competing Strategies for Turkey: Eurasianism or Europeanism?", *Central Asia and Caucasus Analyst*, SAIS Biweekly Briefing, 8 May 2002; and also M. Ali Birand, "Will Turkey Choose the EU or the US?", *Turkish Daily News,* 19 April 2002.

but also on the actual course of developments. At times, this leads to robust attitudes towards the EU and demands for concessions or different treatment that hampers the integration process. More importantly, capitalising on its strategic importance diverts attention away from Turkey's real problems and reduces the urgency to implement the economic, political and cultural reforms demanded by the European integration process. In other words, the more Turkey focuses on its indispensability to the West, the less it is willing to undertake the necessary transformation in its journey towards EU membership. Therefore, EU representatives have been quick to make their positions clear against Turkey's attempts to capitalise on its strategic importance and de-emphasise membership criteria. The EU commissioner responsible for enlargement, Gunter Verheugen, maintained that Turkey should meet the hard criteria to become a member of the EU; otherwise, the whole 'Europe integration project' will lose its credibility. He went on to say that a scenario where the EU "softens the conditions for Turkey's membership" in return for Turkey's "guarantee of strategic aid" was unacceptable: "We cannot make such a bargain".[96] Given the initial expectations that, similar to Turkey's entry into NATO after it contributed troops to the Korean War, Turkey's participation in the military campaign in Afghanistan would pave the way for Turkey's membership into the EU, this warning is quite revealing.

Finally but importantly, given that the underlying roots of the problems that have dominated EU-Turkish relations are unlikely to suddenly disappear, even after 11 September, caution is advisable. The continuation of the Greek veto on the Ankara Document, which in Turkey's view[97] resolved the tension over ESDP, and Turkey's futile attempts to force the EU to set a deadline for the start of membership negotiations are some examples of continuing differences. Therefore, a fundamental shift in the EU's policy towards Turkey just for the sake of Turkey's enhanced strategic importance is hard to expect. Rather, the determination to carry out transformation on the domestic scene and the speed with which Turkey delivers this change should continue to remain the single most important determining factor in Turkey's relations with the EU.

US-Turkish relations: revival of the strategic partnership?

This section reviews US-Turkish relations in further detail. As already underlined in the American point of view, Turkey came to be seen as a critical country whose support and cooperation was essential. Initially, there

---

[96] "Türkiye'yi Kaybederiz", *Milliyet*, 22 October 2001.

[97] "ESDI is completed from our point of view: Cem", 13 December 2001 (retrieved from the news portal at http://www.ntvmsnbc.com.tr).

was a strong belief in the US that supporting moderate Muslim countries that oppose terrorism and extremism was the key to winning the war on terrorism. The Turkish model, which embeds Islam within a secular system, appeared to be the best candidate to fit this role. In addition, Turkey's geographical location and experience in fighting terrorism made its cooperation essential to the international coalition against terrorism. Furthermore, Turkey was more than willing to contribute to the US agenda in Afghanistan by providing troops to the peacekeeping force. As a result, the US-Turkish relations that had been characterised by ups-and-downs throughout the 1990s, started to receive renewed interest. As previously noted, many American politicians liked to call Turkey "a steadfast partner in [the] war on terrorism".[98] The changed mood was observed not only in the declarations of American politicians, but also in the titles of articles written on the issue, which were at times heavily emotional, such as "Turkey and the US: A Partnership Rediscovered".[99]

From Turkey's perspective, the revival of strategic relations with the US implied several potential advantages. Consequently, the Turks expected more active US assistance in a number of areas:

- support in the campaign against PKK terrorism;

- the promise of increased exports to American markets;

- the removal of obstacles to military transfers to Turkey;

- US backing of the Turkish command of Afghan peacekeepers and the Baku-Ceyhan pipeline project;

- support for further IMF loans; and

- support for Turkey's foreign policy on issues such as Cyprus, the ESDP and EU membership.

---

[98] US Department of State (2002), "Grossman: Change in the Value of Enduring Alliances", remarks to the American Turkish Council by US Undersecretary of State for Political Affairs Marc Grossman, Washington, D.C., 19 March; see also "Turkey Called the 'Shining Crown Jewel' Amid Instability: US Team Hails Turkey for its Important Role", *Turkish Daily News*, 2 October 2001; the US Ambassador to Turkey also underlined that the US could have no better ally than Turkey in the war on terrorism (see Robert W. Pearson (2002), "The US and Turkey: A Model of Sustained Engagement", *The Fletcher Forum of World Affairs,* Winter–Spring, pp. 53–62); see also Annie Pforzheimer (2002), "The US and Turkey: A Post-11 September Model of Sustained Engagement", *Polis Bilimleri Dergisi*, Vol. 4, No. 1–2, January-June, pp. 1–8.

[99] Steven A. Cook (2001), "US-Turkey relations and the war on terrorism", *Insight Turkey*, Vol. 3, No. 4, October-December, pp. 37–48.

Another repeated theme in the Turkish arguments was that (in contrast to the Europeans) the US had always been more supportive and sensitive to Turkey's demands on most of the contentious issues and thus a reliable partner. As a result, after the events of 11 September, the US-Turkish relations that were characterised as a 'strategic partnership' by President Bill Clinton in 1999 deepened further.[100] In this regard, Prime Minister Ecevit's visit to Washington from 14 to 19 January was a climax and provided an important occasion to cement the strategic partnership.[101]

In principle, it is hard to ignore that US-Turkish relations converge to a large extent. It was this convergence of interests and shared strategic vision that formed the basis of some common policies on various issues and regions, such as the Balkans and the Caucasus. Nevertheless, one should not underestimate the limitations that force us to take a more cautious stance. To begin with, growing references to Turkey's renewed strategic importance in the wake of the 11 September attacks inevitably reproduces the basic nature of US-Turkish relations, which has been heavily dominated by security issues. Because there are mutual security-related concerns on several issues and regions, this is understandable. But as in the past, this situation leaves Turkey dependent on shifting US priorities. Since it remains the passive receiver of the external conditions in this partnership, Turkey is deprived of the ability to direct this partnership according to its own agenda and priorities.

After 11 September, however, there were serious attempts to diversify the relationship and give it a more solid standing. Given that US foreign policy is going to be largely driven by an objective of 'security first' and some underlying problems in relations persist, it remains to be seen whether a major step towards diversification can be realised. Among others, the most attractive attempt towards diversification was the proposal to increase trade between Turkey and the US. The idea of increasing economic ties with the US is not new and has in fact been on the agenda since the Gulf war. To compensate Turkey's losses in the war, there was a discussion about how the US could help Turkey. The president of the country at that time, Mr Turgut Ozal, pointed out that "We don't want direct financial aid, what we need is more trade with the US. For this, the US should abolish textile quotas and other barriers to trade." Yet once the war was over, Turkey's demands were forgotten and Turkey was left alone to deal with its economic problems.

---

[100] "Ismail Cem's New Year's Address", *Disisleri Güncesi*, January 2002.

[101] "Ecevit's Washington Visit Highlights Turkey's Increased Value", *Turkish Daily News*, 15 January 2002; see also "Turkish-US Relations", *Newspot*, No. 31, January-February 2002; and *Disisleri Güncesi,* January 2002.

Later, following Prime Minister Ecevit's visit to Washington in January 2002, the strengthening of Turkish-American trade and the economic dimension to the strategic partnership were once again on the agenda.[102] At a press conference in Washington, Mr Ecevit said the outcome of his efforts deserved the highest praise: "Adding economic partnership to [the] political and military alliance with the US is an event that deserves ten marks".[103] Towards this end, a Turkish-American Economic Partnership Commission was established to handle all economic and trade-related issues between Turkey and the US.[104] The Commission had its first meeting in Ankara in February 2002.[105] Yet, the conclusions of these meetings fell short of Turkish expectations. In addition, the plan to establish Qualified Industrial Zones (QIZs) was criticised as the US preferred a quick-fix solution and tried to incorporate Turkey into the existing QIZ between Israel and the US.[106] This small example is indicative of the fact that the Bush administration was not ready to take the painful step and seek legislation to establish closer, direct economic relations with Turkey owing to Congressional opposition. Therefore, in assessing US-Turkish relations, it should be noted that US foreign policies can shift easily through the different factors that affect US policy-making, such as lobbying, Congress and internal American debates. At the moment, there are many supporters of Turkey in the Bush administration, but this cannot be taken for granted and there is still strong opposition within Congress against Turkey.[107] The expectation of full,

---

[102] "The Target is More Trade with America: Ecevit", 14 January 2002 (retrieved from the news portal at http://www.ntvmsnbc.com.tr).

[103] For this and other reactions, see Elif Ünal, "PM Ecevit Earns High Marks with US Visit", *Turkish Probe*, 20 January 2002, No. 470.

[104] "US Ready to Discuss Turkish Trade", *Associated Press*, 17 January 2002.

[105] "Turkish-US Commission Meets over Heavy Agenda", *Turkish Daily News*, 27 February 2002.

[106] "Türkiye, ABD-İsrail anlaşmasına katılacak", 27 February 2002 (retrieved from the news portal at http://www.ntvmsnbc.com.tr); see also "Hopes Dim after First Round of Turkey-US Economic Partnership Commission", *Turkish Probe*, No. 475, 3 March 2002; the Chairman of Turkish-US Business Council, Akin Öngör, was critical of the conclusions of the meeting, as noted in "ABD Türkiye'yi Ihmal Ederse Uyuyamaz", *Hürriyet*, 17 March 2002; see also "US Leaves out Several Sectors from Turkish QIZs", *Turkish Daily News*, 27 June 2002.

[107] Although there was optimism that most of the Congressional opposition to Turkey would diminish, on certain issues it did in fact persist, as noted in "Inan: Armenian Lobby has no Chance against Turkey", *Turkish Daily News*, 8 May 2002; for a comparable view, see "Obstacle From the Greek Lobby to Helicopter Purchase", *Turkish Daily News*, 12 June 2002.

unqualified American support for all the issues previously mentioned is therefore over-optimistic, as demonstrated by the developments so far.

Despite the convergence on priorities at a strategic level, there may be divergence at the practical level. In addressing certain tangible issues, the approaches may not always be agreeable and even when these overlap, one should not overlook a fundamental characteristic of this relationship: the concerns of Turkey and the US are guided by entirely different sets of foreign policy priorities (a global hegemony versus a regional power). Therefore, there may always be diverging, even conflicting, interests and priorities on certain issues. Over-activism as observed in the current US foreign policy in the new era is likely to amplify this problem.

Although terrorism may be a common concern to Europe and America, there is a difference of opinion as to how to deal with it. A similar reasoning applies to US-Turkish relations. Turks repeatedly like to argue that the US war against terrorism is a policy parallel to that of Turkey's. As Turkish Ambassador to the US Osman Faruk Logoglu underlined, "We are at the forefront of the war, as a friend, as an ally and in reciprocation for the US understanding of our own fight against terrorism".[108] But in reality, it soon became clear that there are some fundamental differences. The controversy over the military operation against Iraq illustrates the perils of Turkey's geo-strategic position.

Turkey's geographical location is its main asset, but at the same time, it has also produced Turkey's greatest headache: Iraq. In an effort to root out the sources of international terrorism, the US shifted its focus to the so-called 'rogue states'; President Bush took this one step further by declaring Iraq, Iran and North Korea as an 'axis of evil'. Even before this speech, extending military operations against Iraq was on the US agenda. Following developments such as the supposed Iraq-al Qaeda links, the anthrax cases and the dispute over UN arms inspections in the country, Iraq became the next target for the US fight against terrorism. This development inevitably brought Turkey to the forefront again, owing to its strategic value in any future war against Iraq.

Nevertheless, Turkey strongly opposed a war against Iraq. Before 11 September, the Turkish government had been trying to normalise relations with Iraq (despite US opposition) in order to compensate for economic losses that had resulted from the UN-imposed embargo on Iraq. Therefore, the determination of the US to intervene in Iraq was an unwelcome development. Yet the real problem lies elsewhere. There is a fear that the operations

---

[108] "Turkish Ambassador to US Speaks at Fletcher", 14 March 2002 (retrieved from http://www.tacsne.org/Past%20Activities/Fletcherhaber.htm).

against Iraq and the turmoil created by post-Saddam political developments may have serious repercussions for Turkish security. Turkey is worried that the war against Iraq could result in the break up of Iraq and the establishment of a Kurdish state in the north. Such a possibility would, from the Turkish perspective, encourage Kurdish separatist elements within Turkey. For this reason, Turkey's main priority has been to avoid an operation against Iraq. When war became inevitable, Turkey argued that Iraq should remain one nation. Their nightmare is that the Turkish army could be forced to occupy Northern Iraq to prevent the emergence of an independent Kurdish state there, which would affect post-Saddam political developments in Iraq. Such a policy may not be compatible with the US agenda in Iraq and Turkish-American interests could move towards sharpened divergence.

Indeed, some Turkish analysts have persuasively argued that managing divergence and reaching a common position on the Iraq issue could be the 'test case' for the Turkish-American partnership. Reporting on the optimism following Prime Minister Ecevit's Washington visit, Cengiz Candar is blatantly critical: "Turkey's protection by America on 'political and economic platforms' depends to a large extent [on] Turkey's ability to act in tune with America on the issue of Iraq. I mean, as Turkey, you would oppose an American operation in Iraq; but at the same time you would become a 'strategic partner' with the US, and you would rely on US 'economic assistance' to Turkey unreservedly. That will not happen…Cannot happen…Saddam is the 'gist' of the calculations on Turkish-American relations and 'strategic partnership'".[109] Moreover, everything comes with a certain price. It is noted that the deepening of the strategic partnership and the generous support Turkey receives from the US administration ironically intensifies Turkey's dependence on the US, with the effect that the burden of being a 'strategic ally' limits Turkey's room for manoeuvre.[110] Given the obvious difference of position towards Iraq, however, that situation only adds to the complexity of Turkey's uncomfortable partnership with the US.

Finally but importantly, one should also bear in mind that Turkey's willingness to engage in active policies on several fronts is simultaneously likely to lead to conflicts of priorities and resources. Its wish to enhance relations with Europe, while moving towards a deepened 'strategic partnership' with the US and engaging in a proactive policy in Eurasia, could be increasingly difficult to reconcile. Perhaps, as was discussed in the previous section, the debate over whether to choose between membership in

---

[109] Cengiz Candar, "Stratejik' degil 'aday ortak'…", *Yeni Safak*, 22 January 2002.

[110] Kemal Balci, "US Ties Turkish Government's Hands", *Turkish Probe*, 20 January 2002, No. 470.

the European Union and strategic partnership with the US was just an early indicator of the dilemmas of a multidimensional foreign policy.

An end to the cycle of economic crises?

In this section we consider the impact of post-11 September developments on Turkey's domestic economic problems. Since early 2001, Turkey has been hit by a severe economic crisis. The crisis devastated the industrial sector, lowered living standards, raised unemployment and jeopardised Turkey's international financial solvency.[111] In dealing with the crisis, Turkey received a significant amount of IMF credits that have amounted to more than $30 billion. American support was crucial for Turkey to obtain this IMF aid. Because Turkey emerged as a critical ally and the 'best model' for Islamic countries in the new era (from an American perspective), Turkey had to be supported economically. In this way the US could not only assure Turkey's cooperation but also send a strong message that it would not abandon a US ally and Muslim country when it is in need. The remarks by US Congressman Robert Wexler, are quite telling: "An economic collapse in Turkey would be disastrous for America…America has got to treat the economy of Turkey as if it is the economy of New Jersey".[112]

Although the Turkish side repeatedly claims that the IMF credits were provided to Turkey without any political concessions, there is a perception (both at home and abroad) that without the war in Afghanistan and Turkish support in the campaign against terrorism, the IMF would have never given such a huge amount of money to Turkey. According to some comparative analogies, Turkey could have had a catastrophe similar to what happened in Argentina.[113] As quoted above, Turkish Economic Minister Dervis (who took over the Turkish economy in March 2001) and Prime Minister Ecevit have made a strong link between Turkey's support for the international fight

---

[111] "Kriz, OECD liginde küme düsürdü", 19 May 2002 (retrieved from the news portal at http://www.ntvmsnbc.com.tr); see also Bülent Aliriza (2001), "Turkey and the Global Storm", *Insight Turkey*, Vol. 3, No. 4, October–December, p. 25.

[112] "Congressman Wexler: US Must Throw all Support behind Turkey", *Turkish Daily News*, 21 February 2002.

[113] For more on this famous comparison, see two contributions to the *Turkish Policy Quarterly*, Vol. 1, No. 1, Spring 2002: Cem Akyürek, "Argentina's Experience: Any Lessons for Turkey?", and Ümit Kumcuoglu, "Turkey vs. Argentina: A Comparative Analysis with a Long-term Perspective"; see also Murat Ücer (2001), "When You Cry for Argentina, Should You Cry for Turkey too?", *Private View*, Summer, No. 1, pp. 56–59.

against terrorism and the economic assistance offered to Turkey.[114] Similarly, representatives of the Turkish private sector were more than willing to agree with this point on strategic grounds. According to the Chairman of the Turkish-US Business Council, Akin Öngör, if Americans ignore Turkey and fail to support it economically, they would not be able to go to bed in safety.[115]

Whatever the exact motives were behind the IMF decisions, the fact is that with IMF help Turkey was able to control the economy in the short term and avert a catastrophe. Yet, in the long term this situation may have some negative consequences. As long as the economic and political systems remain decayed and structural problems are not remedied, the injection of foreign capital into the economy is bound to have a short-term effect. There is growing speculation by financial analysts that Turkey's total debts, which now exceed its gross national product, may create serious problems in servicing and repayment.[116]

When assessing the performance of an economy and the issue of foreign assistance, perhaps the amount of foreign investment flowing into a country is more important than the amount of direct aid it receives. In this respect, Turkey does not have a promising picture. According to a recent report prepared by the UN Conference on Trade and Development, between 1998 and 2000 Turkey ranked 122nd among 137 countries in terms of foreign capital inflow.[117] The reasons why foreign investors did not prefer Turkey were mainly its macroeconomic instability, widespread corruption and the complex nature of the transactions that needed to be fulfilled. As a result, Turkey later decided to take steps to overhaul its foreign investment rules, as part of its IMF-backed reform process.[118] Another study reveals the other side of the coin: the amount of Turkish capital that is invested abroad, especially in Switzerland and Luxembourg, is estimated to be $70 billion. Most of this money left Turkey after the economic crises for the purpose of

---

[114] Indeed, although Dervis' negotiations with the IMF at the end of September 2001 did not bear fruit, by mid-November the IMF announced the release of a further $11 billion in loans. In the meantime, Dervis visited Vice- President Dick Cheney to bring his request directly to the US. It seems that subsequent US influence paid off (see Aliriza, op. cit., p. 33).

[115] "ABD Türkiye'yi Ihmal Ederse Uyuyamaz", *Hürriyet*, 17 March 2002.

[116] Aliriza, op. cit., p. 33.

[117] "Yabanci Hala Inat Ediyor", *Radikal*, 29 April 2002.

[118] "Turkey Overhauling Foreign Investment Procedures", *Turkish Probe*, No. 487, 26 May 2002.

securing the money abroad, since domestic investors no longer appear to have sufficient confidence to invest in the Turkish economy.[119]

Here is the real paradox of Turkey: with a new crisis in the region, Turks think that the country has become strategically important. Yet, in political and economical terms it is considered to be a risky place to invest, because its economic system is not stable and possible conflicts in the region pose threats to the country. If everyone had been convinced that an operation against Iraq was inevitable, and if the deputy prime minister of the country maintained that the operation could destabilise the whole region, then one wonders how international and domestic investors would be convinced that it is reasonable to invest in Turkey?

Moreover, the belief that 'they cannot ignore us – they have to help us economically because we are strategically important!' is not a good one. Such a view could hinder domestic determination and the ability to solve the country's problems on its own. Further, it could result in a less serious approach to economic reforms and in turn, diminish the self-discipline necessary for economic transformation. Therefore, how Turkey will be able to solve the vicious cycle of economic crises remains an open question.

These economic problems limit the country's ability to act independently in its foreign policy, as was observed in discussions about the operation against Iraq. In a recent television broadcast by the American Fox-News channel, Dick Morris, an advisor to former President Clinton claimed that "Turkey has to support us, because the owner of Turkey is the IMF, and the IMF has already paid Turkey for this service," generating severe annoyance among many Turks and at least one American analyst.[120]

This 'dependency' applies to other cases as well. Many American analysts notably did not hesitate to refer to American support for further aid to Turkey from the IMF and argued for the relevance of the 'dependent alliance' between Turkey and the US. For instance, in a recent article Daniel Nelson presents the case that, "Turkey needs America and the US needs Turkey. Aside from a Republican administration in Washington, Turkey hears only criticism of its human rights record, and sees ongoing exclusion from Europe. Without Washington, $10 billion in further IMF loans would have been impossible, and the image of an Argentina catastrophe would loom. Without Washington, Athens' place in the EU would mean intensified

---

[119] "Türkiye'nin 70 Milyar Dolari Disarda", 15 November 2001 (retrieved from the news portal at http://www.haberturk.com).

[120] "ABD'li yorumcu: IMF Türkiye'yi satın aldi", 2 April 2002 (retrieved from the news portal at http://www.ntvmsnbc.com.tr).

pressures to back away from the Turkish Republic in Cyprus. America has been a better friend [to Turkey] than any alternative."[121]

Nevertheless, there is a fundamental contradiction in the interplay between economics and strategic importance in the new era. The increasing strategic importance and the requirements of the new activism stemming from it, in fact, do not coincide with the needs of the Turkish economy. Whereas Turkey is undergoing a severe economic crisis and experiencing a shortage of capital, the new engagements as part of a Turkish contribution to the international fight against terrorism are no doubt costly and require a solid economic backing. For instance, although Turkey was more than willing to contribute actively and assume the command of the ISAF in Afghanistan, the financial burden of this operation delayed the negotiations.[122] For a long time, Ankara's worries about the financial repercussions of Turkish contributions could not be addressed by the US or the UK. Turkey's repeated demands for Western funding of the ISAF fell on deaf ears for a long time. It was reported that Washington was reluctant to provide extra financial support for Ankara on ISAF because billions of dollars in IMF loans had already been provided to Turkey to help its recovery from the financial crisis.[123] There were even some speculations that Turkey might have given up its quest for ISAF leadership, based on financial and other considerations.[124] After prolonged discussions, in the end it was only through American assurances that Turkey was able to accept leadership of the force.[125] Similarly, because Turkey is keen on power projection beyond its borders to sustain its military engagements abroad, there is a willingness to spend further on military procurement in the aftermath of 11 September. For example, one of the biggest Turkish defence projects came to realisation with Turkey successfully concluding negotiations for the purchase of four AWACS (early warning aircraft) from Boeing. The financial cost of that

---

[121] Daniel N. Nelson (2002), "The Dependent Alliance", *Insight Turkey*, Vol. 4, No. 1, January–March, p. 62.

[122] "Turkey Wants Assurances before Taking ISAF Command", *Turkish Daily News*, 27 February 2002.

[123] Elif Ünal, "Playing 'World Power' Role May Cost Turkey", *Turkish Daily News*, 3 March 2002.

[124] "Türkiye ISAF Liderliginden Vazgecebilir", 11 March 2002 (retrieved from the news portal at http://www.ntvmsnbc.com.tr).

[125] "Türkiye'nin ISAF Faturasini ABD Ödeyecek", *Hürriyet,* 18 March 2002; see also "Turkey to Take over Afghan Mission", *Associated Press*, 29 April 2002. The US aid was delayed, however, due the need for Congressional approval, "Turkish Troops in Afghanistan, US Aid is Delayed", *Turkish Daily News*, 12 June 2002.

project to Turkey is expected to be around $1.1 billion.[126] One has to wait and see how it will be possible to reconcile the strategic calculations that require heavy military spending with the current needs of the Turkish economy.

Before concluding this section, it must be underlined that the interplay between Turkey's economy and its strategic importance is problematic in other aspects. Turkey's over-emphasis on its geo-strategic position and its value to the West and its determination to transform this into tangible economic benefits may have worked in times of crisis. Nevertheless, it should be noted that such a policy could also turn out to be self-defeating in the long term. One cannot take the geo-strategic value granted; it may change over time and depend on the situation under consideration. Therefore, if Turkey is serious about solving its economic problems, it has to focus on structural remedies, rather than conjectural, external developments. More importantly, using its political-military contributions to Western security to gain economic leverage may diminish the trust between Turkey and its allies, adversely affecting relations in the long term.

Conclusion

In light of the activities observed so far, the dominant view is that post-11 September events have contributed to Turkey's strategic importance and thus have helped to reshape Turkey's relations with the US and Europe, as well as relations with Turkey's neighbouring countries. As expressed by Foreign Minister Cem, "The unfortunate events of 11 September 2001 and ensuing developments have confirmed and consolidated some fundamental preferences of the Turkish foreign policy. Besides, they have boosted Turkey's strategic importance".[127]

According to these arguments these events and international reactions may have even stimulated the long-delayed redefinition of Turkey's role in the post-cold war world. An excellent example of these arguments is noted in Wihbey and Kilicarslan (2001): "What is required in the current circumstance is for Turkey to seize the strategic initiative, with bold political leadership that articulates Turkey's national security aspirations within the new regional context. An historic window of opportunity exists for Turks, with Western support and encouragement, to emerge from their bunker-mentality and assert themselves in shaping a positive historical trend outside

---

[126] "AWACS Negotiations Complete", *Turkish Daily News*, 5 June 2002.

[127] "Cem: Turkish Model is Paradigm of Civilisation", interview of Ismail Cem by the *Turkish Daily News*, 7 January 2002.

their borders…Turkey is ready…What remains is for the West, and specifically the US, to help Turkey mobilize its potential."[128]

Although it is generally true that Turkey's international standing has been visibly enhanced, a more cautious approach is needed to assess the post-11 September developments on Turkish foreign policy. This paper argues that the best way to view the Turkish role is in the context of a regional power. Turks have ambitious and at times, over-exaggerated expectations of their country's international position; but in reality, Turkey is mainly acting as a pivotal power, as best observed in the discussions regarding the Turkish role in Afghanistan and Turkey's relations with Central Asia and the Caucuses. For example, on the one hand Turkey is trying to lead the ISAF, but on the other hand, it is asking the US to pay its costs and provide Turkey with the necessary transport, intelligence and logistic facilities. This kind of dilemma is exactly what the country faces as a pivotal state, which highlights the mismatch between Turkey's capabilities and its foreign policy vision. It has to be recognised that, as things currently stand, the gap between Turkey's capabilities and its expectations is difficult to bridge in the short run.

As a result, Turkey's ability to be an independent actor, initiating its own projects, is severely limited by, or depends upon, the degree to which it is successful in balancing its own priorities with external factors. In other words, Turkey could act in cooperation with other global and regional powers, and mobilise their support in areas of converging interests. In this way, Turkey can both advance its own interests and contribute to the agenda of its partners. But the extent to which Turkey's interests diverge from those of its partners may make it increasingly difficult to follow an independent course of action. If this approach is chosen, any growing divergences may run the risk of becoming confrontations. This point (which many advocates of Turkey's strategic importance fail to see) must be the basis of any assessment of Turkish foreign policy. Therefore, Turkey needs to engage seriously in a comprehensive and in-depth debate about its role in the world and in the region, the resources at its disposal, the foreign policy it envisages and its priorities. The responses to these questions are of vital importance for the successful resolution of not only the foreign policy issues faced by the country but its domestic problems as well. Such a debate should leave aside the influence of short-term, conjectural developments and focus more on setting long-term, structural priorities.

This segues into our next observation regarding the post-11 September debate on Turkey's strategic importance. The arguments raised for Turkey's enhanced strategic importance are very similar to those employed at the beginning of the 1990s, following the Gulf war and the collapse of the

---

[128] Wihbey and Kilicarslan, op. cit., pp. 22–23.

former Soviet Union. Yet remembering that the euphoria of the 1990s remained largely unrealised and diverted the country's attention away from more important policy objectives, there is a valid argument that it is high time for Turkey to see the facts in a more realistic manner. First, the foreign policy issues that are on Turkey's agenda will evolve according to the actual realities of the issue under consideration, rather than altered strategic conditions. It is true that the increased strategic value of the country may have positive effects on its international standing, but on contentious issues such as relations with Europe or America, the underlying sources of cooperation or divergence will not vanish. Therefore it would be wrong for Turkey to capitalise on its strategic importance and downplay the necessary steps it needs to take in its foreign and security policies.

Second, the need for a more realistic vision in Turkish foreign policy has domestic implications. Whatever model it follows in its foreign policy or priorities – including EU membership, leadership in Eurasia or strategic partnership with the US – Turkey's international performance will depend above all on its ability to solve problems internally, and reach economic and political harmony. In this regard, a rational assessment of the country's international role would help to avoid unnecessary external adventures and enable Turkey to direct its attention to the necessary domestic transformation.

The economic, political and diplomatic problems facing the country are fundamental; they cannot be solved through a simple redefinition of Turkey's strategic role in the new context. Engaging in ambitious external projects or relying on the tempting idea of Turkey's indispensability to its Western partners could diminish the urgency for reform and take the focus of the country away from economic and political modernisation. Economic reforms, democratisation and human rights issues would receive less attention compared with the life-and-death problems of national sovereignty and national security.

Therefore a choice is being forced upon Turkey. It can aspire to become a so-called 'stable' regional or pivotal actor willing to project power beyond its borders and thus maintain the current political culture (which is dominated by military and security considerations). Alternatively, it can choose to become an ordinary, but 'democratic' and self-sufficient state, by focusing on the necessary economic and political changes needed to reform its systems.

The latter choice is definitely not an easy task. Although Turkey's geographic location offers many advantages, it is also a source of problems for the country. Whether one likes it or not, this volatile region is characterised by several potential and actual crises. For instance, two of the

states that belong to the so-called 'axis of evil' are Turkey's neighbours. Any development in the surrounding region forces Turkey to become involved in one way or another. This reality overarches life in Turkey. Although Turkey cannot escape this reality, it can choose to act in a rational manner with a long-term perspective – based on carefully elaborated priorities – instead of propaganda, conjectural calculations or short-term gains.

EUROPEAN SECURITY STRATEGY:
IS IT FOR REAL?

WITH CONTRIBUTIONS BY

YURI E. FEDOROV
ROBERTO MENOTTI
DANA H. ALLIN

INTRODUCTION BY

FRANÇOIS HEISBOURG

Introduction

François Heisbourg

The written presentations of our panellists – Roberto Menotti (Research Fellow, Aspen Institute Italia), Dana Allin (Senior Fellow, IISS, London) and Yuri Fedorov (Deputy Director of the Institute for Applied International Studies, Moscow) – were completed by a number of remarks, having been urged by the Chairman to dwell on the following issues:

- the nature of the EU's strategic interests and notably the importance of distant contingencies – such as Korea and Kashmir – as compared with Europe's 'near abroad';

- the impact of the difference in strategic cultures between the EU and the US (as well as within the EU itself); and

- the long-term evolution of EU-US strategic relations.

Thus Roberto Menotti underscored the importance of the security strategy text by Javier Solana (High Representative for the EU's common foreign and security policy – CFSP) in helping the Europeans 'think strategically' even if, in his views, such a document could have been prepared earlier. But he also emphasised the need to not 'start backwards': the immediate focus should be on the ark-of-crisis rather than on Korea. He further noted that the current state of the debate could divide the Europeans rather than unite them.

For his part, Dana Allin noted that there would be little time in Washington for a grand strategic debate with the Europeans. He considered that America's extreme strategic risk-aversion ('zero tolerance'), leading to preventive warfare, was one of the root causes of the transatlantic problems, along with the gut feeling in Europe that the US is the prime target of ongoing threats, rather than Europe. He also saw the differences among strategic cultures within Europe as being divisive.

Yuri Fedorov made the point that the current nature of strategic threats – notably the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) – plays to US strengths, thus increasing the significance of the defence gap between the US and Europe (particularly in research and development and space applications). He noted that there was an element of paradox in Europe's evolution: while the EU has been integrating, when faced with real-world crises it has tended to split in strategic terms. He also re-emphasised his written analysis of the 'Americanisation' of Russian foreign policy, driven in part by the similarity of security concerns between Moscow and Washington.

As a prelude to the debate among participants, a senior EU official was prompted to make several remarks, as summarised below:

- The genesis of the Solana paper lies to a large extent in Europe's sense of failure in the Iraqi crisis. Indeed, strategic cultures tend to be formed from crisis to crisis. Although a strategic culture will not in itself change as a result of one single paper, such conceptual work can help.

- One of the characteristics of the current document is that it is one of the first EU texts to be threat-driven. Given the size and scale of the European Union, it is appropriate that the text should emphasise issues such as Kashmir and Korea, because this is a way of thinking ahead and of preparing for a more active Europe.

- 'Effective multilateralism' is a good formula for Europe.

The first round of the debate revealed several divides:

- Some agreed with the proposition that the EU should define its strategic interests globally, while others put forward regional priorities, in the ark-of-crisis and Wider Europe. There were diverging views expressed about the Commission's Wider Europe Communication, wherein one participant underscored its "mediocrity" while another highlighted its "quality", urging for its integration into Javier Solana's forthcoming document. In the words of one participant, we should be "enlarging our vision as we enlarge the Union".

- There was some disagreement about the 'Americanisation' of Russian foreign policy. One participant noted that in practice, Russia tended to operate along European lines, with region-specific policies and importance given to soft-power tools; hence, inter alia the importance of the Wider Europe Communication.

- The US-EU relationship elicited strong views (rather than outright disagreement). If one analyst considered that the "Is-it-for-real?" question could be taken to mean "different from NATO", another expert hailing from a staunchly Atlanticist country noted that the US appeared to be trying to play the Europeans off against each other in the case of the incipient NATO Response Force (NRF). The NRF has become a direct challenge to the EU's Rapid Response Force (ERRF), since the US (despite its non-participation in the NRF) insists on reserving to NATO first refusal rights concerning the use of the NRF. Furthermore, the latter now has essentially the same force volume as the ERRF, thus potentially locking the cream of Europe's forces out of the EU.

- One participant raised the prospect of a US-EU debate on the legitimacy of the use of force. The desirability of such a dialogue drew little controversy.

In their reactions to these remarks, the panellists made a number of points:

- Dana Allin noted that indeed, the US 'wedge' strategy *vis-à-vis* the EU had not stopped.

- Yuri Fedorov observed that there is a division in Russia between Euro-centric and US-centric circles. But President Vladimir Putin had tended to choose the latter. Furthermore, the threat of international terrorism – which a number of participants agreed should be dealt with as a strategic threat, along the lines of the Solana document – brought together countries as disparate as Israel, India, the US and Russia, with elements of a possible coalition between these four countries.

- Roberto Menotti, reacting to the 'global versus regional' debate, noted that the EU is not a global, hard-power strategic actor – so starting with the huge region extending from North Africa to Central Asia made sense.

In the subsequent round of debate, there was an exchange concerning the meaning of 'threat prevention' as used in the Solana security strategy: did this encompass preventive military action or was this more specifically tied to actions related to the enforcement of international obligations in the framework of 'effective multilateralism'? On this score, an EU expert recalled the mention of 'coercive action' (as a last resort) in the texts of the European Council meeting at Thessaloniki, which should be given due consideration alongside the Solana security strategy. With regard to the scope of the EU's strategic concerns, he further added that, "We have to think afar because our interests are afar".

As the debate returned to the issue of the NRF, one analyst reminded the audience that the NRF was in part a US response to an initiative by Prime Ministers Tony Blair and Jose Maria Aznar, while another recalled that five out of the six high readiness units rotating every six months in the NRF are also in the ERRF force catalogue (while the sixth is Turkish). But this drew the retort that this prospect aggravated the situation, since the US wants to have first call on these resources.

In his closing remarks, Yuri Fedorov raised the question of whether "multilateralism can be effective", suggesting that history does not provide many positive examples in this field. Dana Allin, while noting the importance of a sense of "loss of alliance" in the US, observed that the Europeans are still closer to the US in terms of their world view than Russia

or India. Nevertheless he also suggested that waiting for a "regime change" in Washington would not be a sensible way out for the Europeans. Roberto Menotti's statement that US actions would be crucial in shaping European policies did not come as a surprise. Indeed, in the Chairman's words, Javier Solana's document was no doubt threat-driven, but European policies – in some contrast to recent US attitudes – are also "friend-driven", and this juxtaposition of motives is not simple to manage.

'Old' and 'New' Europe:
A Russian View

Yuri E. Fedorov

Europe is paralysed. The diplomatic catastrophe of the Iraq conflict has left it uncertain [as to] which way to turn, which demons to exorcise. It would be futile to conceal this identity crisis. Even the marvellous success of monetary unification cannot make us forget the intellectual breakdown of the largest economic union of the world.

Andre Gluksmann[1]

Introduction

Andre Gluksmann's view as quoted above is perhaps a little exaggerated as a reaction to the political and conceptual crisis in Euro-Atlantic relations, fuelled by the Iraqi war. The European Union is not paralysed, of course. Yet if the identity crisis affecting Europe and the strategic uncertainty produced by it are not overcome, then it is hardly possible to wait for the formation of a coherent, effective vision and policy of European security.

The strategic uncertainty of European security

Since the beginning of the Iraqi crisis of 2002–03 and especially after the American and British intervention in Iraq in March–April 2003, the questions posed about the future of the transatlantic security institutions erected at the time of the cold war, the prospects for a common European foreign and defence policy and a European security strategy have grown ever louder. These questions are essential but they remain unanswered.

The current uncertainty is in many respects a result of the divisions among NATO member states on the war in Iraq. In addition to transatlantic differences, a boundary line between European states has emerged with respect to basic strategic issues. The split has been called a division between 'old' and 'new' Europe. This very expression is in fact a shorthand,

---

[1] See Andre Gluksmann, "West versus West", *The Wall Street Journal Europe,* 28 April 2003.

simplistic, and in many respects, an incorrect description of a much more complicated set of developments in European international relations.

Yet many believe that the war in Iraq was not the basic cause of these divisions but has accelerated and fuelled the decline of Western security and defence unity − including the identity crisis in European security − which began after the end of the cold war. In this light, the formation of a set of bilateral security relations between the US and the member states of Europe is often seen as more important than the presumptive disintegration of multilateral institutions, the first of these being the North Atlantic alliance. Dr Jonathan Eyal, the Director of Studies at the Royal United Services Institute, observed that,

> The old transatlantic community is being slowly dismantled by both sides, giving way to ad hoc bilateral military links between Washington and some Europeans…When the dust settles over Iraq, it will become clear that the dispute between Europeans and Americans has merely accelerated a process of decay in their relations, which began slowly and almost imperceptibly, with the collapse of communism.[2]

If this vision is true, the development of a sustainable and coherent European security strategy is hardly possible because of the split among European nations with respect to fighting terrorism, handling 'rogue states' and similar issues. At the same time, there is also a theory that growing globalisation is leading, in the end, to deeper defence and security cooperation among the advanced democracies of the West. In this light, the principal question arises as to whether the current crisis in Euro-Atlantic relations is a tactical, short-term phenomenon or whether the community of democratic nations is fundamentally dividing with respect to primary international security issues.

The 2003 crisis in Euro-Atlantic relations is of significant importance not only for the family of advanced democratic nations but also for Russia. The crisis has called into question certain Russian conceptual views and has compelled Moscow to make some difficult strategic choices.

Three models of European security

To assess the possibility and the character of European security strategy, it is important to outline the probable structures of security relations within Europe and between Europe and the US. Three basic models of these relations may be useful to analyse the future of European security.

---

[2] Jonathan Eyal (2003), "Battle of the Atlantic", *The World Today,* Vol. 59, No. 3, March, p. 6.

The restoration of transatlantic defence and security solidarity

The first model presumes that growing globalisation and interdependence will lead in the final analysis to a restoration of transatlantic solidarity in defence and security areas. Such a development is possible if common perceptions of threats and a common strategy for preventing such threats are formed by the US and Europe, which means that sooner or later Europeans will have to share the same basic attitudes as current American strategic thinking. In the framework of this model, NATO would return to its former role as the central defence and security institution of the West; however, a deep transformation of the North Atlantic alliance would be necessary. Along with keeping its traditional function of defence of the North-Atlantic area, NATO would require new missions and effective capabilities to fight terrorism, prevent WMD proliferation, implement peace missions and to handle – or even correct – dangerous regimes that lie south of Europe. European armed forces and military institutions would continue to emerge as an additional resource to NATO. A limited cooperation between Russia and NATO is also possible with respect to fighting new threats.

NATO's decline and the rise of European defence and security institutions

The next model of European security development presumes a further decline of the transatlantic defence and security structures and the development of Europe as a relatively independent locus of power that is able to defend itself against a variety of traditional and new threats. In this scenario, Europe would also have a role in maintaining peace and stability in the wider European area, such as the Balkans and the Black Sea regions, as well as in the neighbouring areas of the Mediterranean and the Near East.

The implementation of this scenario is possible if:

- transatlantic differences grow in security doctrines, concepts and strategies;
- European nations are able to develop common threat perceptions and strategic doctrines;
- the EU security and defence institutions are effective enough; and
- European member states are able to increase their defence expenditures and build armed forces that are equipped with high-technology weapons and C4ISR systems (control, command, computers, communications, intelligence surveillance and reconnaissance) comparable with those of the US.

In this scenario, Russia could turn into a constructive partner for Europe, in fighting some of the new threats and could also be a source of some advanced military technologies. At the same time, Russia may choose the US as a more promising security partner, bearing in mind the growing similarities in Russian and American security outlooks and the common security concerns related to developments in the Far East.

The decline of the transatlantic and European security identities and the formation of ad hoc 'coalitions of the willing'

The third scenario postulates the further development of the trends in Euro-Atlantic relations that appeared at the time of Iraqi war. These include:

- the growing differences in threat perceptions, security concepts and interests between, on the one hand, the US and a particular group of European nations, and on the other hand, between two groups of European member states;

- the decline (but not crash) of NATO and EU security institutions owing to the split between 'old' and 'new' Europe; and

- the formation of a set of bilateral security and defence relations between the US and some European countries in the form of 'coalitions of the willing' or in other, more stable and institutionalised forms.

For Russia, such a development creates the problem of choosing a strategic partner. It may be either the US (which seems most probable at the moment) or a group of European member states that in one way or another would be in opposition to the US.

'Old' and 'new' Europe: The roots of division

The ability of Europeans and Americans to form common threat perceptions, security concepts and doctrines as well as the ability of Europeans themselves to develop and maintain a security identity are key factors in the future of European security. To assess the probability of these developments taking place, one needs to outline the roots of the centrifugal processes that were fuelled by the Iraqi war.

In fact, the divisions produced by the war occurred for a variety of reasons. France, whose political elites and public are still strongly affected by traditional Gaullist views, might have been concerned by the possibility that a successful war in Iraq would strengthen the American position in global geopolitics to the prejudice of French international interests. Some German political elites might have shared similar concerns. Yet the negative attitude in Germany towards the British and American intervention in Iraq was

mostly the result of Germany's domestic political situation and the dependence of the German social-democratic government upon an anti-American and antiwar sentiment, typical of a left-wing European political mindset. Nevertheless, the support of the British-American operation in Iraq by a number of European member states may have, to some extent, resulted from a desire to strengthen their own international profiles, against a background of worsening French-American and German-American relations.

These are, however, only some of the reasons that fuelled the controversies in Euro-Atlantic relations on the eve of and during the war in Iraq. The controversies also resulted from the difference in threat perceptions.

Since 11 September 2001, Americans perceive the threats related to international terrorism, Islamic fundamentalism and WMD proliferation far more dramatically than Europeans. Although these differences in perceptions have contributed to the crisis in Euro-Atlantic relations, they cannot fully explain it. Furthermore, such differences, albeit visible, are not fundamental; a few months before the intervention in Iraq, approximately half of Europeans were seriously concerned by the rise of international terrorism, Islamic fundamentalism, WMD proliferation and developments in the Arab-Israeli conflict (see Table 1). The only considerable distinction between American and European threat perceptions was related to China.

Table 1. Comparison of the threat perceptions held by the US public and the European public in 2002 (in percentages)

Types of Threat	Per cent that answered "critical" (US) or "extremely important" (Europe)		
	US	Europe	Difference in public opinion
International terrorism	91	64	27
Iraq developing WMD	86	57	29
Arab-Israeli conflict	67	42	25
Islamic fundamentalism	61	47	14
Immigration	60	37	23
China as a world power	56	18	38
Global warming	46	49	- 3
Political turmoil in Russia	27	14	13

Sources: Martin Ortega (2002), *Iraq: A European Point of View*, Occasional Paper No. 40, p. 10, December, The EU Institute for Security Studies, Paris, cited in the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations/German Marshal Fund of the US (2002), "Comparing American & European Public Opinion on Foreign Policy", *Worldviews Survey 2002*, p. 9, September, CCFR/GMF, Chicago.

At the same time Europeans were very worried that the war in Iraq might lead to mass human loss, especially among the Iraqi civilian population, and that even if British and American forces were to defeat Saddam's regular armies, an intense guerrilla war would be inevitable. Further, there was concern that the power struggle among the Iraqi factions would prevent a post-war settlement. Also, the antiwar attitudes typical of many Europeans – as well as some Americans – resulted from some analytical assessments that the intervention in Iraq would lead to a deep destabilisation in the Middle East and ignite a powerful wave of Islamic terrorism that would deluge both Europe and the US. As a result, by the end of 2002 and the beginning of 2003, some 75 to 90% of the population in the UK, Poland, the Netherlands and Turkey (countries that traditionally support American policy), were against the war in Iraq.[3] The victorious, short-term war and the failure of the catastrophic forecasts have neutralised the effects of these views and concerns in Euro-Atlantic relations. Yet the relations have not been fully restored; antiwar and anti-American feelings still exist in Europe.

The transatlantic crisis is also a result of the distinctions between 'American' and 'European' strategic cultures. In contrast to the US, the existence of an outer threat is a natural and customary element of a political entity in Europe, which has been formed by ages of political history. This attitude in Europe may make the perception of the threats related to international terrorism appear less dramatic than in America. Moreover, since the painful First World War, a visible trend towards the political settlement of conflicts has developed in European democracies. In particular, the 'strategy of appeasement' that permits a compromise with aggressive totalitarian regimes in order to prevent war began to play a noticeable, but not dominating role in European political thinking. In addition, there is the idea that the most effective way to assure international security is to strengthen legal norms and to build strong, multilateral international institutions able to provide their execution. Also, the 'strategy of engaging' dangerous states and regimes into international efforts and institutions to promote a new set of motivations has acquired a special importance. This strategy seeks to prove to rogue states that cooperation and the refusal of aggressive intentions are more fruitful than confrontation. Many among the European political elites and the European public believe that the use of military power cannot destroy the roots of threats, which are related to the growth of extremist movements in the Islamic world. Many in Europe also believe that these threats are generated by social inequality and poverty. That is why economic assistance and building a more equitable and just social order are seen as more effective

---

[3] Philip H. Gordon (2003), "The Crisis in the Alliance", Iraq Memo No. 11, The Brookings Institute, Washington, D.C., 24 February (retrieved from http://www.brookings.edu/views/op-ed/gordon/20030224.htm).

tools of preventing terrorism than the use of force, which may serve to consolidate extremist forces and enlarge their social and political bases.

In the wake of the terrorist assault of 11 September, some principal and most probably irreversible changes have taken place in the American strategic mindset. The current American administration and a large part of the American political domain are convinced that the threats of terrorism are too high and acute, and that political methods of preventing these are not effective enough. The threat of or actual use of force is seen as necessary, and in many cases it is viewed as the only way to fight terrorist networks or the states that support terrorism, encroach upon the territories of other countries and proliferate WMD. The strategic philosophy of the Bush administration presumes that multilateral institutions such as the UN or NATO can play a useful role in maintaining international security yet they are too bureaucratic, too slow and less effective than 'coalitions of the willing' or unilateral actions. Sometimes, the European orientation towards political solutions and multilateralism is seen by the US as an indication of European 'fatigue' and opportunism.

The opponents of the current American approach believe that the US policy may endanger the very idea of collective governance of global economic and political developments. This argument is weighty because there are no guarantees that, despite being the most powerful nation, the US will still be able to assure international security and provide stable global economic and political order when acting unilaterally.

The differences in strategic views and attitudes between Europe and the US result not only from the diversity of their political philosophies but also from the visible gap in their military power. With the exception of France and the UK, European countries are not able to implement large-scale military operations outside of Europe. The creation of a united European force is proceeding too slowly. The adaptation of the existing armed forces of European member states to the new geo-strategic landscape needs large financial resources; however, European member states are not ready to allocate such resources to modernise their military machines in accordance with the emerging revolution in military affairs or to equip them with modern weapons and other technologies. Yet without an increase in defence spending and greater cooperation in military areas, including the development and production of weapons and C4ISR systems, it is difficult (if even possible) to wait for a coherent European foreign, security and defence policy.

The gap between American and European military power is highlighted by Europe's lag behind the US in per capita defence expenditures (see Table 2). The total number of military personnel among the European NATO member

states is estimated to be about 2.3 million, which equates to 1 million more individuals in uniform than the total of the American armed forces.[4]

Table 2. The defence expenditures of the US and European NATO member states, in billion of constant $US in 1999

	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
European NATO member states [a]					
Defence expenditures	154.4	156.7	148.3	135.6	126.0
R&D expenditures	10.5	9.9	9.2	9.2	9.2
Procurement	29.7	31.1	29.6	29.3	29.6
United States [b]					
Defence expenditures	281.2	276.6	278.4	281.6	284.5
R&D expenditures	37.9	37.8	38.3	37.9	39.3
Procurement	46.6	47.2	52.2	55.2	61.2

[a] Includes Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic.
[b] The budget of the US Department of Defense.

Source: The International Institute for Strategic Studies (2001), *The Military Balance 2001–2002,* p. 35, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Meanwhile, in 1997–2001 the gap in total defence expenditures between the US and Europe increased from about $127 billion up to almost $159 billion. The gap in funding military research and development is of special importance. It predetermines the lag in creating key high-technology weapon systems, including high-precision targeting and delivery means, and C4ISR systems (mostly space-based). For instance, during the last 10–15 years, the US has spent about $11 billion per year on space military programmes. Europe's expenditures, in comparison, are unlikely to reach the sum of $1 billion in the near future.[5] The current American plans presume that by 2007, US defence expenditures will reach a total of $450 billion, while military research and development expenditures will reach $58 billion.[6]

---

[4] The International Institute for Strategic Studies (2002), *The Military Balance 2002-2003,* p. 332, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[5] The International Institute for Strategic Studies (2000), "European military satellites", IISS Strategic Comments, Vol. 6, Issue 10, p. 2, December.

[6] The International Institute for Strategic Studies (2002), *The Military Balance 2002–2003,* p. 241, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

The gap in military capabilities between Europe and the US has two consequences. First, the accent on using political means of conflict prevention and settlement may maintain Europe's international influence, while the priority placed on its military force will lead to the growth of the American influence as the only power able to implement military operations all over the globe. Second, given that they are inferior to the US in terms of military power, most European countries are interested in maintaining their military cooperation with the US in order to save their own resources.

Thus, there is a strong body of evidence that the rise of controversies in Euro-Atlantic relations, fuelled by the Iraqi war, was in fact a manifestation of serious contradictions in security concepts, interests and strategies among advanced democratic nations. This conclusion makes a restoration of transatlantic solidarity in defence and security areas highly unlikely in the foreseeable future. At the same time, European elites realise quite well that the demise of NATO would be very painful for Europe. Washington would also like to keep the North Atlantic alliance, although not as the central element of the US national security strategy.

The split in Europe, together with the failure of French and German attempts to form an effective opposition to US policy, make the formation of an efficient European independent defence and security policy rather doubtful. In this light, current transatlantic security institutions will remain and European security institutions will continue to develop, but the role of these institutions will be uncertain and perhaps decline until the advanced democratic nations of the North Atlantic area develop common strategic attitudes either within transatlantic or European frameworks. Bilateral security institutions between the US and Europe will develop, however these will not be an effective substitute for multilateral structures.

The 'split' in Europe: What does it mean for Russia?

For Russia, the 'split' in Europe poses a number of challenges, both conceptual and political. Conceptually, before the Iraqi war Europe was basically seen in Russia as an integrating unit. Many believe that economic integration is followed inevitably by an integration of foreign, security and defence policies. In this general framework, two opposing concepts have developed.

The first concept views the integration in Europe as an essential part of the integration of an overall community of advanced democratic nations, which also includes the US and Japan. Russia, as adherents of this vision believe, should cooperate with the nations of the North Atlantic area if it wants to remain an influential international actor.

The second concept presumes that since the end of the cold war, Europe has been turning into an integrated locus of power, which is independent of the US, and furthermore, even opposes it. This concept was one of the fundamental elements of the so-called 'multipolar' concept developed in Russia by former Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs Eugeny Primakov and his confederates from bureaucracy and academia. They insisted that Russia can and should play on potential, deepening controversies between the US and Europe in order to maintain its own international profile, despite Russia's degrading economic and military capabilities.

Although these two concepts are contradictory, both concepts presume that economic integration is followed by political and military integration. Nevertheless, the emergence of 'old' and 'new' Europe has called this basic thesis into question. Politically, Russian foreign policy has been challenged by a problem of choice: whether to support the US and the UK or to try to use the differences between 'old' Europe and the US to improve Russia's international position. The Primakovian intellectual and political heritage, coloured by strong anti-American attitudes, has spurred Russia towards supporting the French/German opposition to the American-led intervention in Iraq. The split between the US and 'old' Europe has been perceived as the first practical evidence of the emerging 'multipolar' world. In February 2003, Russia's Foreign Minister Igor Ivanov said quite clearly that,

> Russia, France and Germany recently presented a common approach to the settlement of the situation in Iraq. Many observers view this initiative as a new phenomenon in world politics, the significance of which goes beyond the Iraqi crisis…These developments reflect an emerging multipolar order.[7]

The combination of the failure of Russian-French-German attempts to stop the US and British intervention in Iraq, the quick victory of anti-Saddam coalition and the strategic uncertainty about European defence and security policies have demonstrated the futility of the multipolar strategy. After the intense yet rather short crisis in US-Russian relations in spring 2003, Russia's foreign policy has once again acquired a visible tendency towards closer cooperation with the US. Russia's support of UNSC Resolution 1483 was a clear indication of this trend. As for Europe, Russia's approach to relations with the key European actors in the security domain will most probably depend on the ability of Europe to establish a coherent security strategy.

---

[7]Igor Ivanov, "America must not return to cold war attitudes", *The Financial Times,* 13 February 2003.

Conclusion

A vague European security identity is counterproductive to establishing an effective European security policy. Growing globalisation includes the formation of global threats such as the rise of political and religious extremism, international terrorism, WMD and missile proliferation and other threats typical of the beginning of the 21st century. To fight these threats, a closer cooperation among advanced democratic nations is needed, which combines all responsible forces and states, including Russia.

European Security Strategy: Is it for real?

Roberto Menotti

This paper starts by offering a short answer to the direct question in the title that has been given for this series of ESF papers: it may be a qualified 'yes', since the document presented by High Representative for common foreign and security policy (CFSP) Javier Solana, last June constitutes a real effort and indeed a real step forward – but the security strategy is still, at best, on paper. The Solana document marks important progress mainly because it is probably setting in motion a dynamic that is badly needed if the EU is to become a more effective security provider. This dynamic features a 'top-down' approach to security requirements, i.e. proceeding from a definition of basic interests and goals, to the identification of threats and risks, to the formulation of a set of coordinated policies and thus a security strategy for the EU.

What we can call the 'bottom-up' approach is equally necessary, but not sufficient. As we have seen since late 1998 (St. Malo), and even after the acceleration of 1999 (post-Kosovo), an EU focus on 'capabilities first' is *not* leading to rapid increases in usable military (or military-civilian) instruments. We are not looking at a total failure, but what has been achieved is clearly not enough and the persistent deficiencies are hampering the goals officially stated in key CFSP and European security defence policy (ESDP) documents.

Having already identified common shortfalls, working to develop certain common or collective capabilities may be a good way to force more discipline on individual EU members in order to rationalise the use of scarce resources and gradually elaborate a unified doctrine on how these resources will be employed. Yet this incremental approach should not continue indefinitely, as ultimately, military planners require political guidance, just as public opinion demands to know where the taxpayer's money is going. In other words, the critical questions that must be answered are: the EU is seeking to develop such military capabilities to do what? Why? Where? On whose behalf and under whose political control would such capabilities be employed?

Of course, there were from the beginning – and there still are – very good political reasons to concentrate on capabilities and leave aside the thorny questions of EU 'autonomy' *vis-à-vis* NATO. But at the same time there is an equally strong argument to be made that the EU needs to get its act together (in a literal sense) by agreeing on two related commitments. First, the EU needs the political will to move forward in a collective framework on

security and defence. Second, the EU needs a steadfast solidarity among EU members when under pressure, particularly during crisis conditions.

The first commitment to adopt the collective framework is indispensable, with regard to arms procurement for example, or more generally in the planning for likely contingencies. Progress will come only if the expectation is that, unless otherwise decided, Europeans will act together on major security issues.

As for the second commitment, the lack of solidarity was made most painfully evident by the open and acrimonious divisions on the Iraqi crisis in the latter part of 2002 and the first three months of 2003. Any semblance of a common EU foreign and security policy on the issue was totally eclipsed in the months preceding the British-American operation against Saddam Hussein.

One essential task that the Solana paper can accomplish is to prompt the EU to take the initiative and re-launch a transatlantic dialogue based on European goals and priorities (which are not necessarily divergent from established NATO policies but are not necessarily identical either). American goals are pretty well-known – there is an argument to be made that these are not always as coherent and consistently pursued as many believe – while the 'aggregate' European attitude is mostly reactive. Thus, the US administration sets the tone and the framework; individual European governments position themselves as they see fit; and finally, at some point, a residual EU position emerges, essentially as a minimum common denominator. Such an arrangement is not sustainable or rational to the extent that we are serious about making the EU into a true strategic partner of NATO, or even more importantly, of the US.

It is difficult to believe that an official document, per se, is enough to radically change the course of the complex structural factors behind current transatlantic frictions or to overcome them. Yet, adopting an official security strategy raises the stakes and, potentially, builds a consensus around a new transatlantic deal – less automatic than in the past but equally fundamental for our security. And one of the main purposes of the whole exercise is precisely to ease the transition from the old Atlanticism to a vastly updated transatlantic framework in which the EU takes a higher profile.

The good things

First of all, in its current form, the Solana document offers a useful and accurate (albeit brief) description of how we got here. This summary is essential in order to discuss where to go from here and what to do next.

The climate in which the paper was produced is actually described with precision, including: the post-cold war opportunities coupled with new dangers of local conflicts; actual violence in the Balkans (i.e. on European soil); an increasing need for troop (and police) deployments in sometimes distant places; and the realisation of a potential combination of 'new threats' (international and catastrophic terrorism), WMD proliferation, failed states and organised crime. The transatlantic context is also described, citing not only US preponderance in most dimensions of power and influence, but also American (as well as European) vulnerability and the consequent requirement of sustained multilateral cooperation in order to achieve more effective international governance.

Along with all of the dimensions of risk and threat, the paper is in practice a 'wake-up call' designed to counter a sense of complacency among Europeans. Indeed, complacency and introversion seem to be the underlying concerns – and rightly so. But this has the interesting effect of bringing the stated EU approach much closer to that of official US policy than it has appeared so far.

Undoubtedly, as has been widely noted, there are elements of convergence in the Solana document with recent US policy statements, as well as with established NATO policies (about which Lord Robertson has been quick to remark in recent speeches).

The three main points in the document are:

- that international terrorism is recognised as a strategic threat to Europe (as well as to the US and others);

- that a broader European contribution to global security and stability is called for and more specifically there is a "need to develop a strategic culture that fosters early, rapid, and when necessary, robust intervention"; and

- that the worst-case scenario is identified as consisting of a combination or linkage of the three main 'new threats' discussed in the paper: "Taking these different elements together – terrorism committed to maximum violence, the availability of weapons of mass destruction and the failure of state systems – we could be confronted with a very radical threat indeed"; this statement is remarkably similar to the expressions adopted in the US National Security Strategy of September 2002 and several other US administration statements.

Beyond the specific wording, the points above are not particularly surprising or even contested in policy circles, but if fully adopted by the European Council they may contribute to a smoother transatlantic discussion on issues that are by their very nature controversial, such as counterterrorism

operations, counter-proliferation policies and particularly 'pre-emptive strikes' on potential sources of threat, which are discussed later.

Indeed, since the American security role is inevitably a point of reference for the evolving European security strategy, it is instructive to read the whole Solana draft in parallel with the US National Security Strategy. Nevertheless, we should not exaggerate the similarities; unlike the US Security Strategy, the Solana document is not intended primarily as the endpoint of a policy review process, but instead as the starting point of a relatively slow policy production process. In other words, there is not much in terms of existing or past security policies on which Solana's team can build. There are disparate, though sometimes overlapping, national policies and traditions, as well as precious but limited EU experience in peacekeeping missions, but no common strategic culture. In fact, the development of a shared strategic culture is precisely one of the central functions that the document and its future versions can perform. If it does, it will have been 'for real' so to speak.

It is fitting that the European Security Forum has chosen to discuss the merits of the EU strategy paper almost exactly two years after the terrorist attacks that significantly accelerated a shift in US foreign policy, but which certainly have not changed everything, as some were led to believe in the heat of events. The Solana document explicitly takes on board some of the lessons of 11 September 2001. It reflects many of the concerns raised by the collective shock of the terrorist attacks, by depicting a world of potentially radical threats that, frankly, most Europeans and many Americans did not perceive or did not take very seriously before 11 September.

Stating that international terrorism is a 'strategic threat' means recognising that this phenomenon has been underestimated in security planning, while the focus so far has been on (mostly domestic) law enforcement and intelligence efforts (often uncoordinated even among close allies). We could add that the risks of transnational terrorist networks have been raised in the context of specific regional conflicts that have a potential to produce a terrorist 'spin-off', including the volatile situation of the Western Balkans. But the notion that there is such a thing as 'international terrorism' as a distinctive threat is a new construct for Europeans.

Therefore, Solana's draft document amounts to a deliberate effort to raise the level of alert to a newly discovered threat, whose magnitude may still be insufficiently appreciated not only at the common EU level but also at the public level of individual countries – especially when it comes to actually committing additional resources.

This state of affairs can be termed a 'Venus paradox' – to borrow the black and white distinction proposed by Robert Kagan; Venus (Europe) feels secure, but is in fact not secure. At best, it is less secure than most people

believe. At worst, it suffers from a dangerous misperception, the illusion of security under a rather outdated transatlantic umbrella. The picture drawn by Mr Solana is truly one of a complacent and introverted Europe that needs to overcome its Venus syndrome and fully take on a global role.

It is important to note that, in identifying potential threats, the document actively contributes to the development of a 'European narrative' on security affairs. The emphasis placed on the Balkan crises of the early 1990s is telling in this respect: this experience has been formative for the EU and most of the concepts adopted in the Solana document are drawn from there. These concepts include the spillover potential of local crises, the overlap of humanitarian and broader political concerns in a given violent crisis, the various options in the field of crisis management and international intervention, and the central role of prevention and early engagement (now merged in the somewhat odd concept of 'pre-emptive engagement').

The limitations and possible improvements

Since the EU Security Strategy is a work in progress, discussing the Solana draft is an integral part of the dynamic that this paper alluded to at the beginning. An official document concentrates the mind, and details can obviously be extremely important to the overall message that is sent and the policy direction that is delineated.

Before commenting on the drafting process, the sequence of items and in one area, the precise wording, it should be noted that the document is being evaluated on the assumption that one of its tasks should be to present, in a relatively reader-friendly fashion, the rationale and motivations for a common EU security policy and to offer a 'vision', both to European citizens and to the rest of the world. In summary, this is not only a technical product, but also a public statement that should reach a wide audience and provide a framework for future debates.

One general comment is that the threat assessment sounds a bit vague at times, possibly because the definition of what the EU wants in the world, and what it is ready to stand for, is not spelled out – beyond stating a commitment to cooperation, openness, legitimacy and legality. For instance, when assessing the impact of 'regional conflicts', the first two cases cited are Kashmir and the Korean Peninsula. The document asserts that these conflicts "impact on European interests directly and indirectly, as do conflicts nearer to home, above all in the Middle East". The potential implications of this statement should deserve more careful consideration, since it is *not* immediately evident that Kashmir or Korea are – or should be – perceived as directly affecting any major EU interest. Even the Middle East, taken as a whole, is a somewhat vague reference.

The strategy could benefit from a more detailed geopolitical vision, i.e. a willingness to fully adopt a regional perspective to differentiate among levels of threat. This need for differentiation is especially clear in the case of what is usually called the 'arc of instability' stretching from the Balkans to the eastern Mediterranean, and from the Persian Gulf to Central Asia. The reference to this vast region in the paper is concentrated in the section on "Extending the Zone of Security around Europe", where it is specified that "our task is to promote a ring of well-governed countries to the east of the EU and on the borders of the Mediterranean with whom we can enjoy close and cooperative relations".

Here is where geography becomes a key point: a major nuclear crisis in Korea may pose less immediate risk to the EU than a political assassination in the Western Balkans, a contested election in North Africa or a relatively minor border dispute in the Caucasus. It would also be useful to distinguish between major confrontations (India-Pakistan being one case in point), prolonged violent clashes on a local level (such as Chechnya) and military-diplomatic standoffs that nonetheless carry great risks of escalation (such as Korea or Taiwan). Such distinctions could be introduced without falling into the trap of writing down a long laundry list.

In making such critical remarks, we should not lose sight, however, of the central aim of the document: to raise the awareness of the interconnection of rather disparate phenomena, often generating far away from the physical territory of the EU. In many ways, the greatest danger against which Mr Solana is guarding is neglect, since neglecting a local or nascent source of instability leads to deterioration or even contagion – particularly in the cases of state failures and organised crime.

The focus of the Solana paper is therefore a triad of new threats, defined as "more diverse, less visible and less predictable" than large-scale aggression, such as international terrorism, WMD proliferation, failed states and organised crime.

There is a missing link with regard to the sponsors of terrorist activities, most notably state sponsors – in other words, rogue states. As will be seen, the same can be said of WMD, as in both cases Mr Solana does not make the connection between specific types of regimes and specifically threatening international behaviours (either directly or pursued by offering assistance and support to non-state actors). More generally, international terrorism is by definition a phenomenon that involves a wide web of complicity, including those at the political level. The Afghan regime was not removed in the aftermath of 11 September because it was a failed state, but because it came to be recognised as a key seedbed of international terrorism.

The proliferation of WMD is indicated as "the single most important threat to peace and security among nations", with the specific risk of a WMD arms race in the Middle East and the spread of missile technology cited as immediate European problems. In practice, three distinct kinds of threats are conflated here: the first is the effect of the use of WMDs that are *not* aimed at an EU country (either accidental or deliberate); the second is a direct attack by a state against an EU country; the third kind of threat is an attack carried out by a terrorist group (a non-state actor). The latter is described as the most worrisome scenario because "in such cases, deterrence would fail", which seems to imply that in the previous two cases deterrence would work.

The issue of deterrence is important per se, as well as in the context of the strengthening of treaty regimes: if enhanced or new regimes are needed, it is important to know whether deterrence should be an integral part of them and what role it could play. In addition, if deterrence is not viewed as reliable, more emphasis should probably be placed on defensive measures, including missile defence systems.

More generally, it may be good to keep the distinctions between the various aspects of the WMD threat, since these probably require different policies. Some issues could be tackled through a package approach, but others could require specific measures, ranging from technical assistance to maintain or dismantle weapon systems, to legally binding rules on inspections and transparency, and from tighter export control regimes to intelligence capabilities and (offensive) military instruments.

There is also a practical need to manage the proliferation of WMD once it has already taken place to a significant degree – as witnessed in the recent cases of India, Pakistan and North Korea or the older problem of Israel. This reality calls for a strategy of proliferation-management beyond counter-proliferation.

Under the heading "Failed States and Organised Crime", the paper makes a connection between "bad governance, civil conflict and the easy availability of small arms", on the one hand, and a weakening of state institutions on the other. The latter in turn leads to the rise of criminal elements with a transnational/international projection. With respect to other risks and threats, it may be necessary to distinguish among levels of danger: Montenegro or Albania may be more of a 'threat' in terms of criminal activities than Somalia, Liberia or Afghanistan. Weak states closer to home are probably a more immediate concern for public opinion (as well as for parliaments and important pressure groups), than more distant failing or failed states where brutal conflicts are underway. Again, geographical differentiation may deserve more consistent attention.

A central issue definitely requiring more clarity is the use of the expression 'pre-emptive engagement'. Given the frequent usage of the term 'pre-emption' in the media (especially after the publication of the US National Security Strategy in September 2002), often interchangeably with 'prevention', an excessive focus on a single word may be beyond the point. Yet, the concept of pre-emptive action (including, of course, coercive action) is just too relevant and too controversial to be left hanging. In any case, the EU strategy *should not* try to paper over the issue by introducing even more confusion than already exists in this field.

Preventing a threat or an event from materialising practically means that the threat does not come into existence, precisely because it is 'stopped' or eliminated before it reaches a certain threshold. In other words, it is kept at the level of risk or potential threat. Pre-empting a threat, however, means (at least according to most American English and British English dictionaries) something different: it refers to a particular action or intervention that eradicates a threat; even more specifically (according to the Oxford English reference dictionary), to pre-empt means to "prevent (an attack) by disabling an enemy". The noun pre-emption is accordingly defined (at least in the military sphere) as "the action or strategy of making a pre-emptive attack".

This basic distinction should form the basis for a clarification in the strategy paper. In particular, it seems inappropriate to logically argue for a policy of 'pre-emptive engagement' (itself an interesting neologism) starting with the premise that "trade and development policies can be powerful tools for promoting reform…contributing to better governance through assistance programmes, conditionality and targeted trade measures [and] should be an important element in a European Union security strategy", and then it follow it immediately with the statement that "pre-emptive engagement can avoid serious problems in the future".

Why not use the well-tested word '*prevention'*, with its soft power connotation? Why not confine '*pre-emption'* to the exercise of hard, coercive power?

Instead, the confusion is compounded by the subsequent paragraph, which calls for a toughening of EU conditional policy by referring to "a number of countries [that] have placed themselves outside the bounds of international society"; in the event that these countries continue their behaviour, "they should understand that there is a price to be paid, including in their relationship with the European Union". Although there is no mention of coercive measures here, the tone suggests a very assertive approach. And the countries that inevitably come to mind are those otherwise indicated as 'rogue states' – precisely the natural target of (real) *pre-emptive* action, particularly with regard to WMD proliferation and terrorist activities.

In summary, various interpretations are possible and are all perfectly legitimate, but these issues are just too serious and complex to allow confusion on terminology. A solid consensus on fundamentals cannot be constructed when times get tough, so it will have to be achieved in advance of the next crisis.

The larger challenges ahead

At a different level, one has to recognise that there is a daunting security agenda for the 21st century, characterised by risks and threats that can 'mutate' unexpectedly, as well as move geographically. Technological, socio-demographic and environmental trends may converge to produce crucial changes in the strategic landscape, in ways that no security strategy can fully anticipate.

Unfortunately, the EU countries have missed an opportunity that presented itself around the 1999–2000 period, to accelerate the development of a coherent, albeit fairly limited, security strategy. The security agenda of that period was pretty well-defined and, just as importantly, there was a broad agreement among the key governments on the most pressing priorities: enhanced crisis management and robust peacekeeping/peace-making capabilities to be applied in Europe's immediate periphery (with the logical corollary of effective political decision-making and unity of operational command). It would have been natural to start from there and then perhaps aim higher as capabilities would develop over time – in parallel with a political/strategic vision for 'greater Europe'. In the immediate aftermath of NATO's Operation Allied Force in Kosovo and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, the momentum existed for taking the ESDP concept a step further, from a wish list of assets to a transformational instrument benefiting all EU members without detriment to NATO's role (as the latter remained centred on collective defence against higher-level threats).

Instead, what happened was a slow start, characterised by uneven progress, with the ready-made Petersburg Tasks adopted as benchmarks but little ability to fully implement both NATO's Defense Capability Initiative (DCI) and the EU's own Headline Goal, while the Berlin Plus agreement was finalised only in late 2002. As we know all too well, this phase was followed by the shock of the events of 11 September and in turn by the badly divisive debate over Iraq.

Throughout all of this, an EU foreign and security policy seemed to recede into the background, reduced to just another double acronym – CFSP/ESDP – which to this day remains obscure and irrelevant to the vast majority of European citizens. Even worse, the lack of mutual trust on security issues that permeated the intra-EU discussion 'contaminated' NATO, while the

uncertainty about the alliance's future (and about US foreign policy under the new administration) contributed to slowing down the crucial decisions to be made at the EU level. A vicious circle was almost created instead of the often-invoked 'synergy'.

Of course, the events of 11 September would have occurred with or without an effective ESDP and the Iraqi crisis would have probably produced a serious rift under any circumstance. Yet, the habit of close cooperation and solidarity that the post-Kosovo climate might have produced within the EU had the potential to break new ground (and positively affect the debate on the future of transatlantic relations towards a more balanced and mature Euro-American link).

One may well conclude that it was simply impossible for things to happen more rapidly than they have in the field of European security and defence. After all, CFSP itself is a very young creature and the EU as a living experiment in hyper-integration is very recent by any historical standard. The fact remains that, in retrospect, the period from mid-1999 to September 2001 strikes one as having been a window of opportunity, almost the proverbial quiet before the storm.

The end result is that today's world looks populated by shadowy threats, often de-territorialized and against which any society must feel somewhat vulnerable and at times even powerless. At the same time, Europe's key ally – the US – has developed a world view that is not, at least in the short term, conducive to the nuanced arrangements and the gradual, steady advances required by the maturation of an EU security strategy. On the contrary, American policies tend (sometimes deliberately, sometimes accidentally) to fragment the EU front and force the toughest decisions on individual European governments. Difficult missions have come to determine uneasy coalitions just when the EU needs some time to become an effective coalition itself and define its own long-term missions.

The very simplified picture drawn in this paper is not intended to look at an idealised past (a 'missed window of opportunity') with longing and regret, but rather to sketch some key problems we will continue to face in the future: how to consolidate the role of the EU as the main stabiliser in the area of the long 'arc of instability' that lies to the immediate southeast of its current frontier, while simultaneously tackling a whole set of global phenomena that are now – rightly – high on the agenda.

From both a functional and a regional perspective, it would have been more effective for the EU to take over from NATO the tasks of military-civilian crisis management, especially in greater Europe, while gradually upgrading European capabilities to project military-civilian forces anywhere they may be needed. This transition is happening in any case, but is perceived to be

much less relevant than it was just three years ago, because the mutation of threats has dramatically accelerated. The progressive accumulation of experience, self-confidence and credibility that comes with carrying out successful, limited missions close to home is now almost dwarfed by the colossal task of fighting a global terrorist network potentially armed with WMDs, which acts in collusion with rogue states and takes advantage of failed states and criminal connections. A global horizon requires a new mindset and this is especially demanding for a group that has grown accustomed to working in either regional or sectoral frameworks and is having to painfully improve its collective decision-making mechanisms.

These growing pressures worsen the already serious resource crunch (elite and special forces are especially overstretched, as are peacekeepers and policemen, as it remains difficult to carry them to their destination, support them while in place, keep them safe and bring them back). Each national government tends to work in a protracted 'emergency mode' instead of favouring long-term planning and close coordination. If the genuinely global nature of various emerging threats is putting a great strain on the operational capabilities and the prevailing mindset of the US military apparatus (including its intelligence component and the links with domestic law enforcement agencies), it is self-evident that the EU will have a very long way to go. Thus the challenges are certainly 'for real'.

America: No Time for Strategic Thinking
An American View

Dana H. Allin

Security strategy should be about underlying principles and the long term, but there are times when the contingencies of the historical moment crowd out the possibility. This is what the debacle of post-war Iraq has done to any immediate hope of reconciling transatlantic differences over security strategy. It has done so in two ways. First, the stunning mystery of Iraq's undiscovered weapons of mass destruction (WMD) has cast a fundamental – even epistemological – cloud over the intelligence problem that is at the heart of any workable strategy of pre-emption. Second, the security quagmire that post-war Iraq looks like becoming is likely for the foreseeable future to restrain America's appetite for large-scale military action against 'rogue' WMD threats. This development is not necessarily a happy one – there are threats of a magnitude that require action and against which military intervention could be the only effective action. But it looks like the reality at present.

This context makes it difficult to judge whether the evolution of European thinking on security strategy – as reflected in 'A Secure Europe in a Better World', by High Representative for the EU's common foreign and security policy (CFSP) Javier Solana – will go far enough to meet American concerns at least halfway. What we can say is that for the better part of a decade, the major European powers and the European Union as a whole have been developing a more robust concept of the role of military force in an overall grand strategy.[1] Yet a transatlantic consensus remains elusive. Things could change with another major terrorist attack, a ripening of nuclear crises in Iran or North Korea or even a dramatic improvement in Iraq's security and governance. But for the time being, American concerns will be singularly driven by its current difficulties.

Intelligence and commitment

The obligatory opening to any discussion about the missing Iraqi biological, chemical and nuclear programmes is that it is still too early to tell: the evidence could yet be uncovered. And although it is indeed too early to tell,

---

[1] The evolution of some countries, such as Germany, is obviously more dramatic than that of others – notably Britain and France – as they were not very timid about the use of force in the first place.

it is getting later and later. This view is summed up by Francis Fukuyama, no political foe of the Bush administration, who has observed that,

> After three months in which the US has had every conceivable opportunity to threaten, bribe and cajole Iraqi scientists involved in the WMD programme to reveal their whereabouts, not a single one has done so. On the contrary, they have all stuck to the official line from before the war, that these weapons once existed but were disposed of sometime after the first UN inspectors arrived back in 1991. We have to confront the possibility that they are telling the truth.[2]

Mr Fukuyama goes on to say that accusations against the Bush administration are misguided, because it was not just the Bush administration that claimed Iraq was developing these weapons. The assessment was general: it included the United Nations Special Commission (UNSCOM), the Clinton administration, independent experts and the intelligence communities of nations that had supported the war as well as those that had opposed it. The assessment was based on the fact that the Iraqis had ambitious chemical, biological and nuclear programmes before the first Gulf war, that they clearly made an effort to continue them after the war and that they systematically lied about what was going on throughout the whole UNSCOM period. The assessment also relied to a greater or lesser extent on the reasonable proposition that if they were lying so systematically, they must have had something to lie about.

Mr Fukuyama is too easy on a Bush administration that painted the threat in the direst terms to justify a war about which many friends of America had good reason to be wary. Even accepting what was then the consensus view on Iraqi programmes, it was reasonable to argue, as former UK Foreign Secretary Robin Cook did argue in his resignation speech before the House of Commons, that "Iraq probably has no weapons of mass destruction in the commonly understood sense of the term – namely a credible devise capable of being delivered against a strategic city target".[3] Whatever the good reasons were for deposing Saddam Hussein – and they were many – the credibility of the administration's case about the specific threat posed by Iraq's programmes will affect the reception accorded to future American arguments for pre-emptive action.

This consequence is worrying precisely because Mr Fukuyama is correct in a larger sense: while the Bush administration should be held accountable for its

---

[2] Francis Fukuyama, "The Real Intelligence Failure", *The Wall Street Journal*, 5 August 2002.

[3] Robin Cook's resignation speech, 18 March 2003.

hype and exaggerations, this should not divert us from the looming problem of a terrorist-WMD nexus or the difficulty of obtaining politically actionable intelligence. What we thought we knew about Iraq was 'politically actionable' in the US Congress and the UK House of Commons, but not in the UN Security Council, NATO or the court of world opinion. It is easy to imagine cases where the threat would be graver and more immediate, yet the intelligence would even less conclusive and less convincing.

And whatever the final judgment is about this particular case, the larger problem is undeniable. In the new strategic context after 11 September 2001, the Bush administration (and the government of Prime Minister Tony Blair) did make a compelling argument that proliferation of weapons of mass destruction among outlaw regimes such as Saddam Hussein's was no longer tolerable. This conclusion was not because of any particular evidence of a substantial link between Iraq's regime and al-Qaeda. Rather, it was because of the clearly documented determination of al-Qaeda to acquire WMD and the prospective logic of its eventually approaching other sworn enemies of America and the West for this purpose.[4]

One could even take the view that the truth about Iraq didn't matter, i.e. 'if it walks like a duck and talks like a duck', then the international community has no choice but to 'treat it like a duck'. In the case of Iraq, for more than a decade the regime of Saddam Hussein flawlessly played the part of a serial and unreformable violator of UN demands that it dismantle its WMD programmes. If it turns out to have been, at least in the final years, just a bizarre bit of totalitarian play-acting – well, at least the example will have been set for other rogue regimes about the costs of failing to fulfil UN Chapter 7 demands on WMD fully, transparently and to the letter.

Sadly, perhaps, things can never be so simple, for the strategic demands of actually taking on these rogue regimes involve strategic (not just legal or moral) judgments about whether war is wise or necessary at a given point in time. Whether the problem is defined as the repeated violations of UN Chapter 7 demands, as an immediate strategic-level threat, or, for that matter, as a massive humanitarian outrage, the solution will often require a regime change.[5] (The assumption here is that coercive diplomacy has failed, as it

---

[4] The objection that Islamic fundamentalists and secular Ba'thists were ideologically incompatible was really no more reassuring that the suggestion that Nazi Germany and Communist Russia could never have cooperated.

[5] Walter Slocombe, in a paper delivered to the European Security Forum on the eve of the Iraq war, made a persuasive case why this must be so for the WMD threat. Here it is simply added that the major Western interventions of recent years, which were less controversial than Iraq, involved regime changes. This

often will.) And regime change carries the obvious obligation of follow-up state- or nation-building. Here is the second way in which Iraq has clouded the possibility for transatlantic consensus on security strategy. As Morton Abramowitz, a long-time advocate of sustained US engagement in nation-building has argued:

> Bush has probably achieved, inadvertently, what he campaigned for: getting the United States out of nation-building…He has done this by embarking on nation-building unprecedented since World War II and in a land that we do not know well and that does not play to our strengths. And it was done, it is now clear, with little effective planning and with largely unexamined notions of what can be accomplished.[6]

One may add to this point the real possibility that the invasion of Iraq will end up making the Islamist-terrorism problem less, not more, manageable (this opinion is not ventured from a position of having opposed the war – at least not as a matter of principle). And it is important to add that, since premature withdrawal from Iraq would be a disaster for the US, one has to believe that the alternative of staying can yield some measure of success. But it is also clear that the best of intentions can produce strategic blunders.

Paper tiger?

America, in short, will be distracted. This reality overshadows the question of how the US may react to a more robust European security strategy. In any event, is such a strategy at hand? It certainly is on paper, and while paper products are easy to deride, it is important that the Solana document is well-written, straight-forward, clear and direct in dealing with the most compelling security threats of the early 21st century. These are all qualities that some Americans are quick to judge as alien to European strategic culture. Nevertheless European strategic culture is evolving and it has done so since the early failures in the Balkans. Ideas matter, as do their expression and reception by EU ministers. Yet this is not a document that is confined to the so-called 'Venus' or other international relations theories.

It sets clear benchmarks against which the European Union may soon be judged: "Those who are unwilling to follow the norms of the international community should understand that there is a price to be paid, including their relationship with the European Union" (p. 10). Much favourable commentary

---

was absolutely the case for Afghanistan and the net effect in the Balkans. Nation-building responsibilities followed.

[6] Morton Abramowitz, "After Iraq, Shrinking Horizons", *The Washington Post*, 31 July 2003.

has noted that the European Union appears to be taking this line seriously in its attitude towards Iran's nuclear programme.[7] American confidence in Europe as a security partner could be greatly affected by whether the EU carries this tougher Iran policy through to its logical conclusion. Likewise, where the Solana document says that "We need to develop a strategic culture that fosters early, rapid, and when necessary, robust intervention" (p. 13), there is every reason to expect that the conjunction of outlaw regimes, WMD and terrorism could soon put that strategic readiness to the test.

If the promise of this document is fulfilled, it would constitute a serious challenge to the United States, and may actually coax the Americans back into a strategic posture that emphasises global cooperation and a sensible mix of hard and soft power. But much will depend, as suggested at the outset, on historical and political contingencies. If a Democratic administration is elected in 2004, it would probably be receptive to such a development in Europe. So too may a second-term Bush administration that is chastened by its difficulties in Iraq. It is also possible, however, that these difficulties will just embitter the American public and elites, and keep the administration on ideological overdrive.

Inflexible European attitudes could aggravate the problem. The Solana paper is perfectly reasonable in arguing that: "strengthening the United Nations, equipping it to fulfil its responsibilities and to act effectively, must be a European priority" (p. 9). But Europeans also need to recognise the special challenge of hard cases. If France, for example, beguiled by its vision of a multipolar webbing to restrain American power, adopts a rigid formula towards force and legitimacy, one fears a vicious cycle of competing transatlantic ideologues. A view that only the UN Security Council can confer legitimacy on military action could be as counterproductive as the right-wing American aversion to all things UN – and just as unnecessary. France and Europe did not take a dogmatic attitude towards the UN-based legitimacy for the Kosovo war. A similar pragmatism is called for in addressing threats of a character unforeseen by the drafters of the UN Charter.

---

[7] See for example Steven Everts and Daniel Keohane (2003), "The European Convention and EU Foreign Policy: Learning from Failure", *Survival,* 45, No. 3, pp. 179–180, Autumn.

WHAT STRATEGY
FOR THE GREATER MIDDLE EAST?

WITH CONTRIBUTIONS BY

MICHAEL STÜRMER
STEVEN SIMON
IRINA ZVYAGELSKAYA

INTRODUCTION BY

FRANÇOIS HEISBOURG

Introduction

François Heisbourg

We were fortunate in having ahead of the meeting three thoughtful, broad-spectrum papers from which to work. All three of the authors of the papers were asked by the Chairman to pronounce on the validity of the 'Greater Middle East' (GME) concept. Michael Stürmer, who made the first presentation, commented that there is a certain unity to the region, notably in terms of the problems it shares. In referring to his paper, he warned against the American tendency to see democracy as a panacea, as it takes a very long time indeed to establish democracy in cultural terms. In the interval, the Americans should make sure that they really want what they say they want. He also warned against a face-value approach to the GME: there is more than one truth behind what one sees. In looking at the EU's or NATO's action in the region, he underscored the absence of any clear military role in the Middle East, apart, possibly, from the kind of monitoring that occurs in the Sinai.

Steve Simon noted that his paper had a somewhat more optimistic tone than that he wished to convey. He underlined the massive labour supply overhang as a general feature in the GME and that this fact alone made it impossible to be optimistic. He defended the view that democracy should be the priority, albeit one for the long term: it should be encouraged from the outside, but it cannot be imposed. Concerning Iran's nuclear ambitions, he feared that this could prove to be an ultimate source of division rather than of unity between the EU and the US. This situation is all the more worrying given the stakes – it is not for nothing that Saudi Arabia has in the past acquired MRBMs (missiles) from China or that the United Arab Emirates (UAE) has bought nuclear-capable aircraft that have the ability of striking Tehran. On Israeli-Palestinian relations, Mr Simon considered that the EU and the US will have to ensure that an eventual Palestinian state will not implode upon its creation.

Irina Zvygelskaya was diffident *vis-à-vis* the GME category. Indeed, an analysis by sub-regions demonstrated that democratisation was not universally hopeless. In particular, non-Arab states such as Turkey or Kazakhstan offered greater scope for optimism than a state such as Egypt. Similarly, although militant Islam is present everywhere, it is not as great a threat in Central Asia as elsewhere in the GME. In referring to her paper, she expressed special concern about the Islamisation of Iraq as a result of US intervention.

Walter Slocombe was our fourth speaker, recently returned from Iraq, where he served in the Coalition Provisional Authority (CPA) as de facto Minister of Defence. He underscored the huge price the US was still paying for the

events of 1991, when Saddam Hussein was allowed to crush the Shi'ite *intifada*. Although considering that there was a reasonable chance of success of the US policy in Iraq, he also noted that this is the first time that members of the international community are trying to build a liberal regime and a market economy in a continued state of war. Against the adversaries on the ground – most notably those Baathist insurgents who revealingly call themselves the 'Party of Return', the US could play on a number of strengths, including the interests of certain groups such as the Kurds, the Shia and women. This enterprise is made more difficult by the fact that no local equivalent of Nelson Mandela or even of Hamid Qarzai in Afghanistan has emerged.

In the opening round of the debate, one British participant recently returned from duty in southern Iraq observed that Baghdad (and its problems) was not Iraq as a whole. Nevertheless, he criticised the 'one-size-fits-all' approach of the US to post-war reconstruction in a complex country; unlike Mr Slocombe, he had not learned how to wear a helmet but had learned how not to wear one. Broadening the spectrum, another participant suggested that one of the reasons we use the expression 'GME' is because we fear that if something goes wrong in one part of the region, things will go wrong in other parts – it may be worthwhile thinking the other way around.

Yet another participant considered the GME as a useful organising principle, with five key words: democratisation (as an objective); al-Qaeda; Baghdad (arguing, unlike Mr Slocombe, that maybe we shouldn't have gone in); Tehran (is the prospect of use of force on or off the table?); and Jerusalem (should the Geneva Accords be endorsed by the Quartet?). As a response, there was no dispute with one panellist's contention that it was too late to argue about whether the war in Iraq was right or wrong, even if the fact remained that no WMD had been found to date and a firm Baathist link with al-Qaeda had not been established. Nor was there any disagreement concerning the strains between the CPA's action in the centre and the situation in the provinces. Similarly, although there was a strong preference for a cooperative solution with Iran, no one on the panel suggested that force should be entirely and explicitly removed as an option. Yet there was no unanimity on the Geneva Accords: for one panellist, it was unrealistic to talk about the return to the 1967 Green Line while ignoring the central issue of the Palestinians' commitment to deal with terrorism; however, another panellist thought that the Geneva Accords were better than giving the power of veto to the terrorists.

A French participant noted that all of the worst features pointed out by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) report on the Middle East were related to the lack of democracy; hence, we should not be so conflicted about how democratisation occurs. As for Iran, the non-proliferation regime

would implode if countries such as Egypt and Saudi Arabia did not believe in the long-term and successful commitment of the US and the EU in handling the Iranian nuclear issue.

Democratisation – a key word mentioned by one panellist – encapsulated much of the subsequent flow of discussion, on the themes of transparency, human rights, participation, minority rights and individual property. Indeed, as in the second round of the debate, the discussion of democratisation revolved around the question of what kind of model(s) should be followed. This question drew the general response from the panel that there was no single model that should be followed, given that there was a broad variety of them that could fit in with the keywords given previously. In all cases, however, the role of civil society and non-governmental organisations could not be overemphasised. On a hopeful note, one panellist remarked that pressures for change in the Middle East were translating into more liberal conditions in some places, notably in Morocco (with the reform of the *Code de la Famille*). It was noted by one participant that we should not simply be talking about Tehran, Baghdad or Jerusalem: Sanaa, Rabat or Tripoli were equally deserving of attention.

In closing, it is worth recalling a general point made early in the discussion by one of the authors, that one of the peculiar difficulties in the GME is understanding what feasible mission the US now has in mind in Iraq. The suggestion made by one of the panellists, that the 1925 Iraqi Constitution (minus the monarchy) would be a satisfactory outcome to the crisis, might have been a way of responding to that remark. It remains to be seen whether such an aim is (still) achievable and whether it will produce the sort of democratisation that the American promoters of regime change had in mind when they embarked on the road of Baghdad.

What Strategy for the Greater Middle East?
A European View

Michael Stürmer

What is the situation?
What challenges do we face?
And what is it that we have to do?

What is the situation?

Will the West, after having won the cold war, meet its fate in the Greater Middle East? After an ominous start in Iraq, all bets are open and the fallout has not yet been fully assessed – let alone the debris cleared out of the way – while more conflicts beckon. The Atlantic, in recent months, has been stormier than ever and the trans-Atlantic rift runs right across Europe. Europe is in disarray not only over its economic core business and the euro but also over its role in the world. This crisis happens at a critical juncture when the draft Constitutional Treaty aims at the deepening of ties between member states, while the widening of Europe's borders is already far advanced. Never was Euro-rhetoric so far away from Euro-reality.

The Greater Middle East (GME) is a post cold war concept that comprises the cauldron of crises from the Caspian to the Nile and from Cyprus to the Persian Gulf, as well as the strategic idea of dealing comprehensively with the region. In spite of all its conflicts and contradictions, the GME has to be seen in its interdependence. It is the playing field of the new Great Game between the US and Russia, with the Europeans unsure of where they stand on many issues – such as the recent war in Iraq. But it is an unforgiving strategic landscape that promises to provide the world with most of its crises, possibly major wars over terrorism and WMD, energy and supply routes, and issues of access and transit.

The list of possible differences between the West and Russia is long – almost as long as the list of differences within the West itself, which could be summed up by Shakespeare in the phrase, "It will make us or mar us". The most recent addition is Georgia after former President Eduard Schevardnadze, which has been contested between the US and Russia since the country was put back on the map in 1991. Or take Turkey as another example: for those who want Turkey in the EU, notably Washington, the recent terrorist acts provide ample argument for accession. For those who want to preserve the cultural unity of Europe and its cohesion in time of crisis, Turkey's accession, with or without terrorist acts, is impossible.

The case of Iran being en route to nuclear weapons is another example: European foreign ministers, in a well orchestrated good-cop/bad-cop routine with the US, received assurances in Tehran that all suspect nuclear research and development would be 'suspended'. They had asked for 'cessation' but had to settle for significantly less. Meanwhile the US provided the military pressure from nearby Iraq, without which the Europeans would have returned empty-handed. Maybe the Europeans learned something from this experience about the relationship between deterrence and *détente* in the modern age or maybe not. If not, the phrase used by André Glucksmann in the title of his recent book, *L'Ouest contre l'Ouest*, is a real possibility, and not just a philosopher's speculation.[1] The Iranian crisis is by no means over and the military option, as John Bolton said at a recent conference on weapons of mass destruction (WMD), "remains on the table". If Iraq is any guide to the future, the cohesion of the West is at risk. It will need a shared sense of danger, direction, balance and *fingerspitzengefühl* – in short, the rare commodity called statecraft.

The conflict between Israel and Palestine is another item on the list where the relationship between the Europeans and Americans could, if there is another peace process, easily fall apart. The Europeans have some influence with the Palestinian Authority and the Americans some influence with Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon. Neither, however, can dictate or control. The Road Map was, and still is, an attempt to coordinate carrots and sticks. But the test will come when guarantees have to be given, troops deployed and controls applied.

There are other serious differences, but none are more important than those on WMD, their platforms and the methods to deal with offenders. Yet there are also conflicts over oil, gas, access routes and shipping lanes. Meanwhile, Iraq continues to provide the mother of all West-West crises.

What challenges do we face?

Is the Greater Middle East on the verge of moral and political transformation? After Saddam Hussein, Iraq points in one direction. At the same time, Morocco under the enlightened and Koran-legitimised reforms of King Mohammed VI, points to another. Algeria, on the eve of next spring's presidential elections, aims at yet another direction. Imported transformation, home-grown transformation or post-traumatic transformation – the winds of change are blowing across the fertile crescent of the Arab world, and they do not stop at the gates of Turkey en route to Europe or at those of Iran en route to a new, post-revolutionary equilibrium.

---

[1] See Andre Glucksmann (2003), *L'Ouest contre l'Ouest,* Plon: Paris.

Whether or not these transformations will be peaceful and how they interact with each other and with the outside world is impossible to predict; however it is of great, in fact strategic importance for the West, Europe and North America alike. It would not be wise to assume that Islamic countries are unfit for peaceful change and democracy – nor should it be taken for granted that the ride now beginning will be anything but rough and risky.

"An arc of fire" is how Singapore's Senior Minister Lee Kwan Yew described Europe's southern and south-eastern neighbourhood. In their time, the British called it the Middle East, overseen by the Middle East Command in Cairo, Egypt, before they were forced to transfer their ancient holdings 'East of Suez' to Uncle Sam. The Americans, after the fall of the Soviet Empire, have thrown their own coordinates across the region, in economic, political and military terms. Their influence is backed by the US Central Command, situated in Bahrain, along with the Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean and the Fifth Fleet in the Indian Ocean underlining their capacity to project air and sea power.

The Greater Middle East. The GME is much more than 280 million Arabs, the Holy sites of Islam, the Israeli/ Palestinian conflict, a dramatic shortage of water, enormous and continuing environmental degradation, sand dunes, rocks in abundance, dates, camels, oil (for the last 100 years or so), and the princes' luxury and the masses' plight. There are also 70 million Turks in a multi-ethnic state, roughly the same number of Iranians (also in a multi-ethnic state) and the state of Israel – with 5 million Jewish Israelis and 1 million Arabs carrying Israeli passports. In this context, it should not be forgotten that the majority of Muslims live to the east of Tehran in Central and South-East Asia, and as far away as China.

The GME region has a very long collective memory, where the conquests of King David or the heavenly ascent of the Prophet Mohammed are like yesterday's events. It has no organising principle, no economic integration, no system of arms control, let alone collective defence. The Arabs and the Iranians can agree on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict as being the common cause – but on nothing else. Meanwhile, the Turks, not friends of the Arabs since many centuries, are in a silent alliance with Israel, on topics from tourism to air space, the upgrading of ageing US warplanes, the organisation of air force manoeuvres and the squeezing of Syria. At the same time, Egypt and Jordan are trying to balance their cold peace with the Jewish state against the countervailing pressure from the Islamic underground and the mosques.

The Saudis are, for the time being, the centre and the turntable of the Arab world, at least the Sunni part of it. Nevertheless, in the US they are increasingly being seen as – to quote Laurent Murawiec (formerly at the Rand Corporation and since then at the Hudson Institute) from a leaked

statement before the US Senate – "the kernel of evil".[2] Since the events of 11 September 2001, US intelligence services, especially the National Security Agency (NSA) and the White House have shown them the instruments;[3] the Pentagon has moved the vast installations of the Prince Sultan Airfield to Qatar and the Department of Energy is doing everything to reduce US dependence on Saudi (or for that matter OPEC) oil.

The Saudi regime remains dependent on US support, but the princes also recognise that, after Osama Bin Laden's declaration of war against 'Zionists and crusaders spoiling the sacred land of Islam', their involvement with US power is potentially a kiss of death, which they cannot avoid. The Saudi princes, notwithstanding the strict standards of their particular brand of Islam, are the vigilant defenders of the ultra-puritan and joy-averse Wahabite faith at home, but are not above conspicuous consumption – from women to booze – in the London West End, in Geneva or in the sunny Riviera resorts of the idle rich. Although the per capita income of the Saudi population rose to a staggering \$24,000 in 1974, at the time of the first oil shock, population growth and a fall in oil prices have reduced it to a mere \$7,000. This amount still puts the Saudis into a much better category than most of their neighbours (Kuwait and the United Arab Emirates are the only countries far ahead of them in terms of per capita income).

The steep decline in real income is an ominous indicator of conflicts to emerge and uncertainties to explode. Next spring, for the first time, local councils will be elected in a democratic way. Yet the regime is slowly running out of the resources to buy peace at home. Moreover, the Saudi bourgeoisie has produced 15 of the 20 hijackers involved in the attacks of 11 September 2001, and the royals are suspected of funding Islamic charities that pass on the money to al-Qaeda and other terrorist groups – in fact, they seem to be paying protection money to their mortal enemies in hopes of avoiding their wrath and diverting it towards infidels and Jews. Thus, they undermine the same America that is of vital importance to their survival. It is obvious that the Bush Administration will withdraw its hand from the regime as the importance of oil from the region is reduced.

Poverty is not the first thought that springs to mind when Westerners think of Arab potentates who are running countries like family firms or military dictatorships, or as a combination of the two. But the vast majority of the people are – literally – dirt poor, lacking in education and living in squalor. The 2002 UN Development Programme report, written by two Arab authors, was a devastating account of backwardness, illiteracy, ignorance of the

---

[2] See Laurent Murawiec (2003), *La Guerre d'après*, Paris: Albin Michel.

[3] See, for example, the article "A King's Ransom", by Seymour Hersch in *The New Yorker*, October 2001.

modern world and distance to the resources of the information age.[4] This deplorable state of affairs is largely because of the dictatorial character of most Arab regimes, the misallocation of resources, the exclusive pre-eminence of religious education and, above all, the suppression of women in many areas, including their exclusion from professional pursuits in most Arab countries. This report is another variation upon the extensive work on the Arab civilisation by Bernard Lewis: Arab society was, once upon a time, a beacon of scholarship, trade, culture and the martial arts by comparison with Europe in the Dark Ages, but is now in limbo. What went wrong?

Whether in education, knowledge, internet penetration or GDP per capita – the Arab world is in a poor state. Asian Tiger countries send their children to school for ten years, girls and boys alike, whereas the average Arab child attends less than five years. There is a dramatic knowledge gap between the Arabs and the rest of the world. Knowledge attainment is generally poor, for women even more so than for men. In terms of the enjoyment of overall access to services for human development, cultural diversity or links to global state-of-the-art improvements during the last decade – much less than half the population express satisfaction. Internet penetration is 30% in the UAE and further declines in Bahrain, Qatar Lebanon and Jordan. Saudi Arabia registers internet use by some 5% of population, Sudan and Iraq nil, and all the others are in between. One of the reasons (or so the Israelis suspect) most Arab regimes have no interest in peace between Israel and Palestine is the fear of cultural and democratic spillover, first from Israelis to Palestinians and from there to the rest of the Arab world.

The GME is not a system but a geo-strategic concept. Notwithstanding the many conflicts and contradictions among the various regional players it resembles one of those 1960s works of art called a 'mobile'. If you touch it in any one point, everything else begins to move and sometimes swings out of control. Moreover, the GME does not exist in isolation but sells its oil to the world, taking in large amounts of US dollars. Demographic pressure and political oppression combine to produce large scale emigration, especially to Europe, where France is home to approximately 6 million Muslims and Germany is home to 2.5 million Turks, one-third of them Kurds. Since the early 1990s, apocalyptic terrorism is another export commodity to the entire globe, with terrorists like Osama bin Laden fighting their wars against Arab regimes on American soil and trying to force the US to remove its protection from local rulers in Egypt, Saudi-Arabia and other countries.

---

[4] See United Nations Development Programme (2002), *Arab Human Development Report*, UN, New York.

Some countries, however, are more important than others in the GME owing to population, oil, radicalism, strategic location and internal strife – more specifically Saudi Arabia, Iraq, Iran and Palestine.

Saudi Arabia is foremost among these as the pre-eminent Arab country because of location, its oil wealth and the holy sites of Mecca and Medina. But its golden towers rest on proverbial clay feet. The country is under pressure from outside and from within. Externally, the US views the kingdom as the financier of international terrorism, where the absence of political debate and participation creates vast frustration among the bourgeoisie and forces all opposition under the cloak of religious fanaticism. Moreover, the contrast between the strictness of Wahabism at home and the luxury displayed by the princes abroad cannot fail to raise serious concerns. Army officers, now that the oil wealth has to be shared with ever-growing masses and real income is dwindling, feel underpaid. Reforms from above, which the regent is considering, are slow to materialise; no debate is allowed nor is any direction pointed out. Perhaps the strongest indication that the star of the House of Saud is sinking is the fact that the US has been moving all military installations out of the country to nearby bases and seeks to reduce traditional dependence on Saudi oil.

Iraq. Once the seat of the biblical Garden of Eden, Iraq is today and will be for a long time to come the centrepiece of the Fertile Crescent. If Iraq does not find internal peace through compromise or separation, and if the Allies withdraw before law and order are established and an orderly transfer of sovereignty is possible – the Franco-German couple are pressing for an early transfer of sovereignty, meaning in so many words 'Yankee go home' – a large scale Lebanon will ensue, bringing ethnic and religious strife, power struggles, massacres all over the place and repercussions throughout the entire region. The outside world has parted ways at the donors' conference in Madrid: the US collected large contributions, but France wanted its debt paid and Germany refused to forego its $4.4 billion of outstanding debt – though with zero chance of ever getting a penny back. Meanwhile, chances for a reconstructed Iraq are growing, notwithstanding the daily carnage.

Iran. The country is in a similar situation as Germany was in at the turn of the 20th century: too big for balance and too small for hegemony. It has no friends and only difficult neighbours. With the Arabs, there is nothing to unite the two sides but the trumped-up Jerusalem issue and the radical opposition to the existence of Israel. The war in Iraq has eliminated the Saddam Hussein threat – but for how long remains to be seen and it is to be doubted that Tehran sees much reassurance in the US presence. From the long war with Iraq and from the experience of the two last Gulf wars, the mullahs seem to have concluded that, in order to become invulnerable, they need a nuclear capability. There seems to be hardly any nuclear debate inside

the country, nor are questions being asked about the consequences for neighbouring countries. Between Iran and the outside world the nuclear weapons issue has moved to the top of the agenda.

The October mission of the three foreign ministers from Germany, France and UK looked, on the face of it, like a well-considered and consulted 'good-cop/bad-cop' policy, with the Americans providing the sticks and the Europeans the carrots. In the concluding statement, the Iranian side promised to 'suspend' – not cease – the uranium enrichment process, while the Europeans indicated that they cannot wait to do business. The European differences with the US are only papered-over for the time being, as Washington wants intrusive inspections and definitive results, while the Iranians continue to procrastinate. The Europeans want to keep the issue out of the UN Security Council, but the US, not unlike Israel, wants maximum pressure. The mullahs, who to offer the best sources of intelligence to Israel and the US, are on the way to nuclear weapons for long range missiles, which stem back to North Korean help. If this materialises, the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) would be nothing but a scrap of paper and countries such as Saudi Arabia and Turkey could start thinking about their own nuclear deterrent. The West, however, has a dilemma. The short term strategy to stop Iran on its way to nuclear weapons falls in the way of the long-term strategy that would wait for demographic change to do its work. Iran's student population today is probably the most pro-American crowd in the world – but they are also largely unemployed, frustrated and resentful. Among the young generation only one in three has the slightest chance of finding a paying job. This situation creates pressure on the regime to open and to modernise, yet such an opening can only be facilitated through the technology and capital investment of the West.

Is there a magic formula to bring peace and stability to the troubled lands of the Greater Middle East? The US seems to have decided that for the time being nothing can replace the role of the Central Command as a balancer from beyond the sea. In fact, it is the US that keeps all the uneasy balances of the Middle East under control. But, as Richard Haas warned all of us in his 1997 analysis, the US is a 'reluctant sheriff', and imperial overstretch is looming large.[5] Moreover, the close ties between the US and the state of Israel makes Washington a difficult ally for its friends and dependents around the Middle East, and what looks like a guarantee of security may well be the kiss of death.

The European Union. Can the Europeans project enough stability into the region to protect themselves from spillover effects? Turkey's eventual EU

---

[5] See Richard Haas (1998), *The Reluctant Sheriff: The United States After the Cold War,* New York: Council on Foreign Relations Press.

membership, which has been promised since the free trade Association Agreement of 1963, is being advertised by the US as the panacea. But nobody can gauge the effects this would have on Turkey's social and economic structures, nor is there much willingness among Europeans to open the door to ever more poor people from foreign lands. In addition, an ever-wider EU can also be an even more unmanageable system. The best concept may still be found in the European Economic Space (EES), which now consists of only Norway, Iceland and Finland, or in the Greater Europe concept – which, however, is sadly lacking in reality. Should NATO pick up the pieces, as the *New York Times* journalist Thomas Friedman recently suggested, in full earnest, when referring to Iraq, Turkey and Israel? That is most unlikely.

What can be done and what must be done, however, is to revive the best of the various approaches that have been tried since the end of the cold war, from the Madrid process for Middle East peace to the Barcelona Process for Mediterranean development, from the Road Map to the stabilisation of Iraq under US tutelage. A comprehensive system of arms control, especially WMD, must aim at halting the arms race among all the major players in the region. First and most importantly, however, is the objective of helping to establish peace in the Holy Land. But in the long run, the second UN Development Programme report on the Arab world,[6] just published, is probably right in saying that key to the improvement of the Greater Middle East, its endemic poverty, its demographic explosion and its dictatorial politics is investment in education, the empowerment of women, and, concurrently, a slow and measured process of political participation.

What is it that we have to do?

In a recent study, Geoffrey Kemp, who is among the foremost American experts on the Greater Middle East (although not of the 'Europeans are from Venus and Americans are from Mars' school) gave some healthy advice to European governments: "Europe must stop fretting about the dominant role of the United States in the Middle East and start asserting European interests in Europe's backyard. Towards this end, confrontation with Washington is not required. Rather, closer and more equitable transatlantic cooperation on matters of vital importance to all three regions will benefit everybody."[7]

---

[6] See United Nations Development Programme (2003), *Arab Human Development Report*, UN, New York.

[7] See Geoffrey Kemp (2003-04), "Europe's Middle East Challenges", *The Washington Quarterly*, Winter, pp. 163–177.

For many years, perhaps decades to come, the Greater Middle East will remain the cauldron of crises, competing and interacting with the Indian-Pakistani nuclear and religious standoff and with the Far Eastern struggle for mastery. There is no escape from this set of post-cold war threats. The West, if not hanging tough and keeping together, will probably split and fail.

First of all, it is important to share the intelligence as well as the broader analysis. If the overall picture differs dramatically, strategy is bound to diverge and conflict is likely to arise – to the point of blockade and failure – as witnessed by the recent Iraqi crisis. It should be noted that it was not so much a change in the grand strategy that caused the rift, but that Western nations, especially France and Germany, stumbled upon it almost by accident, i.e. electoral convenience and intra-European power play.

Secondly, we should make use of the different experience, strength and expertise that the US, Canada and the various European countries bring to the rendezvous, including soft powers, hard powers, distance and closeness, to achieve a maximum of influence and formative power.

Thirdly, we need to make practical use of those differing formations, experiences and approaches, not only the good-cop/bad-cop routine *vis-á-vis* Iran but even more so when it comes to mixing the proverbial carrots and sticks. The EU has a great reputation for the cornucopia it seems to be wielding, while the US ability to use brute force inspires compromise and reticence. The two approaches, normally regarded as Venus and Mars, need not exclude each other but, if applied gently, consistently and regularly, make a successful formula. Of course, fairness in dividing the benefits of trade and investment is essential.

Fourthly, we must make sure that what we pray for is what is in our best interest. In American ears, the democracy sermon sounds like the winning formula. But it is rare to hear the same pious wishes from Israel or among the more intimately involved European countries. They would be content with governments halfway between Turkey's democracy and Egypt's authoritarianism. 'Osama for President' is a battle cry the Europeans hear when Arab democracy is mentioned while Americans tend to believe that democracy more or less US-style must surely be the panacea for the woes of the Greater Middle East. It is important to try to settle for a pragmatic, reasonable, open-ended compromise. It was Samuel Huntington, of *The Clash of Civilizations* fame, who warned the US against imposing its value system on far away nations that have a different narrative and follow different stars. Modesty and pragmatism may be the better part of valour.[8]

---

[8] See Samuel P. Huntingdon (1996), *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*, New York: Simon & Schuster Inc.

It is also relevant to look at whom one calls a 'friend'. If in doubt, criteria should be found for long-term engagement or, possibly, disengagement. Some advice on this point for the Saudis is: if you have such friends, you do not need enemies. Nevertheless, their oil-policies and their domestic power play regulate the price of the most strategic resource the world's oil economies need. We must not forget, before Western oil reserves have been exhausted, that there is only one oil market in the world, largely dominated by OPEC (more especially by the Saudis) and that it is very inflexible.

Further, we need to make sure that strategic objectives are broadly understood and widely shared. NATO's strategic guidelines of the 1991-vintage had already included strategic minerals – meaning oil – and access routes. But that meant nothing in particular in terms of force rebuilding and transformation: the next Middle Eastern crisis came like a thief in the night.

Adding to the diplomatic toolbox, having enough escalation dominance is crucial to prevail in any test of strength, be it crisis management or be it a full-blown confrontation. No European nation has sufficient means to do so; not even the European security and defence policy (ESDP) would make much difference. It takes NATO and NATO's assets, including its headquarters, to bring home the more robust points.

It is ironic that Europeans, who are closer to the Islamic arc of fire than the US, seem to be far less worried about general insecurity and instability coming from the region than about practical administrative, economic and social issues arising from the southern and eastern neighbourhood. This need not be a source of weakness, or a reason for a public display of antagonism but on the contrary a source of strength, suggesting complementary approaches and different ways of making use of naturalised citizens from southern shores, such as Turks and Iranians in Germany, and Arabs in France, Italy, Spain and Portugal.

Finally yet importantly: we must make sure that NATO remains the centrepiece of Atlantic security and a supplier of stability for the Greater Middle East. It is within NATO that both the analysis and the strategy can be shared. No separate European expedition would have sufficient deterrent effect and escalation dominance to suppress warlords and wars throughout the Near Eastern arc of fire. Moreover, as the nature of the threat is in most cases global, the response must also be organised along the lines of the old J. P. Morgan motto: 'Global reach, local touch'.

Author's note: Among the vast and ever growing body of literature, see also these specific references: "A Survey of Islam and the West", *The Economist*, 13 September 2003 and Shireen Hunter (1998), *The Future of Islam and the West, Clash of Civilisations or Peaceful Coexistence*, Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) Publications, CSIS, Washington, D.C.

A Grand Strategy for the Middle East
An American View

Steven Simon

The Middle East is undergoing a long-term political, economic and demographic crisis. Over the next 12 years, the total population of the Middle East will grow by 32%. Despite declining fertility rates in some countries (Iran, Egypt and Tunisia), demographic momentum will continue to yield high growth. Moreover, 50% of Arabs and 54% of Iranians are under the age of 20; over 60% are under 30. In high-income OECD countries, the percentage of the population under 20 is 25%.[1] Though most Arabs and Iranians can read and write the quality of their education is not good enough to shape them into a labour force capable of competing in an increasingly competitive global market. It is, however, good enough to make unskilled labour an unacceptable alternative. As can be inferred from the population growth figures, the Middle East has the fastest growing labour force in the world: 3.4% each year between 1990 and 1998. Some countries, such as Syria at 4.8%, Algeria at 4.9% or Yemen at 5.6%, face potentially serious problems. (For comparative purposes, the US labour force has been growing at 0.04% and the EU's at 0.08%.) Unemployment in the region is between 12% and 35%, depending on the country. If total fertility rates decline more sharply than expected, population growth will eventually slow too, thereby taking some of the pressure off labour markets – in theory. In practice, however, fertility rates will decline only if women are better educated, which implies that they will then be joining males in the labour force to produce a net increase in the number of young people looking for non-existent jobs. In such circumstances, labour market equilibrium must yield either higher unemployment or lower wages.[2] On average, real wages in the region have remained unchanged for 30 years.

On the demand side, GDP growth has lagged behind the rest of the world for at least two decades. The region has in effect disengaged from the global economy. While over the past 20 years OECD economies grew by 1.4% per

---

[1] See the International Labour Organisation Bureau of Statistics (retrievable from http://laborsta.ilo.org/). The 30 OECD member countries have populations of individuals under 20 that comprise 27.5% of the total population. Alternately, in the high-income OECD countries (which exclude the Czech Republic, Hungary, Mexico, Poland, Slovakia, and Turkey) the under-20 population stands at 24.9% of the total population.

[2] The rigid labour market regulation typical of Middle Eastern countries can produce equilibria at higher unemployment and lower wage levels.

year, East Asia's (excluding Japan) by 5.8% per year and Latin America's by 1%, the Middle East has not grown at all. Real wages and labour productivity are unchanged. Adding to the region's miseries has been the extremely rapid urbanisation in countries that are unable to pay for the infrastructural improvements needed to keep cities from collapsing under the weight of internal immigration.

There is general consensus on how this parlous state was reached. Rent-seeking behaviour by distributive states militated against transparency and accountability and in favour of corruption and unsustainable subsidies. States occupied increasingly large shares of national economies, became employers of last resort and adopted import-substitution policies. In some countries, military procurement added to dead weight losses. All these factors have discouraged foreign direct investment. Such policies and practices are difficult to reverse.[3]

Against this socio-economic background, it is unsurprising that the United States has come to be seen as an enemy, either because it supports national governments that have presided over this decline, or because it has laid siege to regional regimes and undermined their ability to improve living conditions. Perceptions of U.S. policy toward Iraq and Palestine, as well as of the conduct of the war on terrorism, have contributed to the United States' disastrous standing in the region. Public opinion surveys conducted by the Pew Foundation and Zogby International offer a vivid statistical picture of this disaster.

The Pew Global Attitudes Project survey released in June 2003 found that "the bottom has fallen out of support for America in most of the Muslim world".[4] Only 27% of Moroccans, 15% of Lebanese and Turks, 13% of Indonesians, 12% of Pakistanis, and 1% of Jordanians and Palestinians had a favourable view of the US. (These numbers are broadly consistent with recent surveys of other countries in the region. Just 6% of the Egyptian public has a favourable impression of the US, while more than half the population has "very negative" views, according to a 2002 Pew study.) As a result primarily of the invasion of Iraq, the erosion has accelerated.

---

[3] Nor is the IMF agenda, the so-called 'Washington Consensus', (export-led growth, flexible labour market, deregulation, market prices for domestic consumption) necessarily appropriate to states that (a) have no particular advantage in non-oil commodities and no skilled labour, or (b) where subsidies are crucial to civic order and regime survival.

[4] "Views of a Changing World 2003, How Global Publics View: War in Iraq; Democracy; Islam and Governance; Globalization", The Pew Global Attitudes Project, The Pew Research Center, Washington, D.C. (retrievable from http://people-press.org/reports/display.php3?ReportID=185).

Compared with Pew 2002 results, the 2003 returns show a marked drop: the Lebanese and Turkish figures declined by 50%, the Indonesian figure dropped 62% and the Jordanian figure fell 96%. Moreover, the antipathy has spread beyond the Middle East to other Muslim countries: the percentage of Nigerians who held positive views of the US plummeted from 71% to 38%, and in Indonesia the figure fell from 60% to 13%.

With this sudden decline has come a change in the nature of such public opposition to America. For many years, Muslims in the Middle East and elsewhere distinguished between their disapproval of US policies and their feelings about the American people. Whatever their government might have done, Americans were admired for their wealth, can-do attitude, popular culture, devotion to democracy and technological achievements. But the statistical spread between opposition to Washington's policies and negative attitudes towards the American people has narrowed considerably, and in many countries a crucial line has been crossed: Americans are increasingly despised as a people. For example, between 2002 and 2003, the number of Pakistanis holding positive views about American fell from 39% to 16%, and for Jordanians it fell from 54% to 18%. These sentiments are fed by the spreading belief throughout the Muslim world that the US poses a serious threat to Islam. In seven of the eight Muslim populations surveyed, 50% or more believed in that specific American threat; only Nigeria, where 42% shared this belief, was the figure below the half-way line. Remarkably, significant majorities in seven of the eight Muslim populations – with a near majority in Morocco – worried about a potential US military threat to their own countries.

Thus, popular opinion is increasingly receptive to the Jihadist dogma that America is the enemy. Muslims also feel the need for a powerful figure to defend them. In six of the populations studied, the Pew research found that 40% or more had confidence that Osama bin Laden would do the right thing in world affairs – with a majority of Jordanians (56%) and Palestinians (72%) placing their trust in his leadership.

The discourse in major daily newspapers published in the region (including Qatar, a key host for US military forces in the Gulf) present US policy in terms of the supposedly decisive role that Jews play in determining America's aggressive or exploitative actions in the region. The broad point is that America's approach to the reason for its policies – the pursuit of any 'grand strategy' – will be received with scepticism at best, or hostility. Attacks against the UN and the Red Cross, as well as British, Italian and Bulgarian forces in Iraq, and the British Consul General in Istanbul show that countries perceived to be connected to the American presence in the region are liable to be tarred with the same brush.

Against this dismal background, a grand strategy towards the Middle East must attempt more or less simultaneously to integrate the region into the global economy, promote democratisation, stave off the proliferation of nuclear weapons, stabilise local military balances and neutralise terrorists while redressing negative attitudes about the US and its partners. Concurrent with these daunting, long-term tasks, there is a Palestinian state to be created and nurtured, Iraqi insurgency to be defeated and an Iraqi state to be reconstituted. George Bernard Shaw remarked that marriage in the context of daily life amounted to "a battle in the midst of a war". Incubating these two states while coping with the broader demands of a Middle East strategy will seem much the same to policy-makers.

Democratisation. If any of these elements of a strategy has priority, it must be democratisation. This is a project, of course, not a panacea. It has been observed that democracy is a cure for just one ailment – tyranny – and that there are both poor and illiberal democracies. The future may also hold Islamist, anti-Western democracies. Nevertheless, democracies predicated on rule of law entail accountability and a degree of transparency that reduce the opportunity for corruption and misallocation of resources, while giving people a stake in decision-making. Thus democratisation would serve two vital purposes. First, it would improve economic performance and provide a better climate for investment, thereby reducing the labour supply overhang that poses such a severe threat to stability. Second, it would give frustrated, even alienated, publics a sense of empowerment at home that would reduce their resentment of powers abroad.

A commitment to democratisation would also have to encompass a commitment to bringing women into the workplace in countries where they are now excluded from the economic sphere. The faster this happens, the faster fertility rates will fall. Cultural barriers to the integration of women will naturally be reinforced by the economic threat these new entrants into the job market will pose to the hordes of unemployed young men already propping up walls in Middle Eastern cities. This is one reason, among many, that the overall programme of democratisation will have to proceed slowly.

Another reason for proceeding slowly is that the distributive economies typical of some of these states undercut the incentives of the state and of society to adopt democracy. Yet another reason is the ubiquity of Islamist oppositions, whose commitment to Western-style democracy is unclear and who therefore cannot win the trust of reform-minded regime players essential to the pact-making that must precede the emergence of democracy. The Bush administration's Middle East Partnership Initiative is well adapted to these constraints and focused on key objectives: the empowerment of women, support for civil society and enhancement of education. The EU has been pursuing these objectives for a number of years, though at a somewhat more

modest level. The potential synergy and results of combined US-EU initiatives in these areas could, in fact, serve our shared interests well.

These programmes, however, are not enough. Pressure on governments to open up political space is essential. Here, too, the West must think in terms of the long run. We cannot afford to precipitate crises with regional governments or withdraw support entirely when these relationships serve other important interests and there is no acceptable near-term alternative to existing arrangements. The administration's symbolic punishment of the Mubarak government in Egypt for hounding the sociologist Saad Eddin Ibrahim represents the sort of signal that we should be sending more broadly.

Trade and aid. Financial assistance will remain necessary for most of the states in the region. The Bush administration's Millennium Challenge Account (MCA), until a large part was re-allocated for use in Iraq, represented an interesting departure from an approach that had steadily lost credibility – and congressional support – between the mid-1980s and the end of the last decade. The inspiration was a Victorian dedication to the deserving poor, except in this case the poor are countries whose attempts, however feeble, to implement Washington Consensus rules made them deserving of help. The virtues of this approach were the enthusiasm it generated among Congressional appropriators and the smaller chance that the money would be wasted by recipients. The problem is that it punishes the undeserving poor; states that have not – and may never – meet the standard of economic reform that access to MCA money is intended to facilitate. Yet these failing states are precisely the ones that pose the urgent threat to Western interests. A successful strategy will have to allocate funds to the feckless poor as well as the righteous poor.

Aid is not the whole story. Trade is a far better way to help these societies perform better. Assistance tends to perpetuate the structures that hinder democratisation and hobble growth. Trade would take the funds from corrupt, favour-dispensing regimes and put it in the hands of a commercial middle class, empowering civil society and helping to create the conditions for democratic transition. The United States has finally adopted this policy towards the Pakistani textile industry and – as a policy, if not a political matter – made pursuit of free trade arrangements an important part of its foreign policy. This is another area where the harmonisation of US and EU policies can pay real dividends.

Maintain the regional military balance in the Persian Gulf. It will take years before Iraq emerges as a military power in the region – one hopes with exclusively conventional capabilities. Similarly, Iran will not emerge from its own economic weakness and political confusion for years. Nonetheless, the prospects for Iraq's regeneration and Iran's acquisition of nuclear weapons

are real enough. An over-the-horizon military presence, combined with forward-deployed US air force units in Qatar, a fleet headquartered in Bahrain and ground force equipment in Kuwait, will be needed to reassure the states on the Arab side of the Gulf, while injecting some caution into a nervous Iran and Iraq. The US – and its allies – will want to keep their forces available, but out of sight, to avoid inflaming public opinion.

Stem the proliferation of nuclear weapons. Few of the regional states are interested in a nuclear capability; most support non-proliferation goals. Although Iran has apparently experimented with uranium enrichment and would like to develop a production capacity, Tehran has not likely concluded that actual nuclear weapons are necessary or desirable. This will depend on the trajectory of Iraq's development in the coming years, perceptions of the threat posed by the US and the potential diplomatic and economic costs of proliferation if the US and Europe are united in their determination to block it. The US and its allies have at least some control over all three factors. A grand strategy for the Middle East would entail coordinated, firm exercise of this control. Unfortunately, exercising this control will demand a greater level of inter-alliance respect and cooperation than is currently on tap.

Combat terrorism. Whether or not terrorism has root causes susceptible to Western efforts to deal with them, terrorists will have to be rooted out. As al-Qaeda has evolved from a relatively small group of Egyptian revolutionaries and Saudi mystics into a widely shared ideology, this is going to be increasingly difficult. The presence of these insurgents in Saudi Arabia and other countries in the region will force the US and the UK to foster close ties to regimes whose politics spurred the insurrection in the first place. Although this enforced dependence cannot be avoided entirely, a grand strategy would require that it be balanced by nuanced pressure on autocratic regimes and transmitted 'in the clear'. The balance is extremely delicate and the risk of making this worse will be high.

Find a way to talk to opposition movements. It is said that a monologue is one person talking to himself; a dialogue is two people talking to themselves. Recognising the problems inherent in dialogue, the US in particular needs to explain itself better to the young, regional, technocratic elite. During a period when US credibility is at all-time low, this will not be easy. Yet a grand strategy for the region demands that the US – and its allies – be perceived as partners in the advancement of its people, rather than predators or clumsy hegemons, or worse, religious adversaries. What Fouad Ajami called the belligerence and self-pity of contemporary Arab discourse will get in the way, but we will have to forge ahead with some sort of dialogue despite this. The religious expression of opposition language poses an even more daunting challenge. Despite the religious window-dressing of American rhetoric, US policy is governed by secular concerns. Europe, of course, has

expunged religion from the public sphere and private piety is on the wane. Engaging with the self-consciously religious language of the only truly organised and credible oppositions in the region will not be easy. But governments must try.

Palestine and Iraq. Palestine is not the source of America's problems in the region, but it must be part of the solution. A coherent grand strategy would demand more robust US involvement. The disincentives are strong. The parties remain far apart, the two societies are fatigued but not wrung out, politics in both camps remain stagnant and the Bush administration is unlikely to take risks before a potentially close US election. But Washington must be seen to push for conditions that will favour a successful Palestinian state: territorial contiguity and borders close to the 1967 Green Line, with sensible adjustments. Failure to do so will pose not only near-term diplomatic costs, but lead to longer-term liabilities in the form of a stunted, violent Palestinian state that is a source of instability in the region and beyond. Similarly, the US – and its allies – must get Iraq right. The centre of gravity in the region is shifting from the West (Egypt and Syria) to the East. Politics in Iran are turbulent and arguably democratic; in Saudi Arabia, Crown Prince Abdullah talks about elections (and must cope with an insurgency); in several of the smaller littoral states, genuine participatory democracy is beginning to replace the sham practices of an earlier time. The evolution of Iraq will have an enormous impact on these trends. If the state fails or reverts to a dictatorship, these exciting developments may fade; if it succeeds, a regeneration of the region is dimly possible.

What Strategy
for the Greater Middle East?
A Russian View

Irina Zvyagelskaya

A n answer to the question of whether a common strategy for the Greater Middle East is possible is closely associated with how we understand the term 'Greater' and what regions or subregions are included into this macro-region. There is an impression that despite the differences in details many researchers are nowadays inclined to consider the Middle East as a territory extending from North Africa to Pakistan and including the Persian Gulf, Palestine, Central Asia and the Caucasus. If one is to proceed from this definition, the subregions just listed differ significantly from each other by the vicissitudes of historical fate, the level of socio-political and economic development, the specificity of ethno-confessional makeup and the degree of the involvement of external forces. At the same time it is commonly supposed that this new Middle East reproduces common security challenges and threats. Given that the area has a high concentration of despotic regimes and failed states, it is the site of politically radical and militant Islam, terrorism and conflicts. Several countries in the region also produce and supply drugs. To this one may add the danger of further violation of the nuclear non-proliferation regime and of WMD falling into the hands of irresponsible extremist groupings.

There is no reason to regard the challenges mentioned above and threats arising in different parts of the new Middle East as identical or uniform for the entire macro-region. A gradual transformation of societies generating these threats is underway – a fact that changes, if not their essence, then at least the particular features of their manifestation. In this connection there is no common strategy to combat these threats, nor can there be, though a use of similar instruments cannot be excluded.

This paper attempts to present the Russian approach to the main security issues in two subregions of the Greater Middle East – Central Asia and Palestine.

Central Asia

In comparison with the traditional Middle East, Central Asia ranks much higher on the list of Russian foreign policy priorities. The transparency of borders, constant migration flows and the contacts that had been formed back in Soviet times made Russia much more dependent on the evolution of the

situation in the states of Central Asia than had ever been expected. Central Asia has become a region independently generating threats and challenges to Russia's security and simultaneously a transit corridor for threats coming from forces outside its borders. Among them is the growth of extremism in the form of militant Islamism, drugs and arms trafficking, the disputed border issues, tense relations between individual countries, the degradation of the environment and others. These threats do not simply affect Russia, but spread to its territory, intertwining with the Russian domestic security challenges and fostering their intensification.

Over the past years, Moscow has determined its role as a guarantor of the region's security and its defender from external threats. These interests induce Russia to pursue a 'costly' policy. Because of the growth of extremism and terrorism, Russia tried to share the burden of responsibility for security with China (in the framework of the Shanghai Cooperation Organization, SCO) and then virtually acquiesced to the American military presence.

The greater part of Russian politicians and experts agree that in the short term, US action in many aspects meets the demands of strengthening security in Central Asia and in this respect can only be welcomed by Russia. These activities are, in particular:

- setting up an interim government and taking measures to stabilise the situation in Afghanistan;
- deterring extremism in Central Asia by demonstrating a military presence;
- diminishing the channels of foreign assistance to radical Islamists; and
- assisting the states of the region and their economies.

At the same time, in the long term it is not quite clear what the consequences of changing the geopolitical balance in the region will be. The growing geopolitical importance of Central Asia among the priorities of other states may cause difficulties in Russia's relations with them. Thus in case relations between the US and China deteriorate, the American presence in the region can become a factor of tension in relations between Russia and China. The American presence may also create problems in relations between Russia and Iran. Though the large-scale destabilisation of the situation and the outbreak of violence in Central Asia seem improbable, one cannot completely exclude a negative scenario. The US is unlikely to interfere in regional affairs or protect a particular regime, and will probably curtail its presence in Central Asia. In this case, Russia's responsibility for the establishment of stability and its involvement in Central Asian affairs could increase many times over and require huge resources and efforts on Moscow's part.

A threat most often referred to is militant Islamism. The Islamic radicalism in Central Asia has emerged chiefly under the influence of domestic and not external reasons. In the poorest states, a massive restructuring of the economy – de-industrialisation attended by the growth of the comparative importance of the trade and service sector – has resulted from the increase of negative economic tendencies soon after independence. The social welfare sphere has suffered an especially heavy blow. Problems in connection with the payment of pensions and allowances, with the maintenance of the system of education and public health services, and an extremely low level of public safety have promoted the trends to return to traditional practices. Working in the same direction have been such factors as corruption and nepotism in the highest bodies of power, infringement of legality and the weakness of law-enforcement agencies. The people, feeling defenceless, have naturally clung to traditional structures regulating personal and public life. From here greater attention has been directed towards religion, which was, under certain circumstances, expressed in borrowing the recipes for a just reorganisation of society within the framework of political Islam.

The above mentioned features of current development of Central Asian societies have created a breeding-ground for the emergence of extremist Islamic organisations there (e.g. Hizb ut-Tahrir and the Islamic Movement of Uzbekistan). Outside assistance and support on the part of international Islamic foundations and certain governments of Muslim states is playing an important, but nevertheless secondary role. The productivity of this support, which includes financial aid, the training of militants and the export of ideology (the latter quite often at variance with the local tradition), is conditioned by the existence of contradictions, discontent and frustration in the region. In its turn, such support rapidly becomes an instrument of mobilisation, creating an opportunity for protest sentiments to be more swiftly released.

Given the American presence, in the long term this trend may prove ineffective from the standpoint of maintaining stability. This result may happen if the West too actively engages in the introduction of Western standards of democracy, market economy and human rights. Still, it must be admitted that the Americans are beginning to understand the counter-productivity of such approaches in the cultures of traditional Oriental societies, in which respect for the supreme authority is ingrained.

American support, promoting the legitimisation of the Central Asian regimes and their consolidation, could simultaneously engender among them a temptation to use tougher methods towards the opposition, represented largely by the Islamists.

Meanwhile, political Islam in Central Asia is far from being homogeneous politically. Coexisting within its context are both those moderate Islamists who are ready to cooperate with secular regimes in the name of national interests and the champions of a radical approach that is gaining in strength.

The main vulnerability of the official US approach, which is shared by neither Russia nor the European states, consists of shifting the accent to methods of military, forceful pressure, which do not leave political Islam the right to self-expression (it is certainly not just a question of either the terrorists or the extremists). In the Central Asian region there is an ever greater need for using the methods of political influence upon the radicals, isolating them within the framework of political Islam itself, along with the methods of military pressure where these are necessary.

In the long term, the American military presence *per se* can become a powerful, irritating factor, stimulating the manifestations of radical and above all, Islamic opposition, which will represent an especially serious challenge to Russia's security. Although the situation in Central Asia has nothing in common with that in Iraq, one cannot disregard the fact that the American military campaign and its military presence in the country have been encouraging re-Islamisation of the two states ruled by secular Baathist regimes, namely, Iraq and Syria.

In Central Asia as a whole, Russia (while developing cooperation in the security domain with the West along with China), is increasingly prepared to act independently, safeguarding its interests through bilateral and multilateral military-political and military-technical cooperation with the states in the region.

Palestine

The situation in the zone of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict is not a priority for Russian policy. At the same time, as the negative tendencies developing there increasingly spillover the limits of the region, Russia also feels the frustrating impact of the Middle Eastern factor.

The crisis of expectations associated with the peace process has fostered a radicalisation of the Palestinian society, which is less and less ready to accept a compromise variant of settlement with Israel. Even representatives of Fatah (Arafat's organisation) have declared that the peace process was a conspiracy against the national aspirations of the Palestinian people.

The per capita income of Palestinians has decreased by 20% in comparison with 1993 (before the conclusion of the Oslo agreements). Meanwhile, a significant growth of unemployment has been observed, the freedom of

movement has been restricted. The construction of Israeli settlements has continued and the number of Israeli settlers in the region has doubled.

At the same time, the Palestinian authorities haven't demonstrated any efficiency or ability to resolve socio-economic issues. Corruption, the absence of professionalism and the haphazard process of decision-making have resulted in a situation where social problems have largely been given over to the tender mercies of Islamist organisations – Hamas, Islamic Jihad and so forth. These have been raising funds for the Palestinian poor, organising the education of the youth and have naturally pursued a corresponding ideological indoctrination of the population. The political role of Islamist organisations traditionally calling for a 'jihad' against Jews has clearly been growing. Thus the ethno-territorial and ethno-political conflict underlying the Palestinian problem has gradually acquired an ethno-confessional dimension as well. Basically, a confrontation on inter-confessional grounds was not peculiar to the Palestinian-Israeli differences. Among the Palestinians themselves there are Christians and the main Palestinian organisations were represented by secular nationalists who did not use religious slogans as an instrument of military-political struggle in a practical manner. Nowadays, even young Fatah fighters have been gambling with terrorist methods under Islamic slogans, having created their own military formation of al-Aqsa Martyrs' Brigades.

The Russian interests in the Middle East are being formed under the influence of various factors. First, there is the demonstration effect that the events in Palestine have had. For the Muslim world, the Palestinians are a symbol of fighting against the humiliations suffered by Muslims. It is in this context that the Palestinian-Israeli conflict is used by Islamic radicals calling for war against the infidels. The talk about the 'Palestinisation' of the Chechen conflict started after the appearance of Chechen women as terrorists, though this comparison is incorrect. These two conflicts are of a completely different nature; death as a human bomb is not in Chechen traditions – Chechen men will not offer themselves in such a manner. Attempts at such an imitation, however, testify that things happening in the traditional Middle East are ever more affecting the security of Russia proper. It is not ruled out that both the Palestinian radicals and the Chechen terrorists at times receive funding from the same sources. Second, the Russian Federation is compelled to take into consideration the presence of a significant number of Russian citizens in Israel. This factor cannot help but influence Russia's policies, as the leadership of the Russian Federation (RF) is anxious over their security, which under the conditions of the ongoing conflict, is constantly jeopardised. Third, the Israeli support for the Russian policy in Chechnya is also playing its role, especially against the background of constant criticism and resentment of any RF actions in this republic on the

part of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe (PACE), quite often viewed in Russia as evidence of double standards and attempts towards the appeasement of Islamic extremists.

Given this connection, Russia has an interest in promoting the speediest settlement of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. In the process, the direct parties to the conflict nowadays perceive the RF as an honest broker. On the one hand, it has retained its traditionally close ties with the Palestinians and the Arab states. On the other hand, it has wide-ranging relations with Israel, which believes that the Russian Federation is confronted with similar problems of struggle against terrorism. Nevertheless, Russia has neither the ambitions nor the resources to assume an active, independent role in promoting the process of settlement. It is ready to work within the framework of the efforts of the Quartet, advancing the Road Map for peace.

Conclusions

It seems that attempts to construct a new or expanding Middle East have been dictated by political reasons. An automatic incorporation of the states of Central Asia and the Caucasus into the traditional Middle East may have only initially reflected a certain reality expressed in the quest for a national identity and in the attempts to revive connections with coreligionists and ethnically related peoples. But later on, these concepts came to occupy a special place in the system and structure of international relations, linking an opportunity of accelerated development mainly with the expansion of ties with the West. The question of whether the Greater Middle East is united by common security challenges also seems rather contentious. For example, the hierarchy of reasons for the radicalisation of political Islam and the growth of extremism in Palestine and in Central Asia are different. Various external forces have different foreign-policy priorities in these regions and, accordingly, their assessments of the intensity and danger of these threats also differ seriously. Such a conclusion means that the instruments and methods of combating the existing threats are not universal and, consequently, one may hardly calculate on a single strategy for the new Middle East. In each specific case, an approach of its own should be developed and only under such circumstances can its efficiency be ensured. Such an approach will require a coordinated effort, leaving enough room for manoeuvre by each of the parties interested in the stability of the Greater Middle East.

About the Contributors

Dana H. Allin is the Editor of *Survival*, the quarterly journal of the International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS). A graduate of Yale University, he worked as a European-based financial journalist before earning an MA and PhD from the Johns Hopkins University's Nitze School of Advanced International Studies (SAIS). He was a visiting professor in European Studies and American Foreign Policy at the SAIS centres in Bologna, Italy and Washington, D.C., a Robert Bosch Foundation Fellow, and Deputy Director of both the Aspen Institute, Berlin and the International Commission on the Balkans (a joint project of Aspen Berlin and the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace). Dr Allin is the author of *Cold War Illusions: America, Europe and Soviet Power, 1969-1989* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1994) and *NATO's Balkan Interventions, Adelphi Paper 347* (Oxford: Oxford University Press for the IISS, 2002). He is also a co-author of *Unfinished Peace: Report of the International Commission on the Balkans* (Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1996). His numerous articles include commentaries in the International Herald Tribune, Wall Street Journal, Financial Times and Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung.

Gordon Adams is a Professor of the Practice of International Affairs and Director of the Security Policy Studies Program at the Elliott School of International Affairs, The George Washington University. Previously Deputy Director of the International Institute for Strategic Studies in London, he also served as an Associate Director for National Security and International Affairs at the Office of Management and Budget in the Clinton administration and was a founder and Director of the Defense Budget Project in Washington, D.C. Being widely published and quoted on the subject of transatlantic security and defence industry relations, Dr Adams has also testified extensively before various committees of both houses of the US Congress. He holds degrees from Stanford University, the College of Europe and Columbia University.

Hüseyin Bağcı is a Professor of International Relations at the Middle East Technical University in Ankara. In 1988, he received his PhD in Political Science from the University of Bonn. He was a guest researcher at the German Society for Foreign Affairs in Bonn and a Senior Fellow at the Centre for European Integration Studies (ZEI) in Bonn and at the Landesvereteidigungsakademie und Militaerwissenschaftliches Büro in Vienna. He has published several books on German relations. Prof. Bağcı is a well-known TV commentator, a syndicated columnist for the Turkish Daily News in Ankara and is widely quoted by international press. Professor Bağcı is a member of IISS and the European Strategic Forum. His publications include *Parameters of Partnership: The U.S. – Turkey – Europe* (Nomos

Verlagsgesellschaft, 1999); *"Türkische Sicherheitspolitik. Mittelpunkt des neuen geopolitischen Koordinatensystems"*, in *Internationale Politik*, Vol. 53, No. 1, January, 1998; "Turkish Reactions to the EU Approach", in: Susanne Baier-Allen (ed.), *Looking into the Future of Cyprus-EU Relations* (Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, 1999); Die Türkische Außenpolitik 1945–1956", in Norbert Wiggershaus and Winfried Heinemann (eds) *Nationale Außen-und Bündnispolitik der NATO-Mitgliedstaaten* (R. Oldenburg Verlag, 2000).

Henri J. Barkey is the Bernard L. and Bertha F. Cohen Professor in International Relations and International Relations Department Chair at Lehigh University in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania. He served as a member of the US State Department Policy Planning Staff (1998–2000), working primarily on issues related to the Middle East, the Eastern Mediterranean and intelligence. He has authored, co-authored and edited four books, the most recent being *Turkey's Kurdish Question* (with Graham Fuller, 1998). Among some of his most recent scholarly articles are "The Endless Pursuit: Improving U.S.–Turkish Relations", in Morton Abramowitz (2003) (ed.) *Friends in Need: Turkey and the United States after September 11* (New York: The Century Foundation, 2003) and "Cyprus: The Predictable Crisis", *The National Interest*, No. 66 (Winter 2001–02) with Philip H. Gordon.

Klaus Becher is a managing partner of Knowledge & Analysis LLP, an international security consultancy in Richmond, UK. During 2003 he also served as an Associate Research Fellow for the EU Institute for Security Studies in Paris. Until May 2002, he was the Helmut Schmidt Senior Fellow for European Security at the IISS and a co-director of the European Security Forum. From 1988 to 1999, he worked in Germany at the German Council on Foreign Relations (DGAP) and at the Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik (SWP). Between 1997 and 1999, he served as Secretary-Treasurer of the German Group of the Trilateral Commission. He has published numerous studies on international security issues in German and English.

Carl Bildt, with his extensive background in politics in Sweden, is today focused on different aspects of international policy and business. In Sweden, he served as a Member of Parliament from 1979 to 2001, Chairman of the Moderate Party from 1986 to 1999 and Prime Minister from 1991 to 1994. His government negotiated and signed the 1995 Swedish accession to the European Union. In international affairs, he has been particularly active on the different Balkan issues. He served as the EU Special Representative to former Yugoslavia as well as the first High Representative to Bosnia between 1995 and 1997, and then as Special Envoy of the Secretary-General of the UN to the Balkans between 1999 and 2001. In the US, he serves as the only non-US member of the Board of Trustees of the Rand Corporation, is a Senior International Adviser to Akin Gump (a Washington-based law firm)

and a non-executive director of the global asset management company Legg Mason. In the public policy area, he serves on the board of the Centre for European Reform as well as on the Council of the IISS. He is on the editorial board of the magazine Russia in Global Affairs in Moscow, and a member of the International Advisory Board of the Council on Foreign Relations in New York. He is also in the boards of Aspen Institute Italia in Rome and the Fundacion Euroamerica in Madrid. He has an honorary degree from the University of St. Andrews in Scotland, where he is a Fellow at its Institute for the Study of Terrorism and Political Violence.

Dimitry A. Danilov graduated from Moscow University's Economic Department in 1982, where he received a PhD (Economics) in 1987. He works today as the Head of the Department for European Security Studies in the Institute of Europe, Moscow, Russian Academy of Sciences. He previously worked as Senior Researcher in the analytical department of the General Staff (1982–89). He is the author of more than 70 scientific publications. Dr Danilov took part in preparation of analytical reports for state and governmental bodies in Russia and for international organisations, including NATO. He specialises in problems of European security institutions, military-political aspects of transatlantic relations, Russian security policy and has also published some works on peacekeeping and conflict prevention as well as defence economics. He headed the Russian side of a common research project undertaken in 1996–98, prompted at the ministerial level, by the Institute for Security Studies of the Western European Union (WEU) and the Institute of Europe of the Russian Academy of Sciences, with the purpose of finding the ways and modalities for enhanced relations between the Russian Federation and the WEU/EU in the security field

Michael Emerson is an Associate Senior Research Fellow at the CEPS. A graduate of Balliol College, Oxford, he began his career as an economist at the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) in Paris (1966–73). Upon accession of the UK to the EEC in 1973, he moved to the European Commission, where inter alia he was economic adviser to the president during 1977 and 1978. He there led a series of research projects on European integration such as: *The Role of Public Finance in European Integration* (EEC Commission, 1977); *The Economics of 1992* (Oxford, 1988); and *One Market, One Money* (Oxford, 1990). In 1991 he was appointed the first ambassador of the EU Commission to the USSR and then to Russia, a position he retained until 1996. Leaving the Commission in 1996 he became a Senior Research Fellow at the London School of Economics, where he prepared *Redrawing the Map of Europe*, (Macmillan, 1998). In 1998 he joined CEPS, and has since been responsible with co-authors for the following books published by CEPS under the Wider Europe programme:

The CEPS Plan for the Balkans, (1999); *A Stability Pact for the Caucasus* (2000); *The Elephant and the Bear – The EU, Russia and their Near Abroads* (2001); *Europe's Black Sea Dimension* (2002); *Navigating by the Stars: Norway, the European Economic Area and the European Union* (2002); *Cyprus as Lighthouse of the East Mediterranean – Shaping Re-unification and EU Accession Together* (2002); *The Rubik Cube of the Wider Middle East* (2003); and *The Wider Europe Matrix* (2004).

François Heisbourg was successively First Secretary at the French Permanent Mission to the UN, dealing with international security and disarmament issues (1979–81); an international security adviser to the French Minister of Defence; a founding member of the French-German Commission on Security and Defence (1981–84); Vice-President at Thomson-CSF, in charge of European and Euro-American cooperation (1984–87); Director of the IISS (1987–92); and Senior Vice-President (Strategic development), MATRA-Défense-Espace (1992–98). Currently he is a Director of the Fondation pour la Recherche Stratégique in Paris; Chairman of the Foundation Council of the Geneva Centre for Security Policy as well as Chairman of the Council of the IISS (since 2001). François Heisbourg is the author of numerous articles and interviews in the academic and general media. Most recently he authored and edited *European Defence: Making It Work*, WEU Policy for Security Studies, Paris, 2000 and *Hyperterrorisme: la nouvellle guerre*, Editions Odile Jacob, 2001.

Saban Kardas holds an MSc in International Relations from the Middle East Technical University in Ankara, where he has also been working as a research assistant since 1999, and a Masters degree in European Studies from the Centre for European Integration Studies in Bonn. He is currently reading for a PhD in Political Science at the University of Utah. His research interests include international relations theory, the interaction between human rights and international relations/foreign policy, humanitarian intervention, peace operations, European security and defence policy, transatlantic relations, Turkish-EU relations and Turkish foreign policy. Aside from his academic publications, he occasionally contributes to Turkish newspapers with commentaries. His publications include: "Humanitarian Intervention: the Evolution of the Idea and Practice", *Perceptions*: *Journal of International Affairs*, (No. 2, 2001); "Human Rights and Democracy Promotion: The Case of Turkey-EU Relations"*, Alternatives*: *Turkish Journal of International Relations* (No. 3, 2002); "Regime change, nation-building and democratization: American discourse on Iraq reconsidered", *Foreign Policy*, a quarterly journal of the Foreign Policy Institute (Turkey), (Vol. XXX, Nos.1–2, 2003).

Roberto Menotti is a Research Fellow in the Policy Programmes at Aspen Institute Italia, Rome, where he focuses on transatlantic relations and is an

editorial consultant for the Institute's quarterly journal, *Aspenia*. Until July 2002, he was a coordinator of transatlantic studies and Deputy Director at the Rome-based Centro Studi di Politica Internazionale (CeSPI). He has been a lecturer at LUISS University and John Cabot University in Rome in international relations and security studies. He has published extensively on international relations and security issues, including a book on NATO enlargement (1999), and a chapter in *Enlarging NATO: The National Debates*, Gale A. Mattox (ed.) and A.R. Rachwald (Lynne Rienner, 2001). His book on security in the twenty-first century was published in June 2003 (*XXI secolo: fine della sicurezza?*, Laterza).

Alexander I. Nikitin is a Director at the Centre for Political and International Studies, Russia. He graduated from the Department of Philosophy at Moscow State University in 1979. His postgraduate studies include a PhD (History of International Relations) in 1983 from the USA and Canada Studies Institute of the Russian Academy of Sciences and a second dissertation (Doctor of Sciences in International Politics) in 2000. Research work from 1979 to 1989 took place at the USA and Canada Studies Institute (Senior Research Fellow, Section Head). Mr Nikitin also worked as a diplomat at the Soviet Permanent Mission to the United Nations in 1985. Since 1989 he has been a Director of the Centre for Political and International Studies, an independent non-governmental research institute in the spheres of international security and international relations, and has taught at the Moscow State Institute of International Relations (since 1996 – he has been a Professor of the Department of Political Sciences). Among his positions are: an elected member of the Russian Academy of Military Sciences, First Vice-President of the Russian Political Science Association and Vice-Chairman of the Russian Pugwash Committee of Scientists for International Security and Disarmament. Dr Nikitin initiated and authored the Model Law on Parliamentary Control over the Military Organisation, which was adopted by the CIS Inter-parliamentary Assembly in 2001. He served as the coordinator of several multi-national research projects, including the project on Overview of Civil-military Relations in the CIS, the project on Comparison of CIS Peacekeeping Operations with UN Peacekeeping and others. Among his four monographs are *Peace-keeping and Peace-Support Operation, Theory and Practice*, (2000), and more than 90 articles and chapters in academic periodicals, journals and books.

Vladimir A. Orlov is the founding Director of the Moscow-based PIR Centre for Policy Studies in Russia. In addition to carrying out his overall responsibilities as the head of the Centre, Dr Orlov directs the Centre's Nuclear Non-Proliferation & Russia Programme and the project on Prospects for the Global Partnership Initiative. He is the Editor-in-Chief of Yaderny Kontrol (Nuclear Control), the most reputable Russian journal on

international security. In addition, he is a professor at the Moscow Engineering Physics Institute (MEPhI). Dr Orlov is a board member of the Institute for Applied International Research (Moscow), a member of the Russian Chapter of the Institute of Nuclear Materials Management, a member of the IISS and a member of the Russian Pugwash Committee. In 2001–02, Dr Orlov served as a consultant to the United Nations. In 1994, and then in 2001–02, he was a visiting scholar and Senior Research Associate at the Centre for Non-Proliferation Studies, Monterey Institute of International Studies (US). Dr Orlov writes for The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, Nezavisimoye Voyennoye Obozreniye (Independent Military Review), Moscow News, The Moscow Times, Vremya MN daily, Itogi, Yaderny Kontrol (Nuclear Control), Non-Proliferation Review, Krasnaya Zvezda daily, *Pro et Contra* quarterly, and other Russian and international media. He is the editor and an author of the two-volume Russian textbook on *Nuclear Non-Proliferation* (2002, second edition). He has also edited several books and written chapters on non-proliferation (published in both the West and in Russia). Among his most recent ones are *Nuclear Non-Proliferation in the U.S. – Russian Relations: Challenges and Opportunities* (2001), *Export Controls: Policies and Practices* (2000) and *Dismantling the Cold War* (1999).

Dr Natalia U. Oultchenko graduated from the Institute of Afro-Asian Studies (Moscow State University). She is the head of the department of Turkish Studies in the Institute of Oriental Studies (Russian Academy of Sciences) and a visiting professor at the Institute of Afro-Asian Studies (Moscow State University). She is an expert on foreign economic relations, especially international trade and international financial markets. She has written and lectured widely on comparative studies of Russian and Turkish economies during the last decade. She earned a degree in Economics from the Institute of Oriental Studies (Russian Academy of Sciences). Her main publications include: *Turkish Economy in the Liberalization Period (80-90s)* (Moscow, 2002); *History of the Russian-Turkish Border Formation* (Moscow, 1999); and *Turkey-EU: A New Period in Bilateral Relations – Regional Organizations* (Moscow, 2002).

Gary Samore is the Director of Studies and Senior Fellow for Non-Proliferation at the IISS. As the Director of Studies, he is responsible for overall direction of the Institute's research programme, including fundraising for research projects, management of IISS research staff and supervision of the IISS Adelphi Paper series. He is also the Director of the IISS Non-Proliferation Programme, which seeks to strengthen transatlantic cooperation on non-proliferation and support international diplomatic efforts *vis-à-vis* the proliferation challenges posed by India, Pakistan, Iran and North Korea. In this role he has organised numerous international conferences and workshops

and produced a variety of IISS publications on proliferation issues, including the IISS 'strategic dossier' on *Iraq's Weapons of Mass Destruction: A Net Assessment,* published in September 2002. Prior to joining the IISS in September 2001, Gary Samore worked on non-proliferation issues for the US government, focusing primarily on non-proliferation policy in South Asia, the Middle East and East Asia. From 1996 to 2000, he served as a Special Assistant to President Clinton and a Senior Director for Non-Proliferation and Export Controls at the National Security Council. From 1987 to 1995, he held various positions at the US Department of State, including Deputy to the Ambassador-at-large for Korean Affairs, Robert Gallucci; Director of the Office of Regional Non-Proliferation Affairs in the Bureau of Political Military Affairs; and Special Assistant to the Ambassador-at-large for Non-Proliferation and Nuclear Energy Policy, Richard T. Kennedy. He has also worked at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, the Rand Corporation and Harvard University, where he received a PhD in Government in 1984.

Burkard Schmitt has been an Assistant Director and Senior Research Fellow at the European Union Institute for Security Studies (EUISS) since 2002. He has a Doctorate in Contemporary History from the Friedrich Alexander University Erlangen in Nürnberg and a Masters degree from the University of Bordeaux. From 1995 to 1998 he worked as an independent researcher and journalist. He served as a consultant for the SPD parliamentary group (on armaments) and for GES Kassel (on business start-up programmes in former Yugoslavia and Palestine) from 1997 to 1998 and as a Research Fellow at the WEU-ISS from 1998 to 2001. Dr Schmitt has published extensively, in particular on defence industries and armaments cooperation. His recent publications include: *The European Union and Armaments – Getting a Bigger Bang for the Euro*, Chaillot Paper 63, EUISS, August, 2003; *European Armaments Cooperation: Core Document* (ed.), Chaillot Paper 59, EUISS, April, 2003; *Between Cooperation and Competition: The Transatlantic Defence Market* (ed.) Chaillot Paper 44, EUISS, January, 2001; and *From Cooperation to Integration: Defence and Aerospace Industries in Europe*, Chaillot Paper 40, EUISS, July, 2000.

Walter B. Slocombe served as a Director for Security Affairs (National Security and Defense) and a Senior Advisor for Defense in the Coalition Provisional Authority for Iraq (CPA) from 11 May to 10 November 2003. He had previously served as Undersecretary of Defense for Policy from 1994 to 2001. In his earlier government service, he had been a Principal Deputy Undersecretary for Policy from June 1993, a Deputy Undersecretary for Policy Planning (1979–81), a Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for International Security Affairs (1977–79), a Director of the DOD SALT Task Force (1977–81), a member of the Program Analysis Staff of the National Security Council (1969–70), and a Law Clerk to Supreme Court Justice Abe

Fortas (Oct. Term, 1968). During his service in Iraq, he has been on leave from the Washington D.C. law firm of Caplin & Drysdale, Chartered, with which he has been affiliated since 1971 (where he has worked during the periods he has been out of government service and to which he will return shortly). He was educated at Princeton University (A.B. 1963, summa cum laude), Oxford University (Rhodes Scholar, 1963–65, graduate research on Soviet Politics) and Harvard Law School (L.L.B. 1968, summa cum laude). Mr Slocombe, at the time of his appointment to the CPA, was a member of the Defense Policy Board, both Secretary and a member of the Executive Committee of the board of the Atlantic Council, a Senior Advisor to the Center for Strategic and International Studies, a Director of the American Council for Germany, and a member of the International Advisory Board of the Geneva Center for Democratic Control of Armed Forces and of the Center for Naval Analyses Technical Advisory Committee. (During his assignment with the CPA in Iraq he was on leave from all those positions, as well as from his membership in his law firm.) Mr Slocombe has three times been a Visiting Fellow at the Australian Defence College's Centre for Defence and Strategic Studies in Canberra.

Michael Stürmer is a Chief Correspondent for Die Welt and is mainly interested in international affairs, the material culture of Europe in the 17th and 18th centuries, and economic and political history in the 19th and 20th centuries. He read History and Social Sciences in Berlin, London (LSE) and Marburg and received his PhD from Philipps-Universität in Marburg in 1965. Since 1971 he has tenured at Technische Hochschule Darmstadt and served as a Lecturer in European History at Sussex University. In 1973 he became a full Professor of Medieval and Modern History at Friedrich-Alexander-Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg and in the period from 1988 to 1998 he was Director of the Research Institute for International Affairs (Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik) in Ebenhausen/Isartal. Dr Stürmer has also been a Research Fellow at Harvard University (1976–77), a member of the Institute for Advanced Studies, Princeton, N.J. (1977–78); a Visiting Professor of European Studies at the University of Toronto (1983–84), Professeur Associé de la Sorbonne (1984–85), a Visiting Professor at the School for Advanced International Studies (SAIS), Bologna (1985–86 and 1998–99). From 1999 to 2000 he was a Research Fellow at Wissenschaftskolleg, Berlin. As a columnist he featured regularly for Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, Neue Züricher Zeitung and Financial Times. He has been affiliated with EU institutions as an advisor for common foreign and security policy (CFSP) and for the EU Commission (DGIA). His memberships include: IISS; Non-Ex. Director, European Program, SAIS Washington; and Membre Comité de Patronage, Commentaire, Paris.

Bruno Tertrais is a Senior Research Fellow at the Foundation for Strategic Research (FRS) and a graduate from the Institut d'études politiques de Paris. He also has a Master's degree in Public Law (1985) and a Doctorate in Political Science (1994). Between 1990 and 1993, he was the Director of the Civilian Affairs Committee at the NATO Assembly. In 1993, he joined the Délégation aux Affaires stratégiques (Policy Division) of the French Ministry of Defense. In 1995–96, he was a Visiting Fellow at the Rand Corporation. From 1996 until 2001, he was the Special Assistant to the Director of Strategic Affairs at the French Ministry of Defence. His publications include *Nuclear Policies in Europe* (Oxford University Press, 1999)*; US Missile Defense: Strategically Sound, Politically Questionable* (Center for European Reform, 2001); *L'Asie nucléaire* (Institut français de relations internationales, 2001). He is also an Associate Researcher at the Centres d'études et de recherches internationales (CERI), a member of the editorial board of Critique internationale, as well as a member of the IISS and an associate member of the editorial board of Survival.

Nathalie Tocci is based at the Schuman Centre, EUI, working on the role of the EU in conflict resolution in the Mediterranean region. She received her first degree in Politics, Philosophy and Economics from Oxford University and her Masters degree in Development Studies from LSE. Her PhD in International Relations was completed at the LSE and from 1999 to 2003 she was as a Research Fellow at CEPS. There she worked on EU-Turkey relations, the Cyprus conflict, the conflicts of the South Caucasus and the Middle East. Her recent publications include: *The Rubik Cube of the Wider Middle East,* with M. Emerson (CEPS, 2003); "Incentives and disincentives for reunification and EU Accession in Cyprus" in *Mediterranean Politics*, Vol. 8, No. 1 (Spring, 2003); "Self-determination in Cyprus – Future Options within a European Order", in B. Coppieters and R. Sakwa, *Contextualising Secession: Normative Studies in Comparative Perspective* (Oxford: OUP, 2003) and *Cyprus as Lighthouse of the Eastern Mediterranean,* with M. Emerson (CEPS, 2002).

Irina D. Zvyagelskaya has a Doctorate of Science (History) and is a Professor at the Institute of Oriental Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences. She also serves as Vice-President of the International Centre for Strategic and Political Studies as well as a Professor at MGIMO (Moscow Institute of International Relations under the Russian Foreign Ministry). Her field of interests include conflict management, international relations and security issues. She has published widely on Russian foreign policy, the Middle East and Central Asia and she is the author of three books and numerous articles and chapters. Her main publications in English include: "Central Asia and Transcaucasia: New Geopolitics", in *Central Asia and Transcaucasia: Ethnicity and Conflict,* Vitaly Naumkin (ed.), (Greenwood Press, 1994);

Russian Policy Debate on Central Asia (The Royal Institute of International Affairs, 1995); *The Tajik Conflict* (Moscow, 1998); "The Southern Tier: Non-traditional Threats, Challenges and Risks for Russia's Security" in *Russia, the Caucasus and Central Asia: The 21ˢᵗ Century Environment*, Rajan Menon (ed.), Yuri E. Fedorov and Ghia Nodia. (M.E. Sharpe, 1999); "Russia's Policy Options in Central Asia", in *Russia and Asia, The Emerging Security Agenda*, Gennady Chufrin (ed.) (Oxford: OUP, 1999).

Recent CEPS Paperbacks

The Nine Lives of the Stability Pact, Special Report of the CEPS Macroeconomic Policy Group, Daniel Gros, Thomas Mayer and Angel Ubide, February 2004

The Wider Europe Matrix, Michael Emerson, January 2004

Adjusting to Leaner Times, 5th Annual Report of the CEPS Macroeconomic Policy Group, Daniel Gros, Juan Jimeno, Thomas Mayer and Niels Thygesen, July 2003

The Rubik Cube of the Wider Middle East, Michael Emerson and Nathalie Tocci, February 2003

The Euro at 25, Special Report of the CEPS Macroeconomic Policy Group, Daniel Gros, Massimiliano Castelli, Juan Jimeno, Thomas Mayer and Niels Thygesen, December 2002

Readings in European Security, Vol. 1, Marc Houben, Klaus Becher and Michael Emerson (eds), December 2002

Enlargement: Paying for the Green Acquis, Wolfgang Hager, November 2002

Striking a Balance between Freedom, Security and Justice in an Enlarged European Union, Malcolm Anderson & Joanna Apap, October 2002

Europe's Black Sea Dimension, Terry D. Adams, Michael Emerson, Laurence David Mee and Marius Vahl, June 2002

An Integrated Civil Police Force for the European Union: Tasks, Profile and Doctrine, Carlo Jean, June 2002

Fiscal and Monetary Policy for a Low-Speed Europe, 4th Annual Report of the CEPS Macroeconomic Policy Group, Daniel Gros (ed.), June 2002

Cyprus as the Lighthouse of the East Mediterranean: Shaping EU Accession and Re-unification Together, Michael Emerson and Nathalie Tocci, April 2002

Navigating by the Stars: Norway, the European Economic Area and the European Union, Michael Emerson, Marius Vahl and Steven Woolcock, February 2002

The Elephant and the Bear: The European Union, Russia and their Near Abroads, Michael Emerson, October 2001

Available for online purchase at *http://shop.ceps.be*
(€25 in print or €10 in PDF)

READINGS IN EUROPEAN SECURITY, VOL. 1

WORKING PAPERS OF THE CEPS-IISS EUROPEAN SECURITY FORUM, NOS. 1-9

Marc Houben, Klaus Becher and Michael Emerson (eds)

This first volume of *Readings in European Security* contains the complete set of working papers commissioned by the Forum since its founding through November 2002 (Nos. 1-9). Each set of papers is prefaced by an Introduction by the Chairman, François Heisbourg, Director of the Fondation pour la Recherche Stratégique in Paris. The papers are written by independent experts presenting EU, US and Russian viewpoints on the topic.

CONTENTS

Missile Defence and European Security

The Macedonian Crisis and Balkan Security

NATO Enlargement

The EU's Rapid Reaction Capability

The War against Terrorism and the Transformation of the World Order

Russia's Security Policy and EU-Russian Relations

The Role of Europe in the Middle East

European Security and Defence Policy:

Taking stock

Iraq – If or When?