



NATO

and the

Greater

Middle

East

Conference Proceedings

Prague, Czech Republic
October 17th - 19th, 2003



NATO

and the

Greater

Middle

East

Conference Proceedings

Prague, Czech Republic
October 17th - 19th, 2003

 Prague Security Studies Institute



NATO AND THE GREATER MIDDLE EAST

*Program of Atlantic Security Studies (PASS)
Prague Security Studies Institute
Pohořelec 6, 118 00 Prague 1, Czech Republic
<http://www.pass-prague.cz/>
pass@pssi.cz*

© PASS 2004
All rights reserved.

*Edited by: Oldřich Černý, Corbin P. Miller, Jan Havránek
Designed by: diverzity (Pavel Sláma, Tomáš Hibi Matějček)
Printed by: tiskárna TERCIE Praha*

Gratitude is owed to the following people and institutions for their help with the conference and its proceedings:

H.E. CYRIL SVOBODA

Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Czech Republic

HON. PAVEL BÉM

Lord Mayor of the City of Prague

HRH PRINCE EL HASSAN BIN TALAL

NATO PUBLIC DIPLOMACY DIVISION, Brussels

EMBASSY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Prague

INFORMATION CENTRE ON NATO, Prague

EDITORS' NOTE:

In preparing the proceedings of the 2003 conference on "NATO and the Greater Middle East," every effort was made to accurately transcribe the speeches, discussion, and comments recorded over the course of the conference. However, at times, the recorded speech was impossible to discern. In these instances, a small portion of the text was omitted. In other parts of the conference transcription, a small amount of liberty has been taken to edit for content and clarity. We made a concerted effort to limit the number of changes we made and to maintain the original intent of the speaker and feel that any changes are minimal and serve only to clarify the point.

We hope that that you find the content of these official proceedings as interesting as we did and would greatly appreciate any feedback via an e-mail to pass@pssi.cz.

Oldřich Černý
Corbin P. Miller
Jan Havránek

CONTENTS

Contents	9
Foreword	11
Conference Program	15
Conference Summary	
<i>Jiří Schneider, Jan Šnaidauf</i>	19
The Greater Middle East and the West	
<i>HRH Prince El Hassan bin Talal</i>	27
Panel I: The Role of NATO in Fighting Threats in the GME	33
Panel I: Discussion	57
Civilizations, Cultures, Democracies	
<i>Adam Michnik, Václav Havel</i>	79
Panel II: The Role of NATO in Peace-Management Operations in the GME	83
Panel II: Discussion	111
The Road Map: Is it For Real?	
<i>Cyril Svoboda, Madeleine Albright</i>	133
Panel III: The Role of NATO in Democracy Building in the GME	143
Panel III: Discussion	165
The New NATO and the Greater Middle East	
<i>R. Nicholas Burns</i>	187

APPENDIX

PASS Policy Paper: NATO and the GME – a Mission to Renew NATO?	
<i>Jiří Schneider, Michael Žantovský</i>	205
Biographies	221
Participants	231
Staff and Organizers	237

FOREWORD

Michael Žantovský

Today, it is already possible to say that as fledgling think-tankers, we in the Program of Atlantic Security Studies (PASS) awaited the launch of our first conference project last October with some trepidation. For all our internal debates, for all our research, for all our efforts to put together a coherent policy paper and an agenda, we did not know the answer to at least two crucial questions related to the topic:

- 1) Does the concept of the Greater Middle East, a shorthand for the vast geographical area from the Maghreb in the west to the borders of Pakistan in the east, actually make sense?
- 2) Is the involvement of a Euro-Atlantic military alliance in the numerous conflicts, crises and transformation processes of a small part of Africa and a large part of Asia at all relevant, thinkable and/or desirable?

Only the conference itself could start providing answers to these questions and only life itself could confirm or disprove those answers. Whether it was beginners' luck or educated guesses or, most likely, the outstanding contributions of the participants from 18 countries, we are now able to say that the answers to both our questions have been in some part positive. The concept of the Greater Middle East, albeit as controversial and contested today as it was six months ago, now plays a central role both in the transatlantic debate and in the attempts at modernization and/or reforms in the region itself. NATO has accepted a larger role in Afghanistan and although the jury is still out on Iraq, it is difficult not to imagine an enhanced role for the Alliance

even there. The Israeli – Palestinian conflict remains as intractable as ever and any thinking about a role of NATO or any outside party there is premature at the very least. Nonetheless, the unilateral, “Gaza first” disengagement plan of Prime Minister Sharon begs the question of the kind of security arrangements acceptable to both sides after the Israeli withdrawal from the strip.

At the same time, there have been developments that we did not and perhaps could not predict. The stabilization in Iraq turned out to be a more difficult and lengthy process than many of us thought six months ago. The search for the weapons of mass destruction, which constituted one of the most important pretexts for the war, has so far failed to discover stockpiles of any significance. The Road Map, which looked like another light at the end of the long Middle Eastern tunnel last fall, is felt by many to have turned out to be yet another blind alley. And, most significantly and tragically, global terrorism has landed in Europe with the bomb attacks in Madrid on March 11th.

It is this last event which raises questions most relevant to our discussion. Although a member country of NATO was attacked in a most brutal manner, NATO fell strangely silent in the aftermath of the attack. Although the attack is now considered to have been undoubtedly of Middle Eastern origin, it is being treated as a national and European problem. The response to the attack, such as it is, will be apparently coordinated by the EU rather than NATO and will be of a judicial and diplomatic rather than a military nature. All of this would seem to make NATO less rather than more relevant, in spite of another round of enlargement and the ceremonies that come with it.

Before the summit of the Alliance in Istanbul at the end of June where the Greater Middle East concept under its new name is certain to be the subject of some discussion, it may be worth reiterating a few truths, indeed almost truisms, about NATO, which resonated with such force on the floor and in the corridors of the conference last year and which may be even more relevant six months later:

- 1) NATO is the Western world’s organization best equipped to meet any threat aimed at its peoples, values and cultures. There is no other body with remotely the same inclusiveness, know-how, capability and structure that NATO has. This is even truer after the latest round of enlargement.

- 2) Although the NATO's function is primarily a military one, its role has been wider and deeper. In its nonmilitary guise, it has served as a vehicle of stability, confidence building and conflict resolution.
- 3) A failure to call on the vast resources of the organization in situations which present clear security risks and possibly threats to both Europe and the United States could seem to indicate either a dissociation of security interests between the two sides of the Atlantic, or the loss of will to effectively address those interests. The outcome in both cases could be the eventual disintegration of a pillar that has preserved the stability and prevented a major conflict in our part of the world for 55 years.

CONFERENCE PROGRAM

Friday, October 17th

Arrival and Registration

18.00–19.30 **OPENING RECEPTION** at the Residence of the U.S. Ambassador to the Czech Republic

The Residence of the U.S. Ambassador

Dr. Zikmunda Wintera 3, Prague 6

20.00–22.00 **OPENING DINNER** at the Residence of the Lord Mayor of Prague

The Residence of the Lord Mayor of Prague

Mariánské nám. 1, Prague 1

Opening Remarks:

Oldřich Černý, Prague Security Studies Institute

Pavel Bém, Lord Mayor of Prague

Keynote Speaker:

HRH Prince El Hassan: “The Greater Middle East and the West”

Saturday, October 18th

The Senate, Valdštejnské nám. 4, Prague 1

9:00–12:30 Panel I, The Senate Room:

THE ROLE OF NATO IN FIGHTING NONTRADITIONAL SECURITY

THREATS IN THE GREATER MIDDLE EAST

Moderator:

Alexandr Vondra, PASS

Panelists:

Uzi Arad, Thérèse Delpech, Jeff Gedmin, Karel Kovanda,
Onur Öymen

12.30–14.00 LUNCHEON IN THE SENATE DINING HALL

Opening Remarks:

Jan Ruml, Vice President of the Senate of the Czech Republic

Luncheon Speech:

Václav Havel: “Civilizations, Cultures, Democracies”

14.00–14.30 Special Presentation, The Senate Room:

BRUCE JACKSON: “THE FRONTIERS OF FREEDOM AND THE GREATER MIDDLE EAST”

14.30–18.00 Panel II, The Senate Room:

THE ROLE OF NATO IN PEACE-MANAGEMENT OPERATIONS IN THE GREATER MIDDLE EAST

Moderator:

Jiří Schneider, PASS

Panelists:

Günther Altenburg, Ronald Asmus, Marc Perrin
de Brichambaut, Petr Mareš, Ze’ev Schiff

18:30–19:30 PRIVATE VIEWING OF MUSEUM KAMPA (optional)

19.30–22.00 DINNER AT MUSEUM KAMPA– Jan & Meda Mládek Foundation

Opening Remarks:

Cyril Svoboda, Deputy Premier and Minister of Foreign Affairs
of the Czech Republic

Keynote Speaker:

Madeleine Albright: “The Road Map: Is It for Real?”

Sunday, October 19th

9.00–12.30 Panel III, The Senate Room:
THE ROLE OF NATO IN DEMOCRACY BUILDING IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Moderator:

Michael Žantovský, PASS

Panelists:

Ariel Cohen, Steven Everts, Muravchik Muravchik, Oliver Roy, Amin Tarzi

12.30–14.00 **CLOSING LUNCHEON** in the Senate Dining Hall

Keynote Speaker:

Nicholas Burns: “The New NATO and the Greater Middle East”

Closing Remarks:

Michael Žantovský, PASS Coordinator

CONFERENCE SUMMARY

Jiří Schneider, Jan Šnidauf

The conference was greeted by *Craig Stapleton*, Ambassador of the United States to the Czech Republic, and commenced by Hon. *Pavel Bém*, Lord Mayor of Prague. In his opening contribution on Friday evening *HRH Prince El Hassan bin Talal* described the contemporary developments in the Middle East, as they appear from the local perspective. He urgently called for establishing of a strong regional organization with similar characteristics to the European OSCE.

In the course of the conference, several further contributions by distinguished personalities were made outside the main framework of panel discussions. *Vaclav Havel* and *Adam Michnik* (the latter in a written contribution) addressed the participants at Saturday's lunch with a colloquium reflecting the experiences with democracy building in Eastern Europe and advocated a regional approach to problem resolution while maintaining multi-polarity. At the evening gala dinner *H. E. Cyril Svoboda* greeted the conference and expressed a strong determination to help advance settlement in the problem areas of GME. *Madeleine Albright* subsequently presented her views and first-hand experience with the Israeli-Palestinian negotiations during the Clinton administration as well as at present. During the closing luncheon the participants were addressed by Ambassador *R. Nicholas Burns* who delivered the official views of the US administration on issues concerning NATO's role in the Greater Middle East.

As a basis for the conference discussions a policy paper "NATO and the Greater Middle East – a Mission to Renew NATO?" was drafted by *Jiří Schnei-*

der and *Michael Žantovský*. The conference was intended to approach the problem area from three different points of view, i.e. that of challenges (strategic view), that of responses (operational view) and that of consequences and implications. Three panels were therefore envisaged, respectively.

PANEL I – The Role of NATO in Fighting Non-traditional Security Threats in the Greater Middle East

The first panel was launched by *Uzi Arad*, who debated the question whether NATO's function should be newly defined. He argued that the Alliance should preserve its focus on the European theater and not go global, stressing also the necessity to maintain proximity to NATO's original intent, i.e. security threats as contrasted to political problems. Within the field of new security threats Arad further differentiated two sets of problems, one being counter-terrorism and the other counter-proliferation. The latter is, he said, ideally suited for alliances, where pooling the resources and sharing the burden is possible. As for the former, Arad suggested that Israel be a 'fellow traveler' and thus a natural partner for NATO which should view it as an asset and enter with Israel a kind of 'discreet alliance'.

Thérèse Delpech then pursued a comprehensive assessment of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) programs in the Middle East while referring to the broad spectrum of possible policy responses, whether defensive or preventive. On both proliferation and terrorism tracks transatlantic cooperation is improving, she said subsequently and mentioned the Proliferation Security Initiative (PSI) as well as the bilateral ties between the U.S. and European countries and cooperation within the framework of the EuroPol and EuroJust agencies. Finally Delpech stated that in contrast to North Eastern Asia where there might be a doubt about the region's relevance to Europe, there is no such a question in case of the Middle East since any WMD use in the area would 'affect us all'. She also referred to Prague NATO Summit's decision on WMD.

Jeffrey Gedmin, who spoke afterwards, addressed the "software" aspects of NATO's engagement, i.e. the political issues that would have been incon-

ceivable in relation to the Alliance only a few years ago. He drew the attention to the fact that a gap in threat assessment on both sides of the Atlantic continues to present a major obstacle and requires Europe to realize that its 'strategic vacation' is over. The major changes in the strategic environment brought about by the Cold War ending in 1989 and the 9/11 events also contributed to a certain ambivalence as became manifest for instance at various conferences held after the Kosovo war, where European and American perceptions differed. Gedmin then raised a crucial question concerning the farthest limits of disagreement within NATO, which, if overstepped, would imply the Alliance's inability to act effectively.

Subsequently, *Karel Kovanda* pointed out that Afghanistan gave a new meaning to the 'out of area' concept. However, political limitations should still lead to the conclusion that e. g. North Korea is not feasible for NATO's engagement. Turning to the question of transforming the Alliance into a 'toolbox' instrument, he indicated that the idea can be acceptable if understood as a way of supporting operations like the ones in Macedonia or in the Polish sector of Iraq. Generally Kovanda finds double danger for NATO, one being not able to meet the expectations, thus feeding doubts about NATO's usefulness, and the other one a possible failure in action. Furthermore, three points are vital for NATO's future: a full use of Med Dialogue, which is to be more than a discussion without any value added; finding a point of equilibrium for the Alliance; and a serious doctrinal debate over the concept of preemption, which so far has not taken place within NATO.

As the last panelist, *Onur Öymen* referred to some of the major Middle-Eastern problem characteristics such as the big number of displaced persons or victims of conflicts, lack of democracy and the high percentage of terrorist attacks in the region compared to the world's total. He then described the problems in the political area and called for the establishment of a NATO-EU commission on terrorism where the issue could be treated in the same way as in the NATO-Russia Commission (NRC). Öymen expressed his trust in the Alliance's capabilities to combat terrorism and underlined the necessity to fight it everywhere and without discrimination. Nevertheless he finally warned that not every country of the Greater Middle East would welcome NATO's stronger engagement in the region.

The ensuing discussion revealed several other problems. One participant voiced a doubt concerning the definition of the enemy: terrorism and WMD

are merely tools, he said, while the enemy should be rather the Islamist totalitarianism. Then the question was raised whether the U.S. is prepared to share with Europe its sensitive technologies to close the vast technological gaps. Reference was also made to historical experiences with the Baghdad Pact and CENTO and calls were made for the establishment of a Middle-Eastern Conference for Security and Cooperation (CSC-ME), for a GME-specific humanitarian Marshall plan based on human dignity and for a regional conflict analysis center. In discussing the radical Islamist groups, three of their strategies were pointed out: bin Laden's concept of global struggle reaching its peaks, a search for a new safe haven after Afghanistan and the idea of a non-territorial Islamic ummah a warning before preemptive attacks was also expressed, since these might be used as precedents by other countries. Finally, the claim was repeated that NATO is running the risk of losing its concentration on real threats and might dilute into other, i.e. non-security, areas.

Before the opening of the second panel, *Bruce Jackson* drew the attention of the conference participants to the contemporary geopolitical visions of the European and Middle-Eastern arenas. In his special presentation "The Frontiers of Freedom and the Middle East" he indicated several problem areas to be responded to in NATO's post-Prague agenda.

PANEL II – The Role of NATO in Peace-Management Operations in the GME

Günther Altenburg's speech launched the second panel. He spoke about the GME and its specific problem attributes, warning before a possible overstretch in the region that NATO might not be able to cope with. Altenburg further identified several points, which are crucial for NATO's future: the need to make the Afghanistan operation a success, including the option for expanding ISAF's mandate throughout the country. Next, the prospective of the Mediterranean dialogue should be clarified. Importantly, the EU-NATO relationship will require a new transatlantic consensus, he said.

Subsequently *Ron Asmus* took over the floor turning to the Middle East in terms of its significance as ascribed to the region by United States. Now-

adays the source of conflicts is no longer Europe but the GME, which has turned to be the place where American soldiers are most likely to be killed, he explained, concluding that Middle-Eastern threats apply generally more to Americans than Europeans. Asmus also acknowledged the need for a strong political statement in order to recognize the Alliance's role, in that context referring to the forthcoming NATO summit in Istanbul. He then speculated about the feasibility of a long-term goal of the GME's political transformation into a different set of societies and asked whether it be preferable to find a comprehensive solution or rather approach crisis-by-crisis.

Marc Perrin de Brichambaut then made what he called a 'spectral analysis' of NATO's roles, which is increasingly important in regard to all the challenges of the Greater Middle East. He spoke in particular about the Iranian threat, which will force Europe to be concerned with missile defense as it already has in the case of Russia. He further reflected the general significance that oil reserves as well as relations with Israel have for the development in the GME area. Using a historical parallel, Brichambaut went back to the Suez Crisis of 1956 and to whether there are lessons to be learned from it nowadays. He finally stressed the soft-power aspect of European activities and the experience gained through physical contact with immigrant minorities, which might give Europe good preconditions for activity in the GME.

Ze'ev Schiff started his contribution to the debate by contemplating over the actually unclear borderlines of the Greater Middle East. He expressed his support of the view that instability within the GME would directly endanger the territory of Europe. On the other hand, he argued against perceiving the threats as a territorial problem and called for a definition of NATO's role *vis-a-vis* threats of a global scope. As for the facets of international involvement in peace-management operations, Schiff referred to the Israeli experience with different international formations sent to the country during its history. From that point, he derived three basic principles, which are of vital importance for such operations to be successful: there must be a consent of all parties concerned, there must not be too many parties to negotiate with and there must always be outside assistance.

Petr Mareš closed the panel. He asked the key question whether there is a role for NATO in the Greater Middle East other than a purely defensive one and found a positive answer resulting from the primacy of the Alliance in terms of its experiences, its power and past successes. Thus NATO should play a stabiliz-

ing role but it is uncertain whether it is prepared to do so. Nor is it clear whether the Alliance wants at all to assume such responsibility and since the institution itself is not used for decision-making, the question remains open. To avoid a certain failure, though, there must be an explicit determination on behalf of NATO's member states to engage in that type of operations.

In the following discussion, the issue of non-military security function by NATO was addressed, aiming at the process of social & political transformation in the GME countries. Also the absence of NATO's capacity to generate integrated intelligence was underlined as well as the gap between European satisfaction with the contemporary status quo and the American determination to achieve a change. Furthermore, the discrepancy between the approaches to Eastern Europe and Middle East was demonstrated on the Alliance's will to change governance as related to the former, while this was not true regarding the latter. Only after 9/11 was it realized that dealing with terrorism by military means is questionable and the need for bringing back the political agenda was acknowledged. Other questions were concerned with defining the conditions allowing for the use of NATO's military force and the concept of the Alliance as a legitimizing element was voiced. Finally attempts were made at assessing the balance between hard and soft power, both needed in the GME to achieve success.

PANEL III – The Role of NATO in Democracy Building in the GME

The conference's third and last panel was opened with a brief contemplation of the general questions of democracy by *Michael Žantovský*. Speaking as the panel's moderator, he raised the question of universal nature of democracy as well as of its general transportability among diverse environments. Besides that, Žantovský warned against excessive haste in democracy-building, and pointed out NATO's indirect democratizing influence in a number of countries over the years.

Ariel Cohen as the first panelist drew the participants' attention to the war on terrorism that he designated as Fighting for Hearts and Minds. He then mentioned the unique role that dissidents play in a transforming society, including Muslim societies like Iran, where a dissident class assists the contem-

porary social process that might bring an end to the current anti-western ideology, which is feeding terrorism. Next he identified several Islamic groupings, which allow for recruitment of terrorists and proceeded further to the sources of their funding that he said come either from the Gulf region or from Muslim Diaspora in the West. He also pointed to the roots of terrorism emerging through fundamentalist religious education.

The next speaker, *Olivier Roy* started his contribution by indicating three profound problem areas of the Greater Middle East: nationalism, social fabric and Islam. Democracy itself, he said, is welcomed in the Muslim world as well, the question being only how to root it and make people work for it. Nationalism is according to Roy the actual driving force in the Middle East interacting with the specific social fabric of local societies. Thus for instance although Iraq was a nationalist dictatorship, it was not totalitarian, since limited political space and freedoms were available. As for political Islam, Roy insisted that it is no longer a real challenge in the Middle East but rather outside the region. He advocated a policy of inclusion of all parts of society whether they are really democratic or not. Democracy does not require everyone being an a priori democrat, but should be gradually rooted into society's fabric by addressing specific human concerns.

Joshua Muravchik went on by designating democratization as the centerpiece of US strategy in the war on terrorism, not only in military terms but also in relation to its very roots such as poverty. The poisoned political culture in the Greater Middle East requires a 'bomb of democracy', since there are democrats, who have that need and deserve our help. This would be a job for the Atlantic community, although it does not fit NATO's traditional definition. Muravchik also referred to the recent Arab Human Development Report, where major democracy deficits are listed. In response to many being skeptical about democracy in the Arab world, he paralleled the situation historically to Japan after World War II, where similar doubts used to be voiced.

Asking whether the USA and Europe are capable of creating a joint strategy for promoting democracy in the Middle East, Steven Everts commenced his reasoning over the issue, answering immediately: yes they have to, but the key question is how. He continued by pointing to the therapeutic value of the search for common strategy, but reminded of obstacles on both sides: while Europe struggles with its ambivalent attitude towards assuming the leadership role in the region, America cannot sidetrack its massive image problem in

spite of the far greater emphasis on democracy as a strategic goal. Concerning the Western interference in GME issues, Everts gave several policy recommendations including seeing the politics as a vehicle of change, targeting programs to NGO sector, supporting democratic processes instead of individuals, using institutional anchors, avoiding temptation to 'divisions of labor', patronizing attitudes and gimmicks.

Amin Tarzi subsequently briefed on the current developments in Afghanistan, denying that Islamic radical terrorism is a tangible enemy for NATO to fight. He called for a clear roadmap for Afghanistan that would set up the democracy building process.

During the closing discussion a number of so far untreated issues were addressed. The stimulant question "whether a democracy may be built while the house is burning" evoked the proposition that extinguishing the fire in the house would be exactly the task for NATO. Furthermore, while it was indicated that democracies do not sponsor terrorism, a counter-affirmation has been voiced that even some secular democracies do breed terrorism. And even more in the countries where religion and state coincide and cannot be mutually separated since there is no official religious body that could be a partner for the state. The proposition was made of the necessity to combine support for reforms within a country (i.e. for its dissidents) with a care about the environment (i.e. the pressure on states) in order to make our intention indubitable. The Middle Eastern situation was also compared to democratization of Latin America, pointing to the lessons learned there.

According to one participant, the Arab liberal experiment was murdered in the 1930s and now it is time to pave the way for democratization by defeating the current enemy i.e. Islamism by means of NATO-the view was further strengthened through designating attempts at integration/inclusion of Islamist movements as dangerous experiments that proved to be successful only in Turkey. The economic dimension of democratization was addressed in the course of the debate as well as the goal to create a civil society. Doubts were expressed that a democratic Iran would not pursue the nuclear option. It was pointed out, that delegitimizing terrorism should ideally occur by using the concepts of Islam itself. Finally, it was explained that introducing democracy to the Middle East will inevitably bring along Islamic parties that should not, however, present a problem by themselves, in contrast to the pursuit for monopolization of Islam on the part of radical movements.

THE GREATER MIDDLE EAST AND THE WEST

HRH Prince El Hassan bin Talal

The first words I had on meeting our distinguished host, the Lord Mayor of Prague, were that I sincerely hope that this country, that has taken so many initiatives in post-war reconstruction and development, would consider and maybe assist us in promoting the concept of a post-war reconstruction and psychological development unit – a post-war trauma unit which addresses in particular, the trauma that over fifty per cent of the population in our region lives. It was NATO's Supreme Allied Commander in Europe, General James Jones, who said that “the center of gravity for the last fifty years in the alliance has been Western Europe.” For those of us who have lived in the world of the ancients, the world of the *Corpus Hermeticum*, the world of meeting between the Medicis and Islam, I would like to suggest that the center of the world is possibly a little bit further towards the east.

The center of activity in my perspective is moving east. As General Jones said: “...it's not an understatement to say that the geo-strategic center of interest for the foreseeable future has to be the Greater Middle East.” When looking at the Middle East region I would like to pick up on the theme of Paddy Ashdown and Carl Bildt, if I may, by suggesting that the concept of a stability pact in Europe is a concept that is required in our region of the world. I suggested to Vice President Cheney that it is time we considered an organization for security and cooperation in Middle East region; a CSCME was actually written into the peace treaty between Jordan and Israel: a conference for security

and cooperation in the Middle East. Today, with the emphasis on the victories in Afghanistan and Iraq since 9/11, the emphasis on the continuity of the present military action in the war against terror and the new alliances being formed as the result of this war on terror, I would like to suggest that it is conceivable that the Western alliance is undertaking its most sweeping transformation since the end of the Cold War. Simply because I think it is beginning to realize, or as Donald Rumsfeld put it last month, “that the size and shape of the ‘US footprint’, or deployment posture, in the world will evolve to reflect new security requirements of the 21st century.” I am sad to say that Donald Rumsfeld did not offer many details, but I was looking for a glint of what I put to Vice President Cheney – is it not possible to talk regionally from Cairo to Delhi, to talk about stabilizing the region?

At the time the theme was very clear; it is easier to take out Saddam. Well, Saddam may or may not still be there, he may be produced as a good political ploy at a given moment, and let’s hope so. And along with him Karadžić and Mladić, Mullah Omar and Osama bin Laden. I would like to suggest that the devil lies in the details. General Jones explained that “the Alliance is preparing to evolve a presence far beyond Afghanistan and the Middle East.” Securitizing China; if that is the ultimate objective, then this new US strategic center of influence is an important part of NATO’s metamorphosis into a global military player. It is strange to be saying this in 2003. In 1958, just to prove my Western credentials, thirty five women and children of my family were massacred in the courtyard of the Royal Palace in Baghdad, and at that time we were a member of CENTO, the Central Treaty Organisation.

I do really want to say that in terms of the war on terror my concern is, to share with you here and particularly with those of you who I hope will consider a group of reflection between now and January – now and the primaries – that some analysis of a concept of stability and stabilising the region can be generated. You will remember the words ‘mission-empty stability pact’ – those were the words of Carl Bildt at the time. Actually, it was not ‘mission-empty’ at all, and in the absence of anything else on the drawing board I think it was quite interesting. Why it is that the stability pact concept today sounds interesting to me in terms of reflection rather than in terms of hard fact? You will immediately ask, how can we have a stability pact between Israelis and the Palestinians who are at each others’ throats? Well, two days ago at the Dead Sea we had a meeting of Israeli opposition politicians and Palestinians who pro-

duced yet another 'peace plan', 'Road Map'. I was impressed by their achievement, however it was dismissed by the Israeli Government as irresponsible free-lance diplomacy. I hope you will come away with the impression that I am volunteering responsible free-lance diplomacy, where I suggest that in terms of the region every single nationality has sat in a room to discuss a Weapons of Mass Destruction free-zone. I know I have been there, whether sponsored by American universities or the Quakers; we have discussed chemical, biological weapons, nuclear weapons and recognized that there is a certain point beyond which you cannot go. I am not theorizing - I just flew here, three and half hours from Amman, to come here to tell you one thing; that we in Jordan are in the middle of the smoking zone - and I am not talking about nicotine. When I went to the International Atomic Energy Agency that is what I had to tell them. My friend, Dr. El Baradei, today reminded us that Iran is potentially a dangerous country. There is a very macabre good news bad news story that we tell at home: the bad news is that we all die as a result of a missile attack from a neighbour, presumably to our East or to our North. I say 'all' because anything that affects Israel affects us directly. Of course they have new gas masks; we do not have any gas masks. The good news now we are told is that a modified cruise missile from an Israeli submarine will remove large parts of Iran and Pakistan. I think that kind of logic - I do not know whether you call it a 'lose-lose' situation - is a logic against which we have to invest in reflection on the very subject - *quo vadis*.

A consensus has been emerging, even prior to September 11th, on the need to deal with the standing global soft security agenda: poverty, environmental degradation and Aids. Steps in that direction include the Millennium Development Goals (September 2001), The Doha Declaration (October 2001), The Monterrey Consensus (March 2002), the Johannesburg Program of Action (September 2002), and others. The US, Europe and Japan have been behind all these efforts, and presumably if the conversation over consensus in the hard security field, or the basic and current security, continues there will be consensus there as well. Certainly the Japanese are now interested in financing, if not sending troops, and the Koreans are still debating the issue. But I would like to emphasize the importance of giving hope to people in our part of the world. Why is the war on poverty important? As far as the Palestinians are concerned it is very clear. The Oslo Accords are basically focused on displaced persons, not refugees, which means effectively that the host countries for

refugees – the donor countries to the United Nations Relief Works Agency – will be responsible for inclusion of a large number of people. This, I maintain, requires a non-discriminatory poverty alleviation process. It requires an inclusionist system of government in every host country to recognize that everyone with Palestinian origin eligible to be a citizen should become a citizen. I am not talking about settling the Palestinian problem; I am talking about the new departure where you don't continue to accept the terms of the extremist organizations, of the terrorists. As you well know I have said many times that I believe terrorism is an affront to humanity simply because they are exploiting despair.

As far as Iraq is concerned I think you are well aware of the economic straits that face the Iraqi people. I do not know if you are aware of the fact that hundreds of civilians are killed every day. I was speaking to the director of our hospital in Fallujah and the situation is pitiful in terms of the general public. Of course over half a million children die a year anyway because of sanctions over the past twelve years, so something must be done.

I have read all the reports, whether International Crisis Group or the Nuclear Threat Initiative with which I am involved, which focus on reorganizing, or reprioritising investment, from weapons to creating new jobs in our region. But I want to point out that the Security Council is responsible for 85 % of weapons sales, which is presumably why we all feel so secure. I want to emphasise the importance at this meeting of the Atlantic Community vocalising for 'soft power' to create viable alternatives: an over-arching framework I feel is needed for effective leadership of the world economy. Calls for creating a G2 between the European Union and the United States have recently been raised; others have proposed a G3 instead, to include the G22 of developing countries that met at Cancun. This raises the related issue of ESDP (European Security and Defense Policy). The challenge is to develop ESDP as a complementary rather than a competitive security project. All of these issues reflect a fractured Europe and a fractured Western Hemisphere without a foreign policy towards our region.

Dr. Frankenthal, an Israeli friend of myself and the late Prime Minister Rabin, is with us in Prague. He is the man who put together the 'Parents' Circle', 2,500 Israelis and Palestinians who have lost kin in violence over the past few years. He sent me an e-mail the other day saying I have to see you before war breaks out in this part of the world. I do not want to sound taken

away by the moment, but I do want to say that the recent Haifa bombing on the eve of Yom Kippur, the Jewish Day of Atonement, should have been a day of atonement for us all. Sadly of course, neither in Iraq nor within Palestine has the violence abated, nor in the context of Israel and Syria is the violence likely to abate. There is the absence of any form of a regional concept. I have asked: why did the Quartet did not go regional? Stop attending to micromanaging, small issues, and look a little bit more clearly at the strategy for the region. We as Arabs and Israelis, have been brazenly flouting international legalities since 1948; I think we are all hypocrites, we all accuse each other of flouting international legality, but we have all flouted it in one form or another. We are desperately in need of a Code of Conduct; a Code of Conduct which attends to the basic requirements of people, with the emphasis on human dignity. I would like to point out that I would very much like to interact with each and every one of you. It was Alfred Tennyson who dreamt in 1842 about the Parliament of Man, the Federation of the World. Today 160 years later we still ask *quo vadis* - where do we go from here? The American constitution calls for 'a de-cent regard for the opinion of mankind'. I would like to see the development of exercises to offer views in an interactive manner. We have had so many monologues about the need for dialogue that I think I will stop my monologue now and invite your contribution to dialogue.

PANEL I: THE ROLE OF NATO IN FIGHTING NONTRADITIONAL SECURITY THREATS IN THE GME

Alexandr Vondra

My name is Sasha Vondra. I am one of the PASS members who organized this conference. Let me welcome you all to the plenary session hall of the Senate in Wallenstein Palace.

This is the room where Czech senators meet, discuss and, last but not least, vote. So the electric instruments in front of you are little bit more complicated than the usual conference equipment, but I hope that it will be easy for you to learn to use them.

Let me start with a few organizational remarks. First, I would like to repeat what you may have already read in your folders, the ground rules of the conference. The conference is open to observers and invited journalists, so Chatham House rules do not apply. But this is not a challenge to be boring! We would like to have both a transparent and provocative discussion. The conference is structured in such a way that the panels are longer than usual. This does not mean that there will not be any interruptions. I think that we

will have a longer coffee break. You will then have time for informal discussions.

You may have noticed that we have three panels – one this morning, one this afternoon, and one tomorrow morning. There is not a strict division between these three panels; however, several general divisions may be made. We will have a strategic panel in the morning, and a more operational panel in the afternoon. However, I would not like to limit strategists like Ron Asmus and Marc Perrin de Brichambaut to just operative issues. Tomorrow we will have a more philosophically based panel. In other words, we should discuss challenges this morning, responses in the afternoon, and the possible outcomes of our discussion tomorrow.

When we were discussing the general theme of the conference, NATO and the Greater Middle East, we were very much aware of the potential risks of choosing such a huge topic, which is full of controversies. The fact is that the strategic landscape has changed seriously. Moreover, we have instruments of cooperation in the transatlantic area, which also have an institutional expression within NATO. Furthermore, for people like the Czechs, this transatlantic bond is very important, so we have new challenges. We also have solid, vital institutions that can contribute to our response. From our perspective, the theme was obvious, but this is not to say that it will be an easy undertaking. We are very well aware of the fact that the Greater Middle East is, from one perspective, the source of all the major threats we are facing – the combination of terrorism, weapons of mass destruction, proliferation, and, last but not least, certain ideologies of hatred. What's more, there is no doubt that this area, as well as the ways to handle the problems related to it, is the subject of the most serious disputes between the Americans and Europeans, as well as among Europeans themselves. So this is most likely the most difficult point to start from instead of the easiest. Of course, there is also the law of unintended consequences. We can have good intentions behind our actions, but the outcomes could go the other way.

Yesterday, we heard the great speaker, Prince Hassan bin Talal of Jordan. We will start today with an analysis of the situation. There is nobody better to provide us with this analysis than Uzi Arad, a man who worked for Mossad for more than 25 years, who was an advisor to Prime Minister Netanyahu, and who is now involved in working with various Israeli NGOs.

Uzi Arad

I want to say thank you for the hospitality extended to us, and to all who have contributed to this gathering. I also want to give a word of appreciation for the very first rate job done on the summation, which was completed by Schneider and Žantovský, in preparation for the conference. I found this very useful for organizing my thoughts on the subject. And indeed my thoughts will be confined to two things. First, to make an argument about where the focus of NATO's new defined mission should be, and then to conclude by commenting about Israel's relevance to it.

Starting with NATO: historically, the strength of NATO has always been the fact that it was a focused organization. It was focused on the European theater, and it was focused on function, that is to say that it was primarily a defense, security-oriented organization. The time has come now, because of changing circumstances, to change the concept of that organization. This is a process that has been going on for quite a number of years. What I would like to argue is that the principle of concentration should remain and that in the process of moving from one concept to another, there should be no blurring or dilution of the principles that accounted for the success of the alliance during the Cold War. Here, I come to a point of some disagreement with the approach taken yesterday by Prince Hassan because in his vision he made the point, although he did not allude specifically to NATO, that what is needed is OSCME (Organization for Security and Cooperation in the Middle East) - another structure for the stability of the Middle East, a very ambitious organizational and institutional scheme. That may be in order, but I would argue that this should not be NATO's function. NATO should preserve the principle of focus and not become another debating society or multilateral system with varied functions. It should retain its proximity to its original intent, and this proximity should be to the European theater. That is why the emphasis on the Greater Middle East is the right one. NATO should not be looking towards a global spread but towards the one theater that comes closest to the European theater and presents the greatest problems for Europe. I strongly support the point made in the paper by Schneider and Žantovský.

Similarly, I think that functionally, NATO should stick to the original military - and I underline military security threats - and not go into the political ones, such as regime changes and democratization. These may be laudable

objectives, but they are very far from the original character and structure of NATO. We have two clusters of dominant security threats: one has to do with terrorism and the other with proliferation. These threats are among the so-called non-traditional threats and present the clearest form of security threats to the West. Let me make the point, that NATO is the West. So the problem should be one of adjusting vis a vis the issues of terrorism coming from the Greater Middle East and the threat of proliferation.

At this point, we run into the first difficulty, which lies not in the institutional process, but in the fact that these two sets of problems are completely different from the old problems towards which NATO originally organized itself. These threats require new methods, new instruments, new operational rules, new capabilities, and ultimately, perhaps, new doctrines. They are very serious areas of action. More than that, when you analyze the trends and when you assess the threats, they present ominous threats, some of which we have already seen, and some may only be contemplated. Furthermore, there is a certain need for urgency; there is not much time to be spent belaboring all of the institutional permutations that seem to occupy some people. One should have a sense of purpose and urgency in addressing these two clusters of equally serious areas of action.

I will use the word counter-terrorism to refer to the activities meant to deal with terrorism and counter-proliferation to refer to the activities that pertain to the prevention of proliferation in the Middle East. Now, when you analyze these two sets of very serious problems, consider the kind of challenges they present. Which doctrine should be employed against terrorism? The defensive doctrine, which puts an emphasis on protection, intelligence sharing and police, or preventive types of activities ranging from the treatment of governments hosting or supporting terrorism and activities that incite terrorism all the way to special operations designed to suppress terrorism and finally to the use of military force? That, after all, was the essence of NATO in the past. It was a military organization. Terrorism may need military action. Now, what exactly are the capabilities that will need to be martialled towards that end and how will this be accomplished? These are the kinds of serious questions that have to be addressed quickly if one is to have the capability to cope with these sorts of problems.

Counter-proliferation presents a similarly daunting range of options. On the one hand, we have preventive options, including diplomacy, engagement,

and the imposition of sanctions on proliferators, and the use of a defensive orientation, such as the missile defense system in order to minimize the risks of galloping proliferation in the Middle East. On the other hand, we have offensive operations. At this point, we encounter the American doctrine of preventative operations. At this point, we encounter the American doctrine of preventative offensive actions designed to preempt the possibility of proliferation. This doctrine is based upon the assumption that other, more traditional, preventative postures of defense may fail to prevent proliferation and that once proliferation has occurred, it is too late for other measures. All these options require not only doctrines and capabilities but also require an enormous investment in both capabilities and technologies. Based upon general terms, we can also consider the lessons of Iraq and the current situation in Iran; these situations may be only a sample of things to come. NATO has not had a role in either of these situations. The question is, does NATO want to use its capabilities to play a serious role in these games, which, again, are just a taste of things to come? I would argue that NATO should become involved because if there is something common to counter-terrorism and counter-proliferation, it is that they are ideally suited for alliances. The argument was made in the paper for the formation of networks and is based upon the belief that the burden of such a mission is so large and formidable that no single country, not even the entire European force, can handle it alone. In this case, we need a truly international North Atlantic Alliance to confront these threats, to pool their resources, and to orchestrate international activities. This type of burden sharing has always been the essential element and strength of the Alliance and has allowed it to utilize its total capabilities in order to effectively cope with two sets of problems, which by themselves are international in nature. So I would argue that NATO is, because of its organizational capability, suited to shoulder such burden.

The next question is, will it? Historically, it is the United States that has always shouldered the main burden of both of counter-proliferation and the fight against terrorism. That is a fact, and in all likelihood, the situation will remain the same. For NATO to truly rise to the occasion, the United States will probably have to remain in the leadership position and continue to shoulder at least as much of the responsibility as it has in the past. But that may not suffice. Europe should also be part of it. Certainly, Europe should not undercut NATO by employing its own independent forces, which would be too miniscule to address these sets of problems. I don't know for what purpose

these forces are being put together or considered, but certainly they are not adequate to address the magnitude of the threat of terrorism and proliferation. Indeed, together, Europe and the United States should amplify the Alliance's ability to deal with these two threats. This mission calls for concentration and focus, not dilution.

The reason the agenda is full of items that involve pooling of resources, including manpower, intelligence, and institutional and diplomatic capabilities, is that all those exist separately. There could be a multiplier effect were these resources to be used jointly. There should be burden sharing and division of labor, for maximizing the advantages of this Alliance. We should employ the fact that there is already an organizational structure that has worked smoothly to better manage the whole system. We should exploit the inherent advantages in the membership of that Alliance. These advantages may be economic, political, and even technological, as some of the future solutions to our current difficulties lay in an area where the West has an advantage, advanced technology. A full agenda such as this requires urgent action and a sense of purpose. The greatest risks are dilution and politization. The risk is in getting bogged down in structural debates about membership and the international equivalent of bureaucratic politics. That from my perspective is, that where NATO should be heading.

Now, should NATO go in that direction, where would Israel fit in? Israel is a natural partner for that kind of endeavor. First, it shares the same set of problems. Not only is it at the forefront of those in the Greater Middle East, but also, in some ways, it is on the Western or receiving end of some of those threats. Israel shares the same laundry list of friends and foes. However, there are other deeper reasons for Israel to be a partner. First, it has always been a fellow traveler of sorts with NATO; a reference was made to Mossad. Mossad tried to establish a discreet connection with NATO in the mid 50s. And it did succeed later on. So there has been a functional relationship, discreet, modest, but one that was pragmatic and reflected the needs of both the Alliance and Israel at crucial times. When one looks into the future, one needs to see that Israel has much to offer, especially militarily, in the field of intelligence and technology. Some may call it a political liability, but I would argue it is not. Traditionally, Israel has had much deeper relations with the United States, but at the same time it has had good working relationships with a number of key countries, which are members of the Alliance, and I am not only referring to

the obvious examples of Germany, France, and Great Britain, but also to other European countries including Turkey. This is the backdrop against which one would envision and hope for a process in which NATO, as an alliance, would concentrate its evolution towards the ability to effectively operate within two areas of threats which I outlined for you. If, throughout this process, the Alliance remains viable and does not decay into something irrelevant and remote from its original purpose, then Israel would be a natural partner in the venture.

Alexandr Vondra

The next speaker is Thérèse Delpech. Thérèse has both scientific and practical political experience with the region. She worked for the UNMOVIC mission in Iraq with Hans Blix. She also has political experience at home working for Prime Minister Juppé. Currently, she is both the Director of Strategic Affairs at the Atomic Energy Commission in France, as well as the Senior Research Fellow at the Center for International Studies in Paris. She asked me to say that she is here in her scientific, research capacity rather than her political one. Thérèse, we are very glad that you accepted our invitation.

Thérèse Delpech

In my presentation, I will mainly develop three points. The first point is about the reason why the comprehensive and objective assessment of the WMD programs in the Greater Middle East is far from being an easy task. The second point is about the way transatlantic cooperation has continued to improve in the areas of terrorism and non-proliferation, even as differences in other areas have emerged. The third point is that there can be no dispute that not only stability in the Middle East and the Greater Middle East is a common objective on both sides of the Atlantic, but also that any use of WMD in the region would deeply affect us all. Therefore, the first step is to cooperate in preventing proliferation and terrorism.

So let me deal with the first point. Making an impartial and comprehensive assessment of the nature and magnitude of WMD programs in the Greater

Middle East is no easy task. I will give you four reasons for that. The first one is political. There is very often a political reluctance to expose sensitive problems that could endanger the political climate, and this is something we find quite often in Europe. Second, while Soviet motivation and doctrines regarding Europe were supposed to be known (I said were supposed to be known because perhaps we made mistakes), much remains to be learned regarding the Greater Middle East. Here we have an all important ground for misunderstanding, which is extremely dangerous as WMD are concerned. The third reason is that much proliferation related activity is, by nature, clandestine. As a consequence, strategic intelligence appears essential, and as you well know, strategic intelligence is currently the subject of massive, although not always informed, debate about of Iraq's WMD. If we examine NATO's own capabilities concerning WMD, particularly in this region, there is certainly the problem of intelligence sharing. Lastly, the region itself, the Greater Middle East, is under constant and rapid development, particularly the Middle East itself. These developments frequently have WMD implications and here the most important current point is Iran.

Now, my second point is about transatlantic cooperation in the areas of both proliferation and terrorism. I want to make this point in order to illustrate something that is not widely known. In fact, proliferation and terrorism have probably been the two areas where cooperation has not lessened after the war in Iraq, but, in some respects, has actually improved. Concerning proliferation, let me give you the following examples just to illustrate my point. First, there is major 2003 initiative called PSI, the Proliferation Security Initiative. PSI is an initiative of American origin, but it has received very broad European support and was signed in Paris. It deals with a significant problem, which no treaty could address. This problem is how to intercept ships and aircraft transporting equipment that can be used in WMD programs. This is not only a statement of intent, there have been actual maritime exercises which have taken place with the participation of the French Navy. Secondly, concerning Iran and its nuclear program, I do believe that transatlantic cooperation is quite good. The EU suspended its economic and political negotiations with Iran until a satisfactory solution is found. Furthermore, Paris, London and Berlin have adopted a common strategy asking Iran not only to immediately implement the protocol allowing intrusive inspections, but also to cancel its fuel cycle. Lastly, let me remind you that a joint US-EU statement was adopted

in June reaffirming a common view on proliferation and the belief that WMD programs are a common phenomenon in the Greater Middle East.

Concerning terrorism, there are stronger intelligence and law enforcement ties between the US and individual European countries as well as between the US and European assets – Europol and Eurojust. And it seems to me important to underline that even Franco-American cooperation has improved after the war against Iraq, in particular, we have improved our cooperation with preventing the production of false identity document by using biometrical data. Secondly, the WMD terrorism threat has been taken seriously enough in Europe to justify a September exercise in the London underground that simulated a chemical attack. This exercise will take place again during the coming weeks in Paris. Thirdly, work is being done on both sides of the Atlantic to address threats against civil aviation posed by ground-air missiles. You probably recall the Mombassa incident that took place in November of last year. These threats are considered to be global threats, and measures have been taken in this respect.

My third point: it seems to me that there can be discussion about the importance of North-East Asian security to both the US and Europe. Why? While some would argue that Europe is not an Asian power, I would argue differently and, considering the situation in the Middle East, such a debate seems absurd. Stability in this region does affect both sides of the Atlantic, and proliferation is a major factor of instability that affects us all and should be dealt with by both sides in a coordinated fashion. Moreover, it is important to emphasize the fact that use of WMD in the Middle East would not only affect the way in which those weapons are perceived, but would also represent a major catastrophe for both the US and Europe, not just for the Middle East. I should say further use of WMD because WMD have been used in the Middle East. Let me remind you of the chemical weapons used against Iranian troops and civilian Kurds in the 80s. Also, please remember that when the so-called War of the Cities during the Iran-Iraq War ended, the entire world was able to see what missiles with conventional warheads can generate in terms of terror when used against civilians.

In the Greater Middle East, it is important to take into an account that WMD programs are not a new problem and that some of them date back to the 60s and the 70s. Also important is the fact that the trend of these programs is not going in the right direction. Secondly, WMD programs are ubiquitous, and

in the next ten years, if nothing is done, they could progress to a level that nobody will be able to stop. Thirdly, constant progress is made on delivery systems as well, often with the help of North Korea in the case of ballistic missiles, but we have to take into account cruise missiles and UAVs. Here it seems to me there is a real relation between this phenomenon and the decision taken in Prague during the NATO summit last year concerning the study on missile defense.

To conclude, after the 1991 Gulf War, an effort was made to assess the proliferation pattern of the region in order to do whatever was possible to prevent it from worsening. It seems to me that a similar exercise is necessary now. The problem calls for a broad spectrum of policy responses, preventive and defensive, that cannot be implemented without close transatlantic cooperation. As was said before, a number of the developments are new and the latest development is the empowerment of groups of individuals that have the possibility to challenge states in a strategic and a tactical fashion. Let me conclude by saying that to most outsiders, transatlantic disputes are a luxury that only rich and prosperous nations can afford. But is this true, especially considering this troubled region?

Alexandr Vondra

It was very good of you to offer this insider's practical approach to these issues because it shows us that if we go beyond philosophical or political voting and look towards practical cooperation, we have very much in common.

I think that in order to have the full picture, we need a voice from the US. Tomorrow, we will hear the voice of the government; R. Nicholas Burns, the US Am-bassador to NATO, is coming. This afternoon we will have the Democratic view brought to us by Ron Asmus. We were also eager to bring a neo-conservative here. We worked hard to bring Paul Wolfowitz, but unfortunately were not able to do so. However, I am very glad that my friend, Jeff Gedmin is here.

Jeff is not a newcomer to Prague; he came quite often in the middle of the 90s to work on the New Atlantic Initiative to bring new impetus to the Atlantic community with regard to enlargement. This project was very important for us in Prague, which played an important role in hosting the launching

event of the New Atlantic Initiative. Since then, I have always remembered how hard and committed to that enterprise Jeff has been. A year or two ago, he moved from a position in the American Enterprise Institute in Washington to take a new job in Berlin as the Director of the Aspen Institute. He is now able to see the transatlantic relationship from this side of the Atlantic, in the city of Berlin.

Jeff Gedmin

I would like to talk not about the hardware of the problems that we are discussing today, but about the software and the politics. Sasha, since you refer to me as a neo-conservative, I want to begin with a neo-con story that some of you may be familiar with. It is the story of three businessmen traveling recently in Africa; a Frenchman, a German and an American, all traveling together, who were arrested for smuggling. And in this small country justice is swift. They were found guilty, sentenced to death and within two days stood before a firing squad. The captain of the firing squad approached and said, "Gentlemen, you do, as is custom, have a one last wish." He turned to the Frenchman and asked what his last request was. The Frenchman said, "Well, that's easy, my last wish is to have a band play the French national anthem, and I would like to sing along." The captain of the firing squad agreed to the Frenchman's request. Then he turns to the German and asks for his last wish. The German says, "Well, that's easy for me, too. I would like to deliver a lecture and the title of my lecture, which have I already pondered, will be 'The Legal, Moral and Political Criteria and Principles Governing the use of Force in International Relations With a Special Discussion of the Role of International Organizations and Supranational Institutions, in particular, that of the United Nations.'" The captain agrees to grant him his wish as well. Then he turns to the American and asks for his last wish. And the American businessman says, "That's easy, shoot me first I don't want to hear that lecture." This brings me to my first question – whether NATO has the possibility to play a significant role in the Greater Middle East?

Broadly, to get the platitudes out of the way, I will say this. There is much that unites us across the Atlantic – free trade, our commitment to democracy and the rule of law, our commitment to defend against terrorism and to pre-

vent proliferation. I also think that NATO has inarguably come a very long way in a very short amount of time. The out of area question has been answered to some extent. Also, the question of NATO as a global organization has been answered. Questions that are being asked today, like those of this conference, were unthinkable just a couple of years ago, and I do not exclude the possibility that in the future, NATO could play some meaningful role in Iraq. At the same time, I think we should guard against irrational exuberance on this topic. I think that the debate and the divisions that we had over Iraq are more symptom and not cause and that there are some differences and some divergences that are very real. I think the proposition put before us today is a very ambitious one when you consider that this is the area of the world where this set of issues has traditionally been a source of the disagreement between Americans and Europeans. Now, I too read the paper prepared by Jiří Schneider and Michael Žantovský. And the question posed was whether this project is something that can renew NATO. Michael and Jiří argue that there are powerful rational arguments in favor of this, and I have the fullest sympathy for that. However, there are also at least two serious and powerful obstacles that would have to be overcome if this topic is to be dealt with seriously.

The first is a common transatlantic threat assessment. Thérèse, I was quite taken by what you said about the progress that has been made on this issue, and I respect it. I was also taken by something that you said almost a year ago in Washington while delivering a paper on the subject of proliferation. You said that for us Europeans the strategic vacation is over. I wish that were true. And I wish that you or Mark Perrin de Brichambaut or Jacques Rupnik were more representative of Europe. I don't think that you three have ever had a long weekend when it comes to strategic issues, but I am not entirely convinced that Europe, as a whole, has left its strategic vacation behind. Certainly, in my judgment, the country where I live, Germany, has not. People ask why Germany, Europe's largest economy, spends roughly the same percentage of their GDP as Luxembourg does on these issues. Is it because Germans believe more in soft power? Is it because history still inhibits Germans to think constructively about the use of force? Is it the lack of political will? Is it a lack of resources? It is probably a little bit of all of those things, but overall it is essentially because Germans do not feel threatened. This is a country of 84 million, sitting in heart of Europe, and Germans do not feel threatened. Before, during, and after the war, the Iraq debate in Germany has been approached reluctant-

ly, ambivalently, and resentfully. I believe that even if Al Gore had been the president and Edmund Stoiber had been the chancellor, Iraq still would not have been a very interesting subject for the Germans. I think Germans would still have had other domestic and foreign policy priorities that would have been more regional such as making the Euro work, European Union enlargement, a European Constitution, and creating a European defense force more as a symbol of European identity and European emancipation than as a force to defend against something or for something.

Common threat assessment and encouraging NATO to move forward in a significant, meaningful way is a rather serious challenge. I think that it has to do with a changed strategic environment after the end of the Cold War and the changed strategic environment since September 11th. It has to do with Europe's relationship with us, the Americans, because we are an important member of NATO. The Chairman of the Defense Committee of the French National Assembly says, "If we are to agree to this, and this being the wider role of NATO, including Greater Middle East, we run the danger of being at the mercy of all the international policy decisions made by the Americans." Der Spiegel complains, "The Americans are now acting in the absence of limits put to them by anybody or anything as if they own a blank check in their own McWorld." Both those quotations come from the good old days of cozy alliance relations when Bill Clinton was president, multilateralism was in, NATO was in favor and we Americans had a kinder, gentler Secretary of Defense. Those were the days when there were endless complains in Paris about America, the hyper power, where across the continent you could hear from politicians and editorial writers that NATO was going to be manipulated as a tool of American global interest. Milošević was indisputably the butcher of the Balkans, Wesley Clark and Dick Holbrook were the bullies of the Balkans. Remember the conferences on the lessons of Kosovo after Kosovo? The conferences in Europe were different than the conferences in America, and the lessons, to some extent, were different. I mention that because I think some of these issues started before the Iraq debate, and they are now more challenging. As I said at the outset, Iraq was a symptom not a cause.

Now, we have moved beyond the most acrimonious parts of that debate. President Chirac and President Bush are talking, Chancellor Schröder and President Bush are meeting, and their security council appears once again to be united. However, if we are going to move on this subject, for NATO, as tra-

ditionally conceived, we have to answer at least two questions. One is from the Iraq debate. Are there limits to disagreement in our Alliance if we are going to have a functioning Alliance? It was – to put it mildly – extraordinary that during the Iraq crisis at least two members actively worked to undermine the position of the US and Great Britain. And the second question has to do with Iraq itself because I don't think the Iraq debate has entirely resolved itself. I wonder if we are already drawing different conclusions? After the war in Iraq, the German president, Johannes Rau, gave a speech in which he said it was wrong to say that Iraq had divided Europe. He said that Europe was never more united because the populations from West to East were united in their opposition to the war and that the result from the war validated the German and French positions of having opposed the war. This found a positive echo in the press and resonance in public opinion and did not trigger a peep from the opposition in Germany.

In closing, I am aware that I have concentrated in very broad brushstrokes on Germany and France, and that they are not the whole of Europe. I am aware that the skies are not falling and all is not lost, that Germans are with us in a very constructive way in Afghanistan, and that the French are working with us in very important ways on WMD issues. I am aware that the admission of ten new members to the Alliance will change the character of the Alliance. Also, I do not exclude that NATO will play some role, in places like Iraq. However, if it is going to be a substantial role on any sustained basis we have to tackle two problems. One is the still existent gap in threat assessment, and the other is the deep ambivalence that has emerged over the last decade about America, in general, and its role as the leader of the Alliance.

Alexandr Vondra

Thank you for being provocative. As is our privilege, it is time to give the floor to a Czech voice. The PASS view, as was mentioned by Uzi and Jeff, is included in the policy paper, which was distributed. Now, let us hear something about the Czech government's approach.

Karel Kovanda is our Ambassador to NATO. He was our first Czech Ambassador to NATO, arriving there in 1998, the time of our accession into the organization. Karel is a man with great deal of expertise in policy making

vis-a-vis the Greater Middle East because when Czechoslovakia split, we thought how to strengthen our muscles during a period of increasing weakness. We decided to run for a non-permanent seat in the UN Security Council, and we won. We sent Karel, who spent 15 years of his life in the United States, to represent us there, considering him to be someone who would be formidable in the round-table discussions. He was there during the interesting years of 1994 and 1995 when there were many debates about Iraq and WMD's proliferation. Karel, please tell us about the atmosphere in Brussels in the days following the Iraqi war.

Karel Kovanda

I am delighted to be in Prague as well. Never get to be here often enough or for long enough. Today, I am wearing my special NATO tie, I see someone wearing an EU tie. I am wearing a NATO tie. It is very discrete, very subtle, and you have to look very closely to see that it actually has a NATO emblem on it. I will first make one general point and then offer you a set of disconnected remarks.

In the last twelve months, NATO has started to go through an extension in three absolutely different areas. Two of them concern the Greater Middle East. One concerns the Greater Middle East and is in the geographical span of operations. We are in Afghanistan; who would have ever thought that we would get that far? Frankly, the first thought about going into Afghanistan downed on us in December 2001. Again, very soon after 9/11, we toyed with the idea of sending a sort of humanitarian operation to Afghanistan, building on our expertise from the Balkans, where it turned out that we are the only people who can build 100.000 tents in three days. However, at that point it did not work out. Nevertheless, interestingly, the fact that Afghanistan is so far away was not the reason why it didn't work out. In other words, Afghanistan gives a whole new meaning to the concept of "out of area," which hither to had been more or less limited to the Balkans. It also demonstrated how wise it was, especially in the debate that preceded the Washington Summit of 1999, that the concept of what "out of area" actually entails was never set down in concrete. It still remains an open question, whether there are places in the world where we would not go and, theoretically, there are none. This is all

part of the footnote of the paper where Reykjavik and Prague reiterated that we will go anywhere we are challenged. Politically, I am sure that there are limitations. For example, I can't see us going into North Korea under any circumstances right now. So we can see that the geographical extension of NATO's field operations is one way in which NATO has extended.

The second way it has extended is through membership enlargement, but I am not going to talk about that. And the third way in which NATO has extended is in the type of operations it does. Historically, it was always prepared to do the Article 5 stuff, but never got around to it. Since 1995, we have actively been involved in non-Article 5 operations. We have reached a time when we operate indirectly by supporting other organizations and countries interested in doing their own thing. NATO provides them with tools such as its expertise and capabilities. Some people, including Schneider and Žantovský, talk disparagingly about NATO turning into a toolbox. I have never understood what's wrong with this. If being a toolbox means things such as providing support for Germany and the Netherlands in Afghanistan, the EU in Macedonia, and Poland in Iraq, then what's wrong with being a toolbox? Are we going to find that the tools are broken as the paper says? No, what we are going to find is that using our tools sharpens them. Use it or lose it as they say in America.

My second main point is about the prospects of where we are and where we might go. We are in Afghanistan with 5000 plus people, and we will be there for a long time. Right now, NATO is reflecting on which areas of Afghanistan it can be present in. As you know, there was a parallel debate going on in Brussels and in the UN Security Council regarding whether people can and should be allowed, to go beyond Kabul, which the Germans wanted to do very badly. The UN passed a resolution authorizing us to do so, and now, we are figuring out questions such as how, where, under what circumstances, and where we get the forces from.

Is it conceivable that if Turkey decides to go into Iraq and takes over a sector just as Poland has, NATO would provide Turkey with support similar to what it is providing to Poland? Absolutely! Is it conceivable that NATO would take over a sector in Iraq similarly to ISAF? Frankly, I can't exclude that today either. An appropriate UNSC resolution is, of course, a necessary condition, and I return to this question to examine whether it is a sufficient condition. Nevertheless, it probably could be in the works for the debate.

Israel, Palestine is there conceivably a future role for NATO there? I am not going to touch on that one. It is a tough prospect, and I have no doubt that Ron Asmus is going to talk about this in the afternoon. Now, in Iraq, a UNSC resolution would be a necessary condition for NATO's direct involvement, but not a sufficient one. We are facing increased pressure for NATO to do more stuff. I don't know why this is happening, if it is because other people are incapable of doing it or because NATO has proven so successful. We have to reflect very seriously on what NATO can do, as well as how much we can do and what do we have the wherewithal for. There are important changes taking place within NATO since the Prague Summit of just a year ago. NATO is building up its response force and its capabilities and is debating about usability of forces. Usability of forces: it turns out that the Europeans in NATO have a million people in the uniform, and they are hard pressed to find 2-3 percent of those people who can be sent out for operations, none of which in the foreseeable future are ever going to be in anywhere near NATO's own territory. So do we have the wherewithal? My message to you is that today we hardly do. Today, we are hard pressed to meet the absolute minimum requirements that our soldiers have to do ISAF in Kabul, let alone, outside Kabul. But still, we are determined to go outside Kabul. And so what I see here is a double danger for NATO. On one side, we may feed doubts about NATO's relevance by not meeting the expectations of international actors, including everyone from the UN and the US to the non-governmental organizations to the people of the countries themselves. On the other hand we run the risk of failure if we start a job only to find out that we cannot complete the task. These are the twin dangers that NATO is facing today. So does NATO have the self-confidence to say: "We can take on this job, but that job we are not suited for?" Can NATO have the confidence to say this without paying a price in its relevance?

When it comes to fighting terrorism, there is a doctrinal point which has been touched upon by some of the speakers, and that doctrinal point is pre-emption. Preemption is one part of the UN national security strategy, but it has not been debated in NATO. In fact, NATO exercises have, on occasion, been judiciously shut down the moment the question of preemption would even have had to be discussed. Preemption is not in NATO's history. When it was facing the traditional threat from the East, NATO's doctrine was to absorb the first strike and then retaliate. The question is whether this can happen with

terrorism. The debate will have to take place in Istanbul Summit or some time later; and the result of that debate will have to be reflected in the new strategic concept, whether this takes place.

So, as I mentioned, we are in Afghanistan directly, we are in Iraq indirectly, and there is a third way in which NATO is involved in the Greater Middle East today. And that is called the Mediterranean Dialogue. The Mediterranean Dialogue is a strictly political, diplomatic matter in which seven countries of the Greater Middle East: Egypt, Israel, Jordan, three Maghreb countries and Mauretania hold discussions individually with NATO. Sometimes as a group, we have a 19 plus 7 meeting. Those meetings, however, are rather strictly limited to NATO informing the Med Dialogue partners about what we are doing. Personally, I have found the Mediterranean Dialogue to be a barren exercise. I think we have not managed to fill it with value. Characteristically, the Mediterranean Dialogue is only mentioned once, in the back of today's paper, and it is only mentioned in the same parentheses as Ukraine. This tells me that the authors of the paper do not feel that this is a sexy, exciting, contributing issue for many countries, including Turkey. I would not be surprised if my friend, Onur Öymen, touched on this. The Mediterranean Dialogue is very important from the political point of view, but we still have to find the best use for it. Our meetings with Israel are the most substantive ones. I would say that those meetings are more like talking to non-NATO allies than our discussions with other members of the Med Dialogue are. We have not found the way to integrate the Mediterranean Dialogue with our discussions concerning what we are actually doing, be it in Afghanistan or indeed even in Iraq. Perhaps it is not surprising.

So, Mr. Chairman, let me close by recapping three challenges that I see NATO facing. The first challenge is finding the right balance between the work it takes on and the capabilities it has. The point of balance should move over time, especially as we improve and increase the capabilities we have and as we further develop and acquire new ones. The second challenge is a conceptual debate on preemption, which NATO has to have sooner or later. And the third challenge is to figure out a productive political relationship of real value with our Mediterranean Dialogue partners, be it collectively or individually. If we do not sort out these issues, Mr. Chairman, NATO will resemble my tie. It would be elegant but too discreet to notice without looking very carefully to see it. And so let me say this, Mr. Chairman, the big question is not

only what can NATO do for the Greater Middle East but also what can the Greater Middle East do for NATO.

Alexandr Vondra

You mentioned many times that we are somewhere half way between the Prague Summit to the next NATO summit which will take place next spring in the great city of Istanbul. We are very happy to have with us today the great Turkish expert on the NATO affairs. Onur Öymen combines political expertise with the experience of being a practical politician. He served as the Turkish Ambassador to NATO for almost five years starting in 1997. Now, he is back in Ankara as a Member of the Parliament. He is a member of the opposition party, which may be an additional reason to hear his arguments about what we can expect in Istanbul and what the Turks wish to achieve our current debate.

Onur Öymen

We have heard a lot of references to Turkey, and it is good to be referred to. It is good to talk about Turkey, but it's even better to talk with the Turks to learn their opinions. Therefore, I would like to thank the organizers for allowing me to share my views on this extremely interesting subject with you. I understand that your intent is to talk about the greater area and not to focus precisely on the Middle East in the classical sense. At this moment, we are mostly talking about Iraq and the Middle East, but we should not forget the rest of the area where today, as we speak, there are about 1 million displaced persons and large parts of territories are still under occupation. I want to talk about possible role of NATO in all of these areas, that have been a source of tension and conflict for the last three decades or more. The number of persons who have lost their lives in this area during these conflicts, clashes, and acts of terrorism is over 1 million. The question we are addressing today is an extremely serious matter and should not be compared to any other ordinary political discussion. The latest figures show that practically one fourth of all international terrorism activities are taking place in the Middle East. In the narrower sense, the

figure for this year is that 23 % of all terrorist activities in the world happened in the Middle East, particularly in Iraq and Palestine and Israel. Another characteristics of this region is the lack of democracy. We are talking very little about the lack of democracy, but perhaps, this is the crux of the matter. The absence of democracy in the region creates a lot of insecurity, a lack of confidence, and other sources that lead to violence and terror. Therefore, we should remember that in this whole area we have only Turkey and Israel acting as Western style democracies. Democratization of this region should be tremendously helpful for the peace and stability in the entire area.

What role can NATO play? First, our colleagues, particularly Mrs. Delpech, have mentioned weapons of mass destruction. This is an extremely important issue. And as far as Turkey is concerned, we are in the geographic area where any attack by WMD will hit first, before reaching all other NATO countries. We are in the range of missiles that some countries of the region already possess. Therefore, nobody can support NATO activities against proliferation of WMD more than Turkey. However, do we really have a firm policy of acting against those countries possessing these weapons? If we had one, we would be very happy. The elimination of weapons of mass destruction, is always a priority in our foreign policy. Now, I am not necessarily talking only about Middle East, I am also talking about the sub-continent. I remember our first reactions against those countries producing WMD in the sub-continent, and how we shifted policies as a result of the war in Afghanistan and other developments. If we are firm against WMD, we have to be firm in practice, not only in words, but also in deeds.

With regards to terrorism, we have an extremely interesting history in NATO, and I would like to share with you my own experience. For many years we [Turkey] fought the fight against terrorism on the agenda in NATO. During this time, if you saw any references to cooperation or determination to fight terrorism in NATO's ministerial communiqués, you can be sure that it was the product of the efforts of only one country, Turkey. Until September 11th, there was a significant reluctance in NATO to include terrorism on the agenda. Before this day, I don't remember one single NATO council meeting where we had terrorism on our agenda. Karel Kovanda would confirm that. Since September 11th, I can't remember one single council meeting where fighting terrorism was not at the top of our agenda. Everything in NATO changed in half an hour. We heard the news of the attacks against the Twin Towers and the

Pentagon while we were in a meeting. On that same day, NATO changed its policy. During the same evening, we published a declaration on a topic about which we had never ever published before. Moreover, the following day, unbelievably, without discussion, we unanimously decided to implement Article 5 of the Washington Treaty upon the request of the Americans. The United States shifted NATO position. In fact, it was a good decision, and as far as Turkey was concerned, we wholeheartedly supported NATO's new action. If NATO was well prepared to fight terrorism, it was because of the infrastructure, planning capabilities, military forces, and experience of a number of countries like Turkey, the United States, and the United Kingdom. Nothing is more proper for NATO than to play an active role in combating terrorism. Not only in Europe, but also everywhere since our new strategic concept, adopted in April 1999 at the Washington Summit, permits NATO to operate outside its traditional area and to address issues like crisis management, which includes terrorism. NATO is well placed to play an extremely active role, and we are very sorry that NATO has so far not been involved in the Iraq problem. We wish that NATO had been involved from the outset as we previously proposed.

But where is the problem? It is within the political dimension. We should be fair enough and have the courage to share our views about the real issues with each other. This is a political issue because while NATO is an extremely important organization in Europe, it is not the only organization dealing with this problem. We should not overlook the existence of a big organization called the European Union. When we were talking in NATO about terrorism we, Turkey made a concrete proposal. We said, "Let's establish an *ad hoc* committee with the European Union to combat terrorism." We tried hard and had the support of others including our American friends, but so far we have not received a positive answer from the European Union. Today, we do not have, to the best of my knowledge, and correct me if I'm wrong, one single mechanism of cooperation specifically designed for discussing terrorism between NATO and the European Union. Surprisingly enough, we have such a committee in NATO with another country. Which one? Russia. Our cooperation with Russia, on this particular issue is closer than our cooperation with the European Union. The new NATO-Russia forum is designed in such a way that encourages the study and discussion of issues like terrorism. This forum includes the right to vote for everyone, including Russia. NATO's cooperation with Russia is more advanced than its cooperation with the European Union.

In regards to the new structure of NATO's Rapid Reaction Force, we believe that such a force may be extremely useful, but we need political will behind this force. As long as we don't have this will, we cannot operate. Here is an example that I believe illustrates my point. After September 11th, both Americans and Europeans prepared lists of terrorist organizations against which they need to take appropriate actions. The American list was rather comprehensive, and we are thankful to our American friends for including the notorious PKK organization on their list from the outset. This was a good message to terrorists. However, the PKK was not on the European Union's list. It took us several months to persuade our European friends to put the PKK on their list of terrorist organizations, and the day we successfully persuaded our European friends to include the PKK on their list, the PKK changed its name to KADEK. The Americans were kind enough to immediately include KADEK in their list, however, more than one year later, we are still waiting for the Europeans to include KADEK on their list of terrorist organizations. So, my dear friends, as long as you don't have the political will to fight terrorism and don't feel the security threat at home and continue to overlook them; if you do not want to take action against terrorist organizations that are not directly threatening your own security, we cannot be successful. NATO cannot be successful so long as we don't all have the spirit and determination for solidarity to fight all forms of terrorism in all countries all over the world, without any exception and without any discrimination. I remember what President Bush said after 9/11. He said that in our fight against terrorism, there is no gray area. Either you are with us or you are with the terrorists, this is exactly what we, in Turkey, have been saying. If we have political determination in NATO, we will be extremely successful.

On this particular point, since I referred to President Bush's statement, I have a friendly suggestion for our American friends. We are thankful to them for their past cooperation and support of Turkey in fighting terrorism, but at this very moment in northern Iraq, an area controlled by American forces, there are six thousand KADEK terrorists freely operating. Not a single terrorist in modern Iraq has been arrested, detained and delivered to Turkey so far. We know that American and Turkish authorities are talking about strong cooperation, but so far we have not seen any results.

My last point is with regards to the Mediterranean Dialogue countries. It is not enough that NATO is determined to cooperate with its members and to

be operational against terrorism or weapons of mass destruction in the Greater Middle East. We also need the cooperation of the countries of the region. We cannot operate alone. We cannot be considered as an underline of a super-power. NATO is also a political organization, but for that matter we need the participation, the cooperation, and the approval of the countries in the region. Mediterranean Dialogue countries, at least most of them, were reluctant to cooperate with NATO. They were eager to cooperate on technical matters, but when it came to political issues, they were reluctant to even talk. Our first talk with Mediterranean Dialogue countries on political issues of the Middle East was right after September 11th. Even today, I am not sure that all Mediterranean Dialogue countries are eager to see NATO active in the region. They should think of this dimension as well, and Turkey, being the only member of NATO and the Islamic Conference, is ready to bring our contribution to such an initiative.

I would like to end my words with a reference to Iraq. Turkey has often been misunderstood and misquoted on this issue. What we have to say is that we cannot remain indifferent to what is happening in Iraq. We should contribute, but according to our constitution, in order to do that, we need legitimacy. We are happy that we finally got the resolution in the UN, but it is not enough. We also need the elimination of terrorism from the north of Iraq, and also, we need a request from the representatives of the Iraqi people. So far they are not interested in having more troops, particularly Turkish troops. You should not interpret the Turkish position in Iraq as unwillingness to cooperate with our American friends, for as long as these conditions are not met, we believe that sending Turkish troops to the area may create more problems than solutions. And at this moment more troops does not necessarily mean more security. This is our message.

PANEL I: DISCUSSION

Alexandr Vondra

Ladies and gentlemen, as I told you, we will have approximately 30–40 minutes for a discussion, and then we will give our panelists the opportunity to respond. The first name I see is Eran Lerman.

Eran Lerman

I have a possible answer to offer to Karel Kovanda's question as to why NATO is all of a sudden so much in demand. I would like to suggest that, unlike other organizations, NATO is capable of coming to grips with the concept of "an enemy out there." This concept is fairly alien to the EU mindset and totally alien to the current UN, although the UN was originally very much a fighting organization. In other words, it was the alliance of World War II. This is no longer the case, but, because NATO is capable of this, I would define the question, not in terms of "why does NATO need the Middle East," but rather "why does the Middle East need NATO?" I remember the jokes about EDS, Enemy Deficiency Syndrome, in Washington and Brussels, but I think that those jokes are no longer relevant. We have the enemy and NATO is the only organization that can come to grips with this fact.

The challenge is to define the enemy properly, and, the enemy is not terrorism. I will borrow an expression that I have heard from others – to call this a war on terrorism is like calling World War II a war on tanks. Terrorism is

a tool, so are weapons of mass destruction. The question is, the tools of what? There is an answer, which says the enemy is Islamic civilization. But no matter to what extent Mahathir Muhammad and Samuel Huntington play off each other that is very much the wrong answer. I think the enemy is precisely the same enemy that NATO was created to fight, namely totalitarianism. In this case, it is totalitarianism under the guise of Islam. After all, the enemy that NATO was created to confront was not Russia or Eastern Europe, it was communism as a system. And today the challenge in the Middle East, by states and groups, comes from a perversion of Islam, which is largely colored by modern European totalitarian ideologies of both fascism and communism. I have heard a leading Russian official describe the enemy as Islamic Bolsheviks. I would also say that in a larger sense, fascism played a role in the creation of these movements in the late 1920s. I would call it Islamic totalitarianism. a focus on the identity of the enemy is necessary. It will also help to create better criteria for defining who is with us and who is against us. In this case, leaving Israel aside, I would say that once you start casting a broader net, not only Russia, which has already been mentioned here, but also India begin to look like “out of area” anchors for a new conceptual framework.

Two further quick comments: I share the view that the Med Dialogue has failed to deliver, this is a tragic failure because creating the Mediterranean as a community could be one of the most important instrumental building blocks for a better future. The reason it has failed is very clear. From day one, a decision was taken that it would not advance faster than the slowest participant was willing to allow it. Here, it ran up against the traditional Egyptian objection to any active integration that includes Israel. To remove this Egyptian objection and to create a dialogue which runs forward with every willing participant as far as that willing participant would go would be a major breakthrough in the relations with NATO and a good number of Mediterranean countries not just Israel.

Finally, to borrow an important element from what we heard yesterday from HRH Prince El Hassan bin Talal. If we are in a war against an ideology, its allies, and those who deliberately use it as an instrument, then this work cannot be entirely confined to the military dimensions. It also has to deal with certain fundamental issues. The mobilization ground for these movements is the massive migration of the Middle Eastern people. What we see in the Middle East is not unlike what we see in other parts of the Third World, a move from the countryside to the cities. That historical movement is, to a large extent, the result of

the failure to resolve questions about the future of agrarian and rural societies. In this respect, the failure of Cancun was a blow to this struggle. Here is the domain where, focused on the same enemy, the EU and international institutions can play a role side by side and in coordination with a robust NATO military strategy.

Alexandr Vondra

You mentioned Prince Hassan, so let me welcome His Royal Highness, who has just joined us for the morning session, and who would like to participate in the discussion. Before he speaks, I will call others who have already asked to speak.

Ishak Alaton

I wish to inform you that there are some Turks in this room who support the deployment of Turkish forces to Iraq.

And for Ambassador Kovanda, what do you discuss in NATO if you don't discuss preemption?

We have an inclination to deal with blocs. We acquired this inclination during the Cold War. Now, we must be aware that this concept cannot be fully applied to the new situation because the Greater Middle East is not a bloc in the sense of the Soviet Union.

And my last point – can we really reduce everything to terrorism simply because there is a terrorist act involved? What I'm trying to ignore, in a sense, is its political content. If we consider the political content underlining a terrorist act, how can we deal with it unless we take into account the entire picture?

Amin Tarzi

I have a comment and a question for two of the participants. The first part of my question is to Uzi Arad. You cited two main challenges to the West, specifically using NATO in the Greater Middle East, as well as proliferation and terrorism. I actually totally agree with you about that, and you caution against NATO going

into state building and regime changes. However, what we see in Afghanistan, the only place where NATO is involved, is precisely state building. NATO is not really fighting terrorism. Yesterday, Kabul International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) had four Germans and two Canadians killed by terrorist actions; however, ISAF is not fighting terrorism. If you look at the conflict, the terror aspect is mostly in the south of the country, and ISAF will not be there in the foreseeable future. ISAF is expanding northward, which is mostly state building. The Provincial Reconstruction Teams' task is state building rather than fighting terrorism. Furthermore, when you look at Iraq, that was a regime change. Terrorism may have become an issue, but initially it was not a primary issue. So, the two things that you cautioned against, and I personally agree with you, have happened. However, when you look at the core issues, terrorism and proliferation, nothing is happening in the areas where these are a primary concern. We heard that we won't even touch the issue of NATO being involved in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. If we do not discuss that then what are we doing? As for the issue of proliferation, what about the very serious situation in Iran? Is NATO going to get involved in that? What if after October 31st, Iran is not abiding by its demands, and if after that, Iran continues activities such as importing enriched uranium for the purpose of making nuclear weapons? Do you foresee NATO acting, and if not, is the concept you mention really valid?

The second point of my question goes to Thérèse and regards the same Iranian issue. She mentioned that the EU, specifically France, Germany, and Great Britain, have been acting *vis-a-vis* Iran. I, too, see that; for the first time, there is a gelling of these activities. My question is about the demand that they should stop the fuel cycle. Do you think that France or the rest of Europe will act if Iran doesn't comply?

Lastly, I have a comment about the conceptual idea of an enemy who is "out there." NATO is expanding into the Greater Middle East. Looking around the room right now, although my tag says I am representing Afghanistan, my parents are from Afghanistan, I was born in Prague and served with the US marines in the Middle East in the 1990s. So I am as much of an American as much as it gets. With the exception of Turkey and Israel, I don't see anybody from the Arab countries. If you are expanding there, and we are not fighting Islamic civilization as such, shouldn't their ideas be incorporated into this very open type of forum? If not you are sidelining them by essentially fighting the civilization and not the bad guy within.

Alexandr Vondra

Germany was mentioned a few times in the panel, but there is not a German panelist, so I am very glad that Karl-Theodor zu Guttenberg is entering the discussion.

Karl-Theodor zu Guttenberg

This is a question for Jeff Gedmin. You mentioned, as an obstacle to the expansion of NATO, the difference of the common transatlantic assessment again. I agreed with you on that with regard to the war in Iraq, but I wonder how in this context you see the role of the Solana Paper, which was put on the table in June, especially in relation to the national security strategy of the United States.

Margarita Mathiopoulos

Margarita Mathiopoulos, another German. Jeff, you know how much I usually agree with your comments, and I do agree with what you said about the kind of freelance diplomacy our red-green government performed during the Iraq crises, which I think damaged German interests, European interests and Atlantic interests. Now, as Günther Altenburg said yesterday, you need two to tango. As a very old-fashioned Atlanticist, I would like to say that if we do not clear up certain fundamental issues, and reach an agreement on these issues between the Americans and the Europeans before embarking on such a very important debate about NATO and the Middle East, and whether this could be a project to renew NATO, which I believe could be a very nice project, we will fail. Again, as an old-fashioned Atlanticist, I think of one of NATO's finest hours, on 9/11, when the Europeans invoked Article 5, and we were a bit disappointed when the US Secretary of Defense, Mr. Rumsfeld, came to NATO and told us, "This is all very nice of you, but I think we can manage alone."

Second, I think we have to clear up the question of whether the US continues to see NATO as the single military organization to project power to

address the new challenges of the new security environment on a global scale, or will Washington continue to use NATO as a toolbox and so marginalize the Alliance, and push NATO into the role of a second CSCE (Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe). I agree very much with His Royal Highness that CSCE is a very good instrument to use in the Middle East, but I think we need both.

And my third question, “Are the Americans finally prepared to share sensitive technology that will enable NATO to become operable?” Two weeks ago, I was very privileged to join a conference in Rome about missile defense, which is also a very relevant issue in the context of NATO and the Greater Middle East. I think this area will be a prime test where we should, from the European point of view, come in and work together closely with the Americans, but will the Americans really be willing to share sensitive technology with us? These fundamentals need to be addressed openly and answered positively so that the political elites in Germany and in other European countries, who continue to believe in the transatlantic relationship and that the Alliance matters and that the strategic vacation in Germany and in the rest of Europe is over, can have proper arguments to use in our parliaments as well as in our constituencies. So again, to tango you need two, and therefore, don’t only ask what Europeans can do for America, but also ask what Americans can do for the Atlantic-minded Europeans – particularly those in Germany, who are a bit left out in the cold these days.

HRH Prince El Hassan bin Talal

I would like to quote Ambrose Bierce who suggested that “war is a God’s way of teaching Americans geography.” And on the subject of the Greater Middle East, as a member of a state that was part of the United Kingdom once upon a blue moon, I would like to mention once again, that the Baghdad Pact was actually the center of CENTO.

Once again, I will go back to the basic question that many of you are asking, “Are you with us, or are you against us?” First of all who is the us? Are we trying to promote public reason, the majority of the sane, and are we planning to empower the majority of the sane in the fight against terrorism? Or, are we seeing a situation where progressively new leadership is being encouraged to

take over from the rather tired leadership in our part of the world? We have passed through the traditional monarchies. Now, we have the hereditary republics, and I think that the moment is coming when the decision has to be taken either to maintain the state system under enormous stress and strain, because of the lack of pluralism and governance, or succumb to ethnic and sectarian breakup of the region. Balkanization. And my friend, Onur Öymen, knows very well what Balkanization means.

With all due respect, I would just like to point to the suggestion I made that it was not the only call for a CSCE; in fact, both Israel and Jordan called for CSCE, jointly in the peace treaty. My call was for the kind of support that Jordan received, on more than one occasion, not least of all during the last war where it was an exception, not a norm, in terms of the public view that Jordan actually managed to host American troops for a period of time to protect its airspace against the possibility of an air strike going seriously wrong.

I would also like to touch on the idea of our continuing to tell creative lies. As I was sitting in my home, huge transporters of the American Air Force were flying over my head, and I was supposed to tell the general public “No, this is not happening, we don’t have American troops.” The idea of clearly recognizing that a new modality is incumbent on our agreements with the US, with all due respect to my Israeli colleagues here, is not a competition with Israel. How could we compete with Israel in terms of its standing with the United States? It is a complimentary role, an activating of what I call a majority of the sane not only in the fight against terror, but also in the fight to create a basic security situation. And this is why I have hosted meetings with Indians, Pakistanis, Israelis, Turks, all the nationalities of the region, and called for a WMD free zone, but, of course, when everyone steps out into the light of day they are not interested in multilateral solutions. I have called for a clear definition of terror as Uzi Arad, in terms of the Herzlia Center, has also called for a definition of terror. Lastly, I have called for a culture of compliance, a code of conduct for state and non-state actors alike. We have also heard a lot about the importance of a humanitarian program like the Marshall Plan. Shimon Peres once spoke about the importance of a new Middle East, unfortunately his emphasis was on IT and investment. As I have said to him, with all due respect, the emphasis should be on human dignity. Moving from refugee mode to poverty alleviation mode, is one of the direct security investments that must be made in order to help change this hotbed of terror.

As far as religion is concerned, I just want to make one point that within the Greater Middle East there are three hundred million Shia. I find it rather sad that the confrontation today is, on the one side, Wahabi zealotism and on the other, clearly an Israeli position. My sadness is that this confrontation is one where Shiism is regarded synonymous with Islam. The other day, before going to a Paris mosque, where I took with me the former chief Rabbi of France, Catholics, and Protestants, I was talking to the Minister of Interior about the separation of church and state. I cite this as an example because culture is a security issue. I said why is it that we cannot elevate religion above state. Why is it that we do not find a point of reference for all of this? I think that the problem is the absence of cultural affinity. All the international mediators who entered the scene without any background are facing enormous difficulties in understanding that they are losing the majority of the sane. I am not talking about the super-rich who are making money out of these projects; I am talking about a group of people from Cairo to Delhi. I say that with some feeling because I have in-laws in Pakistan, India and Bangladesh, and they know very well how jitters develop, particularly in Muslim minds, when Mr. Sharon visits India and signs an agreement to develop advanced early warning capabilities with India and Russia. So I think in these changing times of alliances and unilateral actions, the time has come to call things directly by their names. We are only a region in name, and in the days of CENTO, Indira Gandhi would refer to the Middle East and say it is not the Middle East, it is West Asia.

Finally, I would like to add one point, groups such as the Netanya Center, whose membership includes Mikhail Gorbachev and F. W. de Klerk, are waking up to the importance of eastern Mediterranean security, including the Greek-Turkish confrontation. I find this extremely helpful, and please, let's give meaning to what I call "alphabet soup" - Partnership for Peace and Partnership for Mediterranean, and the OSCE, who is a major non-NATO ally. I am not sure what being a non-NATO ally means, as it didn't give us a civilian airlift capability to help refugees coming out of Iraq. Continuing without the regional concept, without sensitivity to the possibility of ethnic and sectarian breakup is threatening not only to the region but also to the whole concept of security. There are 26 American bases between the Caspian Sea and China. What are they doing there? What is the logic? If there is a logic can we share in it? Can we ask NATO "*quo vadis*" in terms of the absence of one regional center

for conflict analyses in our part of the world or conflict avoidance? Can we ask, “Isn’t this the time for us to have one single regional center for public policy analyses, so I am not the only token Arab in such a meeting?” Can we have a regional capability of discussing the issue that we are discussing today? The last meeting of this kind was the globalization commission in Brussels. I was chairing the session, and the Americans and the Europeans abused each other. When the moment came for them to turn to me, I asked them to cool it and said that I was supposed to be the token representative from the region, and I would just like to focus again on the region and not on interests. This concept of the revival of the common security and foreign policy initiative in the context of the Western hemisphere is something that needs to be discussed away from the cameras and with some sense of urgency and responsibility before it is too late.

Alexandr Vondra

What you have said is important, and it reminds me of a comment that František Šulc, a journalist from Lidové Noviny, made during the coffee break. He said that he feels that we are all in the same forest, but the problem is that some of us have the tendency to see, think and talk about only the coniferous trees, while the others have the tendency to see or to talk about the deciduous trees. We have to keep in mind that we are all in the same forest.

Ariel Cohen

Before jumping into the discussion this morning, I think that we should have focused a little bit on some differences between NATO during the Cold War versus NATO in the current stage. During the Cold War, NATO was an alliance that faced a very clearly defined enemy and ideology. It was basically facing a nation state cum empire, the Soviet Union and the coalition of its satellites. It faced the clearly defined ideology of communism. Today, NATO, if we can agree, and I hope we do agree, is facing a threat and there is some kind of an enemy. It would probably be beneficial to ourselves to try to define the enemy and the threats. I would submit that we are facing a global movement that I

would call a Jihadi movement. I agree with previous speakers that this is some kind of malignant evolution of Islam. No sane person would talk about a fight against Islam per say; after all, we are talking about 1.3 billion people on this planet. It is a global movement which has different constituent parts, different organizations – including Sunni and Shia – with different roots, the Wahabi roots, the Muslim Brotherhood roots, and the Shia roots. For NATO, which defined itself as European and a regional bloc, we have to keep in mind that some of the threats are out of area, really out of area – Southeast Asia, Indonesia, the Philippines, and now, even places like Cambodia. Who could have imagined radical Wahabi groups found in Cambodia financing madrases and training little jihadis?

So again, the changes are fundamental. And the responses have to be in areas beyond that of the conventional military. They have to be in intelligence, law enforcement, and in common threat assessment, as was mentioned here, but I would suggest that we are still lacking political leadership. We still are lacking the perception by the top level of the politicians, with the exception of the United States and some of the European allies, that we are in real war with real threats. It is a low intensity, protracted conflict which requires different responses.

One other point that was mentioned this morning by our Turkish allies and friends is a danger of picking and choosing the terrorist organizations we feel comfortable fighting against and leaving aside those that we for some reason feel like setting aside. For example, the Turks mentioned the PKK; I would add to that: how long did it take for the Europeans to face Islamic Jihad and Hamas, which were recently proclaimed as terrorist organizations?

I would add one point of very respectful disagreement with Uzi Arad. Tomorrow, I am going to speak about what I call “the battle for hearts and minds” or “the war of ideas.” I was told by the State Department not to call it “the war of ideas” because it is too controversial. However, we need to face the ideological dimension of this war. Just as during the Cold War, we did not only fight with tanks and missiles – in fact, actual fighting with tanks and missiles during the Cold War was minimal – but we also fight using public diplomacy, international broadcasting and other instruments of the war of ideas. This aspect has to be reformulated, reexamined and reconfigured. At one point, Prince Hassan mentioned, very importantly, that we need to educate ourselves as far as cultural, religious, and linguistic literacy is concerned. In my country,

the United States, I find a woeful lack of people who make political decisions with education on Islam, on different currents of radical Islam, who speak Arabic, and who know Arab and Muslim history. This also has to be addressed.

Alexandr Vondra

The last speaker on my list is Ely Karmon, and if there is anybody who would like to speak let me know as Ely speaks. Otherwise, I will pass the floor back to the panelists.

Ely Karmon

I would like to make several comments, not on the NATO strategy, but on the strategy of the enemy, namely the radical Islamist movements, some of which are direct enemies and some of which are potential enemies. I see three new strategic concepts in these movements since the debacle of Afghanistan. First, there is a discussion among ideologues of these movements, especially in the radical opposition in Saudi Arabia, about the role of bin Laden. They say that bin Laden is finished as a leader of the Islamist movement. Perhaps his global struggle against the US and the West or “the infidels” has been achieved, and it is time to go back to the local arena and to try to overthrow the local governments? Perhaps, we can see this result in the bombings in Saudi Arabia and in Morocco in May 2003. Connected with this strategic concept is another one which was presented by Ayman Al-Zawahiri, the real strategist of Al-Qaeda and the deputy of bin Laden. After Afghanistan, he asked to find a fundamentalist Islamist safe haven outside Afghanistan. He seemed to mainly target Pakistan and Indonesia. Pakistan is very important because of its local Islamist movements and also, perhaps, because of its nuclear capability. But it seems that lately there is an effort of all these movements to concentrate on Iraq because of the consequences of instability in Iraq. We see people flowing through Syria, through Iran and even from Saudi Arabia in order to fight in Iraq and to try to transform it into an Islamist state. The last concept, which is also very interesting, is a new concept called non-territorial umma or non-territorial Islamic nation. Which means that Islam has to be fought for not only in the territory of the Islamic nations but also;

wherever a Muslim is present, he must fight Jihad. That means that all the communities, Muslim communities, which are now in the West, in Europe or the US, or even in other countries in the Far East, must wage a war of Jihad against the infidels. And I think that if these three concepts are implemented, they will influence the NATO strategy and the NATO members' situation.

Joshua Muravchik

Just a short response to Eran Lerman and Ariel Cohen about what we call the enemy. I think that President Bush has it right and that it would be a big mistake to try to find some definition, other than terrorism, of what the enemy is. Looking at Ariel Cohen's analogy to the Cold War, he said that instead of fighting Russia, we were fighting communism. That's not quite right. There was no Russia; there was the Soviet Union. The enemy was Soviet imperialism, and the ability to rally people to the battle to counteract Soviet power was dependent on being able to show that the methods that were being used by the Soviets were fundamentally illegitimate, that they involved aggression and subjugation of other nations. Certainly, if we get into a discussion over war against Islamism or Islamic fundamentalism or even Ariel's term Jihadism, we are going to open an enormous cans of worms and embroil ourselves in endless debates about what this enemy is and who is an Islamist or a fundamentalist or Jihadist. The point is we don't care at all about how fundamentally some Muslims may interpret their fate. What we care about is when people plant bombs in pizza parlors and attack American barracks and all the other things that the terrorists do. I think that saying that we are engaged in a war against terrorism is something that enables us to rally people in the West for what needs to be done. Also, there needs to be a tremendous effort to delegitimize terrorism to the public of the Middle East. We are going to make that effort much more complicated if we start to try define the enemy in some other way.

Daniel Kummermann

I refer to Mr. Gedmin and his quote of President Rau. The question is how will the European public feel if something like 9/11 happens in Europe? When it

happened in America, it actually brought American and Israeli public perceptions closer together. If something like that happened in Europe, would it bring Europeans closer to where the Americans stand now? Or would they see it as something like a punishment for being in the same group as Americans and try to pull farther away from them?

Alexandr Vondra

I was asked to make an exception to the rules, and so, with your permission, I am giving the floor to HRH Prince Hassan.

HRH Prince El Hassan bin Talal

I would like to go back to three previous speakers and say that Bengurion, one of the founders of the State of Israel, in reference to a dissenter within the Jewish community, asked, “Why do you call them dissenters, why don’t you call them killers?” And I would like just to point out that in terms of acts of violence – whether the blowing up of the King David Hotel or any other event – we have different perspectives on how these things happened. I would also like to point out that as far as Muslims are concerned, those extremists are not dissenters, they are killers. 9/11 may have privatized war, but it has also privatized Islam. You speak of Islam and you say where is the sane Muslim voice? The Muslim voice existed in Mecca right up to 1924. There were four schools of Islam and our four schools of Sunni, orthodox Islam. Every Friday, these four Imams led the prayer, and the family of the prophet’s house had the respect of the Shia. There was legitimacy. Now you may not want to hear all of this, but the fact is that either you have centrism, which is the way of Islam, or you yield to anyone who grows a beard and wears a funny hat. And that applies to so many different religions. But please, do not confuse the body of Islamic learning, in terms of consultation of developing a shared consciousness in this world and analytical concordance of meanings of what these value systems stand for, with the actions of the so-called Jihadi minorities. The very fact that they choose these names to ennoble themselves is the problem of the crises of legitimacy. Restore moral authority to a Shiite, create a Vatican, an 18 km by 18

km Mecca or Jerusalem. I don't want to strike the parallel, but create a situation of moral authority that rises above politics, and then you will invite scholarship and stewardship and education and governance in the religious domain. But, at the present time, I am afraid we are running after a privatization of war, individuals with enormous egos, and enormous bank accounts who have been penetrated and played by every so called intelligence service. I think it is Groucho Marx who said that military intelligence is a contradiction in terms, and we are living the result of that contradiction today.

Jeff Gedmin

I will respond very briefly to four points that were made. One, if Europe experienced its own 9/11 what kind of difference would that make? I don't know how that would play out but I think it would make a big difference. We have talked a lot in the last two years about September 11th as being an attack on civilization, an attack on liberal values, and an attack on democracy. However, it was also first and foremost an attack on the United States of America, and that has shaped the debate in our country in a way that is different than in Europe. By the way, it was not the first attack by that network on the US. There were two on the embassies in Africa, there was a ship, the USS Cole, in harbor in Yemen, and there was the first attack in 1993 on the World Trade Center. It would make a difference.

Secondly, as to the question about common threat assessment in the Solana Paper. I am interested in the Solana Paper, I applaud the Solana Paper, and I think it is an interesting step in the right direction. In her presentation Thérèse mentioned some of the steps in the right direction in convergence between America and Europe in looking at the threat of WMD and nuclear weapons in the hands of mullahs in Iran. What happens in those next steps, I don't know. Whether you and other good people in this room win that argument within the European Union, I don't know. I think we will reach a moment of truth sooner or later. If and when Iran does not abide by certain obligations, when diplomacy appears to fail, when industry pressures increase and traditional constituencies for constructive dialogue are back again, we will find out. And I am not pessimistic, I am just raising skeptical questions.

Third: Margarita and the three fundamentals that you laid down, and regarding Article 5 and American indifference to NATO's Article 5 Declaration after the attacks on the United States. Tomorrow, R. Nicholas Burns, the US Ambassador to NATO, who is the kind of member of this administration that you Europeans like - he is moderate, multilateral and loves NATO - will be with us. However, he makes a very spirited argument that NATO, as such, was ill-equipped to respond as an organization at that time. There are serious people, Margarita you are one, I think Ron Asmus is another, who disagree with R. Nicholas Burns. I will let you take up that debate with Nick tomorrow, but I will concede that politically and psychologically we didn't handle that well. And it had the effect, intended or not, of telling some of our closest allies, "We do not appreciate you, we do not need you, or we don't see a central role for you."

Second point of yours, Margarita, do we Americans continue to, or will we see NATO, as you put it, as the single security defense organization to deal with threats and challenges on the global scale? I only speak for myself, but I am not willing to say that. When you say single, it sounds exclusive, and I think global challenges need global partners. Iraq showed us that there were certain traditional members of NATO who did not want to join us, other partners, Australia, South Korea, Japan did. So we have to think more creatively about this in the future. It does not preclude or exclude a very important role for NATO, but I, for one, am not willing to sign on to it as the single and exclusive body for dealing with global issues. As far as the Americans marginalizing NATO to make it something like the OSCE, Margarita, I think you give us too much credit and undervalue your own power. Where interests coincide and you bring the capabilities to the table, this question resolves itself.

The last question you asked, "What can the Americans do for the Atlantic-minded Europeans?" is a very fair question. It is my own view that this Administration in Washington had little maneuvering room to move your government in Berlin to a different position on Iraq. After all, it was the Chancellor who, before a decision was made on Iraq and before Germany was even asked for anything, said "No, we will not participate, even if you have a UN mandate." As a footnote to that, I can recall a senior State Department official going to Berlin shortly after that to confer with the German government, and he spent the entire day at the Hilton Hotel doing emails because the German government did not want to confer with him.

Having said that I think your point is a fair one, Margarita. We do have strains of American nationalism. At times, we are guilty of gratuitous unilateralism, and at critical moments, we have been inattentive to the Alliance. We do have to ask ourselves the question you have posed, “What can we do for the pro-American Europeans who share our strategic outlook and who, on the one hand, do not wish to be forever the junior partner of the US, and on the other hand, understand the dangers of trying to build Europe in opposition to the United States.

Mr. Chairman, if you permit me one last final brief comment, I agree with everything that’s been said on the subject of preemption and the absence of a vigorous debate. I think that it is a very important question that relates to all of this. And for those of us who supported the war in Iraq, and I certainly did, we have to address the issue in the months ahead. It relates to preemption. Where are the weapons of mass destruction in Iraq? If we do not find the weapons of mass destruction in Iraq, what is the credible explanation of their absence? To that, I would add also and submit for discussion, we need a vigorous debate about question of authority, too. Because even if we had to this date found substantial amounts of weapons of mass destruction, the opponents of the war would be arguing yes, they are there, but the intentions were not or the authority was not. I understand preemption to be an interesting and complex topic, I think authority is, too. If I recall correctly, when Israel decided in 1981 to attack and destroy a reactor outside Baghdad, the Israeli cabinet had an interesting and vigorous debate about authority with one side arguing no, he doesn’t have a nuclear weapon, he is not on the verge of attacking us, and the other side arguing but wait a second, he is about to load fuel into the reactor and if we pass that threshold, the price, the danger, the difficulty of intervention becomes much more expensive. With that I will stop.

Onur Öymen

I would like to comment on one or two points; the first, being a reference to a comment made by Eran Lerman about Islamic terrorism. We discussed this matter at length in NATO and our conclusion was that we should not put any adjective before terrorism. There is no such thing as Islamic terrorism or eth-

nic terrorism. Terrorism is terrorism. This was the conclusion of nineteen NATO nations. If we call what's happening in the Middle East Islamic terrorism, should we also call what's happening in Spain Christian terrorism? Is there something like Christian or ethno-terrorism in Spain? There is not, so let's stop putting adjectives in front of the word terrorism. We should not give any credibility to terrorism by using noble words like Islam to describe them. They should not abuse Islam for their purposes.

Again, to a comment by Eran Lerman who brought up the Egyptian's objection to cooperation with NATO. It is true that on some points we disagree with Egypt on the assessment of the situation. However, it is also true that Egypt was the first Mediterranean Dialogue country to invite NATO for a consultation meeting. Although this meeting has not materialized because of regional developments, we should give credit to Egypt for being the first Arab country to invite NATO for consultations.

My friend, Mr. Alatan, spoke about the political content of terrorism. Again, this is something that we discussed in NATO, as Karel Kovanda will confirm. We concluded that no political constellation should justify terrorism. Although all terrorist organizations claim that they have a noble cause and that their violence is justified, at NATO we believe that there is no justification for terrorism. If we start to negotiate the root causes of terrorism, there would be no end to the discussion. Therefore, our point of view is that no political constellation should be attached to the fight against terrorism.

I believe that it is hard to find a justification for preemptive attacks. The main problem is that once you have a preemptive attack, it may set a precedent for other countries. Then you have other countries attacking their neighbors using your actions as an excuse. Therefore, a preemptive attack is an action that we should use very cautiously.

In regards to Paul Wolfowitz's disagreement with NATO involvement in Iraq, I personally believe that it would have been much better to involve NATO from the outset of this operation. Nothing justifies the exclusion of NATO from this operation, and it would be much easier for Turkey to be involved if NATO was involved as well. What is written in Financial Times yesterday, is not true; because of constitutional constraints we could create problems for NATO. On the contrary we have constitutional constraints as regards to sending troops abroad, but there is an exception in our constitution for our existing international agreements, which includes our NATO treaty. Therefore, as far as Turkey

is concerned, there will be no more legal objection to any NATO operation. We have never objected to NATO operations beforehand, in Bosnia, Kosovo, etc.

Prince Hassan asked, who is “us”? Us is all of us. Us is the countries who attended the Sharm el-Sheikh Summit right after the first bus attack in Jerusalem. “Us” means the United States, it means Russia, it means Germany, it means Turkey, it means Egypt, all civilized nations have suffered from terrorists. This is “us.” So, when we interpret the words of President Bush, “either you are with us or with terrorism,” does “us” mean the United States? No, us means all of us. I would like to tell you, that I am among those in the NATO Council who said on September 11th, “Today we are all Americans.” So us is all of us.

The Collective Security Council (CSC) is a very important subject. Turkey made a proposal on this subject that at a foreign ministers’ conference of Islamic countries in Amman in 1998. We proposed establishing confidence and security building measures for the region, and, to our surprise, our proposal was accepted. The Islamic Conference formally agreed to start an OEC (Organization of Economic Cooperation) type operation.

We even started to organize groups of wise men, and we had five meetings of these groups. However, our proposed organization has never been realized because some of the Islamic countries wanted to include religious concepts in our Helsinki-type proposal. Our country secularized in 1937, and secularization is one of the fundamental articles of our Constitution. We believe that in countries like Turkey, democracy cannot survive without secularism. Therefore, we are strong supporters of secularism.

As for NATO, I would agree that NATO was considered to be more important during the Cold War. However, don’t forget that NATO was operational during the Cold War; it was a deterrent power. We again became operational after the Cold War, in Bosnia, Macedonia, Afghanistan, Kosovo, etc., and so I believe that NATO has not lost its viability.

Who speaks on behalf of Islam? This is another question of Prince Hassan. Fortunately, nobody is in a position to speak on behalf of Islam. As we do not want anybody to speak on behalf of Christianity in the European Union, we don’t want anybody to speak on behalf of Islam in the Middle East. The last Caliph was an Ottoman Caliph who was sent abroad in 1924, and

since then there has not been anybody in the world with the ability to speak on behalf of Islam.

Finally, to the question of what would the reaction of Europe be in the case of 9/11 type attack? Immediate reaction – cutting off diplomatic ties, very strong action against the perpetrators, the country, all the perpetrators of this attack. So as long as it happens in our territory, we react very strongly, but when it happens elsewhere, it's another question.

Thérèse Delpech

Of course, we women are much less talkative than men! So, first I want to repeat that I do prefer toeing the line where we converge because I do believe that we are the rich, the prosperous, and the peaceful nations in a world where these three qualities are very rare. So we do have a duty to at least try to understand each other and to work together.

Second, concerning the Solana Paper, there are three Solana Papers, not one. One, which is quite good, is on non-proliferation. One, which is new in many ways, is on security strategy and in particular, effective multilateralism. It does speak about international terrorism not as a strategic threat, but as a tactical one. Finally, there is a paper on terrorism, which is being drafted. So there are three different papers.

My third remark deals with Iran. Iran says it wants electricity. Let Iran have electricity. If what Iran wants is [nuclear] electricity, it is perfectly possible to have it with fuel provided from the outside. Additionally I want to say that we have three European ministers currently in Iran, I am sure they are making this point clear.

Lastly, I will make a very un-French point. Since the current fashion seems to be for the French to speak for the Germans, it's a German point. In response to His Royal Highness's comments about elevating religion above the state, I want to reiterate by what Luther said in the 16th century as he made his reforms, "We have to separate God and Caesar; this will be good for God, and good for Caesar."

Uzi Arad

I am under the influence of the very effective points made by Thérèse Delpech, and I think that she points out the right direction for us to pursue. That kind of practical approach, banning Iran's fuel cycle program, for example, is an interesting case in point, but another interesting point was also made. What happens if these efforts encounter Iranian resistance? That indeed may be a moment of truth, and it is in that context that the need for reflection about future NATO missions arises. Yes, we do need to be taking the kind of practical actions that Thérèse mentioned, but at the same time, much thinking ought to go into other contingencies. Remember, there is Libya, there is Syria, and other countries that pose similar problems. That is why, more than anything else, I fear a loss of concentration or focus and the risks of either deflection or dilution. Indeed, the point was made a number of times that what NATO might be suffering from are insufficient resources, insufficient agreement among allies, difficulties about definitions, and the like. Now, not all of that is true, but if it is true, then it is all the more important that NATO prioritize action and not make mistakes by departing into areas which are not typical of possible future NATO missions. There are some areas where multilateral frameworks other than NATO are better equipped to intervene, and NATO should capitalize on its tradition of military concentration, and its organizational capability, and being lead primarily by the United States.

It is in that context that I would like add one point regarding Prince Hassan's valid point about the value of multilateral frameworks for the Middle East. Indeed, I am very much in agreement with the need for a CSC type structure for the Middle East. More than that, I think that we missed an enormous opportunity when we had the multilateral meetings in the Middle East. For example, we had one devoted to arms control and regional security to which Jordan contributed by offering ideas and practical steps borrowing heavily from the CSC experience in introducing these kinds of multilateral solutions to regional problems in the Middle East. The failure to advance the multilaterals that were initiated in Moscow in 1992 falls primarily to the United States for being neglectful of it and to Europe for not rising to the occasion. If there is one continent with solid experience in multilateralism, it is Europe. But the Europeans wanted to insert themselves into the bilaterals and they love noth-

ing more than shuttling from Ramallah to Jerusalem. In the process, they dropped what they could have done much more energetically on this score. So this is called for and this remains a challenge more for Europe than for others. But that is not the NATO task. It may dilute NATO. So let me simply reiterate the appeal to let NATO do what it could do best, particularly in light of great obstacles and insufficient resources that have been eluded to.

Karel Kovanda

Let me comment on two points. Terrorism is a tool, as Eran Lerman pointed out, and I agree with that. However, our saying, “the fight against terrorism,” is not the first time that the international community has applied a certain label of a certain tool of war as going beyond the limit of what is acceptable in warfare without, at the same time, addressing the question of what to do with the adversaries. Here I come down on the side of Joshua Muravchik.

As for Margarita’s question of whether the USA needs NATO anymore, I would say that the answer depends on the answers to two other questions. One, “Can NATO improve its strength and sharpen its own capabilities?” The answer to this is influenced by two other sub-questions, “Is the US to share the technology, as Margarita calls for, and will the US get rid of such garbage as ‘buy American’ slogans?” The second question that Margarita’s question depends on is, “Does Europe need NATO anymore?” I’ll leave it at that.

CIVILIZATIONS, CULTURES, DEMOCRACIES

Messages by Adam Michnik and Václav Havel

Adam Michnik

Dear Friends,

Because of the hearing before the special parliamentary commission on the corruption affair, made public by *Gazeta Wyborcza*, I cannot participate in this conference. However, I would like to share with you some reflections on one of the topics discussed.

During the years of dictatorship, we developed a view of the world in which democratic order represented the opposite of the totalitarian system. For us, totalitarianism was a denial of freedom, the anti-culture; it was a barbarian negation of our common civilization.

In the struggle for democracy, the democratic opposition built small outposts outside the police state that allowed us to cultivate the values of our common culture and to live according to democratic values.

Our democracy was thus built from within: in independent seminars, in uncensored underground magazines and books, in our activities in defense of human rights. This environment gave birth to ideas that came to fruition in 1989 in the series of velvet revolutions in this part of Europe.

The years of totalitarian dictatorships, both the Nazi and Communist, have taught us a lot about the barbarian nature of totalitarianism. We learned

that in these systems man is treated as property of the government – a simple object of power, which could be bought or intimidated at liberty. We also understood very well the relationship between violence and lies and therefore chose to wage the struggle without violence. At the same time, we understand that there exist such forms of totalitarian oppression that cannot be defeated without violence. It was impossible to defeat the regimes of Hitler and Stalin without violence. That is why we could not understand the pacifists of Western Europe who demonstrated in the streets for a unilateral disarmament of the West in face of the Soviet threat. Metaphorically speaking, if the German pacifists could not stand the Americans for having American military bases in Germany, we Poles could not forgive to Americans for deserting us at the time of the Yalta conference – which gave us Soviet troops, which guarded Soviet interests instead of American bases. We felt our own weakness, and even felt some bitterness for having been left alone in Warsaw in 1944, in Budapest in 1956, in Prague and Bratislava in 1968. How we wished then that the democratic governments would respond by force to the violence of the totalitarianism.

From this point of view we could call for and support any intervention whose aim it was to defeat a totalitarian oppressor. For this reason, we accepted responsibility for the interventions in Kosovo, Afghanistan, and Iraq.

Today, we fully understand that overthrowing a dictatorship does not mean that freedom is instantly established. Moreover, we know that it is possible to win the war with a dictatorship and to lose the peace. Because of this, we think we have to follow through in Iraq. The military intervention will succeed only if and when we can help the Iraqis to build some form of democratic government. It is not simple, but neither is it hopeless. The Germans after the fall of Hitler, the Italians after the fall of Mussolini, and the Japanese after the military defeat all built well functioning, democratic states with the help of other democratic countries. This is the reason for hope.

Does it follow from this that democracy is “transportable”? Perhaps yes, but only to a degree. When I was watching the toppling of the monument to Saddam Hussein in Baghdad, I experienced moments of joy and a moment of reflection. I remembered in that moment how in the fall of 1989 in Warsaw my fellow citizens toppled the monument to Felix Dzerzhinsky, the creator of the Soviet secret police, which had been built in the heart of the town as if a symbol of its humiliation. In the destruction of the monument of the Bolshevik

commissar, there was also the symbolic act of the parting with the traditions of the time of oppression. At the same time, after all these years I understand better the complexity of the problem of parting with the symbols of the past.

There stands in Gori, Georgia, a giant monument of Josef Stalin. After the Khrushchev speech at the 20th congress of the CPSU in 1956, they wanted to destroy this monument. A task force came from the capital of Tbilisi and started to dismantle the monument. But then the people of Gori came out of their homes to defend Stalin, who was born in the town, with their clubs, knives, broomsticks. And I think that the higher value is to respect the decision of the citizens of Gori than to topple the monument according to the wishes of the central government. For democracy also must respect those who think differently from us, even when they think differently about the years of dictatorship. The stability of democracy depends on having a place under the sun also for them. Although we condemn empty pacifism, which is in principle an act of cowardice and capitulation before a totalitarian dictatorship, we are not obliged to blindly approve every act conceived under a democratic government. In the case of Saddam Hussein the use of violence was justified. But the victory could turn into defeat if it is conceived exclusively as a way of imposing our will on the Iraqis. Democracy in Iraq requires Iraqi democrats who need our help, without them the process of building democracy is destined to failure.

Václav Havel

Ladies and gentlemen, dear friends, I take a point from Adam Michnik's message and will start from there. A couple of years ago, I read a short article about an attempt to blow up the Museum of Dimitrov in Bulgaria. The attempt was not entirely successful, for the building just moved a little bit but remained more or less intact. I see it as a symbol of the fact that it would be very naive to think that you can install freedom, rule of law, and democracy overnight and have democratic institutions in place and functioning from one day to another.

We are now living amongst the debris of old regimes and we are trying to build a new and better world, but we should be very sober and very rational about this. We should understand and come to terms with the fact that this is a

neverending task that will indeed take a very long time before it is done; we shall never be able to brush that point away from our agendas. I also believe that countries that have been fortunate to have enjoyed freedom and democracy for 200 years or several dozens of years should have an understanding of countries that have been fortunate to enjoy democracy for maybe 10 or 13 years and that those countries in turn should be full of understanding *vis-a-vis* the countries where freedom needs to be established. All this should take place in an environment of full and very genuine respect for different cultures, for different customs, and for the different beliefs of the peoples around this world.

I believe that we are now entering a multi-plural world and that every one of us should realize this and that people should genuinely seek what is joining, what is common, what is bringing together the different cultures, the different cultural environments, and not to seek out the differences. Another phenomenon that I have noticed during my unnaturally long stay in politics is the new phenomenon, that is gaining more and more in importance, of regional grouping or of regional entities. There is nothing bad about this fact and it is only logical and fair that the Western civilization framework or entity, for instance, if you will, has its own institutions such as the North Atlantic Alliance, but it seems to me only natural and fair for the other regional entities – here I have in mind the geographical and entities of civilization – to have their own transnational institutions and bodies. In this world that we are in now, it seems only natural to me. Now in conclusion let me thank you all very much for having come to this very important and very interesting conference.

I would like to say a word of thanks to the circle of my friends who have put this event together. It has several types of importance and may I mention one of them in conclusion. I would like the message to be clear and that is the fact that I would like to hope that this conference, the Forum 2000 conference that coincidentally is taking place around the same dates, together with the Conference on Tibet and the launching of the Institute of Strength here in Prague would send out a clear message to the outside world that the Czechs are indeed very much interested and very much concerned about what happens elsewhere. And I also believe that it is a very important message for the Czechs, indeed, for the local scene, it should be clear now that it is no longer possible to close ourselves behind our doors in this “Bohemian basin,” in this cozy Czech environment and not be concerned about what happens elsewhere. Thank you very much and I wish you great success in your deliberations.

PANEL II: THE ROLE OF NATO IN PEACE- MANAGEMENT OPERATIONS IN THE GME

Jiří Schneider

Before the panel starts we will have a special presentation. But before that let me give a floor to Alexandr Vondra to introduce our speaker.

Alexandr Vondra

It is my privilege to introduce another speaker who has a little different status than the other speakers on the panel. Bruce Jackson is an old friend of mine. I first met him before I came to the US when he was setting up what later was called the US Committee on NATO. It was a bi-partisan institution of many distinguished Americans, some of whom, like Ron Asmus, are here with us today. The purpose of that committee was to attract the attention of American politicians, the general public, and the media towards NATO's future, including the NATO enlargement. Since then, we have been working together because I con-

sidered the work of this committee as instrumental in gaining support for subsequent consent of the US Senate with enlargement. What's even more important is that during the work I did with those people, I clearly concluded that they are doing their job not for prestige but because they have this issue in their hearts. The best evidence of this is that after the first round of NATO enlargement had been completed and security experts in Europe were more comfortable considering another set of enlargement, Bruce continued his mission. His committee is not as active as it was in the past, however, and is now under an umbrella institution called the Project on Transitional Democracies, which he leads.

The purpose of this presentation is simply to show that there are also other tasks, not only the Greater Middle East, but are somehow related.

Bruce Jackson

About a year ago President Havel spoke to many people in this room and said there is only one question left in Europe and that is: "What is Europe and who is a European?" At about that time, we went back to Washington, and they said, "Well we have one question, which is what the hell do we do in the Greater Middle East?" So I basically started work on this pitch – maybe by answering Havel's question, we will answer Washington's question.

We are calling this presentation "The Frontiers of Freedom and the Greater Middle East." What you see here are people of the Islamic faith walking towards Europe over the Accursed Mountains. This briefing covers a range of things, including one of the reminders that Havel always made; this is a moral enterprise, not a political or military enterprise. I also want to look back at where Europe came from, this concept of the third phase of European history, and these major projects – the Balkan peace, the Black Sea, the Borderland of Values to see if in their completion in Europe, we can discover how to do the Greater Middle East. Moreover, although we talk about the adaptation of an alliance, it's a little like a marriage; and people are basically saying, "rather than talk about the marriage, we are going to reupholster the couch." NATO may be the answer, but it is not the question. It's one of the things we may do along the way. This is the largest enterprise in change of the political landscape we've seen since the Peace of Westphalia.

Let's move to where we began. Obviously the Austro-Hungarian, the Russian, and what used to be Turkey, were the great empires. In looking at the archeology, one of the first things that we can all realize is that we cannot return to the 19th century where we had a weak Turkey that was detached from Europe.

Reminding us of where we came from, this is the evolution of NATO. We have the original post-war alliance, the adaptation in 1952, the adaptation in 1954, Spain in 1982, the modern adaptations of Visegrad, and then what we call "the big bang" that brought us to Prague and basically gives us Europe where it is in 2003. It's been continuously evolving since we began in 1949. And now the twin events of Prague and Copenhagen set the stage for additional questions such as the Greater Middle East.

A couple of days after Havel talked about the notion of one final question, Brzezinski was talking about the idea of a third phase of European history. I just want to review what's been happening since 1989, and how we get to these third phase questions. We've been talking about memberships since the beginning - the re-unification of Germany, Visegrad, Vilnius, and now the Adriatic Charter and potentially Ukraine. We've been arguing about the missions all the way along beginning with the strategic concepts in Bosnia and Kosovo and continuing all the way through Afghanistan and Iraq. Obviously, like any good marriage, you argue about money. We have been arguing about who pays for what all the way along. There are really only three big questions left. The burden sharing debate ends in the EU relationship; the missions debate has become the Greater Middle East, and the membership question obviously ends with the question of what is a completed Europe. One of the first fundamental differences between US thinking and European thinking is that we don't think there is a lot of time left. It's a general consensus in Washington that there is a limited amount of time and that's probably not the consensus when you talk to a Prodi or a Solana. So that's a fundamental axiom, whether there is a long period of time to adjust or a relatively shorter period.

This is the notion of the third phase of European history. The German unification, with 18 million, was a preambullar phase. The largest phase of Visegrad was 60 million; followed by Vilnius at 43 million. However, if you go around and ask, there are 170 million people that think that they're Europeans who currently aren't in all, or any, of the institutions that they would wish to

be. Also, these phases are different in kind. Throughout the Visegrad period, all these countries were European democracies that were coherent nation states. In the Vilnius period you still had issues such as problems in Romania and Bulgaria, so you had to do democratic transformation and integration. It was a two stroke process. And in the third phase, we are talking to states like Macedonia that don't know their name and like Georgia that don't know their borders. And there will be a huge debate as to whether or not they are European. That debate obviously began in Copenhagen. There is an increasing degree of complexity. If you think about what happened in Europe in the 19th century, it was the discovery of a nation state in Italy and Germany. And the great lesson of the 20th century was that you had to be a democracy, and then, obviously, the great project in the 21st century is European market and political integration. So all these countries have to do is accomplish in three years what their Western neighbors did in three hundred years; this is a pretty sporty proposition.

Looking forward, this is where we were in Prague and many people in the United States said we were completed, but there was no Adriatic system. The peace in Southeast Europe had not been won. There was no Black Sea security strategy, and frankly, there was no Mediterranean Dialogue. We are just now reaching the limits of our ability to integrate countries as we are talking about progressive engagements with Kiev and Moscow. One thing that you can already see happening is that this alliance no longer points north and east, it points southeast. It is already pivoting on its axis, and basically, there is a new change for Europe, increasingly looking across the Mediterranean and the Black Sea towards the Greater Middle East. If you analyse this, you find there are three projects left. The project of the Balkan peace, the project of the Black Sea security system, and the project of the classical border land. What I would like to do is just skim through these things and show you what's happening and basically suggest some things we might some day apply to the Middle East.

We begin with the Balkans and the project of permanent Balkan peace. Obviously we are not just building something, we also are trying to destroy something including a profoundly misunderstood experience of Serbian nationalism. We are also beginning to reject previous political models. Traditionally in the South, when in doubt you would annex Bosnia as the Austrians did in 1908. The other alternative was basically to begin to repar-

tion of the South and move the ethnic population around. The Vienna model is now what we call Dayton. The Ottoman Displacement Model or the Balkan war models is what we call Kosovo final status. However, none of these models worked during the last 100 years; they served to further repress the Balkan people and did not resolve the central contradictions. So basically what is happening instead is that new models are being built. And let's just take a look at them.

This is a kindergarten of democracy that was created in this multiethnic community in the western Balkans; since 1995 all of our institutions have been engaged there in some manner. These are the Adriatic Charter countries, EU transitional force, international protectorates, and Belgrade. It is actually very interesting that all the Euro-Atlantic institutions, not just NATO, are playing a role in the western Balkans. This may actually be a model for how we use our institutions to create kindergartens for democracy and to keep pursuing complementary objectives. Moreover, they are actually building new institutions inside their country – this is a Catholic Croatia, this is an Orthodox Macedonia, and this is a secular and Islamic Albania. This is the first time I can think of that three different creeds and ethnicities have basically built a conjoined security system to pursue common political objectives. I can't think of an organization in European history that has this characteristic. This actually looks like something new. So models that basically respond to the kinds of challenges we may encounter as we move towards problems in the Greater Middle East may be already developing.

This is actually a summary of where they are today – these are NATO allies, these are Adriatic Charter countries, and these are basically countries in pre-accession. Moldova is trying to cross over into a stability pact, and the Adriatic Charter wishes to expand to include Sarajevo and Belgrade. Croatia, Romania and Bulgaria are in some near phase of integration into the European Union. This is a very good sign.

Frankly, this is what the Baltic region looked like as recently as in 1998, and this is almost 5 years behind where the Baltics and Nordics are today. This is the kind of thing you would expect to see in a stabilizing regional security system. I don't think it was by accident that at lunch Havel mentioned the importance of regionality as we think forward. Obviously, in this region the next step is to bring Belgrade and Sarajevo into the system.

Looking outward and closer than to the Middle East, this is the question, can the Black Sea become a second Mediterranean system with shared securi-

ty and cross-border cooperation like the original? This, as you can see, is the largest extent of the former Ottoman Empire. Everything we talk about today, whether it's European energy security, the reconstruction of Iraq, the Middle East peace, the Western Balkans, or where is the source of new threats, emanates from this part of the world and deals with this area. We don't talk about the GIUK gap anymore. This is not mentioned. So clearly the attention of Europe is already preoccupied with this part of the world in a rather profound way.

This is a CIA map of projected and existing oil and gas pipe lines. Also, this is the route of sexual trafficking, narcotics, illegal immigration, terror, and proliferation. Whatever you think the threat to Europe is, you want to control the Black Sea. Name your poison; make sure you handle this. However, this is not just a source of dangers, it is a source of great possibilities for both Europe and the Middle East. This region gives us a vehicle to engage Russia in a meaningful role in energy trade with Europe. Also, it secures the energy supplies that Europe will need for going forward. Today Europe imports 50 % of its energy, and in 2020 it will import 70 %. However, perhaps, more importantly, by stabilizing this region we basically set up a mature relationship with Russia and lift up the people who were left behind in 1989.

This is actually a Shevardnadze chart of the Silk Road, but it also reminds you that the Black Sea has traditionally been key to this region. This used to be a route of silk and spice, and potentially it is also the route of democracy.

This chart, of roughly the northernmost expansion of the Ottoman Empire, basically talks about some of the issues that we will confront. This chart shows the southernmost extension of the Russian empire. Every single conflict to the OSCE runs along that place and then lies to the northwest of the Black Sea. This is essentially the critical fault line in our civilization and the interface between the Euro-Atlantic system and the Greater Middle East system. This fault line holds the key both to the democratization of Russia and the Middle East. This is where we should concentrate our efforts.

The big obstacle in our way is obviously in Nagorno Karabakh, which incidentally, as I recall, is a confrontation between two creeds. So basically the Caucasus holds the key to Europe's third Russian policy. The argument being in 1997, we had the NATO founding act, and in 2002, we had the NATO-Russia council. The question is what are we going to do with Russia in 2007 or 2008? Is

there something we can do for the stability of the South and basically bring in economic rather than just security interests to this region? And finally, we have the beginning of the greater Europe's engagement with the Greater Middle East.

Today, the Caucasus region is not nearly as advanced as the Balkans. Recently, we were doing relatively well in the Pankisi Gorge. We have not gone back to Nagorno Karabakh. There is no such thing as regional cooperation. The border between Turkey and Armenia is still closed, and we really haven't engaged the Russians on Chechnya. Obviously, we do not have a policy, and if we don't have a policy, that's what we are going to get. Basically, what we learned in the Balkans is that if we don't stop them early on, sooner or later you get to Srebrenica. That won't stop unless we find a way to manage this.

I'll only show you a little bit about the Borderland issue because it is actually further away from the Greater Middle East. However, it does show us a couple of things that are relevant. First, there is a structure. When President Bush says: "from the Baltic to the Black Sea," he has things just about right; although, the standard structure, running parallel to the "fault line," goes from the Baltic to the Caspian. These are basically the reasons we would want to tie northern Europe to the Black Sea and southern Europe. The EU is talking about the concept of preemptive engagement, and this is one place where you can see what preemptive engagement means. There are three big areas in the north to work on. The first, is tying Moldova into a stability pact. Second, we need to recognize that Kiev and the northern Black Sea are also part of the security solution because they tie Europe to Moscow and basically allow us dialog to the Caucasus. Obviously having a dictator separating northern Europe and Moscow is a huge moral and strategic mistake. Now adding up what all this means and seeing it in the completion of Europe does help us understand what's possible in the Greater Middle East.

Let's just look what's happening around Europe. NATO is basically looking towards expansion: first in Istanbul and then in the next summit in 2006. The EU is going through its intergovernmental conference and planning its next big decisions for 2007. The Adriatic group is pretty well organized and is focusing on a regional security solution as early as 2006. The central Balkans are trying to catch up with them and will try, as early as Istanbul, to move into the Partnership for Peace and Membership Action Plan. Turkey is obviously completely focused on the EU and will use the Istanbul Summit

and other campaigning mechanisms to be there as early as 2007. Ukraine is trying to find the place to get started and will probably try to go for the Membership Action Plan. There is basically a thirty-six month period before any of our institutions will make profound adjustments. Obviously there is a major project going on in the South and in the East, and Turkey is part of both of these projects. This basically summarizes where most of the 170 million people are.

This is just so I can show you how we're talking to these groups. There are groups of EU candidates largely in the eastern Balkans that are focused on 2007. There are the victims of war in the western Balkans that are focused on 2006, and the victims of forgetfulness on the far side of the Black Sea that are just trying to get noticed. Finally, there are the victims of themselves right on the borders of Europe that are basically trying to find a place.

Looking at these big strategic concepts, this is the argument as a completion of Europe, which is expressed as a core EU Europe. We define that by saying every country in that group is in every institution it wishes to be. Countries such as Sweden that are not in an institution like NATO are not members by choice.

These are the 170 million people that wish to be closer to the European institutions. This is what we are calling the Greater Europe. We would argue that the Greater Europe is not only morally but also strategically preferable. One, it allows you to finally dissolve the ambiguities with Russia and set up a mature and more modern relationship. Second, if you were to be serious about the Greater Middle East, this Greater Europe has a far better chance of succeeding. As you can see, the Greater Europe touches the Greater Middle East all the way from Morocco to the far side of Iran. So basically the argument is that the Greater Europe sets the stage for two great endeavors of 21st century democracy, which are the full integration of a democratic Russia and Euro-Atlantic community and beginning of democratization and revitalization of the Greater Middle East. If you think these are worthy projects, this might be how to do it.

If you were to do this, the capitals of Ankara, Belgrade, and Kiev are key; without them the Euro-Atlantic Community will be less prosperous, smaller, less generous, and far less capable of dealing with the challenges that should be posed in the policies on the Greater Middle East. Also, this is an argument that the economic use; many of the conditions that exist for successful demo-

cratic transition are on the immediate borders of Europe. Croatia, Romania, and Bulgaria have this characteristic, and of the nine countries in the world that fit this country eight of them are on the border separating the core of Europe from the Greater Middle East. So if you wish to radiate freedom and prosperity outward, you should exploit these favorable characteristics that are meeting you at the doorsteps.

Interestingly, if we actually go to the EU and say: "How do you see the world?," you'll get something that looks very similar. This is what the newspapers call the core EU Europe, and it is almost identical. To get their picture, they add current and future EU states, which gets you to twenty-five plus three. Interestingly enough, Turkey is in there but Croatia is not. So Turkey is in a more advanced and conclusive category, at least in the new neighbor concept. Instead of the Greater Europe model, they follow the EU's new neighborhood, which is quite comprehensive. It's actually seventeen plus one, the one being Gaza and the West Bank. However, it leaves out the three Caucasus, which seems to be a huge oversight, and I expect that they will reverse it between now and the middle of next year (2004). Theirs is quite a progressive version, and the shocking thing is that it is very similar to the ideas in Washington.

Here are the conclusions of all of this. There are two competing visions of the future of Europe. There is a core Europe that moves more slowly, and a larger, completed Europe that is to be established more quickly. Obviously, because of our axiom, we believe that this revolutionary period matters. We believe that the decisions we will be taking in the next forty-six months will not only effect these 170 million people we discussed, but also the strategic and moral perimeter of the Euro-Atlantic community. This is where all will be decided. We have to be honest with ourselves; people haven't actually had successful policies in the Balkans, the Caucasus, and Ukraine in European history. The argument, however, is if you were to do this, the huge pay off would be a successful and final reconciliation with Russia, which would set the stage for change across the Greater Middle East. Said in another way, without the Greater Europe, you really can't hope for the Greater Middle East. The completed Europe is the prerequisite for transformation beyond Europe. The conclusion is that where Europe finds itself five years from now will be where Europe stands for the next fifty years, and in our view, these are the frontiers of freedom.

Jiří Schneider

I think that was a proper after-lunch catalyst of our discussion; it not only bridged the first two panels, but also it enlarged our perspectives on our topic.

Before introducing our next panel member, I would like to remark that there are still people who like grand designs and big perspectives. Also, paradigms do matter. Now, we have a good example of a clear-cut paradigm, Washington's paradigm of the current world. We also have a sense of momentum, which was, I think, the bottom line of the presentation. Our time is limited, and we have to do something now, before the momentum dissipates. We do not have luxury to address only the frontiers of Europe and all that they entail and then focus on the Middle East, we have to do both simultaneously. And that makes our challenge even greater.

Before going any further, I should introduce myself. My name is Jiří Schneider, I am co-author of the paper which is the basis of today's discussion, and I have the privilege to introduce several speakers. The following panel is composed similarly to the morning's panel, but it is different, as you will see.

Our first speaker is Günther Altenburg, who is Assistant Secretary General for Political Affairs and Security Policy at NATO. And he has remarkable record, including work with the UN. He also has some Middle Eastern experience. I am not sure in which capacity he is going to speak whether as a NATO representative, or as a German reacting to some voices from the first panel.

Günther Altenburg

I will start by saying that the Iraq War may not have yet generated a new political dynamic in the Middle East, but it certainly has spiked a new debate about the future of transatlantic cooperation in the Greater Middle East. The debate has only just begun, and those who are sitting on the panel don't have a monopoly on intelligence. There are a lot people here that I'm looking forward to hearing during the discussion. I'm going to speak as a NATO bureaucrat, and as a NATO bureaucrat, I have to say I am pretty scared about these new perspectives that are, for us, uncharted waters. Nevertheless, this is a per-

fect time for reflection. As someone who has been working in what you could term “the Smaller Middle East,” and in particular as a NATO bureaucrat, I will try to sharpen our focus. And will start out with several caveats.

First of all the definitions. The term “the Greater Middle East” is problematic in itself. Some have applied it rather liberally to the region encompassing the whole Mediterranean area as well as Afghanistan. Such definitions appear to me as too casual. The risk is not only that you imply that one size fits all when approaching different conflicts, but also, partially in reference to this morning’s conversation, you are running the risk of lumping all these Arab and Islamic countries into one big group and into a new north-south conflict with all those in the south under suspicion of being terrorists. Our definition needs to be very specific. It is clear that the problems and conflicts in Afghanistan are different from those in Iraq, and these are different from what is going on between the Israelis and the Palestinians, and this is again different from what is going on in the Western Sahara. My point is that if we want to reach solutions, we need to be specific.

I would like to make a note about what NATO has to do in all of this. Yes, NATO is a community of values, but this does not mean that it is a tool in a kind of a war of civilizations; to replace Communism with Islam. NATO looks at issues in military terms, and when speaking about military terms, you look at operations. Furthermore, when you speak about operations, you look at concrete geographical theatres where there are problems. In these terms, you inevitably have to deal with the sources of the conflict, and you need to find a solution to these conflicts in those respective theatres. The question is: “Do we have a solution to the problems?” In other words – in terms of the peace support operations that NATO is currently participating in – before you can have peace support operations, you must have a peace to support. That is very easy, we have Dayton, and we have the Petersburg agreement for Afghanistan, so there is a way here.

I would also offer another word of caution with respect to the role of NATO and terrorism and WMD. As mentioned this morning, we have a military concept to combat terrorism. NATO is not the world’s primary terrorist hunter. What I mean is that we need to take a much broader look at this. We have a lot of other national, international, and multilateral institutions that have to come in here. The same thing is true with respect to WMD and their means of delivery, we are sharpening the tools that we already have in order to protect against

this. However, if we are talking about proliferation, we need the whole range of interlocking institutions cooperating on an international level.

My second point deals with rationale; the notion of NATO in the Greater Middle East contains a discernable element of transatlantic damage control. I think that was also a little bit of the intent of all of this. In other words, the need for a NATO role is acknowledged, first and foremost, as a means to bring Europe and America back together after Iraq. However, is getting us into the Greater Middle East really a recipe for restoring transatlantic harmony? To put it bluntly if the transatlantic marriage is failing, will it really help to have a new baby?

My next point is the players. Thus far, the debate has largely focused on NATO alone, but it is clear if we are looking at the areas mentioned in the previous presentation, other players need to come into the picture. NATO certainly has to play a substantial role in the Greater Middle East in terms of security, but this situation requires a broader political and economic approach. It is essential to get groups like the EU, which has money, into the game. Also, Karel Kovanda asked, what can the Arab countries do for their neighbors and for NATO? Those that have money can contribute financially. Last, but not least, the United Nations should be involved. Above all else, these groups have to sing from the same song sheet.

My fourth and the most important point, however, is timelines. Anyone who is to seriously deal with peace support operations in the Middle East must be clear about the following. Let's take the Israeli-Palestinian issue as an example. This is a long-term, if not a lifetime job. We need to be clear about that. At this point, NATO forces are already reaching the point of overstretch. Missions in the Balkans are going to go on; Afghanistan is going to go on, and now we are supporting the Polish division in Iraq, which is already proving to be quite difficult, so we need to consider our options and the level of ambition. As a bureaucrat, I believe that we need to be careful. Now, with these caveats in mind, where are we heading?

First, we need to make Afghanistan a success. The extension of ISAF beyond Kabul is the next crucial step; however, as everybody in this room is aware, the allies have not yet implemented their troop commitments with respect to the operation in Kabul itself. We need to be clear about this. The failure in Afghanistan would mean the end of further and more ambitious thinking about the Greater Middle East before we have even begun doing anything. Again, with respect to Afghanistan, we cannot afford to fail.

Second, we must make up our mind about the future of the Mediterranean Dialogue. As Karel Kovanda has already said in his own way, for too long this dialogue has been a sort of a step-child of NATO. For too long neither allies nor dialogue partners seem to agree on what this dialogue should really be about. We could incorporate elements of the Partnership for Peace into the dialogue, which could give the dialogue the substance to support a broader NATO approach to the region.

Third, we need a closer NATO–EU relationship. Stability for the Greater Middle East requires both hard and soft security; NATO has much of the former and the EU has much of the latter. And this fact alone suggests close coordination, but there are other reasons as well.

Fourth, before we endow NATO with even more difficult jobs, we must first find a new transatlantic understanding on the importance we attach to this organization, and its role in the future. Throughout the Iraq crisis NATO was seriously underutilized as a consultative framework. Only if both sides of the Atlantic come to appreciate again the centrality of this organization can we confidently debate the widening of NATO's reality.

Fifth, and last, we need a much broader transatlantic debate on new threats. Much of the transatlantic disagreement over Iraq was the result of diverging threat perception. In the approach to the problems of the Greater Middle East, without having achieved a broader transatlantic agreement, things will not work. We would simply project our disagreements onto an even bigger canvas.

Jiří Schneider

Following our first, more visionary in scope, presentation, we are now anchored to reality thanks to the second presentation. Thank you, Mr. Altenburg, for briefing us on your pragmatic, bottom-up bureaucratic perspective.

The topic of this panel is peace management operations. It is not a nice road, but we should try to keep that in mind even without having mentioned any specific terms related to peace building. In any case, this panel should deal more with the practical possibilities of engagement.

The second speaker is Ron Asmus. He needs no introduction. Ten years ago, he wrote an article with Steve Larrabee that really opened the debate on

NATO enlargement. He also recently wrote an article on rebuilding NATO. I hope he will open another important debate, and that this debate will succeed as well as the first one did.

Ron Asmus

First, let me just say congratulations to you for holding this conference. It is fair to say that this is the first major conference on this issue in Europe, and the fact that it is taking place in Prague and not in another European capital is a testimony to your vision and leadership.

We are here today discussing this issue due to a combination of good news and bad news. The good news is that in the 1990s we were successful in building a peaceful, democratic, and secure Europe after the great conflicts earlier in the 20th century. We Americans used to believe that Europe was the source of the greatest potential threat to America, but those conflicts are gone, and for the first time in almost a century the American president no longer goes into the office worrying about the dangers of war in Europe.

On the other hand, the bad news is that September 11th has opened our eyes to a set of threats. While the threats were out there beforehand, the concept that if Europe was the potential source of the greatest conflict of the 20th century, that the Greater Middle East is the greatest source of potential conflict of the 21st century had not yet crystallized. This has led to a paradigm shift in the way Americans view the world as well as Europe. Some summarize it by saying that the threat of Washington's being hit by a weapon of mass destruction today by a terrorist group from the Greater Middle East is greater than the threat of Washington's being attacked by the Soviet Union during the Cold War. I think that's a true statement. As a consequence to that, with all due respect, if we are enemy number one, then Europe is enemy number two. Actually, perhaps, Israel is one, we are two, and Europe is three. Although this idea may not have sunken in yet, it is creeping in. Thus, we are debating whether we can reorganize America and Europe to face these new sets of threats. I don't disagree with Bruce and the ideas he presented; we need to focus on his issues as well. However, those issues are not going to produce threats that are going to kill Americans. I worry more about the Greater Middle East because if you ask me where my countrymen are most likely to put their

PANEL II: THE ROLE OF NATO IN PEACE-MANAGEMENT OPERATIONS IN THE GME

lives at risk, it is going to be in the Greater Middle East. So the question we are facing is: "Can we organize ourselves as Americans and Europeans to face this challenge?"

This is not the first time we have faced this question; we also faced it at the end of the Cold War. I am sure you all remember twelve years ago when a good many Americans said NATO's job is over, pack up, go home, and declare victory and that the collapse of communism was the fulfillment of our mission. A very small group of people, including a number of Czechs we've heard speak today, said: "Wait a second, that wasn't what that was all about, this was about building a continent whole and free so that Europe would never again go to war. Your job isn't done and won't be done until the eastern half of the continent is as secure as the western half of the continent." A number of Americans came along and said: "You're right." In the past when I pushed for NATO enlargement, intervening in the Balkans, NATO-Russia cooperation, and NATO out of area operations, I was told that I was crazy and would ruin my career by advocating such things, but look where we are today. It has only been in the past year and a half that people in Washington, including myself, have been calling for the Great Middle East to be the next transatlantic project. Again, people said, you are crazy; this will never happen. Today, I would have a hard time explaining why I don't completely agree with the National Security Advisor to the President of the United States. When the President of the United States speaks you can see the same views that a number of us have been advocating. We are winning the intellectual battle in the United States. Others agree that if this great Alliance is going to have a purpose and deal with the most immediate, direct, and permanent threats to its members, it has to tackle the problems of the Greater Middle East. Even in Europe, where a year ago we would have been hard pressed to fill this room with people who agree with this thesis, today people come up to me and say: "Okay, basically you are right."

How do we do this? How do you take this big idea and break it down into bite-size pieces so you don't overwhelm my friend Günther Altenburg? How do we give him an agenda he can start to work with? If we recognize the problem, do we necessarily have an answer to the question of how? The answer is no, or at least not yet. You don't need to be a genius to understand the list of problems. If we put any group of smart people into a room and asked them to list the problems, they could do that. Their list would be get Iraq right, the Middle East peace

process, Iran – potentially the greatest danger as well as the country that potentially could change in the right direction – Afghanistan, Northern Africa, Egypt, Saudi Arabia. They would also talk about some new regional security structure for the region like Prince Hassan suggested. A while ago, I was at the American Enterprise Institute sitting in the back row listening to a meeting with the Iraqi opposition. Someone suggested imagining a world in which we succeed in building this quasi-democratic, pro-western Iraq. Basically, this Iraq is trying to be like Turkey. And so, what is the one thing Turkey has that this fragile democracy in a bad neighborhood, surrounded by predatory states with only one democracy, Israel, who is not going help, does not? It doesn't have an anchor like. The Turks have NATO, they have an EU perspective, and this Iraq would have nothing. Everyone looked at me and said don't you dare start advocating Iraqi membership in NATO. I said: "No, I won't." But the point was this: you need to create an anchor for the countries in this region. If we succeed in helping them to change, they can lock on to, and build something bigger and better.

So, how do we take that big agenda and start moving forward? We have a NATO summit in eight months. What would be a bold but still realistic agenda? We could aim towards setting a new course. I would say first the summit has to be a reconciliation summit. We are never going to be able to tackle problems unless we have a greater degree of political cohesion with regards to what we are about. Second, I think we need a political statement. Some people are saying we need to rewrite NATO's strategic concept, and other people are saying we need a new Harmel Report. I think we should be more modest and say we need a political statement recognizing that the great tanker of NATO is shifting course and that we recognize that is the GME part of the world and that sorting out its problems has to be one of our top priorities. We can follow that up with the appropriate documents later; anyone who has been in NATO knows sometimes you change the reality first and then you update the theories. Third, if it is true that getting Iraq right is so crucial and if the European leaders are right when they say that the success of Iraq is as important to them as it is for us, then it has to be true that NATO should have a role in Iraq. And I think that role should be NATO support for one of the sectors and eventually taking over one of the sectors.

We have not come far enough, and if we set out the goal of moving forward, Istanbul could be an important step. What about the missile defense theater? What do we do with these new threats? Sometimes we talk about the

Harmel Report and the sort of mythological success we had because we came up with the grand strategy, not only to defend ourselves against the Soviet Union, but to beat it politically, to transform it. Again, we need this combination of defense, transatlantic security, missile defense, and an offense by way of political strategy. We know that NATO has a NATO response for us. If you were in Washington today, participating in this debate, you would hear people talking about a Partnership for Peace or the functional equivalent thereof for the Arab world. This is something we should think about.

Regarding Iran: I'm willing to bet today that Iran is going to be a major issue by the time we hit the Istanbul Summit. We need to be talking and have something to say about it. As for the whole issue of WMD, we tried to make weapons of mass destruction the major focal point of the Washington Summit in 1999, and we need to come back to it. However, as many of you would agree, NATO is not going to win that battle. Our basic political message should be based on transforming the Greater Middle East into a different set of societies that doesn't produce people who want to kill us and have the capacity to do that. NATO has a role in working to contain WMD, but the idea of political transformation is going to be as critical to winning the larger battle as it was to winning the Cold War. We need to send a message that the West is shifting course and is putting its soft and hard power into a strategy to help change the region for the better.

Can we do it? Even I have to admit that sometimes my wife looks at me and says: "Couldn't you pick a slightly easier project?" This is a really hard project, but the reality is that I don't think we have much choice. And when we ask whether the level of ambition isn't too great, I ask the following questions. What are the real problems that we are going to confront? If we don't confront these what's going to happen? I was in the White House recently talking to a colleague of mine and he said to me: "Look, the reality is that Americans and Europeans are going to end up on the ground of the Greater Middle East because the problems of the region are going to pull us in." That's already pretty obvious. The only question that's open is: "Are we going to be capable of getting our act together in advance in order to have a common framework and strategy, in which case we will have a greater chance of succeeding, or are we going to be pulled in willy-nilly, crisis by crisis, making it up on an ad-hoc basis?" That's the choice we face. Not whether or not we get involved, but how we get involved. And it's really a test of our leadership on both sides as to

whether or not we are up to this challenge. Imagine if the Truman generation came back and joined us at this conference. What would they be advising us to do? Would they be saying, “No, this is a little bit too hard; you might fail; be cautious.” No, that’s not how that generation created NATO. They didn’t have a common view of the Soviet Union when they created NATO, but they knew they needed one. And they ordered the smartest people into the room and said, “don’t you dare come out until you start to lay a foundation for a common strategy across the Atlantic to deal with this problem.” And frankly at the end of the day, if we were in Las Vegas and Ishak looked at me and said, “Ron, put your money on the table. Do you think we are able to do this?” I would have to say that I am not sure, but I know we have to try to do it. If we wait to have this conversation a year from now, and we have another major terrorist that further destabilizes the region, we are all going to look back and wish that we had acted earlier and were more ambitious rather than less ambitious. So I am going to fight for the ambitious route.

Jiří Schneider

Thank you Ron, you made a long list of ambitious tasks, but you were concrete and that is appreciated. Next speaker is from Paris, Marc Perrin de Brichambaut; we will have a chance to hear another strategic voice from Paris. Mark has a remarkable record in multilateral diplomacy and strategic thinking and a long record of thinking about transatlantic relations, so it is our pleasure to have him here.

Marc Perrin de Brichambaut

Let me start by saying I am squarely on the side of Ron’s wife. Through her questions, he has already expressed the questions I have on my mind. Nevertheless, it is fascinating to have just now heard two members of the winning team. Five years ago both Bruce and Ron began the project of convincing the administration and the US Senate that a broad enlargement of NATO was the right answer. They were brilliantly successful, so they should be praised for that. Indeed, they should be thanked for coming out with a new challenge

in view of the threats which our countries are addressing, many of which come from the Greater Middle East. Is this the time to have a new grand strategy, and at the same time, is NATO the right body to implement it? It is a central question, and it is good to have a discussion about it in Prague. Günther Altenburg has already mentioned many of the questions that are on the minds of NATO members, and since France is usually one of its most demanding stepmothers, I am grateful to him for having taken that line. In taking up all the arguments, we have to have a spectral analysis of what we expect from NATO in confronting the threats emanating from the Greater Middle East, which have been identified with great talent this morning.

NATO is first a military alliance in charge of the territorial defense of its members. And in view of what is happening in the Greater Middle East, there is at least one member who is directly on the frontlines, Turkey. There is another set of members who are pretty close and directly affected in many ways: the Mediterranean members of NATO. And, there is a new set of members who are particularly keen on territorial defense because they have had some rather recent experience in this area: the Central and Eastern European countries. The new European countries loved the old Alliance, the one that insured physical security. Now, if these territorial threats come at the alliance quickly, this will be very high on its list of concerns. Indeed, the Iranian issue has been raised. If the Iranians are not persuaded to stop their ballistic missile and other weapons programs, they will become a direct threat to a significant number of NATO countries, forcing all of us to look very squarely at the issue of ballistic missile defense – an issue which NATO has been very slow to address. Russia is equally concerned about this threat, but we don't speak very much about the Russians here. They are also concerned by the threats emanating from the Greater Middle East, and are not the only ones to utilize them for their own ends. In terms of territorial defense, NATO will have to address those threats whether it has already recognized them or not as they will be imposed on it very quickly.

The second function of NATO, which is a success story of the last decade, is providing military force to help stabilize and reconstruct countries. This is a job that NATO has been doing in the Balkans and is just taking up in Afghanistan. In fact, NATO only went to war in Kosovo; the rest of its history of military involvement is in this business of providing a framework for its members to ensure stability with, as Günther reminded us, a UN mandate, and

a very clear requirement for a majority of NATO members, which are keen to have the deployment of their forces involved within a framework which puts them at ease within their democratic and legal traditions. There is, of course, as the support for the Polish contingent reminds us, no shortage of likely challenges in the Middle East where there will be a need to deploy reconstruction forces and where it would be useful to have NATO provide a framework of support. In fact, NATO is in the process of becoming a sort of stabilization management agency. This is a perfectly respectable job that it does very well. It will probably not become a crises management agency, and I will come back to that. This means that NATO could possibly be called on to get involved in a bigger way in Iraq. Other members have mentioned the idea of NATO being called upon at some stage to provide a framework for forces involved in the stabilization of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

There is one thing we have so far ignored at this conference. NATO members, as individual countries, are already greatly involved in the Greater Middle East. Since the first Gulf War, they have ensured the strategic stability in the Gulf region. They intervened against Saddam Hussein, and through the bigger countries, they have direct links with the key oil producing countries in the Gulf. Regardless of whether we want it or not, NATO is involved in the balance of power, in helping to maintain the stability of the Gulf region, and in ensuring that neither Iran nor a resurgent Iraq is a threat to the major oil reserves in the world. And this is, of course, the source of permanent tension for many NATO members. There is not only the state of Israel in the Middle East, but there is also plenty of oil, and the requirements of ensuring the security of those two entities sometimes do conflict.

Which leads me to the third function of NATO: NATO is also a political alliance. It is a place where partners meet, debate, and try to find common ground for action. It is a continuous, living place for transatlantic exchange and togetherness. Of course, the recent record in this area is not terribly encouraging because on both sides there have been actions which have led to the question whether or not NATO is still relevant. We have already heard in great detail about whether NATO is relevant to the US in the post 9/11 world and on the Iraq issue, so I won't go into that. Now, we are hearing questions coming from the US as to whether or not NATO is relevant to the EU when it sets up its own institutions. NATO Secretary General complained to several EU defense ministers, some of which happen to be members of NATO, that the

EU is not respecting NATO. One of them reacted by saying that perhaps NATO was not respecting the EU. This sort of exchange is not the most felicitous, and indeed one may wonder whether the Greater Middle East is a very promising topic for NATO political debate. There has already been one interesting crisis in which two NATO members, with the State of Israel, led a preemptive attack on an Arab country in order to change the regime because a guy in charge was doing things that were disturbing. It didn't turn out very well because key NATO members said, "Will you please stop? If you don't stop, we may use a pretty big stick on you." This was the Suez crisis. So NATO and the Greater Middle East are not entirely new to each other, and we have just gone through a number of fairly unpromising sequences of political events in regard to that area. NATO members have spent seven or eight years drifting apart on the Iraq issue, which is still far from being resolved. Also, there is an increasingly different chemistry, which is very much reflected in the polls, among NATO members regarding the Israeli-Palestinian relationship. Clearly, the sensitivity is not the same in the US as it is for some of its European partners. We've just heard that the Mediterranean Dialogue, although worthy, is not the greatest success story. So is it a wise choice to ask Europe and the US to be partners in a great new plan under a NATO framework? If it is not a NATO framework, what part can NATO play in a broader framework, which involves other institutions? I think this is the question we are trying to address.

The EU clearly has the tools for soft power. It has money, the commercial elements, the physical contact with immigrant populations – which is a very important part of national thinking – and the prospect of including one member of the region, Turkey, which is going to change its way of looking at its dynamic. Therefore, it is a full partner in this, and it is also in the process of putting together its strategic perspective in a broad way that is very relevant to what is coming out of the region. The second Solana Paper includes weapons of mass destruction, terrorism, and the need for a mix of soft and hard power to deal with them. This is an ongoing project.

The second question of course is, "Is the United States really willing to entrust to NATO its own Greater Middle East strategy, or is it willing to share it with the EU?" That's a big question, and I do not entirely take Ron's word that the answer will be yes. The good thing about the new liberals is that they pay more attention to working with Europeans and the neo-conservatives, but that does not mean that it will be easier or that the neo-liberals will be willing to

make more concessions to the European view of things or European sensitivities in order to reach a real common strategy. During Bruce Jackson's presentation I was struck that he is not lobbying the US Senate anymore, he is lobbying the European Council. Good luck to you. I hope they will listen to you; in many ways they are an even tougher body to convince.

To conclude, a practical guide for what we need to do – prioritize, take problems as we can address them, recognize that the modernization of the Middle East is a very complicated process and that the forces at work, Arab nationalism, Arab radicalism, and various strands of Islamic fundamentalism, are very tough, much tougher than the countries of Eastern Europe which were coming back to democracy after a pause. Unfortunately, we will muddle through, we will not come through it with a big plan, but let's keep trying.

Jiří Schneider

I thought it was nice that you were the first to mention the Suez incident. I was surprised that it hadn't come up yet.

The next speaker has been a prominent a member of the Israeli journalism community for the past fifty years. His focus has been on security. It is my pleasure to introduce Mr. Ze'ev Schiff, who can offer us his own view of the big picture.

Ze'ev Schiff

NATO peace management operations is not an easy topic to discuss, but I have some experience here, and have two points that I would like to make.

As the first speaker already referred to this, my first point which will be the shorter one, and has to do with the question of the borderlines of the Greater Middle East. What does the term "the Greater Middle East" mean? What is the difference between the Middle East and the Greater Middle East? Is Pakistan in the region; is Pakistan in the Greater Middle East? I understand that NATO is looking for new missions and that it's quite easy to look in the direction of the Middle East for several reasons. First, it is very close to Europe, only a two or three hours flight away. Second, the conflicts there attract a lot

of attention. I fully agree that an unstable Middle East might endanger not just NATO but also Europe and that a spillover of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict or the spread of WMD might endanger the world beyond Europe. I fully agree that there are problems here, and I would even say it is an over simplification of these problems to start defining the Middle East with even more simple words such as the Greater Middle East.

My first point is that the problem is not a territorial problem. The best example here is North Korea, not Pakistan. The proliferation of missiles and other weapons is not just an issue for South Korea, China, Japan, and Russia in the Far East. If the international community is slow in dealing with North Korea, the Middle East and Israel will be affected. While we are discussing the question of how to provide food to North Korea, the North Koreans sell not only missiles, but also nuclear know-how. So it is not just a territorial issue, it is an international terror issue. Terror is not just a suicide bombing in Tel-Aviv or in Jerusalem; it is international problem whether in Afghanistan, Pakistan, or Bali. If you want to fight Al-Qaeda, the answer is not just a question of talking to the Palestinians, it is much broader. It is a real problem when you are saying NATO and the GME; you have to take a different approach here that recognizes that this is a global issue. It is NATO and a number of global problems that the Middle East is facing immediately; tomorrow, unfortunately, they may be facing even more.

Now my second point relates to the peace management operations. Let me tell you, we, meaning Israel and its Arab neighbors, have a lot of experience with this issue. We already have international involvement in this area in several ways. Looking back to the beginnings of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and the establishment of the state of Israel, we had at least seven international forces or groups of observers, two of whom were involved from the beginning of the conflict in 1948 and 1949. They are still there, and they are still not sure what they should do. There are a few observers from the UN sitting in Sinai and Egypt, and I don't know why they get their salaries. We had UN international forces in 1956 and 1957. We had UNDOF between Israel and Syria and UNIFIL in Lebanon. We also had international forces there which were not sent by the UN. On the contrary, in one case, the UN was against sending in an international force after the peace agreement between Israel and Egypt.

To draw lessons from our prior experience in the Middle East in order to have more effective peace management operations in the future, you also have to ask what the reasons were for these forces to withdraw or to fail – and most

of them did actually fail. Some of them were even expelled; let me remind you that the US, England, France, and Italy were pushed out of Beirut in 1983. Also, one day the French suddenly withdrew two battalions from UNIFIL because two soldiers were killed and these were either NATO or American soldiers. Finally, there was UNIFIL, which, despite its force of five to six thousand people, couldn't even lift a finger to stop the terror or the shelling in the war of 1982.

Now to conclude this sad history, I have a few suggestions to make for future peacekeeping operations. First, there is no chance for an international force to succeed if both sides of the conflict will not agree to the deployment of an international force beforehand. Also, both sides need to see a purpose in having an international force present in order to at least lessen the conflict. We don't need them for crisis management or even necessarily for keeping peace agreements. For example, there is no peace between Syria and Israel, but the situation in the Golan Heights remains quiet because both sides have a mutual interest in keeping things quiet. This is a good example of why UNIFIL is not a good example. Second, an international force cannot succeed in a place where you have too many groups involved. In Lebanon we had the Lebanese government, Hezbollah, the Syrian Army, the Israeli Army, and the Revolutionary Guards from Iran. The same problems will happen between the Israelis and Palestinians if the PA entity is sent in; at the same time, the PA would say we cannot fight Hamas, we cannot fight Islamic Jihadi, and so on – so too many groups means no chance for an international force from any entity, the UN, the EU, or NATO, to succeed. The Americans are very smart to understand this, and they haven't moved in.

To conclude, in the past, personally I was extremely against any international involvement. Now, I have a strong feeling that we will have real difficulties solving our problems without international assistance. We do not need intervention; we need assistance. If NATO were to jump in, it would have to be very careful not to become part of the problem but instead a part of the solution.

Jiří Schneider

Thank you very much, Mr. Schiff, for presenting us with the complexity of the situation and for cooling our enthusiasm to seek a new mission for

NATO a little bit. We have two views here. One is that NATO is seeking a new mission in order to save itself, which is not true. The opposite might be true. There are some urgent challenges that we have to face with or without NATO. In any case, we should be aware of the complexity of any kind of involvement in this area. For this reason it is healthy to present Israeli skepticism regarding any international involvement here.

Now, the last speaker is the Deputy Prime Minister of the Czech Republic, Mr. Mareš. Mr. Mareš is an academician turned politician and the head of one of the coalition parties of the Czech government. We are proud to have a representative of the Czech government here, although I am not sure in which capacity he is going to speak. We saw many nice maps in Bruce Jackson's presentation maybe you noticed that the Czech Republic is located somewhat inland in all of these maps. It might be tempting for a country like this not to look beyond its borders and to maintain an illusion of security. It will be very useful for us to hear the views of a member of the government of a country in this position, the second Luxembourg of Europe so to speak.

Petr Mareš

I have to start with saying that I am speaking for myself and not for the Czech government. I don't think anybody in this room expected Israel to speak with enthusiasm about international involvement in the conflicts. Everybody knows that it is very difficult for Israel to even think about international involvement. Nevertheless, the fact that assistance is needed, is a key message for us. As is typical for the issue that we are dealing with at this conference, we have a long list of questions. I am afraid, though, that there are more questions than answers. We can, however, put these questions into three crucial groups, and I will try to comment on them from the Prague view.

The first question is whether there is any role for NATO in the Greater Middle East, and my answer to this question is yes, there is. If not for any other reason, I believe this because of the fact that NATO is the most experienced, most sufficient, and most powerful international organization prepared, at least to some extent, to deal with such problems. We, the Czechs, have never considered NATO to be a defense oriented organization only. We also very

much appreciate NATO's other roles, as mentioned earlier, including the stabilization roles and the political mission of NATO: in other words, NATO's democratization role, with which we, along with Spain, Portugal, and Turkey, have some experience. All three roles of NATO can be applied in the region we are discussing now.

So yes, there is a role for NATO, but is NATO prepared to play this role? My answer is, "I don't know." I answer this way not because of the situation in the Greater Middle East, but because of the situation inside NATO. The EU-NATO relationship has been touched on many times in previous contributions, and this is the key to this problem. I am afraid that NATO and the EU are still tempted to play good cop, bad cop. It's a good approach in certain situations, but it's not a good approach if the good cop is trying to win over the subject of the investigation. It is my feeling that in their approach to the Greater Middle East, Europeans and Americans, are, in many cases, trying to do just that. I must confess that the Europeans are trying to play this role more frequently than the Americans.

The third question is directly related to the second, "Does NATO want to play this role?" Again, my answer is, "I don't know." We, the Czechs, are already involved in the region, but we are not involved as NATO members. We participated in the Gulf War even before we became members of NATO. Many other countries did this as well. I am afraid we are not using the possibilities that NATO offers to us. I am not saying that we are not using it in its defense capacity, but we are not using it as a political alliance, a platform for discussion, coordination, decision making. Decisions about what we should do in the Greater Middle East are still being made in national capitals and not on the NATO level.

Only when NATO decides, "Yes, we want to play this role," we can achieve greater security of the North Atlantic area as well as greater stability and the future democratic development of the Middle East. I know that this challenge is enormous; we have heard about all the organizational, political and other difficulties that we now face. Nevertheless, after deciding that in future, NATO should not be purely focused on the physical defense of the North Atlantic area, the only logical next step is to be involved in this new challenge. We have to be involved as NATO, as a political alliance with one common language that is able to prepare a plan and behave according to that one plan.

Jiří Schneider

The presentations are over. Looking around at you, I think you really do deserve a coffee break. Please, keep your questions, comments and disagreements for the following discussion.

PANEL II: DISCUSSION

Jiří Schneider

As all those who want to participate are here, we will begin. I am not sure who asked to speak first, and because the right wing of the room seems less active, we will start on the left side and move right.

Shlomo Brom

In his presentation, Ron Asmus highlighted a key concept and that is the idea of having an anchor. He referred to Turkey and said that Turkey has an anchor through its membership in NATO. But I believe that Turkey has two anchors: NATO membership and the possibility of joining the European Union. Also, I had the opportunity, rare for an Israeli, to visit the Balkans and there I found two similar anchors. One of them is the presence of peace-keeping forces, most of them belonging to NATO. The other is the wish to join the EU, which unites everyone in the Balkans.

The problem in the Middle East is that we don't have any such anchors. And I envision the creation of two similar anchors. One of them is security guarantees by a third party of every real peace agreement in the Middle East. They can have different forms from bilateral agreements and multilateral agreements to peacekeeping forces, monitoring mechanisms and so on. There will be a need in any future agreement in the Middle East for similar security guarantees. In the past, the security guarantees were provided only by

America, and the classic example of that is the Israeli-Egyptian peace agreement. Due to the changing nature of NATO, it can play a similar role, along with both the US and Europe, in future agreements.

However, we also should think about a second anchor. The second anchor is not membership in the EU; I don't think it is feasible to integrate the Middle East in the EU. However, it could be a stronger economic relationship between the Middle East and Europe. The difference between the Middle East and Europe is that in Europe, the economic inter-relationships were the basis for the unification of Europe. In the Middle East, the situation is quite different. There are no economic inter-relationships. The real economic inter-relationships are between the different Middle Eastern states and the outside world, mostly Europe. So, the economic anchor should be based more on the relationship with Europe than on inter-relationships in the Middle East.

Mark Heller

I would like to try to provoke the panelists to elaborate a little more on some of the references that were made to the non-military security functions of NATO. In particular, the suggestions that it might be possible for NATO to contribute to the social and political transformation of the Greater Middle East. At one point, it was even suggested that NATO had helped to democratize Eastern Europe. The reason I want to try to stimulate this reflection may be based on misunderstanding of mine, because to the best of my knowledge and recollection, NATO did nothing to democratize Eastern Europe. To go even further, it did nothing to democratize or re-democratize authoritarian countries in southern Europe, which either had always belonged to NATO or were subsequently admitted. In fact, my understanding is precisely the opposite: that the processes of democratization had come first after which came association with, then partnership with and ultimately integration into NATO. By extension, one might also say the same thing about the European Union.

The point is that these processes of transformation, including political transformation or democratization, were primarily generated from within and that the roles of NATO and the European Union involved a post-factum contribution that helped to consolidate processes that had already been self-generated. Now, if my understanding is correct, by extrapolating from past experi-

ences, we can say that neither NATO nor the EU can really do much in terms of transforming societies in the Greater Middle East except to wait until they transform themselves. I'm going back to the point raised in Adam Michnik's letter that the democracies have to be there in the first place, and only in that case can others come around from the outside and help them. If that very brief and superficial overview is at all correct, does it mean that there is not really any kind of political and social transformational role for NATO or the EU in the Greater Middle East and that there is nothing constructive that can be done in this regard unless and until they transform themselves?

Jiří Schneider

Let me just refer to tomorrow's panel which is named "The Role of NATO in Democracy Building" and does not include a reference to what is first and what must follow. You were absolutely right in expressing that NATO's role is in the consolidation of something that is already somewhat there. It is a very pointed question, and I am looking forward to the answers of the panelists, as well as to the answers we will hear tomorrow. I appreciate that your question gives us the opportunity to expand the number of reactions we will hear on this topic.

Eran Lerman

I feel a little bit self-conscious about being the third Israeli in a row to raise a point here, but I am not necessarily speaking as an Israeli or even as a representative of the American Jewish Committee, but as a former intelligence officer. Some of the issues, including general concerns, the pathologies of the management of the Iraq crisis and the future, reflect the absence of an independent NATO capacity to generate and integrate intelligence beyond what is provided by the member states. The current mechanisms, at least those I have seen, are very rudimentary. The creation of a more extensive capacity for forming views about terrorism, proliferation, and the underlying political, ideological and social conditions that give rise to the threat as well as the creation of a common threat assessment has to be driven by the

creation of an integrated intelligence framework. This framework would also provide players in the Middle East with the first and most important building block for a dialogue. This is a practical suggestion that should come out of this conference.

Amin Tarzi

I'm going to go all the way back to the eastern front of the Greater Middle East, and the first question is to Mr. Altenburg. I agree with you totally that Afghanistan is a crucial test for NATO involvement in the Greater Middle East. I also assume that there is some kind of a concept, a geographical door, but I do have a problem specifically when it comes to Pakistan. Where does Pakistan fit in that picture? Having said that, the NATO led ISAF is soon to expand into Kunduz with the Germans and possibly the Belgians and the Finns. My question is whether there is a negotiated structure for how the NATO controlled ISAF will deal with the US led operation, Enduring Freedom. This is crucial because if it doesn't exist, there may be potential problems. If not, the blueprint is not yet in place, why not?

The second question has to do with time assessments within NATO. Is the NATO commitment to Afghanistan only going to be good until the Bonn Agreement is in place and Afghanistan has a constitution and president next June, or will NATO stay beyond that? Unless some miracle happens, and I don't believe in miracles, things are not going to get "good" by June 2004. Is there a commitment beyond any possible future government in Afghanistan?

I also have a question to Ron Asmus. When you mentioned priorities, you focused more on Iraq and Afghanistan was secondary. Do you share Mr. Altenburg's belief that Afghanistan is crucial? If so, although I don't believe in models, can Iraq be somewhere that you can work with in a framework and then put that into the play in Afghanistan? Or is Iraq more crucial because of its importance as a country and that has to come first?

Lastly, we discussed the issue of Russia in NATO and that it is threatened by proliferation. As somebody who worked on Iranian missile proliferation, I think yes, Russia is threatened, but without Russian help, Iran would not have any of the capabilities that they have right now. This includes nuclear capabil-

ities. So, yes, Russia is a partner, but at the same time, up until now, they have also been a contributor to proliferation. What will NATO do about this?

Jiří Schneider

Thank you, Mr. Tarzi, for your very concrete questions. We will address all these questions at the end of the session. Mr. Schueftan, please.

Dan Schueftan

When we speak about the role of NATO in the Middle East, we actually mean Europe's contribution, because United States already has a major role there. The United States would like to have European partners as long as they are responsible and effective. Having said that, it is a bit difficult for Europeans to have a role in the Greater Middle East as they have failed in the Smaller Middle East, more specifically in the Arab-Israeli context. Before Europe learns the lessons of this failure, it is very difficult to see that they might have any broader success in the region. If you look at what is happening right at this moment in the Middle East, you will find that there are only three minor problems that the Europeans have – the Israelis don't trust them, the Arabs don't respect them, and the Americans don't take them seriously. Other than that, the situation is fine. The problem is that if the Europeans want to become involved, they will need a completely different approach to the Middle East, which might be provided to some extent by the European enlargement. Perhaps the best indication of Europe's coming at age with regards to understanding the Middle East will be when it disengages itself from the assumption that the Middle East is about to perform some kind of quantum leap from national and Islamic radicalism to post nationalism following the European example. Perhaps the best example of this belief, heard here this afternoon, is the notion that in the Middle East you can have solutions. Unfortunately, I meet this term in many European analyses of the Middle East. I don't know why they use this term. It seems to me that solutions are fine when you speak about crossword puzzles, but this is about the only place where I think solutions can be found. To conclude, I am remind-

ed of a quote from the movie Shirley Valentine, where the frustrated wife says, “marriage is like the Middle East, there is no solution.” I would say that the Middle East is like marriage, there is no solution. Once we start from this assumption the rest will be easy.

Jiří Schneider

I remember a couple of years ago someone rudely told me that there is no such thing as a peace process. First, there is no peace, and second, it is not a process: it is a state of war rather than a peace process. You made a very good point, we also discovered that NATO is also comprised of Europeans, and when you talk about NATO, you also talk about Europeans. Sometimes, it looks as if there are two kinds of Europeans, NATO Europeans and EU Europeans. Hopefully, we will overcome this schizophrenia. Now, Mr. Polenz.

Ruprecht Polenz

I would like to come back to Bruce Jackson’s presentation and his breathtaking view of EU enlargement including not only the Balkans but also the Black Sea region and the border states. I would like to leave aside what this would mean for decision-making processes within this future European Union, which is still designed to be a political union and not free trade zone – even in the decades to come. I would like to go back to Bruce Jackson’s idea that the European Union establish peace-enhancing transformation processes, as in the case of the stability pact for the Balkans in which they promised that if things go well, the Balkan states can be members of the European Union. The thought behind all this is that security cannot be one against the other instead it must be one with each other. If we try to apply this idea to the Greater Middle East, we have a basis for the road map. Unfortunately, as far, as I have heard this evening, we won’t discuss the Road Map, but I would like to raise the following question. This Road Map was designed by the United States, the Europeans, the Russians, and the United Nations as well as the Israelis and the Palestinians, who, in my opinion, agreed with crossed fingers behind their back. My question to all the panelists is: “What is your assessment of this

approach?” Coming back to Jeff’s comments this morning, we have not only a similar assessment of the situation, but also a very elaborate plan to address this long lasting conflict with the possibility to solve it in the foreseeable future.

We have many Israelis here on the floor, but I wish we had more Arab voices because my impression is that we are discussing the Middle East. We should ask ourselves what kind of initiatives would also be welcome in this area. We should try to take the opinions of the Arab countries which are represented by Prince Hassan seriously. I would also like to hear your assessment about whether we are going to balance this discussion.

Jiří Schneider

Thank you very much, speaking for the organizers I have to assure you that we tried hard to get some Arab voices but we obviously didn’t succeed in the end.

Rouzbeh Pirouz

Rouzbeh Pirouz from the Foreign Policy Centre in London. While I’m not one of the Arab voices, I’m originally Iranian so I think that’s close.

I only have one issue to bring up and that is whether NATO is a productive instrument of change. It seems to me that the very nature of the military threat in the region is not really a state versus state threat, but more of an unconventional threat similar to terrorism. Of course as we’ve realized, our ability to deal with terrorism through military means is limited. We’ve discovered that eradicating terrorists through military means can only go so far, when terrorist go and hide in caves and basements and so on. Thus, the issue very quickly moves to the political agenda and bringing about political change. It seems to me that there are very different understandings in Europe as opposed to the US of the need for political change. While the US may have come to the game relatively late in the day, it underwent a fundamental transformation on September 11 and now believes in the need to bring about a pretty substantial transformation in the political order of the region. Whereas with the Europeans, any approach they advocate would be for change, based on issues, such as human rights, that are much more incremental in nature. I

wonder if the panel would agree that this gap exists, and if so, then how can that gap be bridged? Can Europe and the US work together effectively on pushing for that political change? Moreover, can NATO really be an effective instrument given the fact that it requires a certain degree of consensus on what needs to be done, how it needs to be done and how quickly it needs to be done?

Joshua Muravchik

I want to dispute the argument that Mark Heller made and my argument might actually pair well with the comments we've just heard from Mr. Pirouz and might be something that the panelists want to comment on. It's true that NATO, as a body, became involved in the democratization of central and southern Europe via the process of linking NATO enlargement to the meeting of certain democratic-oriented criteria by the candidates for membership. This involvement came after a long history of the NATO members as individuals having worked to undermine communism in the communist countries of Europe. These activities by the United States and various Western European countries involved intelligence activities, international broadcasting, and a variety of kinds of support for the democrats and dissidents within those countries. For example, an allusion was made last night to the role of the residence of the US Ambassador in Czechoslovakia when there was so little space for free meetings and speech. The point is that the western nations viewed the existence of totalitarian regimes in Eastern Europe as something ultimately unacceptable, something unnatural. While there might have been the feeling that we did too little - there were severe limitations on what means we could use - there is no question that western policy included the goal of changing the form of governments in those countries to something more normal, namely democratic governments. But our view towards the Middle East has never been that. Our view towards the Middle East has always been it is what it is and that's because of its culture. It's strange to us and it sits on a lot of petroleum and as long as we can buy the petroleum we don't want to poke any sticks in this hornets' nest. I think this is what Mr. Pirouz was referring to when he said that there has been a very recent change in that view at the US since 9/11. Perhaps, it's typically

unfair and impatient of us Americans to be chastising our European allies for not having instantaneously made the same change along with us. However, the question of how NATO itself can be an instrument of change in this area remains open. We also have the question of whether the western states will adopt the view toward the Middle East that is somehow analogous to the view that we used to have toward Central Europe when it was under communist rule.

Onur Öymen

We have listened with great interest to all the panelists. We have discussed what role NATO could play in the Middle East and in peace management. What we have not discussed so far, as far as I understand it, is the gist of the matter. The discussions that we have had today and yesterday need to take place in NATO so that we can coordinate our policies. What we lack in NATO is a political discussion on the Middle East. I don't remember any meeting of NATO where we discussed the political aspect of the developments and the problems of the Middle East. So, to put the horses in front of carts, we need to start to talk in NATO. I understand that some European countries in NATO are not very comfortable discussing such matters within the Alliance because they believe that it is the exclusive duty of the European Union to discuss these matters. If we want NATO to play a role we first need to negotiate not only what we can do together, but also what we should not do in regards to these regions, particularly on the issue of countries supporting terrorism. If we give a unified and coordinated message to these countries we could play, as NATO, a role of political deterrence even before intervening in a military way. I will give you an example. When Syria was the centerpiece of terrorism against Turkey, Israel, and many other countries, the Secretary of State of the United States visited Damascus twenty-two times, but he did not visit Turkey once. Why? Because they needed to have the backing of Syria for the Middle East peace process. Shall we sacrifice our principles in favor of political advantages? This is the main problem to address. If we have a policy to hold a firm line against countries supporting terrorism, then we have to coordinate our policies and act accordingly. This is what I see as one of the main problems.

Ivan Gabal

I feel such a tension on the panel between the belief that there are growing problems in the Middle East that we will have to deal with on one side and on the other side, the feeling that NATO currently is involved in enlargement to such an extent that it isn't able to accept any new mission. This is my first question: "Is there any idea in NATO of what it means to successfully complete the mission in Afghanistan? If so, what does it mean?" I don't think anybody can expect that we will be able to restore Afghanistan back to the country which it was before the Soviet invasion. Looking at Kosovo, we are escorting buses from Belgrade to Pristina, and we are fighting smugglers from Serbia and Albania; the only serious thing that we do is bringing back Serbian families for resettlement. Is there any idea of when we will withdraw from the Balkans? At this point we are mostly policing the area. If we include the criteria of when we will be released from one agenda to go on to the next, we could better plan for our next "baby." While it rarely happens, sometimes having another baby saves the marriage.

My second remark is on our poor national perspective. If we are to have NATO in the Middle East in its military capacity, then we shouldn't have to do so against public opinion. As NATO members, we are not neutral, and we need to use NATO membership as a legitimizing political instrument to show that there is certain underlying meaning to the missions on which we are sending soldiers.

My last question is to Ron Asmus. You mentioned the success of NATO-Russia cooperation. We are in a new situation. If there is any danger of proliferation, it comes from Russia being unable to control its internal security. This is not even speaking about how much tension Chechnya generates for Islamic radicalism. The question of Russia is contributing to the spread of WMD and not being able to control its own internal organized crime is an issue. Do you think this is a new agenda to put in front of Russia? I believe it is. On one side, we see very interesting options for Russian cooperation in Iraq, and on the other side, we constantly read news about weaponry and technology sales and proliferation.

Jiří Schneider

Thank you, it's a nice circle; we started with completion of Europe and you ask about completion of Afghanistan. It's enlarging our agenda.

Petr Luňák

I have a question for Mr. de Brichambaut and for Ron Asmus.

Mr. de Brichambaut, you suggested a clear distinction between NATO and the EU. You said that NATO has a hard-military-power and that the EU has a soft power. Indeed, you seem to suggest that the EU is better equipped to deal with some of the challenges of the Greater Middle East. In my view, the problems in the GME are as complex as the Middle East itself is, so you need both hard and soft power. In fact, in order to apply some sort of pressure through soft power, you very often need military hard-power. Indeed, some of my Balkan friends say that NATO is very successful in applying pressure precisely because it utilizes diplomacy backed by military force. So my question is: “Instead of the European Union acquiring hard military power, why not have NATO acquire soft power?” At the Prague Summit, the Alliance did an excellent job in acquiring new military capabilities and the ability to deploy military forces out of area. The question now is whether it shouldn’t also be able to deploy not only military forces but also nation-building capabilities.

Mr. Asmus, in a recent article in *Foreign Affairs*, you seem to argue for a new Harmel Report, which helped to mobilize NATO when it was neither intellectually nor conceptually equipped to deal with the challenges of détente in the 60s. In fact, you rightly point out that the Harmel Report was a strategy for regime change in Eastern Europe that allowed military capabilities to be kept. What do you think must happen within NATO to start a new strategic debate?

Barry Rubin

As I was listening, I began making list of specific questions and scenarios. While covering these ideas may require a second stage of this discussion, I would at least like to raise a few of them here.

Among the notes I took are the following questions. Under what conditions do people foresee NATO using force in the Greater Middle East? Here is a quick rundown of a list of areas that I came up with; I don’t expect you to address them all. First, we know that Libya has been involved in the destruction of two civilian airliners, and that France is demanding compensation.

Should NATO power be used to back France's demand? Second, we know that there are something like twenty-two Al-Qaeda leaders in Iran. Iran first said that they restrain them, and now, they say they can't find them. Is this a situation where NATO should put pressure on Iran to turn over Al-Qaeda operatives? Third, US Secretary of State Colin Powell met with the Foreign Minister of Syria who said that the terrorists' offices were closed. A week later he gave an interview saying that they weren't closed. Is this an issue for NATO? Fourth, Iranians cross borders for the subversion of the Afghan government and of the Iraqi government, probably including the assassination of two key clerical leaders. Is this something for NATO? Fifth, Syria and its support for cross-border terrorism against coalition forces in Iraq. Sixth, Iran and WMD, as well as its sponsorship of terrorism in Europe and the PKK. Also, North Korean, Chinese, and Russian WMD technology help Iran's weapon programs. Lastly, the Algerian civil war and GIA's activities in Europe and other places. These are a number of specific cases and only one touches on Arab-Israeli issues. These are actual issues that exist at present. At some point one has to discuss what is the appropriate NATO role in these situations, what issues we are going to take up, and what are we going to do about it? Obviously, this is a very preliminary list of issues, but it would be worth hearing some thoughts about the criteria of such issues. Under what conditions do people see NATO military forces becoming involved in fighting in the Middle East?

Petr Mareš

The question most related to what I said before coffee break was a question about the potential of NATO for playing a democratization role. There are two ways to answer the question. The first one is connected with what happened in Central and Eastern Europe and what's currently happening in the Balkans and other Eastern European countries. I cannot agree completely that NATO simply waited until countries became democratic and then entered the field. I have my personal experience with some countries, such as Georgia, which are now on the waiting list for possible NATO membership. My experience is that such tools as PFP or MAP are very efficient and the simple idea that they are going to become the members of the Alliance makes it possible for certain political forces in those countries to convince their partners to behave a bit

differently. Simply the fact that in NATO there is an article declaring that NATO wants to contribute to peaceful and friendly international relations by strengthening the framework of institutions is helpful. For example, I sincerely believe that even as far as our neighbor Slovakia goes, the fact that NATO expected something from this country in the way that it develops some of its institutions played an important role in the way the country developed during the last five years. But there is a problem here: in all those cases I mentioned, there was a prize at the end or there is a prize at the end – if you will agree with the principle of NATO, we will help you to strengthen your new institutions. But what is the prize for the countries in the Greater Middle East? That's a very difficult question to answer. Nevertheless, if NATO is able to decide to play a role in this area, the simple fact that it is an institution based on sharing common values will be an important factor. There is a difference between NATO involvement and involvement of a single nation. As an organization based on democratic principles whose success is based upon the success of democratic principles, it might have an important role in spite of the great challenge of the situation.

One more question on your comparison of the Cold War and the Post-Cold War periods. Of course, the importance of common defense up to the end of the 80s was more important for NATO as an organization than, well, at least it seems so, common values. However, since the beginning of the 90s, common values are more important to NATO than they used to be, for member states, for the future member states and, maybe, for the future allies. If the prize is no longer the membership, why couldn't it be a sort of alliance, a sort of support, a sort of continuing help from NATO?

Ze'ev Schiff

I counted 12–15 questions which were raised here, I would like to touch two, three points, mainly because of the time and I am not sure I have an answer to all the points.

I am afraid that the tendency here is to see each of the major conflicts separately, and it is wrong to approach the situation in this way. We cannot take the Iraqi crises separately and saying, let's deal with Iraq and take the proliferation issue separately, period, and then the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. All of them

are actually interconnected. If the United States and the international community fail in Iraq, it will immediately affect and accelerate proliferation and terrorism in the Middle East. If the proliferation of nuclear weapons in Iran goes on we shall immediately see more countries in the Middle East gain nuclear capabilities. It is not just Iraq either. If America loses its fight against terrorism, we shall see an immediate increase in terrorist activities throughout the region. This situation involves one major issue with other components and should be treated as such.

Another question – someone asked, I think it was Mark Heller: “What is the non-military role of NATO?” My feeling is that NATO cannot just wait to make certain decisions. Yes, they cannot come if they are not invited, but they can play a role even if they are not directly invited. They have to be more active in the Road Map and not just to say in major headlines “Yes, we are supporting the Road Map.” They have to be involved in the first stage, which is fighting terror, and then we shall move to the second stage, that is, building a two-stage solution. NATO has a non-military role to play here by pushing the parties to take a more active role in anchors and in multilateral security cooperation in the Middle East and by being involved in better intelligence sharing.

Finally, the most difficult mission is fighting terror in the Middle East. I am afraid of the possibility of an international force being deployed anywhere in the Middle East, not just in Israel. I don’t want to think about the possibility of a German force within NATO, for example, being deployed on the Israeli-Palestinian boarder. Can you imagine a situation like that? What if an international force is deployed there, and behind their back someone goes on with the terror activities? Falling into this trap would be a disaster. What I mean to say here is that we have to keep in mind what we as peace loving people, not just as NATO, have to do in order to prevent the spillover of the conflict to other places. This is something which can be on the agenda of NATO.

Marc Perrin de Brichambaut

We should pause to think about what made the last exercise a success, which is what has brought us together today. It is a spirit of mutual respect, of faith that things can be improved, and of hope that democracy and common values can work. If we want any other exercise to have any chance of achieving any

goal we have to keep those values. I am sorry to say I do not see this spirit present in some of the speakers we have heard today. We should avoid any attitude of nihilism. There is sort of implicit belief that only brutal force runs the world; this is not how Europeans see the world. Those who believe that only brute force runs the world are making a big mistake, and they are completely against the spirit of this continent and the way it is built. I very much regret that they do not have a sense for this and that they do not see any future for the region along those lines because it means that indeed we are drifting very far apart. Europeans are present in the Greater Middle East. They do have a relationship with three hundred million Arabs. They are present in the human point of view, in the economic point of view, and in the cultural point of view. They are present militarily along with Americans in Iraq, not all of them but some of them, and why not? They are actively involved in many other countries, and they try to maintain a relationship of respect for many Arabs that feel a sense of resentment and hatred towards the United States. So I think this is something we should take seriously and not lightly.

The second thing I would like to say is that modernization is indeed a very difficult process, that it has to be done within society, and that assistance can be provided throughout this process. Furthermore, there are encouraging moves happening in many Arab and Islamic countries towards modernization; we should all hope that they are successful. The neo-conservatives have clearly told us not to be complacent about authoritarian regimes in this area and to look at all the possibilities for improvements and to be actively involved.

NATO, of course, cannot duplicate what the EU is doing. You should know better. Indeed, the EU has a structure, it has a budget; it has capabilities, and there is no reason that NATO should try to grasp 1.8 % of the GNP from its members. It would not be very successful in achieving this. In fact, as you may know, the military forces available to the EU, which are the same as those that are available to NATO, are coming from the same countries and are not - as one speaker said in a very patronizing way - miniscule operations acting on the assumption that they will be using NATO assets to avoid duplicity. There is no reason we should start from the assumption that there is no potential for cooperation. When the time is right for NATO to become a forum, a serious forum, for dealing with the Middle East, when everybody is willing to put their assets on the table and share them, then I am sure that NATO will again become a political forum in these things. Mr. Ambassador, you told us with

a great deal of eloquence about the difficulties you have had in handling the terrorism issue in the past, so I am sure you understand what I mean.

Regarding Russia, we all know that Russia is a multiple and, in fact, unreliable entity, but there is only one Russia right now that we have to deal with, and I guess everybody is convinced that it has to be dealt with and engaged. This is the work of NATO, individual European nations, and the United States. Europeans who are involved in the Great Middle are handling the issue of Iran in a straightforward way and this includes trying to change the attitudes of Iran.

Ron Asmus

Let me start with Mark Heller's question. A majority acclaims the consolidation and democracy of Central and Eastern Europeans. That said, NATO played a critical role in two regards. One of which could be relevant to the Middle East and one of which not. The two regards are the following. First, the whole theory was that NATO would create the context in which it would be easier to build democracy by extending a security umbrella, thereby removing security issues from the table. Secondly, there are a large number of issues that we directly linked to NATO membership. And I could mention dozens of treaties and agreements that would not have taken place among Central and East European countries if NATO and the United States had not been together in saying unless you do the following things you will not get in. However, Shlomo has the right question. They wanted an anchor; we called membership the golden carrot. Membership was the carrot that Central and Eastern Europe wanted and we could link it to so many issues and leverages in so many successful ways. We don't have the golden carrot in the Middle East. We don't have the anchor. But we need to create anchors that would help us build something in the Middle East. There are a couple of other ideas in addition to the two very good ones Shlomo put on the table, and we need to think about them.

To Mr. Pirouz's question, we are exuberant, enthusiastic, idealistic Americans who've been attacked and have undergone a paradigm shift like Josh said, however, we'll have a better strategy if we add a little bit of European wisdom, history and culture to it because we will never be able to do this part by ourselves. If we are going to be able to do this, it's going to be by learning from

each other. I sometimes wish I could give Europeans a major dose of American enthusiasm and some of my American friends a little dose of European historical perspective.

The hardest question is how to organize the soft power and the hard power of the West to use it towards accomplishing some of these goals. The hardest piece in this challenge is not NATO, but how you organize the soft power of the West for this agenda over years or decades. In theory, you could do it through the US and the EU, but we can't. Today, the EU is not a strategic actor that is capable of having that dialogue, and we don't treat the EU as one either. So you have to figure a different way of dealing with it, which takes me briefly to the Harmel Report idea.

The Harmel Report was written by eight people who were sent off by a bunch of heads of state who had a big problem in order to write a paper that would allow us to kiss and make up after the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia when the Alliance was in serious trouble of breaking down. These eight people wrote a report that was basically common sense. They said NATO has to be a defense shield in a policy of deterrence, and it needs a positive policy of engagement that opens up the perspective of eventual transformation of communist countries. They managed to marry these goals in such a way that the Alliance came back together, not only across the Atlantic, but also within Europe.

It wouldn't be a bad idea if a group of people were allowed to go off and write another such straightforward report based upon the ideas that people are currently considering, including the fact that NATO, as a metaphor for the West, needs a defense posture to defend itself against these new threats as well as a policy that's a combination of defense and offense. Now, that report may be done either in or outside of NATO, but something has to be done to put this framework together and to put us on a new course. This is a good time for such a task, although the tactics of this course are a little bit tricky.

Referring to Afghanistan, while I am a Democrat, I do not believe this administration is making more serious efforts in Afghanistan because of problems in Iraq. We are doing what we are doing because we have got to make progress, put pieces together, and connect them together.

Finally, what is NATO going to do? We talked about NATO having a spectrum covering stability operations, force packaging, and war fighting. For the foreseeable future, if we can get the capability to produce forces for stability

operations, that's Afghanistan, that's a role in Iraq, and the force packaging, the future of NATO is not going to be necessarily in warfare. However, the next time we have a job to do in Iraq, for example, if NATO could say "we can put a division in and sustain it for operation, we can put together little countries and medium countries," then we look at the problem from different perspective. The problem NATO has today is that there are over 1.2 million European men in the armed forces and only three percent of those forces are actually deployable and sustainable. In America, the military is about fifty percent deployable. So we've got to expand the European portion to about 20-25-30 % over the next ten years in order to have a pool of forces that is available for stability operations and packaging. Then we've got to deal with the command structure issues, but if we get half way through that agenda I'm going to claim the victory.

Günther Altenburg

First of all, I would say one needs to bear in mind that NATO doesn't have a life of its own, it does what the members want it to do. This is very much true for all things you have just been saying with respect to the Middle East and the Harmel Report. At this point in time I don't see anything like that happening, not even with the prospect of the Istanbul Summit. All these things need to be agreed upon the consensus of the allies. They need to settle on a direction for all these things and acts. At this point in time, let me say we are just in a phase of consolidation and implementation, and the kind of perspective and vision you were talking about, Ron, is more behind the horizon than on this side of it.

With respect to the non-military functions of NATO, one needs to be clear about what we are talking about. The Membership Action Plan, with respect to what we did in Central and Eastern Europe, pre-supposed that these countries were committed to democracy and that this is what gave us the leverage over them. There are others with whom, for quite some, time we have good relations in terms of Partnership for Peace and so on and so forth who are not moving towards democracy. We try to tell them all sorts of things about how to control the military by civil and political power, and they go and elect the son of the President. We see this all through Central Asia, in the Caucasus, and even in those countries who pretend that they want to become members of NATO very soon. We need to see that there are probably some historical and political

obstacles we have to overcome. Comparisons between Central Asia and the Middle East are very difficult. We have done these comparisons in Germany, and it is easy. We are definitely going to make them in Iraq as well, and this is really far off the mark. First, we liberated Kuwait and the plan was to democratize it. Where are we? Frankly speaking, we are back to square one. When we talk about changes in the Middle East, we need to talk about changes in the societies. Where did all these 9/11 terrorists come from? They came out of Saudi Arabia. So we probably have a problem with the Saudi society.

My next point would be about Europe's role in the Middle East and whether there is a solution and can we find it? Frankly speaking, I have a problem with that sentence saying there is no solution to the Middle East problem and to these Palestinian questions. If we want to hit and have a perspective, it will be through common security. It needs to be something where both parts find their way: this is how I read the Road Map.

My last point: Afghanistan, indeed, is a test of NATO's ability to go ahead. As for that practical question of coordination between ISAF and Enduring Freedom, indeed there are arrangements so that the US forces will assure extraction of ISAF if need be. Other than that, however, I think it is very much the responsibility of the commanders on ground to do business there. As for when we will leave Afghanistan, as I said in my introductory remarks, once you are in, you are in for quite a while. We have not yet ended our Balkan operations, and Afghanistan is another long-term project. In order to maintain our presence, we need patience and stamina.

Ariel Cohen

I am wondering how the French comment about not using raw power, applies to the forty-seven French interventions in Africa without the Security Council's sanction.

Jiří Schneider

This is not a good comment for the end of the debate; you should have made it at the beginning as it would have helped us to spark discussion. If there is

anyone who wishes to comment on these remarks please keep in mind that I still have Bruce Jackson who asked to have a chance to wrap up.

Bruce Jackson

I found myself listening to this debate and exchange between Ron Asmus and Marc Perrin de Brichambaut, and as a conservative Republican, it's very uncomfortable to be half way between the Democrats and the French Ministry of Defense, but I think there is a broad agreement here. When Ron, others, and I were talking about the expansion in the 90s, the catchword was not if but when. When you listen to this debate about the Middle East it is not if but how. And all these things are basically tactical questions, and I have emphases on three different points, which I hope came out in that presentation after lunch.

One is the question of sequencing - when do you do what. The military takeover of Europe in World War II was preceded by the military consolidation of North Africa. It would seem to me that the political makeover of the Middle East during the war that we are currently in must be preceded by political consolidation of Europe. History is littered with the corpses of well-intentioned empires wandering around the Middle East before they consolidated their political base and came up with the resolve and a plan. Now, Ron may be right we can tolerate a high degree of concurrency, but I still think we should be cautious of not finishing what we've started along the way.

The second question is the question of instrumentality. I agree with Günther that sending NATO alone is fool hardly. Frankly, if NATO were flanked by the EU and the host of wide range of newly created institutions mentioned by Josh Muravchik and others, including Black Sea charters, a Caucasus security system, the four freedoms of a wider Europe in the EU mechanisms, an additional Russian partnership, Partnership for Peace, and had the tools for the longer job then it would be appropriate to put NATO in the center of that force. NATO should not be there alone.

Finally, there is a question of speed. There is basically a school that says we should do the Middle East fast, and we should do the new democracies slowly. There are persons who would say we should hand the command of Iraq over to the new Iraqi government in 14 weeks. If you ask them about Ukraine, they would say 40 years. I think that's reversed. I would prefer to do

the new democracies along with Serbia, where we have opportunities, more sprightly, and do the Middle East more deliberately, basically recognizing that we are dealing in generational or historical time.

So those are basically questions of emphasis, which are questions of strategy. Finally, I owe the panel an apology for having to step out for so long but there is good news, which I think reflects on our discussion here today. For the first time I was called out to defend our French and German allies from the attacks of the British press. This basically bodes well for us. With the United States as peacekeepers in Europe, we must be sure that we can handle the Greater Middle East.

THE ROAD MAP: IS IT FOR REAL?

Introduction

Cyril Svoboda

Your Royal Highness, Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen,
I have been given the difficult task of briefly introducing someone with a particularly remarkable background. Fortunately enough for me, this task has been made somewhat easier by the fact that it comes at a rather opportune moment in that the memoirs of tonight's speaker were very recently published and that the Czech translation is due to appear on Prague's bookshelves in just a few days. Let me assure you that we are all eagerly awaiting this book

I will also take this opportunity to remind us of the prominent role tonight's speaker played in bringing about an end to the atrocities and enforcing the peace in former Yugoslavia. Indeed, it was our [Czech] participation in the peacemaking activities in the Balkans that paved our way to NATO in 1999. She has always been tough on dictators and strong promoter of democracy. Finally, with the help of NATO, Milosevic and Saddam Hussein are out of power, and the Serbian and Iraqi people have begun to be free; we all think about their future and are willing to assist them as they progress through the difficult stages of transition.

The topic of this conference, "NATO and the Greater Middle East," links together two important priorities of Czech foreign policy - our interest in

keeping NATO in business, effective, and involved, and our active policy in the Middle East – I was therefore glad to provide the auspices for this important conference.

Symbolically, both NATO and the Middle East were two major areas of your activities in the U.S. government, Madame Secretary. For your significant contribution to opening NATO's door to the Czech Republic and other former Warsaw Pact countries is undeniable and for that, we shall always remain grateful to you. Your relentless efforts to bring peace to the Middle East – highlighted by your attempts to broker a final deal between the Israelis and Palestinians in the summer of 2002. Unfortunately, the historical momentum of the work has been lost to rejections of far reaching compromises.

As we all well know, there have been many peace plans, but good intentions and plans are insufficient. Without sufficient political courage and determination – consistent characteristics of your remarkable political career – difficult initiatives can never succeed. Tonight, it is my honor and pleasure to welcome our speaker, Madeleine Albright.

The Road Map: Is it For Real?

Madeleine Albright

Good evening, it is wonderful to be back here in Prague and to see so many friends and familiar faces. It is an honor to be present amidst such a distinguished gathering in such a magnificent setting.

Michael Žantovský is a dear friend and a person I deeply admire. I was delighted to accept his invitation to participate in this conference. Of course, I didn't know then that I would be expected to follow Václav Havel to the podium or that my assignment would be to say something new and interesting about the Middle East. These tasks are not difficult, they are impossible. Even saying that, however, does not give me a way out, since a collection of President Havel's speeches entitled "The Art of Impossible." In other words, just because something cannot be done is no excuse for failing to try. President Havel sets a standard far above my grasp, but I can refuse him nothing. So I will do my best.

The topic of my remarks, as listed in the program, is "The Road Map: Is it for Real?" This title was selected by the conference organizers several months

ago in hopes that the answer would be plainly positive. At the time, there were many who believed the ouster of Saddam Hussein would open the door to rapid progress toward a negotiated settlement between the Palestinians and Israel. According to the theory, anti-Israeli terrorists would be shocked by American resolve, so disheartened by the ouster of Saddam, and so impressed by the creation of a democratic and stable Iraq, they would rapidly shrivel up. The support of other Arabs for Palestinian extremists would cease, reform-minded Palestinians would take charge, and the peace process could go forward.

This optimistic thinking has shaped U.S. diplomacy in the Middle East for at least the past year and a half. With this attention centered on Iraq, the Bush administration has limited its involvement in Middle East diplomacy, ignored Chairman Arafat, and placed great faith in the short-lived appointment of Mahmoud Abbas as Palestinian prime minister.

Less than two months ago, the President's National Security Adviser Condoleezza Rice said that all was going according to plan: "We have seen real progress toward peace for Israelis and Palestinians," she said in a speech. "Israeli leaders increasingly understand that this is in Israel's interest for Palestinians to govern themselves, in a state that is viable, peaceful, democratic, and committed to fighting terror. [And] a new Palestinian leadership is emerging that understands – and says, in Arabic and English – that terror is not a means to Palestinian statehood, but rather the greatest obstacle to statehood."

Unfortunately, between then and now, not much has gone right. Caught between the hammer of Ariel Sharon and the anvil of Yasser Arafat, Prime Minister Abbas resigned despite backing from the United States, Europe and the UN. The new government, handpicked by Arafat, has neither the inclination nor the clout to confront Hamas and other terrorist groups, at least not now.

Meanwhile, terrorist attacks have continued and the Israelis have struck back not only on the West Bank but also against symbolic targets in Syria. Israeli leaders are one more talking about removing Arafat from the scene. Work is proceeding on a security fence that is already provoking a new round of Arab and Palestinian outrage. There is little evidence that the war in Iraq has altered Arab thinking about the Middle East and no sign that the ability of Hamas and other terrorist groups to recruit volunteers has diminished. As for Arafat, his health may be weak, but his support among Palestinians appears as strong now as it has ever been. It is, all in all, a dismal picture.

A decade ago, the world was focused on a different picture, that of Yitzhak Rabin and Yasser Arafat shaking hands on the White House lawn, launching the Oslo peace process. I will never forget that moment. For the first time, Israelis and Palestinians pledged to become partners in peace, to acknowledge the legitimate rights of the other, and to find a way to live as neighbors.

President Clinton called it a brave gamble that the future could be made better than the past. Chairman Arafat talked about the courage required to build coexistence and peace. And Prime Minister Rabin spoke directly to the Palestinian people, "We are destined to live together on the same soil in the same land," he declared. "We, the soldiers who have returned from battle stained with blood; we who have seen our relatives and friends killed before their eyes;...we who come from a land where parents bury their children; we who have fought against you, the Palestinians - we say to you today, in a loud and clear voice, enough of blood and tears, enough."

Within a year, Israel and Jordan has made peace. Some form of negotiation or promising contact was opened between Israel and every Arab state except Iraq and Libya. Regional economic conferences were convened during which Israelis and Arabs cordially discussed plans for creating jobs, luring investment and expanding trade. The momentum toward peace was stringer than at any time since the founding of the state of Israel.

Unfortunately, the Oslo process was designed for Yitzhak Rabin. Although Middle East negotiations are never easy, Rabin's character and largeness of spirit served as a kind of lubricant to discussion. Unlike some Israeli leaders, he refused to let terrorists dictate the ebb and flow of the peace process. We must negotiate a peace as if there were no terror, he said. And we must fight terror as if there were no negotiations. Domestically, Rabin had the military credentials required to survive politically as a champion of peace. He did not, however, survive literally. Israel has its own terrorists and on November 4, 1995, one of them murdered this good man whose wife fell in love with him because he had, she said, "the eyes of David."

When I became Secretary of State in 1997, the Israeli prime minister was Benjamin Netanyahu. Netanyahu did not believe in the Oslo approach. He did not believe Israel could be secure in the presence of a Palestinian state encompassing more than a fraction of the West Bank. He told me quite frankly that, in the absence of peace, Israelis expected to fight, and preferred to do so when the Palestinians were relatively weak. His views were

reinforced when Palestinian terrorists struck twice during the summer of 1997.

During this period, the Israelis and Palestinians essentially ceased talking to each other. Instead, they spent their time yelling at us. This was when I learned how frustrating it could be trying to deal with Chairman Arafat. Arafat's entire life has been dedicated to the Palestinian cause. That is both his strength and his problem. The Oslo Process required that he transform himself from professional victim to partner in peace. It also required him to settle down on the West Bank and administer a government, instead of traveling around the Arab world being treated like a prince.

He never made the transition. His government was riddled with corruption; he locked the emergence of democratic leaders. He did nothing to prepare his constituency for the compromises needed to achieve peace. Instead of trying to defeat Palestinian terrorist groups, he sought simply to coopt. And three years ago at Camp David, he turned down the best deal Palestinians are ever likely to be offered.

The only way out of this mess is if both sides think honestly about how they got into it. If the Palestinians had firmly and decisively rejected terror when the Oslo process began, they would have their state today and it would be both viable and contiguous.

They would have their seat in the United Nations, their airport, their ability to travel freely and reason to look forward to the future with hope. Nothing has done more to discredit Palestinian aspirations than terror.

There is, of course, no moral equivalence between bulldozers and bombs. But if the Israelis had only built settlements truly needed for security, they might or might not live in peace today, but they would surely have more international friends on whom they could count. Nothing has done more than expanding settlements to gratify Palestinian terrorists and deprive Israel of diplomatic strength. The question now is whether the two sides will ever come to a point where they can agree on the terms of peace.

Last summer, the Pew Global attitudes survey found that eighty percent of Palestinians believe the answer to that question is no. They simply do not think Israel's right to exist is consistent with the realization of their own rights. And given their definition of those rights, they are correct. No Israeli government is going to return every inch of lands taken during the 1967 war, or recognize the unfettered right of Palestinian refugees to return to their

home. Unless those expectations are modified, or the issues somehow side-stepped, the vision of a viable Palestinian state and Israel existing side by side is indeed a pipedream.

During my years as Secretary of State, I believed Palestinians would indeed settle for less; now I am not so sure. Arafat told me at Camp David that if he accepted what Israel was offering, he would be killed by his own people. Israeli Prime Ministers Netanyahu and Barak both told me they could not survive politically if they made further concessions to the Palestinians. No one was more skilled at finding words to bridge differences than our chief negotiator, Dennis Ross. But even he could not conjure up language that would make fundamental differences go away.

And since the Clinton team left office, the Israelis and Palestinians have grown steadily further apart. Dislike has been replaced by loathing. Lack of confidence has grown into a total absence of trust. The desperate nature of the situation has prompted calls by some for an international peacekeeping presence in the region. Some speak of a NATO force moving in to prevent terrorists from operating in Gaza and the West Bank. Some envision a United Nations force that would shield Palestinians from Israeli strikes. Some see an American force that would patrol borders and keep the peace, while preventing a new Palestinian state from receiving prohibited arms. Some propose a combination of all of the above.

When it comes to the Middle East, I would never say “never” to anything. Nothing has worked, so everything should be considered. But it is difficult at this moment to envision an international deployment without the consent of both parties. And hard to envision both parties agreeing on what the purpose of such deployment might be.

The Middle East Road map was produced seventeen months ago by the quartet of Russia, the EU, the UN and the United States. Is it for real?

Yes, of course, as a statement of goals, it is for real. But as a statement of genuine intent, it is not. Neither of the parties has taken it seriously and the White House has done little to push it. Brief bursts of high-level attention followed by long periods of drifts are not sufficient.

I know from experience that progress in the Middle East, even under the best of circumstances, requires constant, painstaking diplomacy. It demands a willingness to take the heat, to confront obstacles head-on, and to endure the endless posturing and gamesmanship masterfully practiced by both sides.

During the past two and three-quarter years, we have not seen that kind of commitment.

Yes, the development of the Road Map was a constructive step, but the difference between words and actions in that part of the world is like the difference between a human being and its shadow. The truth is we are witnessing a massive failure of leadership in the Middle East by Palestinians, Israelis and Americans. Part of this is a failure of analysis. The idea that ousting Saddam Hussein was a necessary precursor and likely to spur the progress toward an Israeli-Palestinian peace is highly questionable. A stable and democratic government in Iraq would provide many benefits to the region, but resolving the issues that divide Palestinians from Israelis is not one of them. In fact, this is a picture that might make more sense if turned upside down.

According to a recent report commissioned by the US State Department, opposition to American policies has reached “shocking levels” in the Arab and Muslim worlds. This hostility is making it harder for the U.S. to make progress in Iraq. And the biggest cause of this hostility is the perception that the White House does not care enough about what happens in the Middle East.

Mostly, however, this has been a failure of vision. Unlike Yitzhak Rabin and Jordan’s late King Hussein, there is no regional leader of stature who understands that current modes of thinking on both sides have to change not to benefit one or the other, but to realize the core aspirations of both. Two groups of people are clashing for control of this tiny area between the Jordan River and the Mediterranean Sea. For reasons of history, geography and demography, the clash is intense, bitter and prolonged. But what does this mean?

I fear that, to those currently in charge, it means that for either to survive, one side must destroy the viability of the other. I believe it means the reverse – that neither side can survive trying to destroy the other.

President Havel has sometimes cited the example of a Hindu legend concerning a mythical bird called Berunda. The bird has a single body, but two heads and two minds. After an eternity together, the two heads begin to hate one another. In their eagerness to inflict harm upon their enemy, they swallow pebbles and drink poison. Naturally, the whole bird lapses into convulsions and dies. Krishna restores it to life as a reminder that hatred is not only destructive but self-destructive, as well. That is an important lesson, but not always easy to bear in mind.

During my years as Secretary of State, there were half a dozen suicide bombings on Israeli soil. Each was an occasion for shock, capturing the world's attention, as families mourned and victims were buried. I thought it horrible, but it was nothing compared to the anguish we have felt since as new bombings and retaliatory killings have been reported nearly every week. Many people say now there is no hope; and that Israelis and Palestinians can never live together, unless one side is crushed or the other pushed into the sea.

Despite all the bloodshed, or perhaps because of it, I still do not believe that. And we should not accept it. Because the truth is there is nothing inevitable about murder and mayhem in the Middle East. To strap a bomb around your waist and blow yourself up amidst a crowd of civilians – that is a choice. To glorify murderers as martyrs is a choice. To teach children to hate is a choice. To dehumanize and disrespect the dignity of others is a choice. To refuse to negotiate seriously and in good faith is a choice.

These are all choices, and what people have the capacity to choose, they have the ability to change. We cannot make the choices for those who live in the Middle East. But we can confront and rebut those who rationalize and make excuses for terror, who say that targeting and murdering innocent people is a legitimate form of armed struggle.

It is not. Like genocide, ethnic cleansing, slavery and racism, terrorism is illegitimate and wrong not sometimes but always! Those who draw a distinction between terrorism as practiced by Al-Qaeda and terrorism as practiced by Hamas or the Al-Qsa brigades are moral cowards and intellectual hypocrites. The murder of civilians in the name of a political cause is still murder. Changing the name of the act does not change its repugnant nature. That is why Europe did the right thing when it agreed to place Hamas on its terrorism blacklist, not because Hamas lacks a social dimension, but because having a social dimension does not redeem a terrorist organization.

In this era, we have to draw clear lines, because we cannot afford the luxury of fine lines. There can be no excuse for knowingly providing money support or sanctuary to any organization that engages in terrorism. The plain fact is that the Palestinians must reject terror not because outsiders want them to, but because terror far more than Israel is the enemy of the Palestinian people – destructive not only of its economy and territorial hopes, but also its very soul.

America, Europe, the Arab world and Palestinian moderates must all work to create a Palestinian consensus that excludes and excoriates terror. As long as murders are hailed as heroes, there can be no real peace, nor any Palestinian state is worthy of the name.

The Israelis, too, must be wary of the impact of their own policies of aggressive self-defense. Golda Meir said once she blamed Arabs less for killing Israelis than for making it necessary for Israelis to kill. Israel has a right to protect itself against terror, and the need at times to take – yes – preemptive actions. But it should never forget that it is destined to live next door to the Palestinians forever, sharing the same land. It is a dangerous illusion to believe there is a military solution to that.

So even while defending itself, Israel must hold open the door to peace. a strategy designed to demoralize and drive Palestinians to despair will only backfire. Creating facts on the ground that are incompatible with a realistic peace undermines Israel's claim to global sympathy and support. Progress toward peace depends on each side helping the other show the benefits of cooperation. The reason Mahmoud Abbas resigned is that he had little to show his people and certainly not enough to outmaneuver Arafat. His departure was a defeat for Israelis and Palestinians alike.

The Middle East Road Map is supposed to lead to an independent, democratic and viable Palestinian state living side by side in peace and security with Israel and its other neighbors. Like the Oslo process, the Road Map depends on both sides agreeing that there is no military solution to this conflict. Like Oslo, it is based on the principle of land for peace, enshrined in the UN Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338. Like Oslo, it hinges on the growth of trust between the two sides, on the evolution of confidence that promises made will become promises kept. Like Oslo, it calls upon the world community to support peace and to help alleviate the dire economic conditions in Gaza and the West Bank. As the similarities suggest, the general shape of a viable Israeli-Palestinian peace is no great mystery.

The Road Map resembles in many ways outline of a peace plan put forward in 2001 by Saudi Arabian Crown Prince Abdullah. It is compatible with recommendations produced earlier that year by a team headed by former U.S. Senator George Mitchell and EU Secretary General Javier Solana. It is similar in many respects to the proposal offered by Prime Minister Barak at Camp David in 2000. It is even consistent in form with a plan presented by American

President Ronald Reagan in 1982. There is a reason why proposals for Middle East peace do not go away even in the face of terror and violence. The human desire for peace is a durable thing. It can be pounded and crushed and kicked and set on fire, but like the Old Testament's Burning Bush, it is not consumed.

I am convinced, even now, that the vast majority of Israelis and Palestinians yearn to move in the direction of peace, if only they had leaders with the guts required to reach out to the populations of the other, and the wisdom to guide their own people in the only direction that will ever make either side secure.

Eight years ago next week, in Jerusalem, Yitzhak Rabin was buried. Visiting the Holy City for the first time since he was a little boy, Jordan's King Hussein spoke at the funeral of his friend. "Let us not keep silent," he said. "Let our voices rise high to speak of our commitment to peace for all times to come, and let us tell those who live in darkness and who are the enemies of life, that this is where we stand. This is our camp."

It has been said that if you begin by doing what is necessary, and then proceed to do what is possible, you may suddenly find that you have accomplished the impossible. After what we have witnessed these past few years, a comprehensive Middle East peace is clearly impossible. Which is all the more reason to raise our voices high so that those with good will on both sides will hear and understand that they are not alone. We will stand with those who stand for peace because this is our camp and because we have all seen enough of blood and tears, enough.



PANEL III: THE ROLE OF NATO IN DEMOCRACY BUILDING IN THE GME

Michael Žantovský

The subject of this session is Democracy and NATO and the potential role of NATO in democracy building. As far as I'm concerned, the subject can be broken down into two questions. The first is whether democracy is desirable everywhere in the Middle East. This might sound trivial, but I'm sure we have all noticed that there are some people who point out that hasty democracy building carries risks with it. The sub-questions to that are as follows: is the Western model of democracy the only possible democratic model? Is this model inseparably linked to Western civilization? Is there a danger of a Huntingtonian clash of civilizations if we try to impose this model on other regions and other civilizations, and is it inseparably linked to culture and history, or is it transportable? Furthermore, is it compatible with other ideological systems, above all, religious ideological systems? Is democracy possible without the separation of church and state, which had preceded the development of democracy in Europe? We often forget that the wars of reformation, which made the separation of state and church possible in Europe, did so at a very high price of perhaps one quarter of the population in this part of the world.

The second question is: does the effort to build democracy in areas like the Greater Middle East increase security or decrease security? Some say these efforts increase security because, as has been often said, “democratic nations” do not wage war against each other. Others suggest that efforts to build democracy in these areas decrease security because they create the clashes of identities and cultures. Also, they bring about the possibility of a democratic ascent of Islamist regimes that may not be totally committed to democratic ideas. Sitting in this place it may be wise to remember that after World War II the communists came to power in this country through a democratic election in 1946, and there was hell to pay for the next 40 years.

Now, as to the role of NATO, I think it was Mark Heller who said yesterday that NATO has no role in democracy building, and I would beg to differ with him on this point. In our experience at least, countries that associate themselves with NATO as full members, part of the Membership Action Program, or within the Partnership for Peace framework invariably did so to increase their own security. Security in this part of the world is a very much valued commodity and it is the net benefit for those countries. In exchange for security, they had to accept some restrictions on their behavior and these restrictions, while not necessarily connected with democracy building, are generally conducive to more, not less, democracy. They include civilian oversight of the armed forces, which makes the democratic transition easier, sharing of information between NATO member countries or PfP countries, which leads to more transparency, and managing their border and ethnic disputes. I believe that were it not for the wish to join NATO, there would be no ethnic Hungarians in the Romanian government and some of the disputes between neighboring countries would still be more acute than they are today. There is also the secularizing influence of NATO. It is hard to imagine a NATO member country without the separation of the army from the church, and the separation of the army from the church is impossible without the separation of the state from the church. Lastly, not only does democracy increase security because “democracies do not go to war against each other,” but also diminishing external threats to security enables governments to be more liberal domestically. While this is not always the case, in this sense, democracy, or increased democracy, is also a byproduct of security. It is also possible to argue the opposite: that security is a byproduct of democracy. There is an empirical body of evidence on the points about which I have been talking. All we have to do is

look at the fifty years of NATO's history starting with Germany, then countries like Spain or Portugal, and obviously, countries like Turkey or Greece, and the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland, and most recently Romania, Bulgaria and Slovakia, the countries of the next round of NATO enlargement. While there is no direct link, there is a beneficial influence of NATO on democracy building, and I hope that the debate that will ensue does not entirely disprove that point.

I have a very distinguished panel of experts, friends, and scholars, and we will start with Ariel Cohen. From his biography it is clear that he was once a member of very large and profitable industry called Kremlinology. Also, he has been a research fellow in Russian and Euro-Asian studies at the Davis Studies Institute of the Heritage Foundation. He is also a policy advisor to the National Institute of Public Policy, and a consultant advising USAID, the World Bank, the US government, and Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty. He is the author of a number of very interesting essays and articles, has frequently testified before committees of the US Congress, and regularly has pieces on major news networks.

Ariel Cohen

Thank you, Ambassador Žantovský, for aptly reading the self-promoting bio that I wrote about myself. I asked to be first because this is the second night in a row that I have only slept for four hours; this is bad jet lag. I am afraid that either I will fall asleep, or you will fall asleep; it is Sunday after all. Thank you all very much for being here, and thank you, Ambassador Žantovský, for inviting me. This is a wonderful city and a wonderful building; we are all privileged to be here.

As I was fighting my jet leg I was thinking about the symbolism of Prague to the topic I am going to talk about and that's fighting for hearts and minds in the war against radical Islamic terrorism. Prague is an example of how a city and a people in a time and place can trigger a chain of events that lead to tremendous historic results. In 1968 when the Soviets invaded after the Prague Spring, a very small group of Soviet dissidents came out to the Red Square before the Kremlin, and this was the first demonstration of dissent in the Soviet Union and that movement eventually led to the deteriora-

tion of the Soviet ideology that held the empire together. Then, here in Prague in 1977, a bunch of Czech dissidents signed Charter 77 and again, that was a historic event that triggered another chain of events that led to ascendancy of power to the man who gave the luncheon address yesterday, President Vaclav Havel. President Havel fought in the realm of ideas and won in the realm of ideas. The Russian dissidents including people like Andrei Sakharov, Anatoly Sharansky, Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn fought one of the most inhuman ideologies of the 20th century, and there was a very interesting interaction between the people who articulated the ideology over there and we in the West who provided an echo chamber for the Sakharovs and the Solzhenitsyns. For months now I have been saying to my wife and to anybody who would listen, when will the Sakharovs and the Solzhenitsyns of the Islamic world be celebrated by the West? Well, God heard my prayers. A brave Iranian Islamic lawyer, a woman, was given a Nobel Peace Prize, and we are in the beginning of the process that hopefully will lead to changes as fundamental as the changes the dissidents who were demonstrating against the invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968 did. I hope these changes will happen during my lifetime, and having lived through the collapse of the USSR, there will be another event I feel privileged to witness – the dissolution of the radical, anti-Western, human-hating ideology that drives the terrorism that we are facing today.

To get to the ideological sources of the terrorism that we are facing today, you really have to go back to earlier chapters of Islamic history. One of the problems of this community, or the majority of people in this community, who come out of European security studies, Russian studies, etc. is our lack of familiarity with Islamic history, with the Arabic language, and with Islam. The ideological roots of terrorism are deep – the sect in the 8th century, the Hashashin group, who created the term of assassin from Hashashin, those who smoked hashish and then in the state of narcotic trance attacked and killed people, and the writings of those, such as Ibn Tamiya, who delegitimize rulers in Islam. These are the predecessors of the two or three main ideological trends that spawned radical terrorism. The three main trends are the Islamic Brotherhood, the second would be the Salafi, or as we know them the Wahabi sect, and the third is radical interpretation of Shiism. The terrorism, putting aside secular types, we are facing comes from either one of these three sects. If it is Hezbollah, it's Shia; if it is Al-Qaeda, it's Wahabi, and if it is Hamas, it is

the Islamic Brotherhood. The main common denominator of these sects is the negation of the West, of non-believers, the kuffar, as well as those Arab rulers who are not seen as true Islamic rulers, and the extremists believe that the blood of these rulers is permitted. Two examples, His Royal Highness Prince Hassan's grandfather, King Abdullah of Jordan, was assassinated in the mosque in Jerusalem in 1952 by an assassin from the Muslim brotherhood. And President Sadat was assassinated by the group that Ayman Al-Zawahiri, Osama bin Laden's number two man, was in charge of, and then, Gamaa Islamiya merged with Al-Qaeda. The sources of funding for these groups are numerous; they primarily come out of the Gulf, but they also come from the diaspora, from the Umma, including Europe and the United States. The United States is working with the governments of European allies and other countries to try to intercept the sources of funding, but it is a very difficult proposition. Moreover, the ideology of Jihad is a pretty consistent ideology; it is anti-Western, negates democracy, women's rights, human rights, and ethnic and religious minority rights. For example, the Wahabis don't really recognize a number of other Islamic sects, such as the Sufi, and in some cases, the Shia, as legitimate sects.

But this is far from being the only voice in the Islamic world. The moderate Muslims from Arab countries, from Pakistan, and Indonesia are an under-represented minority, possibly even a silent majority – of the Islamic world. But they are with the exception of Turkey very weak in formulating an agenda of moderate Islam which is compatible with the West. In many places it is a combination of deficiencies of state, control of the media and an education system that tends to allow radical preachers to preside over madrassas. Madrassas are Islamic academies which, in some cases, brainwash kids – sometimes as young as five. Of course, the extreme case was the Taliban regime in Afghanistan, but there are similar examples from Pakistan and from the Gulf. The translation of the first great Pashtu textbook demonstrates what I am talking about. Here are a few sample sentences. “Ahmad has a sword. He performs Jihad with his sword.” To teach the word weapon the author used: “My uncle has a weapon. He performs Jihad with his weapon.” The book says Jihad is obligation for everyone and that growing a beard is mandatory. The Palestinian Authority K to 12 (kindergarten to twelve) Guerilla training summer camps are another example of a combination of radical ideology and a perversion of religion that is used to create a generation of suicide bombers and fighters.

What can be done? I think that the instrumentality of the Cold War has to be rethought, reinvented, and deployed in the battle of hearts and minds. The reports from the US State Department are negative, but this is done against the base line of government propaganda in the Muslim world that blames the West for structural and social failures that have to be addressed through reform from within the Muslim society. In addition to that there is a lack of the political action component in the intelligence community in the United States. That political action component was abandoned in the 70s under Congressional investigations and some failures. This was a long time ago; we have to rethink not just international broadcasting, exchanges, and education, but also political action. This can be done overtly where possible and covertly where necessary.

Let me just tie this to NATO because the security and ideological component are closely tied with it. NATO has the Partnership for Peace program in Central Asia. Although, we have spoken very little about Central Asia here, I would be very happy to answer any questions about Central Asian dilemmas on the authoritarian governments that do not allow either a modern Islamic alternative or secular alternative for themselves. NATO has effective officer training and officer exchange programs that are possibly under-utilized *vis-a-vis* Islamic countries. Also, to some extent, NATO has a voice and influence with the foreign ministries, the defense ministries, and the security services, and thus, with the governments. The prevention of radical Islamic terrorism is a good investment so that less budgetary allocations will be needed in the future to fight terrorism on the battlefield.

Michael Žantovský

The next speaker is Olivier Roy, a well-known name in debates and discussions about the Middle East. He is the Research Director of the Humanities and Social Sciences sector of the French National Center for Scientific Research in Paris and has been a consultant for the French Minister of Foreign Affairs since 1984. He undertook a number of trips to Afghanistan during the times of the Russian invasion and the Mujaheddin. He was a special representative of the OSCE in Tadjikistan in 1993 and 1994. He is a well-known author, lecturer and speaker.

Olivier Roy

We've just spoken about the background of routing democracy in the Middle East. What does this mean? First, I would say forget comparisons. Forget about the idea that we can look at the German paradigm in 1945, the Latin American paradigm, and the examples of Kosovo and Bosnia and so on. We have a very specific situation in the Middle East, and there are three problems that are tied with the issue of democracy. The first problem is nationalism. The second is the social fabric, and the third is Islam. Of course, people would like to have democracy. If you conducted an opinion poll in Iraq, Nigeria, Morocco, or anywhere else, people would say, "yes, we love democracy, we want democracy." The issue is not democracy in some abstract sense; the third issue is how to teach people to work for democracy and to do this we have to address these three issues.

The first issue is nationalism. There will be no possibility for democracy to take root if some basic nationalistic requests are not granted. We have to take nationalism into consideration. It is very clear with the Palestinians. Arafat is not popular; he is corrupt and all the Palestinians know this. However, they want to keep him as their last symbol of nationalism. The Palestinian people are a sophisticated people and are ready for democracy, but not until nationalism has been addressed. Nationalism in Iraq is also very important; it is the main issue for Arab Iraqis who want to have some sort of Arab Iraqi national state. The Kurdish Iraqis wish to have some sort of Kurdistan. If we don't address nationalism, forget about rooting democracy.

The second issue is the social fabric of the area, often called tribalism. I don't like to use this term because "tribe" is a very specific concept, but let's use the term tribalism in a loose meaning. People used to stick to their primary group for loyalty, solidarity, political action; this primary group could be a clan, a tribe a small ethnic group, an extended family, or the work of a patron/client relationship. We have some sort of a linkage between tribalism and dictatorship. The mistake about the Middle East is to consider, for example, that Saddam Hussein had a totalitarian state. No, it was a bloody dictatorship, not a totalitarian state. Ideology didn't play a role in Iraq. Saddam Hussein was very clever to play on tribalism. When you have a dictatorship, you usually have a reinforcement of traditional solidarities. It is both a way to protect the family against dictatorship and a way to try to find its way through the dic-

tatorship by trying to connect one's own group with the state apparatus. This is how it is now in Nigeria. The army is playing on the segmentation of the society, and the people are playing on networks to connect themselves to the army. The problem is how to break this link between the authoritarian state and tribalism. The right way to do this is not to suddenly institute a democracy tomorrow morning, but to start the process of opening the political scene through freedom of expression, the freedom to have political parties, and legitimate elections. The idea is to let a class of political leaders who are not working just to enhance the interests of their primary group over time. But to do that we need legitimacy, and there is no legitimacy without taking nationalism into account. So we are back to nationalism.

The third issue is Islam and democracy. I may be in the minority, but I do not believe that political Islam is still a challenge in the Middle East. It was a challenge 20 years ago when the idea was that Islam is the solution. "Let's have an Islamic state and everything will be okay." It didn't work; it doesn't work; it will not work, and people know it. It is an absolute failure in Iran. In Algeria the opposition to the regime is not an Islamic opposition; demonstrators on the street of Algiers are not shouting "Islam, Koran," they are shouting democracy and freedom. What we see now in Egypt and Palestine, and what we will see in Iraq, is a mix of Islamism and nationalism. In Egypt when you read an article it is very difficult to know if the guy who wrote the article is a conservative Islamist or a leftist nationalist – you have the same anti-American mood and occasionally the same anti-Semitic mood. You only know whether the guy is the Islamist only when you see him; if he wears the beard, he is an Islamist. When Professor Ibn Ibrahim was jailed sometime ago for promoting freedom and democracy in Egypt, he was not supported by his fellow secular, leftist intellectuals because most of them felt that because he got some money from the Americans he was a traitor. So for them, nationalism, not democracy, was the main issue.

If we look at the Islamic movements, they are going in two different directions. The first direction is assimilation into the political process. We have Islamic parties who are now accepting democracy not as an ideology, but as the rules of the game. In Morocco, in Jordan, in Kuwait, and if they were allowed to do so, in Egypt, most of the Muslim brothers would be slowly converting to what they would call a Muslim-Christian democracy. They are not ideological democrats, but if we wait to build democracy, until everyone is

a democrat, we will never have a democracy. Democracy is not made of democrats. In France, we have lived for one century with more than a third of the electorate voting for non-democratic parties, from the Communist Party to some extre-mist parties. We have to work with non-democrats; the idea that one should exclude the radical Islamists is nonsense. If we exclude them, then the political scene will never be open. Iran is a good example of this. Who are the democrats in Iran? They are former revolutionaries; the so-called liberals in Iran are the same people who incited the revolution. And when they speak about the failure of the revolution, they know what they are speaking about. Of course, it took 20 years to get to this point, but it is also something we have to take into consideration. All these processes need time. As I said, the Islamists are going in two directions, and one is this integration of the political process. I don't speak about democratization; it is the integration of the political systems that we have to push for.

The second direction is radical internationalism. It is interesting to see that Islamic political violence has decreased in the Middle East when it has increased outside the Middle East. I don't consider Hamas to be Islamic political violence - Hamas and Jihad in Palestine are Shia nationalists. However, it is also difficult to differentiate between an Islamic suicide bomber and a secular bomber. The result is the same, and the motivation is the same. Most of the Islamic political violence happens outside the Middle East by people, many of whom, including Mr. bin Laden, come from the Middle East, but who stay away from Middle-Eastern politics. International Islamic terrorism is not an issue in the Middle East; it's an issue outside the Middle East. We have to address the human actors, the political actors of the Middle East. How to do that? Fortunately enough, my time is running out because I do not have ready-made recipes.

There is one danger. The danger is the mistake we made, meaning the West or everybody, in Egypt with Ibn Ibrahim. That is to say, focusing on one sort of liberal, democratic, intellectuals and making these people the only supporters of democracy, which may come sooner or later. In doing that we are creating some sort of nature reserve for the protection of an endangered species: the democratic intellectual. We are not helping the true process. The idea is to root democratization into the social fabric, into the real society. For that we have to take into account what is moving the people. What do they want? We have to address the human concerns.

Finally, we have to begin with taking into consideration nationalism and legitimacy. It's a big issue in Iraq. The American position is that we need some time to establish security and to bring the economy back, and then, when everything is okay in the society, then yes, of course, we'll let the true Iraqi government emerge. In my opinion, this is not the right way. The Iraqi people want a legitimate government now. The policemen are willing to die for some legitimacy. The issue of legitimacy is absolutely essential. The central issue is not improving the economy or opening the market. It's good to improve the economy, I have nothing against improving the economy, but there is no automatic linkage with democratization and improving the economy.

Michael Žantovský

Joshua Muravchik is a Resident Scholar at the American Enterprise Institute and a specialist in US foreign policy and international relations. He has written extensively about subjects like democracy, the role of ideas and ideologies in international politics, America's role in the post-Cold War world, etc. His most recent book, my favorite, is a history of socialism, called "The Heaven on Earth." Joshua is also a member of our advisory board and has been a friend of mine for many years.

Joshua Muravchik

First let me say thanks to you Michael and to Sasha, Olda and Jiří, for having created this new organization which may play a tremendously important role in holding, or re-stitching, together the Atlantic Community that has come under enormous strains in this last year. And thanks for putting on this very interesting conference and for honoring me with a place on the program. I thank you somewhat less warmly for making me the twenty-fourth speaker, if my count is right, and which inclines me to want to begin my remarks with a kind of apology, which is to say that it may be true that everything that needs to be said at this conference has already been said, but not everyone has yet had the opportunity to say it.

The germaneness of the topic this morning is that the efforts and hope for democratization in the Middle East is a central piece of the overall American strategy in the war against terrorism. It is the central part of that strategy and it is based on the idea that we not just have to confront the terrorist groups militarily, but also that we have to try to attack the root causes of terrorism. In contrast to the view articulated by Kofi Annan, among others, soon after 9/11 that terrorism arises from poverty, as was manifestly demonstrated in the case of the very rich spoiled boy, Osama bin Laden, and the nineteen killers who carried out the 9/11 attacks, the American strategy is based on the belief that the root cause of terrorism is the poisonous political culture of the Middle East which is entirely based on fanaticism, violence, and fantasy. Moreover, the best way to change that political culture is to try to bring “the bomb of democracy” to the region.

Whether we can succeed in that, nobody knows. It’s a startling fact that out of the twenty-two Arab states, there are no democracies; whereas out of the one hundred and seventy other states in the world today, one hundred and twenty one, over 70 %, are democracies with democratically elected governments. On the other hand, the skepticism that one can hear expressed today about the possibilities of the Arabs establishing democracy has been expressed elsewhere. Skeptical evaluations could have been heard a generation or two ago about all kinds of other countries, cultures, and parts of the world which today, we take for granted as democratic. For example, it was the official assessment of the US Department of State during the Second World War that it would be impossible to introduce democracy to Japan after the war because historical experience in Japan had showed that democracy could not work there. So we get at least some hope that the cogent reasons for skepticism about prospects of Arab democracy will turn out to be no less well-founded than the cogent reasons for skepticism about Japanese democracy.

The program of trying to bring democracy to the Middle East is a promising basis for a reinvigoration or renewal of Atlantic cooperation. It’s a task that gets us around or away from so many of the problems that have beset US-European relations in these earlier phases of the war on terrorism. For starters, it’s primarily a program which is non-military and non-violent in nature, and therefore, we get away from the argument about whether the Americans are too prone to resort to force quickly. Secondly, it is an area in which the differential of capabilities disappears. There is the political work that would go into

trying to spread democracy in this region. It is not expensive, and it does not require high-tech weaponry. In fact, the European partners bring special assets to the table that the Americans don't have; they have larger Muslim populations, which ought to be an asset in this process. The Europeans of this part of the world, Central Europe, have recently made a transition to democracy and so have the asset of that recent experience of democratization. This is also a kind of naturally multilateral activity where the coordination is easy because it doesn't require much; if there is agreement on goals, you don't get into issues of inter-operability. Everyone's activities can be complimentary to everyone else's.

What does this project consist of? I think it consists of a handful of elements, and the cornerstone has to be the success of the project of democratizing Iraq as a kind of model for the rest of the Arab world. This is a project to which the new democracies of formerly communist Europe have an opportunity to bring their recent experiences and knowledge, which is greater than our own. Beyond that it should entail a campaign to try to support opposition in Iran and to undermine the most tyrannical and pro-terrorist regimes in the region, particularly those of Syria and Libya. We should also work to support opposition movements in exile or however they might be organized. Also, this project includes working to challenge Syria's domination of Lebanon, which is illegitimate and stifles the one country in the Arab world that has had a peculiar kind of functioning democracy for a period of time. It also should entail a collaborative relationship with the monarchical regimes of the region, beginning with Jordan, Kuwait and smaller Gulf sheikhdoms who are already cooperating with the West in other ways and in the war against terrorism. These countries have, in varying degrees, expressed openness to some liberal reforms. There is a European experience that the Americans don't have with monarchical democracy and with the gradual transition from monarchy to monarchical democracy. There are others, the difficult cases, which are Egypt and Saudi Arabia. These are not only countries badly in need of democratization, but they are also countries where we don't want to just destabilize them and see where the chips fall. However, important work can be done in those countries by supporting democrats and finding, nurturing, encouraging democrats through the creation of, if I understood what Olivier called them, nature preserves for liberals.

The overall idea is to create a weight of diplomatic and psychological pressures on this region on behalf of demands for liberalization and democra-

tization. Bringing to bear, psychologically, the idea that the only kind of legitimacy for governments in the modern world is legitimacy that flows from a democratic basis. There are also many practical things that can and should be done both by Americans and Europeans in terms of broadcasting. We all do radio broadcasting, but none of us, as far as I am aware, have begun to catch-up with the Al Jazeera revolution which has made television a much more potent and interesting political communication medium in the region. Technologically speaking it is not difficult for us to get into that game. Similarly, the rapid increase in the use of Internet, particularly by young people in the region, presents new ways of communicating, even in societies where the regimes try to restrict communications. Above all else, the key work of sponsoring democracy in this region or in any region was pointed out to us by Adam Michnik in the letter that Michael read out at lunch yesterday, and this is, contrary to what Olivier said, to support democrats. It's the human capital, and there are democrats in this region who need and deserve our help.

I am sure that everyone here is familiar with the Arab Human Development Report that was published about a year ago by the UN Human Development Commission which pointed to three deficits in Arab world: freedom, information, and women's participation. It was written by a team of several dozen Arabian intellectuals, some living in exile, some in their home countries. You may not be aware of this, but there is a second Arab Human Development Report that is going to be issued tomorrow. And that will be followed up by a third and fourth report; they are taking up each of their three recommendations in greater detail. The one issued tomorrow is about the deficit in knowledge, and what they need to do to correct it. Last week, I attended a briefing by the authors, and it's a very interesting and impressive group of Arab intellectuals who are, no doubt – perhaps because some of them are in the safety of exile – eager to fight for liberal and democratic ideas in their region. There are few things more valuable that we can do than to find ways to support them and the ideas they are proposing, such as a massive program of translations of Western books into Arabic.

Finally, the question that is put to us by the title of this panel, is this a job for NATO? And the answer to that is I don't know. It possibly could be, but it certainly doesn't fit neatly into NATO's traditional missions or institutions. However, whether or not it can be or should be done under a NATO umbrella, it's a job for the Atlantic Community. Also it's a job on which the Atlantic

Community can be more united than we have been this last year. And there are very few tasks ahead of us that are more important.

Michael Žantovský

Steven Everts is a member of the Centre for European Reform, a relatively young but increasingly influential think tank based in London. He is the director of the CER's transatlantic program which covers the full range of US/European relations, foreign and security policy, trade issues, financial, and economic cooperation. His own research focuses on trends in EU foreign policy both in terms of the policies the EU should pursue and the institutional reforms that are necessary to make the EU a more influential global actor. He is also working on how to maintain a close and constructive partnership with the US.

Steven Everts

Now, the exam question that we are discussing today is: can the United States and Europe join forces in a common strategy to promote a more liberal, democratic, and transparent political order in the Greater Middle East? Can we, together, promote the rule of law, political pluralism, and religious tolerance? We have to acknowledge that the starting position for such a joint strategy is not particularly great. In some respects this question reminds me of the famous story where a gentleman is walking in the Irish countryside, and after a while he gets sort of thirsty. So he walks up to the farmer and asks him to point him in the direction of a pub so that he can get a drink. The farmer looks around and sees hills in every direction, so the farmer says, "If you want to get to a pub, I wouldn't start from here." In some respects, this is also true of the United States and Europe forging a joint strategy. We have got to do it, and Ron and others, have laid out the case for doing so in a very compelling manner. However, it's an ambitious project. Yet, as Josh has indicated, it can also have a therapeutic value because this is something that we should be able to agree upon more easily than some of the sharp ended issues, such as WMD, that we discussed yesterday. I will structure my thoughts under three headings. The first is very briefly

recapitulating why we need to do this. Secondly, I will discuss the roles that the United States and Europe should play. Lastly, I will end with some dos and don'ts for making a very practical and concrete agenda for moving forward.

Why do we need to do this? It's now becoming accepted across the political spectrum in the United States, in Europe, and in the region as well that without a change in the underlining political dynamics that pertain to the region, the names of the terrorist groups will change from one day to the next and the rogue states that represent the crisis of the day will change in name. But we're dealing with symptoms. We have to be more ambitious and accept that without a change to the sclerotic political systems, the persisting human rights violations, and the absence of the rule of law and due process, we are not going to advance very much. There is, as the Arab Human Development Report has catalogued, a real crisis of governance that we have to tackle. The good news is that there is this new consensus emerging not only in this crowd but also among regional specialists that the status quo of stagnation is untenable, unsustainable and unacceptable because it produces neither security, nor development, nor stability. We are in the process of witnessing a paradigm shift. We are moving from the situation where we privilege political stability, oil supplies, and markets for arms exports, to a new situation, whereby we privilege political pluralism, independent media, and the rule of law. So we at least try to transcend that devil's choice that we have always faced – either support the sclerotic and authoritarian political order set as it exists or let in radical Islamic groups. We have got to transcend, and from Britain it might sound slightly tired, but there has to be a third way. That's what we have to seek to achieve. Now, the bad news is that despite this new consensus, we don't really know how to promote democracy. We pay lip service to it; we organize conferences about it, but we don't really know how to do this. And this brings me to the roles of the United States and Europe as outsiders.

There is a danger of a sort of Greek tragedy playing itself out in front of our eyes. The tragedy might run as follows. The Europeans should be able to play a leadership role in this exercise, but its also true that within Europe's political class there is still a huge amount of ambivalence and skepticism as to whether this is really doable. On the American side, there is, at least on a level of political rhetoric, far greater emphasis on democracy as a strategic goal in the context of the global war on terror. However, from a European point of view, there are two counterpoints that need to be made. Does the United States realize that it has an

image problem in the region? The United States has a massive image problem in the Greater Middle East, and it has to tackle it. That image problem is linked very directly to a history whereby the United States and also the Europeans, but more in the perception of the region, the United States, of supporting corrupt but pro-Western regimes. It's the Faustian pact that we had. Secondly, America talks a good game about spreading democracy, but in terms of financial resources it's still woefully inadequate. So we could in a caricature say that the Europeans have the resources and the political base but lack the sense of urgency and the sense of will for changing the political dynamics of the region. The United States is ahead of us in strategic vision but may not realize their lack in political standing and capital as well as resources to some respect.

Lastly, some dos and don'ts. The first dos are primarily aimed at the Europeans. Do you see politics as changing things, not just managing the status quo? Europeans particularly need to reacquire the will to initiate and follow through with policies that seek to bring about political change in the region. Second: both of us, but particularly the United States, need to spend much more on civil society projects. The existing programs are far too focused on capital investment instead of human capital and are far too focused on government-to-government relationships. We need far better targeting of our existing programs. I have some limited experience in trying to shift some EU programs towards those objectives, and it's very hard to make that case. We also have to grapple with the vexed question of conditionality. Positive and negative conditionality, whereby we benchmark countries and reward those who make progress, such as Morocco, must be implemented, but we also have to have the guts to withdraw support from Lagos, Egypt, and others. Some people say yes, but that's deserting the poor. Not so, because there are other delivery mechanisms that we can use the traditional government-to-government mechanisms that we currently use. Third: support democratic processes, not just individuals. Avoid the sort of Yeltsin syndrome that we had in the 90s. Also, support outcomes of democratic processes even if they are unpalatable to you in the short term. This is particularly true with the Europeans when they grapple with the Algerian dilemma. The Americans have their Turkish dilemma and the troop access to Iraq scenario. Fourth: this project needs some sort of institutional anchoring and expression. Now, NATO will be part of that, but I am sort of with those who say, "we also need something else." There are worse places to start than with these ideas that are floating around of an Arab BFP or some sort of

OECD for the Middle East. I am sympathetic to that. Nothing, as the famous European will say, is possible without individuals, but nothing lasts without institutions. I think we need to set up some sort of institution to give a firmer footing to this.

Now some don'ts, they are three. First: avoid the temptation of a rigid division of labor where Europe does the Maghreb and America does the Gulf, or Europe does the Palestinians and America does Israel. There are some inevitable priorities that both sides have; however, even with a functional division of labor of hard power, soft power can get out of hand. Second: avoid patronizing attitudes; the sort of approach that "We are going to sort you out, and we know what's good for you." Work with people that are from the region, local reformers, domestic groups, and give them support as Josh and others have said. Avoid gimmicks such as some sort of a nice magazine that gives the impression that we talk to Arabs, but are not interested in what they have to say. People in the region are quite experienced with exposure to propaganda, so they see right through this. That's not going work; we've got to be slightly more sophisticated in our public diplomacy, and also make sure that our public diplomacy is aligned with our actual policies. If you listen to people from the region as to what Europe offers them, they will say that it offers agriculture protectionism and stringent visa regimes. Similarly, they have a perception that the United States offers a sort of iron fist and military interventions, but no stringent visa regimes. Now, we may think that this is a very incomplete picture, but it suggests the size of the task ahead. Lastly, don't despair and become defeatist. This is going to take a generation or more. There is no quick fix, but we have to start now. I would like to think that Americans and Europeans don't just walk away from something because it's in the "too-hard-to-do" category. I would argue that even more so than managing Iraq or forging joint strategies on WMD, necessary as these things are, a project of promoting political and economic reforms in the region is both necessary in and of itself and it can also have a beneficial effect on transatlantic relations.

Michael Žantovský

Amin Tarzi is an analyst for Afghanistan and Iraq and compiles the weekly Afghanistan report and writes the Afghanistan sections for the Radio Free

Europe/Radio Liberty Newswire. Prior to joining RFE/RL, Tarzi worked as a Senior Research Associate for the Middle East at the Center for Nonproliferation Studies (CNS) at the Monterey Institute of International Studies where he taught a graduate seminar on Middle East security policies and threat perceptions. He was also a US marine.

Amin Tarzi

I want to thank Ron Asmus, as he is the reason I am here. I will talk about NATO specific issues, and I actually created the title “The Role of NATO and Democracy Building in Afghanistan: the First Real Test.” I will not talk about theories and what is possible and what could be done; I will talk about specifics.

Afghanistan is the very first test of NATO expanding beyond its original, mandated, or envisioned area. People thought that Kosovo was too much out of area, but this is way out of area. However, if we look at what we have discussed, the so called conceptual Greater Middle East, wherever you put the border, Afghanistan is way out to the east of it. It is not an Arab country as most of the Middle East is. Yes, it is an Islamic country, but it's way out in the corner of it. It's a very good test case to see what happens.

That stated, just a few peculiars about the Afghanistan mandate where NATO is now involved. First, Afghanistan has a very clear UN mandate as to what's happening there. Second, even without the UN, the coalition called Operation Enduring Freedom, led by the United States of America, has enormous support. At the time it began, there were eighty-seven countries with a liaison or some kind of a force structure within the operational aid structure of the central command in Tampa, Florida before the bombing started on October 2001. Most of them were volunteers, so Operation Enduring Freedom was extremely collective, which is not the case in Iraq. Another issue is a clear road map towards democracy and state building in Afghanistan. Some people could say that this is too short-sighted or that it puts too many things on the same table, but there is a very clear statement. The constitution should be written by December of this year, general elections should be held by June of 2004, and then you have democracy. This is all very dandy and good, but the question is whether it's working or not.

The second question is, "What is the role of NATO there?" NATO is in Afghanistan as we speak, and while I'm sure you all know this, I'd like to go over the list of forces that are in Afghanistan. Operation Enduring Freedom is about 11,500 troops led by the United States, but as we speak, there are many other nations, some openly, some not so openly, who are working as members of this coalition. This does include non-NATO members. Then you have ISAF - the International Security Assistance Force, which until August, was basically led by three: Turkey, the United Kingdom and Germany. Germany, along with the Netherlands, joined with about 5,000 people, and they are based in Kabul. Their area of responsibility does not go beyond what I call Greater Kabul. As of August, when NATO took over, Canada will be taking over from Germany very soon. Then you have what is called the ANA, the Afghan National Army, which is envisaged to be about 75,000 people by 2007. Every expert you can talk to will say that this will never happen. Right now they have between 4,000 to 4,500 people, most of them in the desert, and nobody knows where their loyalties are. The national army does not exist as we speak. It is envisaged, but it does not exist.

And then you have the old armies. Remnants of the communists are there. What I call the Old Taliban, the Taliban regime remnants are there. Al-Qaeda is there. And then something else, it's a term I coined, the Neo-taliban are there, too. Who are the Neo-talibans? The Neo-talibans are some Taliban members, and as Olivier said we cannot look at these things with very clear divisions, the Neo-talibans also include drug dealers. a lot of these fights are over drugs. However, because whether they want US cover, or they want money, they will say the Taliban did this. Also, there is another important part of the fabric of the society, the disenchanting Pashtuns. I use that word because the Pashtoons in Afghanistan feel that they are not part of the main political process. They also go under the name of the Taliban. The Afghan president, or the chairman of the Afghan transition administration, Hamid Karzai, has made repeated efforts to get his own people not to call all of them Taliban. He is trying to distinguish between the good and the bad Taliban. He knows that's what should be done, but it's not working because right now the Taliban has a bad name.

So you have all of these forces, and a drug issue. I want to emphasize the drug issue in Afghanistan. Last year Afghanistan produced more drugs, than in any other year. There was a 94 % increase from 2001 to 2002. This is not my

number, it is from Vienna, from the UN. Those drugs will end up on the streets of Paris, London, and even Prague, and eventually, maybe immediately in the United States. That's another aspect and there is a lot of money being exchanged there.

Terrorism and drugs usually go together; then you get money. This is where NATO is coming in. However, as we look at NATO's situation right now, NATO is not coming to fight terrorism in Afghanistan. As I said yesterday during one of my responses, six ISAF members have been killed by terrorist bombs – one was a suicide bomber hitting a bus, which killed four Germans, and then two Canadians died two weeks ago when a freshly laid land mine blew up their vehicle. However, Kabul itself is not a hotbed of terrorism. In Kabul things are pretty much going well. People are not being shot, there are restaurants, and people are functioning. The first expansion of NATO beyond Kabul is Kunduz – the so-called safe island. If I were a German soldier, I would take that name very negatively. It's not a very safe place to send your troops without much of a notion about what's going to happen. So NATO will be going to Kunduz, which sits to the north. It is not a drug producing place. There are no major Al-Qaeda, Neo-taliban or Taliban there, so it is safe relatively.

The questions that are still unanswered, which I asked some of the panelists, especially Mr. Altenburg, is what the full structure is. What is the command/control decision on how to integrate the expanding NATO forces with Operation Enduring Freedom? I don't think there are answers. What we heard specifically is that there is a search and rescue system put in place, but beyond that we don't know what's happening. So NATO is facing a real test, in a real place with a real and very clear mandate, but without a very clear blueprint.

What I also want to say about Afghanistan and the situation with Islamic terrorism or Islamic radical terrorism is that it is not the only enemy. NATO and most states talk about state structures; they like to have defined enemies or defined problems. NATO is a very structured, defined organization. It needs to have a defined enemy. The Soviet Union was very defined. We knew exactly where they were, and we even knew where their missile silos were. It used to be my job to calculate how these things would come in, where would they hit, and what is their area. While there are some clearly defined situations like that in Iran, a relatively small country in comparison

to its neighbor, there are a lot of blurred lines in the region. From day one when we, meaning the United States and the world, went into Afghanistan, there were a lot of lines that were blurred. Some of them were blurred by design; some of them were blurred because people were annoyed about what was happening in Afghanistan. Today, the allies we have are fighting against us. I give you a very clear example, and I will go into some recommendations that I have.

Take the event in Mazare Sharif last week. Mazare Sharif is the third largest city in Afghanistan; it sits in the north of Afghan country. There is a PRT there. For those of who you don't know, PRT stands for Prevention Reconstruction Team and NATO is expanding within these systems. This is a US designed idea that came about to bring security, peace, and reconstruction to specific places. The teams are about fifty to eighty people at specific places supported by military. Now, NATO will be supporting one of them in Kunduz and maybe more elsewhere. There is a PRT in Mazare Sharif with sixty-five British soldiers on the in the ground here. Last week's incident involved two people and two major parties. The parties were the group that people normally call the Northern Alliance, but it is actually Jamiat-i Islami Party and the Junbish-i Milli-yi IslamParty. Jamiat-i Islami Party's leader is Marshal Mohammad Qasim Fahim, the defense minister of Afghan Interim Administration. Junbish-i Milli-yi IslamParty's leader is General Abdul Rashid Dostum, who is a former Communist and now a special advisor to president Karzai on security matters. I just want to highlight that these two are major people in the government, and last week they had a tank battle in the middle of Marzare Sharif. I don't know in what estimate you are interested, but forty dead is the least, eighty is the most. US sources say about forty-five were killed in this tank battle in the city full of civilians. Guess where the PRT was? In their barracks! The British did not even come out to see what was going on. When the cease-fire was being negotiated, the British ambassador and the PRT came and said okay we are here to solve this situation. Now my question to NATO is: if this happens in Kunduz what would NATO do? Would it intervene? Does it have a clear-cut blueprint about what to do in cases like that? We are talking about a tank battle. Afghanistan is not a war area, yet there is a little war zone there. Moreover, who are we fighting with and are we going towards democracy? Mr. Karzai is a very good person. He is a legitimate person, and he is a person who

could win an election. He does not have a military; his defense minister has a military that is illegitimate in Kabul and under the Bonn agreement there should not be any Afghan forces in Kabul.

Lastly, some thoughts for you to take with you. Is NATO important? That question has been answered here. They are in Afghanistan and from what we heard, they will be there past June 2004. To the United States, Europe, all NATO members, and those of you sitting here today, I urge you to study Afghanistan. Get to know who we are dealing with and what the plans are, not only on paper but also in reality. I understand that you do not want to share all your military options with the world to see, but at least talk about them within your formal structures and your allies, so they understand what is going happen. Are you going to call the US to come in and bomb? The US is part of NATO, but is it the US and NATO's ISAF together? These are questions that are immediately important as Germany, followed by Finland and Belgium will be there soon. Please ponder that before we will think about NATO creating a safe heaven throughout the GME. We have to look at specifics, and Afghanistan is a specific case.

PANEL III: DISCUSSION

Michael Žantovský

There are already a number of people asking to speak on my two questions from the start of the session. We have already gotten some answers from our speakers. Can NATO play a role in democracy building in the Middle East? I think the answer is “we are not sure.” Maybe we are to blame for not posing the question in exactly the right manner. We were never sure of NATO being involved in democracy building, as it plans military operations, but just the same, we believe that NATO has a sort accidental democratizing effect. So far it’s been empirically true that whenever or wherever NATO steps in, democracy follows sooner or later. Whether or not this would be the case for the Middle East is another question. As to the second question: “Is more democracy the answer to the problems of the Middle East?” – I think the answer is probably yes; but we are not quite in agreement as to whether we have in mind democracy as a process, or democracy as a value-based system. In the latter case, we should probably speak about liberty rather than democracy. As a countryman of Olivier’s and a well remembered visitor to Josh’s country noted about one hundred and fifty years ago, democracy and liberty are not exactly the same thing. I will start with Mr. Alaton.

Ishak Alaton

Can we build democracy while the house is burning? This is a question I want to underline, because for the time being, the house is burning. Amin Tarzi told

us about the mini-war in Kunduz with forty dead between the two fractions. So now I transpose this scenario to Iraq where the house is also burning. I have a question for Olivier Roy. You very briefly touched on the social tendencies in post-Saddam Iraq. You also very briefly touched on what you called Kurdish aspirations; you probably meant aspirations to autonomy or eventual independence. You then mentioned the Iraqi Shiites, the Arabic Shiites, who have another agenda. You didn't touch on the Sunnis, who are an extension of the Saddam regime. These groups have started fighting among themselves. Now, I want to bring in an additional element and ask you a very specific question, so that you may peer into your crystal ball and make some predictions. The Turkish government has made the decision to sending troops into Iraq. It is a limited number of troops, 10,000, so it is not an imposing force, it is more a token force. Knowing the conditions there, what is your assessment? What are, provided Turkey goes in with 10,000 troops, the best and the worst case scenarios for Turkey? In the end, should we, Turkey, send troops to Iraq or not?

Dan Schueftan

When it comes to democratizing or democracy building in the Middle East, it seems to me that the question is: "What we are really after?" If we want to feel good, it's a great idea. We try to work for democracy, it makes us feel good, and it's a major gratification. But if we expect results, I suggest that we should be very modest. Taking the new definition you have given here, that where NATO goes, democracy follows sooner or later, I would add: much later, and perhaps to a very marginal extent, at least for this generation. The reason I have to adopt this very pessimistic opinion is that we are looking at two hundred years of failed attempts to export democracy and modernity into the Middle East.

I agree with Josh Muravchik that it is not working on the human development scale. If the notion is to let us help export democracy to the Middle East, two hundred years of failure is not something accidental. We need to see why it has failed.

To repeat something that has already been mentioned, we need to look at the question of why the only place in the world where democracies are conspicuously missing is the Arab world. Let me be very specific, I am not saying the Middle East or the Muslim world, I am saying the Arab world. If you look at

the Middle East, the only countries which are either democratic, democratic to a considerable extent, democratizing or have the potential of democratizing are non-Arab states. Of course, I am speaking about Israel, Turkey, and Iran. In Israel you have democracy. In Turkey you have a version of it that is now undergoing a fascinating experience of the marriage between Muslim fundamentalist party – or with its roots – and a pluralistic society. In Iran, where, in spite of very totalitarian regime, you have two-thirds of the population committed to a more pluralistic society. We can learn a lot from Iran. Not only that it is an Arab problem, not a Muslim problem, but also that totalitarian regimes don't prevent the emergence of democratic structures that can later be used to build a democratic regime. The totalitarian regime there is much more oppressive than that of many other countries in the Arab world, but the popular demand is for more pluralism and that is different from what we have in many other countries in the Arab world. Look at the two cases in the Arab world where there were almost free elections. In both cases it was an accident, and people don't pay attention to what happened in Algeria and Jordan. In both of these cases, the populations decided that the authoritarian regimes were not authoritarian enough. They wanted to have Islamic totalitarianism, which is even worse than what they had before. Of course, these people are speaking in terms of, "Let's have free elections." This is what Bernard Lewis called the system of one man, one vote; once they establish themselves in power, it's too late for anything else to emerge.

Can things change? Of course they can, but not necessarily for the better. The notion that if you have change, it inevitably must be for the better, reminds me of an old story. One day I was very gloomy, and a voice came out of the darkness and said, "Cheer up! Things could get worse." So I cheered up and sure enough, things did get worse. Things are getting worse in the Middle East; look at what is happening in Egypt. It is really depressing for a person who has followed the cultural trends in the Arab world for so long. Cairo used to be a place with more pluralism than many other places. Now, not only is there a strong anti-Semitic element, but there is also a society that is becoming less and less tolerant to anything that is not according to dogma. Things are getting worse in many places.

Finally, what can we do? We should support people who promote a more pluralistic approach. Ibn Ibrahim is a very good example. We should reward regimes that are opening up and condemn those who don't. More than anything

else, we should have very little hope. We will leave something for our grandchildren to deal with because there is not much hope in the immediate future.

Günther Altenburg

First of all, I would once again recall that no religion has a monopoly on terrorism. Look at Europe – ETA, IRA, Red Brigades, Red Army Faction, railway bombings. I don't think we are really helped in a political way by knowing who has been with whom together in a terrorist training camp. This does not open the prospects for political solutions. We need to deal with conflicts. We have called it asymmetric warfare. This is what it is about, and we need to deal with the conflicts rather than with modalities.

My second point is about democracy, and I have to say that Dan Schueftan stole most of my lines. Democracy is indeed a challenge for all countries in the Middle East, including Israel. I would subscribe to differentiating some of the Arab countries: Iran, Turkey, and so on. One needs to be very specific. The experiences that we have had in Central Asian states indicate to me that we have a long way to go before we can achieve good results.

My last point will be to thank Amin Tarzi for his excellent briefing on Afghanistan. He gave us an idea of the problems ahead. Having NATO involved in the extended mandate in Afghanistan and face situations like the ones in Mazare Sharif will be a real challenge for us all.

Michael Žantovský

My friend Arthur Avnon, the Israeli Ambassador to Prague, asked me for the floor last night, and I was waiting for him to give me the sign, and now I can see it.

Arthur Avnon

I would say right at the outset that I am a representative of the government of a country that is not a member of NATO. I am not even an academician, so

I don't feel as though I am in a position to give advice. Nevertheless, I would like to express some thoughts. I will start with what Dr. Cohen said, when he referred to democracies as historically not being engaged in fights among themselves. I would like to extend that and say that democracies are not sponsors of terrorism either. If we all accept the notion that one of, if not the major, problem for the free world in the beginning of the 21st century is terrorism, then no doubt this makes tackling the issue of how to promote democracy in the Middle East even more important. What can we do about it? On Friday, I had the great honor and pleasure to attend a ceremony held by the Prague Society for International Cooperation and the Forum 2000 Foundation, in which President Havel was awarded a prize. He immediately turned this prize over to a young man, Mr. Dinko, who is the Editor-in-Chief of a newspaper in Belarus for the work that he is doing there. Maybe Mr. Dinko is not branded as a dissident, but he is working for democracy. The thought that crossed my mind during this ceremony was: "Isn't it about time that such prizes are turned over to dissidents in the Arab world?" However, I then thought to myself: "Are there any dissidents in the Arab world?" Yes, there are some, but most of them live overseas. Could anybody imagine a dissident in Syria, or for that matter in Saudi Arabia? They would probably not live for very long. This does not mean that the free world should ignore what is going on in these countries, not only from the angle of their own national interests but also in the interests of the free world and of human rights. It's about time for the world, and for that matter Europe; I'm not mentioning the United States here because they are already doing it, to start talking about democracy and how important it is for the promotion of stability in the world and in the Middle East.

The other facet of this issue is how not to take those democracies that exist for granted. My country is sometimes taken for granted. As an example, I would like to mention the speech made by Madeleine Albright last night, in which she said that it may not be very fair to criticize someone who is not present. Most of it was eloquent, and I could agree with most of what she said. Her denunciation of terrorism was very clear, but when an equation is made between a leader of Israel, Mr. Sharon, and Mr. Arafat, and ignores where these people come from, that is a failure to recognize the political surroundings in which democracies operate. If one would take, not to speak about the history of these two people, the assumption that if more democracies existed in the Arab world, maybe the Road Map would have a better chance. Mr. Arafat would

be under more pressure to do more about terrorism, which is the main reason why the Road Map was devised. Maybe if this democratic atmosphere, which does exist in Israel, existed in the Arab world, it would give us a better chance at success. Even the comparison of the current Prime Minister of Israel and the late Prime Minister Rabin, who was admired by many in the world for what he did, did not recognize the existing democracy of Israel. If one makes this comparison, one erases the years that passed between Mr. Rabin and Mr. Sharon. Something happened in the Middle East since Mr. Rabin died. The analysis, which is not my own, and the public opinion polls state that, of course, Mr. Sharon was elected democratically. If Mr. Rabin were to run for election today, there is a chance that he would not win this election because of what has happened since the year he was murdered. What to do?

Before sending in NATO or any other international organization, the free world has to be much more specific and vocal in expressing dissatisfaction with the Arab regimes for not having freedom in their countries. I know that this sounds naive. In 1974, I was a young diplomat at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. International terrorism as we know it started at the beginning of the 70s. Messages were sent from our foreign minister to the foreign ministers of other countries in Europe asking for cooperation in combating international terrorism. The response was that they could not do anything about it. Everybody knows why, there was oil and other interests, some of which exist even today. We should not give up, and the voice must be loud and clear.

For the record, as far as the purpose of this conference is concerned, NATO as a participant in the Middle East, there is experience in having foreign forces on Middle Eastern soil, and by and large, it has been a positive experience. It has been positive only because the sides agreed to have these foreign forces standing between the belligerent sides, and this should be recognized. It's recognized by many in this room, but it should be said, for the record, by an official of the government of Israel that if there is agreement between the sides to have NATO there, it can probably happen.

Gunduz Aktan

Yesterday, we understood that because of a transatlantic dispute over Iraq, over terrorism and so forth, NATO cannot take up the issues of the Greater

Middle East and that without discussing it thoroughly, NATO cannot really develop a strategy towards the Greater Middle East. First things first, they should embark on discussing this issue.

My second point has to do with our working assumption that democracies do not breed terrorists. This is not true. In Europe there are many terrorists in many democratic countries. Indeed, throughout the democratization process, terrorists, historically speaking, become very active. The speakers who had contributions are wonderful, but they have neglected two topics. One is secularism. This is one of the crucial matters; you cannot have democracy without secularism. The second is economic development. You cannot have a sustainable democracy without sustainable economic development.

The most costly enterprise would be to stop terrorism through transforming the Greater Middle East. How could you do it? As Mr. Olivier Roy said, without a nation state you cannot have democracy and without a nation you cannot have a nation state. Iraq is not a nation state and doesn't have a nation. Now, how to create a nation? You have a dilemma here. Either you have to wait decades, if not centuries, so that a given ruling elite can create some nation or you have to break the country down into smaller units where the ethnic allegiance will replace the national allegiance.

Lastly: terrorism consists of terrorist acts. If you reduce this to terrorism, then it is easier to understand. However, terrorist acts are committed in the war between Palestinians and Israel. And Palestinian suicide bombers are killing themselves as part and parcel of a war, which falls under the international humanitarian law. As some people asked, how can we, in this case, separate the terrorist nature of this warfare from the political solution of the Palestinian question?

Rouzbeh Pirouz

I wanted to take the topic and look at it a little bit more broadly, not just at the role of NATO but at the whole Western project of democratization in the Middle East. There are two main areas of risk that we need to look at and mitigate. One area is that an attempt at liberation will be perceived as colonization or occupation, which would be terribly unfortunate as we have found in Iraq. We can go in with the best of intentions, but people will interpret our actions differ-

ently, which makes the whole thing backfire. The second area is that in trying to do this quickly, as Josh Muravchik pointed out, we are potentially opening a can of worms, and we don't quite know what the outcome will be. As somebody said, the situation might get worse rather than better. These are two areas of risk that should be addressed, and I have just a few thoughts on how we can do that.

In terms of regional perceptions of our actions and our motives, it's very important that we listen to people from the region even when we don't necessarily agree with them. It's a great shame that Arab representatives did not accept invitations to come to this conference because while we may not agree with many of the things that they say, how these things are perceived in the region is very important. It can mean the difference between success and failure. We can incorporate that into the nature of the policies we execute. For example, if the project in Iraq had been more multilateral or designed somewhat differently, we could potentially have avoided some of the issues that we have right now with people perceiving it as an occupation despite the fact that it's intended as a liberation. We need to adopt an approach which is both top down and bottom up, combining it with what Olivier Roy and Ariel Cohen said. You have to strengthen the forces of reform, but you also have to make sure that the environment is one that allows them to operate and that the institutions are there for them to develop. I was really glad that Ariel Cohen mentioned Sharin Ebadi, the Nobel Prize winner; she is exactly the kind of figure that can be instrumental. Her selection produced an enormous amount of excitement in Iran. The outpouring expression of excitement, especially on the part of Iranian women was exhilarating. This is just the kind of thing that we should be looking into, but we also need to put pressure on states to give people like her the chance to operate. She, for example, spent some time in prison.

The role of Western information sources such as the BBC World Service and Voice of America, are very instrumental. It is a battle of ideas, and people are thirsty for information. These services, even Radio Israel, have a huge audience in these countries. This is a fantastic tool, not just for struggle, but also for shaping public opinion. By the way, I was told that Ebadi granted an interview to an Israeli newspaper, which I think took a lot of courage, and is an omen of the potential changes that can come about. Furthermore, we need an alliance with the middle class in these regions. The middle class in the Middle East is probably like the middle class everywhere and looks above all for economic security. These people will likely place economic security above Jihad. They could be a

fantastic ally in this. We underestimate the role of opinion polls in understanding the middle class; as Olivier Roy mentioned, all the opinion polls indicate broad support for democratization and relatively limited support for fundamentalism. My fourth recommendation is that we don't need to see it as an all or nothing deal; we can approach this in an evolutionary way. We should hold states to making progress in certain areas that eventually will lead to full democracy; that itself is progress. The Turkish example is very interesting in the sense that the prospect of EU membership has brought consistent change in Turkey over period of time. This approach requires real conditionality which means consistently rewarding people when they perform and punishing them when they don't.

Finally, a unified approach between Europe and the US is absolutely critical. The example of the pressure on the Iranians on the nuclear issue is a classic example of that. The Iranians really reacted seriously only when they realized that the EU and the US were on the same page because otherwise they could always play the two against each other. The Europeans have a great deal of nuance to add to the strategies, but if the approach is unified, the impact will be much more effective.

Ruprecht Polenz

If you are discussing the difficulties of promoting democracy in the Middle East, you should also take into account the problems with globalization in this region. Globalization and modernization put all those societies under tremendous stress; people feel themselves cut off from their cultural roots, and perceive democracy as an additional stress. It is much more difficult than we might think. I agree with my Israeli friend that first we should try to promote more pluralism, the rule of law, and gradual change, otherwise we might fail. Experience with promoting democracy in Latin America in the 70s and 80s supports this approach. The political foundations of the German parties have worked there for decades to improve trade unions and the development of political parties. They were quite successful, and in Latin America democracies are now firmly established. There are other parts of the world where democratization was a success. A democratic Iraq probably will mean, besides a balance in the constitution among Kurds, Sunnites, and Shiites, a Shiite majority. This

Shiite majority will probably be not as pro-American and pro-Israeli as we all would like it to be, but nevertheless, if it's democracy, we have to accept it.

Roger Robinson

We haven't, as yet, talked much about the economic and financial dimensions of democracy building in the region or, for that matter, the war on terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and ballistic missiles. Here again, we see rather serious differences among NATO members concerning the pursuit of a policy of engagement, for example, versus, isolation. To underscore this point, if you look at Iran, which is quickly approaching the October 31 IAEA deadline, whereby they have to prove that they are not pursuing a nuclear weapons program – something difficult to do as they are – the question is: “Will the UN Security Council go forward with new economic sanctions?” Is this something that we'll support? Europe traditionally has a different view on that than the United States. Syria is facing a new round of unilateral US sanctions in the coming weeks and months from our Congress that are going to prohibit dual-use equipment and technologies from American firms. You can be confident that those kinds of dual use equipment and technology will be forthcoming elsewhere. The Iran-Libya sanctions act of 1996 is something that has been waited by Presidents including the current President, but the Congress is seeking to tighten it, even though it has an extra territorial reach. There is also the North Korean crisis, where we are going to see a system being put together that can fabricate one nuclear weapon a month over the next eight months – something the US will probably find intolerable. The Europeans and others may feel that a policy of engagement and dialogue is indicated there. Cutting to the question, the strains created by these differences on the economic and financial policies in the greater Middle East aren't trivial. I am curious as to how one or more of our panelists believe these growing disconnects will play out.

Hirsh Goodman

I have been sitting here wondering whether NATO involvement in the Greater Middle East might not enhance the view of a “War of the West” against Islam –

another western organization positioning itself against the Middle East. The other thing I was wondering was whether it would be helpful to clarify which NATO we are speaking about in this regard. Are we speaking about NATO the military, or NATO and it's non-military aspects? I found it a little bit confusing over the past day and a half because it has been like a porridge. Instead of sorting out which arm of this organization you want to do which job, we have been speaking in generalities.

I am not sure if democracy is really the goal. Some people want kings, some people want queens, and some people want democracy. The goal should be civil society, non-rogue states. We should modify the goals and bring them down to the doable, rather than trying to impose theoretical systems that may not be endemic. I am not a religious person, or I would have been in the synagogue yesterday, but a quote from the Talmud keeps reverberating in my head. "It takes a fool to throw a pebble in a pond, and a thousand geniuses can't stop the ripples." When one comes along with ideas like this, we have to be very surgical and specific, otherwise we may end-up with another Afghanistan or Iraq.

Onur Öymen

I would like to add my voice to Günther Altenburg when he spoke about terrorism outside the Middle East and outside the Islamic countries. I will also stress the fact that some of the terrorist organizations in the Middle East are sponsored by non-Islamic countries. We have detained some terrorist leaders carrying non-Islamic country passports. They have openly revealed the support they received from non-Islamic countries, so you should consider this as an important element while evaluating terrorism in the Middle East.

My second point is that you, Michael, ask yourself the question whether democracy is desirable in the Middle East. I believe it was a rhetorical question. We do not have the right to deny some people democratic societies because of the geographical region where they live or because of their faith. All people of the Middle East deserve democracy just as the rest of the world does. Research shows that in the last twenty years, democracy has developed everywhere in the world except the Middle East. Is this the fault of the people of the Middle East? This is my question.

With regards to Iraq, it would be a big mistake to try to build an Iraqi democracy on a sort of compromise, or a coalition of different ethnicities and religious groups. Democracy should be built on citizenship, just as it is in the rest of the world. It would be a mistake to put all sorts of religious leaders, ethnic leaders, and war lords into the basket and hope that at the end we will have, as a by-product, a democratic society. It will not work. The composition of the transitional council is not the best model for democracy.

The main question is whether we are willing to have a democratic society in Iraq or not. In case that we are for democracy, we may pay a price for that. The output of a democratic society may not always make decisions in favor of our own interests. While working for democracy, we should be aware that the end product should be good for their people but not always good for our societies.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, democratization is not a taboo in NATO, the Middle East is. We have experience in NATO with democratization. We have pressed candidate and PfP countries hard for democracy. What we have not been able to discuss in NATO is the Middle East.

Eran Lerman

I want to answer a challenge raised by Olivier Roy regarding the question of comparisons. I think the only relevant comparison is of Arab societies and the Arab world to itself in the first part of the 20th century. In the 30s, the level of evolution of politics and civil society in the southern Mediterranean was, to a large extent, more advanced and more dynamic and interesting than in the northern Mediterranean. What happened? It is my suggestion that the experiment with Arab liberalism did not die a natural death; I suspect it was murdered by the needs of Cold War players on both sides: the communists undermining it on one side, and the assumption that a powerful colonist was better than a soft Pasha in countering communism undermining it on the other side. Here I go to directly to Mr. Polenz's comment about Latin America – what has enabled the transformation of Latin America was the demise of Communism as a world system side-by-side with the demise of the colonists who presented themselves as protectors of the bourgeoisie against Communism, which made democracy possible. The role of NATO is not, in this case, to directly pro-

mote democracy, which institutionally it is not capable of doing, but to defeat those powers harming the Arab world. The reversal of Egypt in the late 90s away from democratization and possible liberalization, the NGO law and other decisions made by the Mubarak regime is a direct reflection of Islamism as a threat. If Islamism as a threat is defeated decisively, then what happened in Latin America can happen in the Middle East.

And the point about Shia, I am not sure that our assessment of the future of the Shiite politics should be colored by the Iranian example. I think that the Iranian example essentially, or the Khomeini example has been, as his grandson now admits, a perversion of the Shiite faith. In many ways the Shiite experiment and experience is more amenable to some of the principles of civil society than even the Sunnis' respect of authority. Therefore, what is happening in Iraq is of tremendous importance, not only for the future of Iraq but also for the future of Iran, of the Gulf, of Lebanon, and of the entire region.

Ely Karmon

I strongly agree with the analysis of Olivier Roy, but there is one point about which I wonder if there is a good solution, and that is the integration of the Islamist movements in the political game. They have learned to play the political game very well, but the moment they are in power, this leads generally to a theocratic and autocratic state. This is not only happening in Iran and Afghanistan, but it is also happening today in the north-western border provinces of Pakistan, where they have long-awaited elections, and in northern Algeria. The good case is Turkey, as Turkey has an eighty year history of secular ideology and a strong army to defend this ideology. My question is: "How can we really integrate these movements without ending up with theocratic or autocratic regimes?"

Jeff Gedmin

I would like to ask Josh Muravchik a question as well. Josh, it seems to me that in all this Iraq may well be crucial. Could you give us a six-month early report card on the United States in terms of what we are doing right what we are

doing wrong and what would you do differently in terms of democracy assistance?

Steven, I want to ask you for the European piece of that. If these things are to be a transatlantic project, it seems to me that thus far in Iraq the Europeans are not rushing in with enthusiasm to provide non-military aid and build trade unions and free media and that there is still a lot of reluctance and ambivalence. If that's true, how do we overcome it?

Amin Tarzi

First, about the perception of NATO - that's a very crucial question. Yesterday, somebody mentioned NATO as a Western power. There's no question about it's being a Western power. It is very crucial and the test, again, I point to the Afghanistan test, is that when NATO goes in, it not only goes in with its military force, but it brings with some sort of an understanding of the ideology. Moreover, they must make sure that everybody knows what NATO is and that it acts as a more impartial and more understanding force. I mention Afghanistan specifically because the vast majority of Afghans actually welcome foreign forces. When you have a situation like that, and you have a test case where they are seen as provider of something better, it will be a good step forward. However, it is crucial to make sure that NATO understands its position. NATO is no longer a force against communism or expansion of the former Soviet Union; they have to redefine themselves, but until, and this is my crucial point, they redefine themselves, it's like they are diving into water without knowing how deep it is or if there are some weird animals in there.

A question was raised about the Pashtuns not being in Afghanistan, and that we have to make sure their political order is established. Karzai is a Pashtun. Yes, as I said, the Pashtuns are disenchanting, but what is happening in the case of Afghanistan specifically, and this is very NATO oriented, is that there is a short term and a long term. The short term is to make sure that terrorists, Al-Qaeda, specifically, and then the Taliban, the real and old Taliban are eliminated, caught, or killed as soon as possible with the least amount of damage both collateral and to the US and allies. This is the main objective; the other objective is democracy. And, as somebody mentioned, you cannot have democracy without a state. I absolutely agree with that.

Afghanistan is not a state according to Political Science 101, so you have to build the state and NATO is doing just that. Just make sure that when you build a state you take into account the fact that you have some nasty people you have to kill here and there. In the long run, you have to make sure that you also stabilize the democratic aspects in order to have some kind of a base. As someone said, you cannot be in a burning house and build democracy. You have to find a balance, and again, that is a job for NATO. We are talking about an abstract, and I am talking about very specifics. NATO has to come out and say, "This is our mandate, we will go in, and this is how we are going to do it."

Somebody mentioned all the radios, and then we mentioned our radio I have to take this chance to point out that RFE/RL is the only radio station in Afghanistan, which broadcasts twenty-four hours, and it is the most listened to. We have 6,5 million listeners.

About Iran, yes, there are a lot of good things happening there, but let's not count our chickens right now. Iran has not given up yet.

Steven Everts

On Iran: Lots of people spoke somewhat encouragingly and approvingly about Iran as a possible example of some good news. I share the comments that have been just made. This is sort of relevant to our discussion about whether democracy promotes security benefits to us. I remain to be convinced that if it was democratic, Iran would not seek nuclear weapons. This is often an assumption that underlies a lot of debate and while Iranian domestic politics are definitely in flux, when it comes to the nucleation a consensus they want them - for security reasons.

Secondly, somebody asked about dissidents in Syria - do they exist? Well, very few of them, but a friend of mine has an illegal press, on which he prints lots of books. Also, he is desperate for support. So if somebody wants to do a good thing, either from the EU or from the USA, I will be happy to act as facilitator there.

Somebody raised questions about economic development and its link to democracy. It is probably true that it is difficult to sustain democracy in the absence of economic success and stability, but the point is that, at the moment,

the authoritarian regimes have not delivered economic development. So you can flip the argument around.

Then, somebody else made the point that, whether or not you can have democracy in a multiethnic state or multinational states. Of course you can. I live in one, the UK, and India is another one – multi-religious. So that's definitely possible.

Lastly, I'll remark on Jeff's particular point regarding what we can do to shore up European enthusiasm to share in this project of making Iraq a success. There was up until now a US mentality that perceived Iraq as a prize that the US wanted to keep for itself. Now, it is increasingly seen as a burden to share. So that shift will help, and the Security Council and its resolution this week is a step in the right direction and will probably unlock some additional support. But for the Europeans, you have got to use very hard, realistic arguments alongside the transatlantic rhetoric. The hard realistic argument is that it is in our interests; it will hurt our interests even more than your interests if Iraq goes wrong.

Joshua Muravchik

I am afraid I can't answer the one question that was put directly to me, which is Jeff's question about the report card. Jeff, you and I are about to go there, and we would be better equipped to make a judgment then. The one thing that I would say is that obviously the US is having a harder time than some imagined in Iraq, but I am not impressed by the criticisms that we should have planned better. One should always plan better. There was planning; the problem was, that the planning didn't necessarily fit the circumstances we encountered. I am not sure if this is a kind of undertaking that it is possible to plan until you start trying to do it; we are trying to do something new in that place that hasn't been done before. And if you look back at the history of the occupations of Japan and Germany, which were fabulously successful, there were lots of foolish things done and lots of mistakes made along the way that got undone and tried again and a lot of learning by trial and error. And so the fact that we are having some difficulties in Iraq doesn't suggest to me that we are failing there.

You can't build a democracy in a burning house. Well, it is harder to build democracy in a burning house, which we tried to do in Vietnam and without

great success. But we did succeed in other situations. For example, we built democracy in El Salvador in the middle of a quite violent guerrilla war. It is not black and white.

As to Mr. Altenburg's comment that no religion has a monopoly on terrorism: this is one of those things that is literally true but meaningless. It may be that no religion has a monopoly, but in reality there is a tremendous difference between the incidents of terrorism that emanated from the Islamic world than from that of any other part of global civilization. There is a huge difference in the amount; you mentioned a handful, you could have said the Weathermen, most of them dating to a time when there was a very powerful support system for terrorism, the Soviet Union, which encouraged the support of these groups. However, they are all more or less small potatoes compared to the vast amount of terrorism emanating from the Islamic world. It is really not just a matter of the quantity, but also a matter of the legitimacy. The difficult reality we confront is that terrorism is uniquely acceptable and legitimized today in the Islamic world. So when Kofi Annan tried, in the wake of 9/11, to bring forward a new UN convention against terrorism, he was blocked despite putting a lot of his own prestige on the line. He was blocked by the organization of the Islamic Conference which would only support a convention on terrorism that said terrorism on behalf of bad causes is bad but terrorism on behalf of good causes is good – in another words a convention that was pro-terrorism. And likewise, we have the sort of poster child of the Islamic world, the PLO, which is an organization whose whole history is steeped in terror. Week after week we have new proclamations made by opinion leaders, governmental leaders, and religious leaders in the Islamic world blessing or condoning so called martyrdom operations. So the reality is that when we talk about a war on terrorism, we have got a very big problem and challenge in trying to delegitimize terrorism in the Islamic world. It is a problem that doesn't exist anyplace else in the world.

Finally, Dan Shueftan, there were not so many subjects of disagreement between you and me, except for your focus on pessimism and mine on hopefulness. When you mention the Arab Human Development Report and say that this group of Arab scholars themselves point to the great failures in the Arab world, you take that as an index of the failure of the Arab world. But what I see is that this group of scholars has come forward and made that statement. And that seems to me to be what's interesting and new and different. It is not true that for two hundred years the West has tried to democratize the Middle East; our inten-

tions in the Middle East were far different from trying to democratize. Moreover, many other people also chimed in with comments that re-enforced your pessimism and tried to bring us to an appreciation of the difficult realities of this area. I respect all of that, but one has to see the dramatic revolutionary change that has happened across the globe in a very short period of time with regards to democracy. The numbers I said before, which are the Freedom House count of the number of legitimately elected governments in the world – today, 63 % of the nations of the world are governed by governments that were elected in open elections by their citizens. The important thing about that is that only thirty years ago the percentage was only about 30 %. So the proportion of nations where they elect their governments has doubled in thirty years. And this is a tremendous revolutionary change that has touched a lot of places in the world that people didn't expect to touch, and maybe it will touch some more.

Last point: with great respect for your point that not all change is change for the better and that it's possible to set out trying to democratize a place and succeed only in destabilizing it and bring in to power a worse dictatorship than was there before – as happened in Iran and as happened in Nicaragua in the late 70s. My observation is that the most important work for democracy in most cases is not to try to punish or damage undemocratic regimes, but rather to help the democrats in those societies. It is not just a matter of destabilizing existing non-democracies, but it is a matter of trying to strengthen and build up a democratic alternative in most places.

Olivier Roy

So how to create the nation? Occupy it? Then you have a nationalist reaction. I wrote in the New York Times in April that if the American goal is to get a friendly, democratic, and stable Iraq – forget it. You can pick two of the terms and be lucky, and if you pick only one, it is a defeat. Now, it is a test of legitimacy for the ruling council. The ruling council is unanimously against the call for Turkish troops. But if they are bypassed it means that there is no Iraqi legitimacy, and that the Americans are in charge. If the Americans give up the idea of calling the Turkish troops, then of course there will be a lot of problems in terms of manpower, money and so on. So the situation is quite complex.

Of course, there are many issues in the Middle East, but sometimes it is because of external intervention. If Mossadec had not been toppled in Iran, Khomeini would have never come to power. And for the Iranians the story about Mossadec is very important. The statement one man, one vote, once – it is a good joke, but it never happened. If the Islamic liberation succeeded in Iran, it was not because of an election; but because there was no election. It is because a revolution took power. In Algeria, it was a manipulation of the army to suddenly call for elections in one day. Of course, it was a disaster, they knew it would be, and that is why they did it, it was sheer manipulation. The message that is sent by the sentence of Madame Delpech is that an authoritarian secularist state is better than a possible Islamic state. That it is the western policy. We have always supported authoritarian thugs against would-be Islamist, and amongst Islamist, by definition, there are many thugs. Okay, but the message is that it is more secure not to have democracy. So if we want to have a democratization in the Middle East we have to deal with Islamists; if not, all these bad guys will get in, and we'll have them for a long time.

The issue for me is not religion and state. The problem in the Middle Eastern countries is not Islam as such. It was said that Islam has no nuclear energy except in Iran. The problem is nobody can have monopoly of Islam. So to have democratization we need a diversification of the religious field and this is important. The religious field is here and it is very important, it will stay. For example, let's take Turkey. Twenty years ago I had discussion with some people in Haifa. Their argument was very simple – they said, look, in Turkey, 80 % of the Turks say that they are Muslims, practicing Muslims. We are the only party to put Islam to politics so normally 80 % of the population should vote for us. But we never made more than 20 % because there are many people who are religious but didn't want Islam to be a political object of a political party. What I am seeing now in the Middle East is precisely this diversification of the religious field. There is no other time that one party could say, "Islam, it's me – from Morocco to Pakistan."

Then, the last point on Islamic terrorism. The issue is not why does Islam send terrorism. The problem is that the people who complain about the ruling order now in the world are mainly Muslims. Rightly or not, but it is not by chance that terrorist are mostly Muslims. As I said, the Islamic terrorism now is not so much a Middle Eastern phenomena, it has far more to do with what I

call the Westernization of Islam. Look at biographies of most of the so-called terrorists and the real terrorists who have been arrested. The new generation have a Western trajectory. They became born again Muslims in Europe. The pilots of 9/11, all these guys became born again Muslims in Europe – not in caves or elsewhere. There are more and more converts now who are coming to Islamic terrorism. Bin Laden is an heir of the Red Brigades and Carlos. Carlos did convert in jail, so in this case, it is not Islam which is the core of terrorism, but many people are looking towards some sort of radicalism because they want to fight and adopt terrorism.

Ariel Cohen

I am far from having the last word because we will return to this subject again and again and again. We are at the beginning of a protracted conflict with a threat that is common to the United States, to Western Europe, to Russia, to India, and to Israel and it is the threat of a permanently mutating and changing, a very poisonous and radical interpretation of one the world's greatest monotheistic religions, one of the three Abrahamic faiths, etc. It is a minority that has tried to hijack the faith and use it as brainwashing against the West. Many think that political Islam failed; you said it failed, and it's safe, but it still wants to destroy the US. Well, it still not only wants to destroy the US, but it wants to build what they call the caliphate – the global radical Islamic military dictatorship. It's a meta-project, it's meta-idea, it's hard to achieve, and I'm not sure if they are going to achieve it. However, they'll try, and one of the ways they'll try is by subverting western Europe in undermining the US including trying to get weapons of mass destruction and attacking the United States, wear out the Israelis, and killing Indians in their own parliamentary building.

Market segmentation is one main point that I have. A long, long time ago, I started working in audience research at Radio Liberty, which is now based here in Prague. Looking at how to convey ideas of democracy, open-markets, and human rights, I see several key audiences. One is the middle class and business community, which has been mentioned. Then one that we didn't talk about is women; women have to be empowered in these societies. I come from a conservative think tank that nobody would suspect of being a feminist

organization, but looking at these societies, if you empower women, it will change the nature of these societies. And while there are mothers who brag on Palestinian television that their sons or daughters became shahid, suicide-bombers or murder suicide-bombers, a lot of mothers and fathers will tell their kids not to do that thing. A lot of Hamas leaders, as it was reported in Western media claim that their kids are so talented that they need to become doctors rather than to blow themselves up. Things like that, as a part of this interaction of ideas, and I don't want to use the term "war of ideas," have to be conveyed to the Muslim audiences. Muslim audiences must hear that the people, who send their kids to blow themselves up and to kill the other kids, don't send their own children to kill themselves. The other target audience is youth. The youth can be offered a hope of paradise, of killing themselves and going to paradise, or given a hope of a successful future on this planet before they live their natural life span and die. So the economic development and education is important. If you go and look at the curricula and the educational professional standards that many universities, colleges, and high schools are churning out in the Middle East, they are people without marketable skills. If these people have a hope for a better future economically, it will make a big difference.

Finally, I think that it may be an issue of political correctness to say: "Oh, there's terrorism everywhere." The systemic threat to the U.S. today and to other democracies comes from a specific Jihadi movement. It doesn't come from the "IRAs" or other European terrorist organizations; these are very localized terrorist organizations that did not have radical religious roots. They were nationalists or they were communists or Soviet-supported or class warfare organizations.

This should be done by Muslims for Muslims. It will not be done by the West or by the United States. The U.S. and Europe should work together. We have the resources, we have the technical expertise, we have the broadcasting facilities, the satellite channels and dishes, the exchanges, education, and the money. We are not capable of articulating in Arabic, in Farsi, in Pashtu, and in Dari any of these ideas I am talking about. In democracy, Josh, I think and I respect your work but respectfully disagree, I think democracy will be sort of icing on the cake. It'll be the end phenomenon in the process of changing attitudes and changing values. And it's a long and painstaking process that we all should encourage.

Michael Žantovský

Because of the time constraints, I will wave my last word privileges, but I had better warn you that after we've gone through all this incredible body of wisdom, experience and insights, we will be back with another policy paper, hopefully with Sasha and Jiří so you will hear from me yet.

THE NEW NATO AND THE GREATER MIDDLE EAST

R. Nicholas Burns

Permanent Representative to the Council of the NATO

Michael Žantovský

For the last couple of days, we had a number of excellent speakers representing governments, parliaments, or the non-governmental sector from a number of countries in Europe and in the Middle East. And we had a number of our friends who are currently out of the government in the United States. What we have been missing so far was a representative of the current US administration. Of course, we do have Craig Stapleton here who has been very generous with his time and wisdom, but we consider him almost native. We also felt the need to impart a speaker, and I think that on this particular subject, we couldn't get anyone better than R. Nicholas Burns, the US permanent representative to NATO in Brussels.

Nick is a career diplomat. He has worked for the National Security Council, which is where I first met him. In the early nineties, he became the toast of Washington when he became the spokesman for the State Department and the Acting Assistant Secretary of State for Public Policy. And, very relevant to the issues we are discussing at the conference, he also served in Cairo and in Jerusalem as a US diplomat at the consulate in Jerusalem and the US Embassy in Cairo. He's been a very good and loyal friend to us. The last

time we saw him here was at the NATO summit in Prague, and I hope we will see him again soon.

R. Nicholas Burns

Good afternoon ladies and gentlemen,

It's a great pleasure for me to be here and see so many friends and familiar faces. I want to thank Michael Žantovský and Sasha Vondra for having invited me. It is a great pleasure. I have been convinced to come, really convinced to come, by my very good friend Craig Stapleton, who I think has been an outstanding American ambassador to the Czech Republic in every way. I have great respect for the job that he has done here.

Let me also say that I very much welcome the presence of Karel Kovanda, the Czech Republic's Ambassador to NATO. Karel is our dean; he is the longest-serving ambassador at NATO, and the dean has quite substantial powers over all of the rest of us. I would very much like to thank Karel for being here today. And finally, Onur Öymen, member of the Turkish Grand National Assembly, formerly Turkish Ambassador to NATO, one of my best friends and colleagues, and one of the most effective ambassadors and spokesmen for Turkey in every job he has had, particularly in the NATO job. So it's great to be among friends.

I don't have a prepared speech, but I do have some things that I want to say briefly, and then I would like to encourage a discussion and any observations you want to make; any questions you want to ask me, I am game, I would like to respond to them.

I am sorry I missed the rest of this conference, because I understand just from talking here that it was a very fine conference with very fine speakers, and I think it's an aptly named conference, "NATO and the Greater Middle East," because it is towards the Greater Middle East that we in the Bush administration believe NATO has now to focus its efforts. And I would put it this way: NATO has been in existence for 54 years. For the great majority of those 54 years, NATO had one threat - you all know what it was - and our military and diplomatic strategy was singularly focused on containing and meeting that threat.

The Prague summit, that was organized so brilliantly by Sasha, and led so brilliantly by President Havel, was the fundamental turning point, I think, in

NATO's 54-year history, because it gave us a new mission. It gave us an entirely new mission. It gave us the sense that we have to restructure ourselves militarily; it gave us seven new members, who are going to change the Alliance for the better; and it gave us a strong appreciation that as threats had changed, we had to change with those threats.

So, everything that we have done in the Bush administration, led by President Bush and Secretary [of State] Powell and Secretary [of Defense] Rumsfeld since that time, has been to try to implement the Prague agenda. And I think we will be implementing the Prague agenda for a decade: that is how substantial the change was. All of our 19 NATO leaders met at the Prague summit - President Havel, President Bush, President Chirac, Chancellor Schröder - all came together conceptually and operationally, and it's useful to remember that, on a common transatlantic agenda.

The new mission is the most important mission. And it speaks directly to what you have been talking about here for the last couple of days. And that is that, obviously during the Cold War, we amassed a huge continental army in Western Europe to defend Western Europe. NATO's mandate is still to defend Europe and North America. But we don't believe we can do that by sitting in Western Europe, or Central Europe, or North America. We have to deploy our conceptual attention and our military forces east and south. NATO's future, we believe, is east, and is south. It's in the Greater Middle East.

NATO's future is to deter crises and to respond to crises - whether it's a combat mission or a hostage rescue mission or a peacekeeping operation in that arc of countries where we assume and believe the great majority of threats to France, and Spain, and the Czech Republic, and the United States will come from - in Central and South Asia, in the Middle East itself, and in North Africa. And the threat is, as we all know, this juxtaposition of terrorism - global terrorism - with weapons of mass destruction, which President Bush has said, since September 11th, 2001, is the greatest threat affecting the American people, but we believe also, all the people of the 19, soon to be 26, countries that embody this alliance.

This is a fundamental change. I don't think there's much of a partisan difference in my own country, in the United States. If I can just use Ron Asmus, my good friend, as an example - who is a Democrat - has just written an article in Foreign Affairs, which I think everyone should read. If you take out the first couple of pages, with which I profoundly disagree, where he criticized

the Bush administration's policies, and take out his conclusion, with which I also disagree, criticizing my administration's policies, in the middle, the great core of Ron's argument is an argument that NATO needs this changed mission. It has to be in the Greater Middle East. I think there's a lot of resonance in our country that Democrats and Republicans can come together on.

How have we proceeded since Prague? In the middle of the Iraq crisis, when France, Germany and the United States had the most difficult crisis in our relationships, well, in memory, we agreed – France, Germany, the United States, the Czech Republic and all the other NATO allies – that NATO should go into Afghanistan, and take over the UN mandate for the peacekeeping force: which we did on August 11. We now have nearly 6,000 soldiers there, and we are now debating an expansion of that force from Kabul – where it's been for two years – out to the provinces where everyone believes we must be. There's no chance for a long-term peace in Afghanistan without an international peacekeeping force, which encompasses a region larger than Greater Kabul. The German government took the lead in this debate, which is also significant. It wanted to lead NATO in this great change, and Germany is prepared within 30 days to put troops in Kunduz to establish a small provincial reconstruction team, which we believe should be the model for how we act in Afghanistan in the future.

So, Afghanistan was the first example: not just that we were ending the transatlantic crisis – or beginning to repair it, I should say to be more accurate – caused by the Iraq war, but that we had a common conceptual strategy for how we had to act in the world.

Second [example] was in Iraq. Eighteen of the 26 NATO countries, if you include the seven countries invited to become members next year, have soldiers on the ground in Iraq. More will come. I think we'll be over 20 countries in a couple of months. NATO also agreed, collectively, to support Poland and Spain, as they set up their new division at the end of August. We've given them logistical support, intelligence support, communications support, and we generated the force for this mission. If you look at all the divisions in Iraq, they're all led by NATO countries: the United Kingdom, the United States, Poland, Spain, and Turkey has just decided, very importantly, that it will contribute a division of troops to Iraq, as well. We're very pleased, and we congratulate the Turkish government, and National Assembly on that decision.

I think that these are true concrete expressions that NATO has recognized that, in addition to dealing with the problems of Europe and the remain-

ing problems of security in Bosnia and in Kosovo and Macedonia, we have to be out on the front lines where the problems are. I don't think this is a momentary tactical decision on NATO's part. It's a long-term strategic decision, which is being forced on us because of the change in security, but which we gladly accept and embrace. All of us are together on this.

The other dimension of this strategy in the Greater Middle East is the following: NATO has had a program called "The Mediterranean Dialogue" since 1995, where we engage Israel and six Arab countries, from North Africa as well as Egypt and Jordan. There's a lot of talk that we ought to expand that program; that we ought to have a greater concentration to seek political dialogue with the Arab countries, and with Israel. We certainly want to strengthen the Mediterranean Dialogue, and perhaps to make more of the military content, in terms of training and exercises, with those countries. I know there's been some discussion of that just at this conference. We haven't made any decisions at NATO as to whether or not we should do this, but it's a very live issue. I think we'll have a lot of debate on it in the next couple of months, as well, as we focus on the Istanbul summit, NATO's next summit, which will be held in the spring in Turkey.

Now, if we have a new mission, then we have to have a new military doctrine, and we have to have a different set of military capabilities to be successful in this new mission. We were successful in the Cold War because France and Germany and the United States and Britain, and all the other members of the old Alliance, were willing to pay the political price to keep several hundred thousand soldiers in Western Europe. But that was a heavy, tank-based, conventional force, backed up by the nuclear umbrella of NATO itself.

If we're going to be successful in peacekeeping in Afghanistan, or war fighting in a potential crisis somewhere in this arc of countries, or in a hostage rescue mission somewhere in the future, we have to have an entirely different set of military capabilities. At the Prague summit we agreed on what they are. We need strategic lift, because the possible deployments are thousands of kilometers from Germany and from France, and from the heart of Europe. By and large, while the United States has this ability, the great majority of our European allies do not. At Prague we decided that we must go out and achieve that capability.

Second, we said that we've got to have air-to-air refueling, in order to allow missions of the type we've seen over Afghanistan and Iraq during the last two

years. One example of this: I talked to a Norwegian F-16 pilot – female pilot – who flew air missions from Kyrgyzstan down into Afghanistan and back during the war in her F-16. She told me she was refueled five times on that round trip in combat missions. If we don't have the air-to-air refueling capacities that the United States and some other countries have, we cannot be successful as an alliance across the board in waging, in vast expeditionary missions, long-term strategic military missions for the future.

We said that we had to have secure communications, which we lacked during the Kosovo war, when the Serb army listened in to ground-to-air communications in NATO aircraft. We've said that we have to have precision-guided munitions – more of them, because that made the difference in limiting civilian casualties during the Iraq and Afghan campaigns. We've said that we have to have more and better special forces, because of the type of fighting, and peace-keeping, which we are likely to embrace in the future.

All this costs money. It means that European countries especially have to think through transformation, defense spending, and spending more wisely to be effective in the future. So, we have a new mission; we are going to have new military capabilities, led by countries like France, the UK, and the U.S., which, I would argue, are the countries that have done the most to transform their militaries and to achieve this kind of expeditionary capability.

And we have new members: going back to 1999, ten new members, led by the Czech Republic, and Hungary and Poland; and now seven to add to those three. We in the United States government look upon these new members, as President Bush said here in Prague, during the summit, we believe they will refresh the spirit of the alliance. We think the center of gravity of our efforts is moving eastward, because of these ten countries. And when the seven countries come in at Istanbul, 40 % of our members will be formerly Communist countries. That's going to change us. Their history, their shared perception of the world and how to confront security challenges is going to change us, and is going to change us for the better.

We believe very profoundly in my government in Washington that these countries must also be part of the European Union, and that we should not ask them to choose between those two institutions. We should not ask for loyalty tests between NATO and the EU. They ought to be part of both. They will strengthen both. Together, that twin enlargement will make a critical historic difference in solidifying democracy in all of Europe.

In addition to new members, we have new partners. If the strategic objective that Chancellor Kohl, President Mitterand, President George H.W. Bush and Prime Minister Thatcher articulated back in 1989, 1990 and 1991 is to be achieved – one Europe, whole, free, at peace, stable and united – then we have to have Russia, Ukraine, and the states of the Central Asia region and the Caucasus as part of that strategic whole. These countries are not likely to be members of NATO any time soon. But, you can't construct a durable peace in Europe that will last without them. And so, in addition to the Prague summit, we made another strategic decision to embrace Russia in our creation of the NATO-Russia Council; and to embrace Ukraine, which has been, frankly, a more gradual, and sometimes fitful, process. Russia has been much more open to a long-term engagement on a constructive basis with NATO.

In my government, we believe we need to take a step further, and this year, as we look toward Istanbul – and Istanbul is an apt place for our summit – we need to think about not only an extension of NATO influence with the Mediterranean Dialogue, but in the Caucasus region, and in Central Asia. These countries have been very important for the efforts in Afghanistan. They don't share all the democratic values that we share – we in the Atlantic Alliance – but they share a strategic perspective that they want to be part of peacekeeping, and they want to be part of conflict prevention. And so, they're our partners, and we ought to work to build that up.

So, if you put all this together – new partners, new members, new military capabilities, and a new strategic mission – we have a new NATO. At least figuratively, we've retired the old NATO, in honored glory, with thanks for the job it did during the Cold War, but we're constructing a new NATO for a very different time, with very different threats.

I'd just like to conclude my remarks by posing some challenges for all of us as Europeans and Americans, as we construct this new NATO. What I just reviewed were the accomplishments of the Prague summit and accomplishments since the Prague summit – this vast transformation that we've undertaken. But, I think there are three great challenges that remain for us, in order to complete the vision of the Prague summit leaders. I would take them as follows:

First, we have got to complete the military transformation of the alliance. We've done a lot. Just last Wednesday, we launched the NATO Response Force that was created less than a year ago, on November 21, here in Prague. We launched it in Brunssum, in the Netherlands. It does not have a full capability,

but if General Jones is asked by the NATO Council to deploy it tomorrow, he will be able to. That is a dramatic expansion of NATO's military capabilities, one we've never had in 54 years – the ability to react very quickly, within a matter of days, with substantial force in a crisis.

We created a new Transformation Command in Norfolk, Virginia, to plug the European countries into the transformation process in the United States military. We've taken a number of steps to strengthen ourselves with new capabilities.

But what hasn't happened are two things militarily. There hasn't been, I think, a strategic decision by the European allies to either increase spending on defense, or, if that is not possible, to spend differently, and to spend more wisely, so that Europe can have a greater capacity to act, whether it's in NATO or whether it's through the European Union – a process which we very much support.

Let me give you two figures. President Bush has received \$376 billion from the U.S. Congress for our defense budget in 2003. Our 18 allies combined this year will spend \$140 billion. Now, that huge capabilities gap in spending has existed in the Alliance since 1949. It's not new. But what's new is that the premium in military capability is now with advanced technology. It costs more. So, the actual gap in capabilities is expanding greater than the defense-spending gap. That's a true crisis in the alliance. It has to be closed.

And here, Marc de Bricambaut is here – I should have recognized him at the beginning – France has been a leader. Britain has been a leader. Norway has been a leader, and Turkey has been a leader, along with the United States, in making a national commitment to greater defense spending. It's a difficult choice, if you're a member of parliament, to make that decision between domestic and foreign priorities. President Chirac has made it, and we thank him for that. Prime Minister Blair has made it. But a great number of other allies have not made it. In fact, Germany and the Netherlands have their defense budgets capped until 2007. I think that's an issue that, with respect, our European allies need to look at it.

The second issue is this. It's what Lord Robertson is calling a "usability gap." There are 2.4 million Europeans in uniform that belong to NATO countries. 55,000 of them today are deployed outside of Europe and their own countries, in Bosnia, Kosovo, Macedonia, Iraq, Afghanistan, Africa, and other parts of the world, where countries have responsibilities. Our European allies

are telling us that they are maxed-out: they can't contribute any more forces to expeditionary missions. If that's the case, then about 3 % of Europe's soldiers can be deployed overseas. That's a terrific problem to contemplate.

If we have to assume that the threat to all of us will require long-term expeditionary missions in the future, then the Europeans need to increase the percentage of their soldiers who are physically fit, equipped, trained and ready to go to places like West Africa, where the French are, or Afghanistan and Iraq, where many of us are: a true problem to contemplate. That's the first challenge for NATO.

The second is this: to build stronger ties between the European Union and NATO. I don't think any of us are satisfied with the present state of relations between the two organizations. Let me say some positive things about the European Union, because sometimes the Europeans say that we Americans don't say enough that is positive. President Bush and our administration support the European Union. We support its development and strengthening. We support a European security and defense policy. We have supported the European Union taking over the peacekeeping mission in Macedonia, and it's been a great success. We have great respect for the European people and their leaders, and that you want to be more active in a security and defense sense. It makes sense. If you look back at the arguments we had in the early nineties concerning Bosnia, Europe ought to have a greater capacity to act as Europe when NATO is otherwise not engaged, when NATO has decided not to engage.

Europe – the European Union and NATO – with its twin enlargement, are going to make the crucial historical difference in the East. We have a common security threat, and Europe has a security paper that Mr. Solana floated at the Thessaloniki summit that is very much in line with what President Bush and our national leadership have decided is our set of threats. All of that unites us.

Furthermore, we came together and agreed on seven specific agreements in March of this year as to how NATO and the EU would act together. Essentially, this agreement, which is called "Berlin Plus," says that the European Union will be helped by NATO in developing its own strength and unity as a defensive and security force. But the deal is, of course, that the European Union will not seek to duplicate what we Europeans and Americans have built over five decades: no new military headquarters to compete with NATO; no new planning authority to compete with SHAPE, for instance. Imagine our surprise, then, when a month later, the leaders of France, Germany, Belgium and Luxemburg met in

Brussels and said that they want to create a new European Union military headquarters; they want to create a planning authority; a mutual defense clause for the European constitution; an armaments agency, which is not objectionable at all on the surface, as long as it doesn't become a Fortress Europe, vs. a cross-Atlantic defense trade.

This is now the crucial issue in NATO-EU relations that we've got to work through. We have a meeting on it tomorrow in Brussels. We'll continue to discuss it for months on end. I would boil it down to this, and it's awfully simplistic - my apologies to Marc and others for being simplistic in a short set of remarks. If we can guarantee cooperation between NATO and the EU, and if that is going to be the spirit and fact of our relationship, we'll be fine. But, if some members of the EU want to turn this into a competitive relationship, then we're going to have a great disagreement, because we Americans want to preserve NATO.

We're not members of the European Union, so we don't want to intrude on internal decision-making there. But, we want to preserve NATO as the pre-eminent security institution in Europe, with first right of refusal as to when NATO's engaged. Then, if NATO doesn't want to be engaged in a crisis, we will be the strongest supporter of the European Union, and we'll give the European Union all the NATO resources - SHAPE and NATO resources - needed to do the job. This is a terribly important discussion that we're having. I think we can have it without emotion, and we should have it without emotion. I think we can resolve it. Because, I think the great majority of countries in NATO want to preserve a strong and vital NATO.

My last point on this would be to say that there's a corresponding argument made by some Europeans that Europe ought to become a counterweight to the United States at some point in the future. We Americans absolutely reject this. We want to maintain an alliance and partnership in one transatlantic relationship, with the American military physically present on this continent, and with the United States fully engaged, along the lines of the policy that President Bush articulated when he was here in Prague 11 months ago.

We do not see ourselves as rivals with Europe. We see ourselves as partners and allies. If you look at the new threats, we share those threats. We are threatened by them together. So, we have to meet them together, not as rivals, but as one alliance across the Atlantic Ocean.

The third challenge is to rebuild the transatlantic relationship after the Iraq crisis. We can do it. I think it's already underway: we had a 15-0 vote [on

Iraq] in the UN Security Council the other day. If you look at these threats, if you look at the global challenges that we face with environmental degradation, international crime and drugs, and trafficking in women and children, these are threats we can confront together and we should confront together. I hope that as we do, we'll recognize that NATO is vital, and that a strong partnership based in NATO remains vital for Americans, as well as Europeans. I hope that's a contract that we can agree on as we move ahead in the future.

Michael Žantovský

Nick will now take questions. Mr. Heller?

Mark Heller

It wasn't very surprising that you made a passing reference to the Mediterranean Dialogue, but I was a little surprised when you suggested that there was going to be a focused discussion on deepening and broadening of the Dialogue. The reason that I was surprised is that, in my limited understanding, it hasn't really accomplished very much up until now, and it doesn't appear to promise very much in the future. I am wondering if you can tell me why I'm wrong.

R. Nicholas Burns

Thanks for your very easy, softball type question. You are right in one important respect and that is that a number of us who sit on this council with Israel, Egypt, Jordan, Algeria, Morocco, Tunisia, and Mauretania, are a little bit frustrated and feel that there is too much talk and not enough action. By action, I mean a deepening of our military relationship - not as allies, because we are not allies, but as friends. We've done some military exercises; for example, we made a very important port visit to Algiers by NATO vessels last year. We also have training for Arab and Israeli officers in doctrine and consultations in transformation at our NATO defense colleges. These are things that Arab countries and Israel need as much training in as we do. While we have no official

proposal from the US government on this, we're still very actively thinking about the Med dialogue in Washington. Also, a number of the allies have come forward and said, "We want to see an expansion in terms of the functions of the Mediterranean Dialogue and the programs." Not coincidentally, most of the Mediterranean allies in NATO, Turkey, Italy, Greece, France, Spain, and Portugal are leading the proposals that we do more. We haven't agreed on a formula yet. We only have one choice and that is to go forward. If NATO is to have a greater role in broad terms in the Greater Middle East then we ought to have greater relationships with those nations as well. I think that they are seeking it. The Arab countries have come forward and said that they want to do more. Israel has been a very active participant that wants to have a better relationship as well. I agree that we haven't done extraordinary things over the last eight years, but it's been a start, and we ought to build on it.

Jan Žižka

I am Jan Žižka from the Euro Magazine here in Prague. My original question was about what you said to the NATO ambassadors this week because there has been a lot of media coverage and it was not very clear. To what extent is your fear of the duplication of the EU and NATO resources related to the current talk about the changing position of the United Kingdom? It seems that the United Kingdom is coming closer to the position of France and Germany.

R. Nicholas Burns

Thank you for the question: it gives me the opportunity to comment on a very unfortunate situation that occurred at NATO this week. We are a military and political organization, and we have classified meetings every week. We don't talk to the press about what we discuss privately. Unfortunately, one delegation did. Not only that, but also they quoted some people, including me. Moreover, they did it in a very unhelpful way because it was distorted. I am not going to comment on what happened behind those closed doors because we're not allowed to. We have a contract among the nineteen allies that we talk frankly together, but we don't try to complain about each other publicly.

I will say this, we, as Americans, have no stronger partner at NATO than the United Kingdom. There is no problem between the United States and England. I was spokesperson for the State Department for a couple of years, so I'm accustomed to this. In my experience, the press almost always gets it right; moreover, the international press covering NATO has pretty much always been on base in discussing what we're doing. This week some of the articles, such as Thursday's Financial Times piece, were one hundred percent wrong; there is no conflict between London and Washington. We have no closer partner in discussing, behind the scenes, ESDP and NATO's reaction to it than the United Kingdom.

Marc Perrin de Brichambaut

We have had a very good conference here, and I think that we have reached a broad agreement among ourselves that there are some very major and difficult challenges. We have also identified that the Greater Middle East is an extremely tricky region and that whatever we might aim at achieving will require a lot of thought, caution, and some very serious and hard preparation. I have noticed that you have put great emphasis on the Istanbul Summit, so, perhaps, in the spirit of the vision of the Istanbul Summit, you might want to give us a little bit of the analysis from the administration on how you see the perspective that you would like to emerge from the Istanbul Summit in terms of the relationship of the Alliance and the region. It's a very open question. We have just tested among ourselves how delicate and important those things will be. We have not necessarily reached a consensus that we should burden NATO with too many of those responsibilities. Some say that it needs time to digest the progress that it has achieved and that shouldering it with very tough challenges at an early stage might not be the best thing to do. Still there is a sense of urgency, and it is important to understand in what direction the US is thinking.

R. Nicholas Burns

I would just say this, we are going to carry on a productive conversation about NATO/EU relations and the development of the European Security and

Defense Policy. However, you have to understand that we are going to act vigorously to protect NATO's interests as we see them. I think that as we talk around the table we can see that the great majority of allies want NATO to remain strong, vital, and the preeminent institution and want a cooperative, not competitive, relationship with the EU. Our opposition to Teruven and to the sons and daughters of Teruven that have sprouted since April is that it would unnecessarily duplicate what we already have and that it would be costly. Moreover, we don't think it will be entirely effective. What Secretary Powell said the day after these proposals were announced is that what Europe needs is more capabilities not more headquarters. We remain convinced of that. So we hope that we can break through any disagreements and agree on a vision forward that would have NATO remain vigorous, strong, cooperative, not competitive, with the EU.

Second, the press has not focused on the fact that France has made a major contribution to the NATO response force. And Mark and I were together with Minister Alliot-Marie and Secretary Rumsfeld in Colorado Springs ten days ago, where I think they agreed that the French and the Americans need to be together as the leaders of this response force, and we are very pleased about Paris attitude.

Third, I think that you are right. We need to approach Afghanistan with a great deal of humility. Being effective in Afghanistan is, perhaps, NATO's greatest challenge in fifty-four years. We don't have any immediate plans to send forces throughout the entire country, but we have agreed in principle that we ought to expand beyond Kabul. The Germans are leading the way. I think that other countries will quickly come forward with ideas, and we ought to support those ideas, and slowly build a more capable NATO to help President Karzai and to help stabilize Afghanistan.

Regarding Istanbul, our President has not yet decided on the blueprint of what we seek to achieve, so I can't give that to you today. I can generally say that we are very pleased that Turkey has volunteered to host the summit because there is no more important ally in NATO than Turkey. The commitment that Turkey has made to Iraq is quite impressive and valuable, and the fact that the summit is going to be in Turkey speaks to this fact. It's a natural coincidence that our conceptual agenda is leading NATO out of Europe and North America and towards the Greater Middle East where Turkey, of course, has more experience than the rest of us.

And so I think that ought to be the theme, NATO in Afghanistan and Iraq and building all of our relations with the countries there and in between to expand NATO's influence in that region.

APPENDIX

NATO AND THE GREATER MIDDLE EAST – A MISSION TO RENEW NATO?

PASS Policy Paper

Jiří Schneider and Michael Žantovský

Summary

The key challenge for NATO in the 1990s was whether to accept the call for “out of area” missions. Since Bosnia and Kosovo this has been no longer a question. After 9/11/2001, the main question remains whether – in the context of fighting international terrorism – NATO should “go global,” and if so, what should be the rationale, the scope and the goal of such a mission.

The purpose of this paper is to argue that there exist powerful rational arguments for a **mission of NATO in the Greater Middle East**.¹ At the very least, the idea deserves an honest and thorough discussion among the Allies.

The main rationale for NATO’s engagement in the Greater Middle East lies in the very nature of threats emanating from the region – terrorism, proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD), poor or irresponsible governance (failed or rogue states), often with virulent anti-American and anti-western rhetoric as the sole coherent policy, as well as local conflicts with global repercussions. Allies should take up the gauntlet and make an effort to design not only a common strategy but also to agree on joint measures with-

in NATO itself. a failure of the U.S. and Europe to face up to these challenges would be detrimental to security on both sides of the Atlantic.

The following seem to be the possible scenarios and their consequences:

1. Both for the U.S and the EU, it is a policy option **to bypass NATO**² in pursuing their security goals. However, it would be equal to giving up on the political potential of the Alliance. Therefore it is *the least desired option, especially for new NATO members* since it would devalue their hard won membership, and consequently relegate NATO into oblivion.
2. To turn NATO into a common **toolbox**³ that is to be used either by the U.S. – in building coalitions of the willing – or by the EU – in providing muscles for CESDP ambitions – seems to be a tempting “middle-of-the-way” option for some. However, it would put a constant pressure on NATO’s cohesion.⁴ Sooner rather than later, we might find that many of the tools in the box are broken, or even worse, that the toolbox is empty.
3. If enough political will is present, NATO could serve as a proven framework for building a coherent strategy and providing joint or at least common capabilities. In this case, NATO would maintain an independent ability to project power in order to protect the interests of its members in **NATO-led “out of area” operations**. We tend to view this option as an imperative task for the Alliance. However, we could *be risking possible overstretch*.⁵

At this moment, there prevail obviously different policy approaches on the two sides of the Atlantic: the U.S. tends to rely on ad hoc coalitions (or multilateralism *a la carte*) rather than on the Alliance, whereas some Europeans view this as unbounded U.S. unilateralism that should be countered. It is NATO that can bridge this potential transatlantic rift – the U.S. should perceive NATO as a formalized ‘coalition of the willing’ and Europeans should use NATO as a primary multilateral venue for cooperation with the U.S. It seems to be clear that using NATO is advantageous both for the U.S.⁶ and European⁷ NATO members.

Introduction – NATO after Iraq

The fact that the Iraqi operation was conducted by a ‘coalition of the willing’, outside of NATO structures, is often interpreted as a failure of NATO.⁸ Others, e. g. Richard Lugar, vehemently oppose this view.⁹

NATO Secretary General Robertson has recently addressed the key question¹⁰ – why should NATO be involved in stabilizing Iraq? Other analysts¹¹ have concluded that Iraq created another political challenge for NATO members. As a matter of fact, difficulties in postwar management in Iraq have led the U.S. to seek broader support materialized in military contributions¹² and providing greater political legitimacy.¹³ In principle, few U.S. policy-makers would like to see the U.S. as a lonely global policeman¹⁴ supported by various ad-hoc coalitions.

So far, the role of NATO in Iraq has been limited.¹⁵ NATO's involvement in postwar Iraq extends only to provide logistical support to the Polish-led division of the multinational stabilization force. Nevertheless, NATO has been always dealing with current principal threats, as has been recently manifested in its takeover of peace operations in Afghanistan. It is no wonder that a discussion about the future of NATO's role in Iraq and the Greater Middle East is looming.¹⁶

NATO in the Greater Middle East – Key Questions

This paper addresses the topic from the following angles: the nature of new security threats, NATO's capacity to cope with them, the "out of area" concept and its geographical and resource limitations, the possible role for NATO in Iraq or in the Middle East peace process based on NATO's niche capabilities, potential political implications of NATO's Middle Eastern engagement, and, finally, the possible "democratizing" effect of NATO's involvement.

1. TERRITORIAL CORRELATIONS / CONTEXT OF NEW SECURITY THREATS – TERRORISM, PROLIFERATION, FAILED AND ROGUE STATES

The end of the Cold War changed the very substance of European security. Territorial defense against a massive military conflagration in Europe ceased to be the main concern of the Alliance. Wars in the Balkans and accelerated trends toward autonomous European security capabilities forced a drastic change in the security policies of NATO.

After Kosovo new threats emerged into prominence. Terrorism, proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and means of their delivery, concern about failed or rogue states (non-cooperating states or states of concern, non-state actors, etc.) – these threats seem to dominate any post 9/11 analysis of the international security environment. As a consequence, the geopolitical focus moved beyond Europe,¹⁷ or at least to its periphery. The emphasis has shifted from Article 5 of the Washington Treaty towards dealing with non-traditional threats.¹⁸ Inevitably, this has raised concerns of some NATO members – both old¹⁹ and new – fearing that the exclusive club is losing its prestige by diluting its commitments.²⁰

The Greater Middle East²¹ (GME) seems to be a conundrum of the above-mentioned threats in the potentially most explosive combination.²² Moreover, GME is the region where both America and Europe share fundamental interests,²³ although – due to various differences – they do not necessarily agree on the policies to pursue these interests. However, there is a powerful incentive to come to an agreement since “neither the U.S. nor Europe can fix the Greater Middle East by itself.”²⁴ In any case, “NATO’s ability to deal with new threats faces an early test in the Middle East.”²⁵

2. HOW CAN NATO REACT? WHAT CAN THE ENLARGED NATO OFFER IN DEALING WITH NEW SECURITY THREATS?

The concept of collective defense (Article 5) has not outlived its relevance. Solidarity among liberal democratic states in defending common values and interests remains vital for the future of democracy. NATO has to maintain its core functions even as it is advancing new ones.²⁶ The nature of the new threats deserves an appropriate response: “To combat transnational terrorist networks effectively, NATO should more closely resemble a network itself.”²⁷

The conceptual answer to the new challenges is territorial enlargement, although that has been motivated also by other factors, and functional extension²⁷ or expansion.²⁸ Any future enlargement of NATO remains geographically confined to the Euro-Atlantic area. However, if NATO is to assume a global role, it cannot do so without closely cooperating with non-European allies (e.g. Australia). In principle, NATO should keep the door open to all eligible allies³⁰ (e.g. Israel). Any functional expansion requires intra-alliance consensus – the current position of NATO is reflected in the Strategic Concept adopted at the Washington summit in April 1999.

2.1 The Shift From Military to Non-Military Roles ('Nation Building')

The new security environment is often characterized by the growing relevance of non-military³¹ and non-state factors. Some analysts argue that NATO and the EU should divide labor as if the non-military tasks were solely the EU business,³¹ whereas others think that NATO is also capable of nation building tasks.³³ NATO's contribution to the democratic transformation in Central and Eastern Europe as well as to similar transitions in some of the older member states – e. g. in cultivating civilian control of armed forces – cannot be denied. This might be of utmost importance in societies where the military serves as a backbone.

The question arises whether the EU is better equipped for the so-called soft security tasks or whether it is simply making a virtue of its inability to deal with the hard ones. It is unclear why European NATO members should be ready to offer more capabilities under the EU flag than they are offering as a part of the Alliance.

In this context, it is important to argue that NATO rather than the U.S. – EU format should remain the main framework of transatlantic security cooperation. It is obvious that NATO provided the necessary political element in containing the Soviet military threat. Coping with the current threats again requires the kind of political legitimacy that can best be secured through NATO.

On a deeper level, it could be argued that NATO – as the traditional repository and defender of “western” values: liberal democracy, free market, rule of law – should be the appropriate vehicle for responding to the new non-traditional threats since they seem to be targeted against this very body of values rather than against any single country, specific territory or specific policy.

3. IS NATO'S “OUT OF AREA” CONCEPT APPLICABLE IN THE GREATER MIDDLE EAST?

The main question considered during the 1990s was whether NATO had to expand and accept new missions beyond defending its own territory. As Richard Lugar argued in the early 1990s “NATO has to go out of area, or out of business.” However, NATO strategic and conceptual documents (Rome Declaration of 1991 or Madrid Declaration of 1997) kept referring to European or transatlantic security. The Strategic Concept adopted at the Washington summit in April 1999 reflected the growing awareness of the changed global secu-

urity environment.³⁴ Terrorist attacks of 9/11/2001 showed how urgent the question about the place of NATO in the global security system really was.

3.1 Should NATO ‘Go Global’?

No consensus on this question has been achieved.³⁵ The debate about the global role for NATO has on the one hand revealed a growing awareness of global challenges,³⁶ inhibited on the other hand by fears of overextending NATO’s obligations³⁷. Talbott³⁸ and Kugler³⁹ tried to formulate a balanced view by rejecting global ambitions of NATO. In recent years, opinions among NATO members have shifted significantly: even NATO’s Secretary General suggested that the once unthinkable is no longer taboo.⁴⁰ After 9/11, Afghanistan and Iraq, one may witness a new dynamism of this debate and some go even further by calling unreservedly for a global NATO.⁴¹

3.2 The Greater Middle East as a Key Global Challenge?

As we mentioned earlier, the Greater Middle East is the most prominent source of mutually correlated threats at the intersection of vital interests. Not incidentally, the region is denoted as the Rubik Cube.⁴² Emerson & Tocci identified four main interrelated crises in the GME – the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, threats of Al-Qaeda, the crisis over Iraq and the overall development of the region, or rather the lack thereof. However, due to their preferences for the UN, the US and the EU engagement, the authors have assumed only a minor role for NATO in the region. Others suggest that any engagement of former European colonial powers in the region may raise old fears and resentments.⁴³

3.2.1 NATO and Israeli-Palestinian Conflict

The Israeli-Palestinian conflict has been traditionally viewed as the very source of Middle Eastern instability. In the past, one might come to the conclusion that without solving this conflict one cannot envisage stability in the Middle East. At the same time, before the occupation of Iraq one could not realistically expect a resolution of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict (many Israelis still think that that conflict management is the best possible outcome). Rolling back Iraq changed the strategic map of the whole Middle East and paved the way for the Road Map – a new attempt to move the Israeli-Palestinian track forward. In fact, the Pandora box of GME has been opened in a different way than expected.

The truth is that without international engagement the Israeli-Palestinian relations are likely to deteriorate even further.⁴⁴ The idea of international monitoring of an Israeli-Palestinian settlement is supported from various policy perspectives:

1. NATO peacekeeping role after the settlement⁴⁵
2. UN or NATO presence as crisis management⁴⁶
3. U.S.-led trusteeship⁴⁷

Any international presence would be highly sensitive for Israel and it is perceived with caution in Washington, too. On the other hand, Palestinians consistently call for international involvement as a counterweight to Israel. So far, Europeans have preferred to be involved as the EU in the Quartet format (US, EU, Russia, UN) rather than going through NATO. However, one cannot exclude the possibility that at a certain stage of future settlement NATO – alone or in concert with others – might contribute politically rather than militarily on the ground.

There is also a defensive rationale for channeling any western involvement in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict through NATO. A dual-track (US, EU) or a multiple-track (US, EU, UN, and Russia) approach might in the course of time transform the so far differing perspectives into conflicting ones, with disastrous consequences both for the Atlantic cohesion and for the Israeli-Palestinian conflict itself.

3.2.2 NATO and the Gulf – Iraq

The Persian Gulf is of primary concern to NATO allies because of two reasons: proliferation of WMD and securing energy supplies.⁴⁸ It seems that Americans are more aware of the coincidence of NATO member countries' interests in the Gulf and see more European engagement as desirable.⁴⁹ It is the European reluctance that stands in the way of more allied cooperation in the Gulf.⁵⁰ As was shown in the Iraqi case, some Europeans do not subscribe to the U.S. policies in the Gulf. Nevertheless, in the current circumstances the way for NATO to the Gulf leads through Iraq.⁵¹

4. POTENTIAL ROLE FOR NATO AND ITS TOOLS

The key question is whether there are any niche capabilities that neither the EU nor the US alone can provide. What may be the unique contributions of NATO in the GME? Are they primarily in the military or in the political areas?⁵²

NATO can provide political legitimacy to stabilization and democratization in the GME. Nevertheless, there will be always a tendency toward using selective formats (e.g. Quartet, Contact Group, etc).

There is the remarkable military record of NATO in planning and running peacekeeping operations including post-conflict stabilization and reforming security structures.⁵³ Suggestions have been made to use this expertise in the GME.⁵⁴

It is a matter of further discussion whether NATO is capable of providing assistance in nation building and promotion of democracy. Here again, Iraq is a test case.

In 1990s NATO has developed a spectrum of tools to deal with the external challenges it has faced: enlarged cooperation forums (NACC, EAPC), NATO+1 dialogue (NRC, NUC, Mediterranean Dialogue), partnership programs (PfP) and even procedures for future membership (MAP). Patterns of dialogue and cooperation, of sharing best practices and standards, and of providing assistance are firmly rooted in the NATO culture. Possible ways of using some of the existing models in the GME region should be considered. NATO should offer a modified PfP program to some of the countries in the region. Whether this may include even a long-term perspective of membership remains to be discussed. The weak point in applying the above-mentioned formats – which were designed for Europe – in the GME is the following: what kind of sufficient incentives – apart from the membership perspective – can NATO offer in reforming the security system in the GME? Security consultations or partnerships not involving full membership do not seem sufficient, especially for some of the smaller democratic or democratizing countries of the region. The problem is that the “added value” of a NATO security involvement as opposed to a US security guarantee is at the moment not very high. That, however, can and should change in the course of time.

5. IMPLICATIONS OF POSSIBLE NATO ENGAGEMENT IN THE GME (IRAQ, PALESTINE) – CEMENTING TRANSATLANTIC RELATIONS OR DESTROYING NATO’S COHESION?

NATO could obviously neglect global aspirations in its further development. The consequence would be the loss of global significance.⁵⁵ All depends on policies of member states. The most poignant expression of this fact comes from the U.S.⁵⁶ If NATO takes up global challenges – initially in the GME region

– it would be a serious test of its interoperability and cohesion. It would have inevitable implications for planning⁵⁷ and decision-making procedures⁵⁸ within the Alliance, which present some member states with an undoubtedly sensitive dilemma. Authorization of planning procedures and weakening of the principle of unanimity are definitely explosive subjects for political discussions within NATO. However, the alternatives seem to be even worse. The risk of bypassing or marginalizing NATO is evident. Deepening of the Atlantic rift over NATO would be detrimental to both its shores. There is a way out – the U.S. should perceive NATO as a formalized ‘coalition of the willing’ and Europeans should use NATO as a primary multilateral venue for cooperation with the U.S. Thus NATO will be able to deal with the most urgent current crises starting with the Greater Middle East.

To search for a global role for NATO just so that it has some kind of a role would be both wrong and destined to fail. A freedom-loving alliance, just like a freedom-loving country, should not seek adventures abroad, “in search of monsters to slay.”⁵⁹ However, in the case of GME, the monsters are already very much there. To address their threats is thus not a question of expanding or transforming NATO’s mission but rather a question of the continued vitality of its original mission and purpose.

Endnotes and Bibliography

- ¹ By the Greater Middle East we understand the region from the Mediterranean to the Persian Gulf – sometimes also called “wider Middle East” = Maghreb + Mashreq + the Gulf – see Emerson, Michael & Tocci, Nathalie (2003), *The Rubik Cube of the Wider Middle East* CEPS, Brussels.
- ² “NATO might be sidelined by ad hoc coalitions of states more able and perhaps even more willing than the old NATO fogies.” Rühle, Michael (2003), *NATO after Prague: Learning the Lessons of 9/11*, Parameters, Summer 2003, pp. 89-97.
- ³ “In extra-European contingencies NATO is just one operation framework among many...serving as a toolbox (military service center) for extra-European operations...no a priori geographical limits.” Bertram, Christoph (2002), *Paper for Discussion on 15th Review Conference on the Future Task of Alliance*, Berlin, September 25, 2002.

- ⁴ “The time may have come to look at how a toolbox approach can be reconciled with the continuing need for political cohesion.” Rühle (ibid.)
- ⁵ “NATO may not survive as a general contractor for the pan-Eurasian renovation project.” Talbott, Strobe (2002): From Prague to Baghdad: NATO at Risk, *Foreign Affairs* Nov/Dec 2002, pp. 46–57.
- ⁶ “Should institutions that the United States belongs to—such as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)—continue to hold a decisive place in U.S. strategy, or should the United States coordinate more with other institutions, such as the European Union (EU), where it has less influence?” Moss, Kenneth B. (2000), *Strategic Choices in the Mediterranean: Europe, the Mediterranean, and the Middle East*, *Middle East Review of International Affairs* Vol. 4 No. 1/March 2000.
- ⁷ “...by positioning NATO at the hub of European anti-terror efforts, it would provide them /i.e. the Europeans/ with a voice in the planning and implementation of these efforts, as well as bring them in contact with the alliance’s substantial assets and capabilities.” Johnson, Rebecca and Zenko, Micah (2002), *All Dressed Up and No Place to Go: Why NATO Should Be on the Front Lines in the War on Terror*, in: *Parameters*, winter 2002–03, pp. 48–63.
- ⁸ “...to many commentators and not a few policymakers, the Atlantic Alliance is dead...” Kupchan, Charles (2003), *The Atlantic Alliance Lies in the Rubble*, *Financial Times*, April 10, 2003.
- ⁹ “The political rift over Iraq has given ammunition to those who wrongly believe that NATO has outlived its military purpose.” Lugar, Richard (2003), *Nation-Building is a Role for NATO*, *Financial Times*, May 29, 2003.
- ¹⁰ “If NATO is the best military framework in the world, can we afford not to use it to help bring stability to post conflict Iraq?” Robertson, George (2003) *The West after Iraq: Are the Security Strategies of the US and Europe still Compatible?* BMVG-FAZ Forum Berlin, June 24, 2003.
- ¹¹ “The post-Iraqi war era provides an opportunity for NATO to reorient towards the Middle East.” Millen, Raymond A. (2003), *Strategic Effects of the Conflict with Iraq: Europe*, *Strategic Studies Institute (SSI)*, March 2003, <http://www.carlisle.army.mil/ssi/pubs/2003/irqeurop/irqeurop.pdf>.
- ¹² “[In Iraq] we want the military burden shared both for military and economic reasons, but also for reasons of political acceptability and legitimacy.” Haass, Richard N. (1998) *Iraq What Next? Containing Saddam is the most likely U.S. policy*, *The San Diego Union-Tribune*, 1 March 1998, available at www.brookings.org.

- ¹³ "...giving a role to NATO would prove that Iraq was not a mere American protectorate..." Gordon, Philip H. (2003), *An Alliance for Iraq: a NATO role would heal many hurts*, International Herald Tribune, April 15, 2003.
- ¹⁴ "...key NATO members other than the U.S. and the UK would have a greater say in the management of Iraq. This could be to the benefit of the United States which has neither the temperament nor the will to be a permanent hegemon in such an inhospitable region of the world." Kemp, Geoffrey (2003), *Beyond Iraq: Repercussions of Iraq's Stabilization and Reconstruction Policies*, Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate, June 12, 2003.
- ¹⁵ "...the alliance has no plans for a greater role in postwar Iraq...NATO is already committed in helping in Iraq, we are not at a stage yet of looking at any broader involvement to Iraq." Robertson (AFP, July, 16, 2003).
- ¹⁶ "If the U.S. and Britain decide that a broader military presence is required, NATO is the natural choice, as has been the case in Afghanistan." Kemp (ibid.)
- ¹⁷ "...the new threats of terrorism and weapons of mass destruction ... emerge from outside of Europe... they draw US attention away from Europe, ...away from NATO." Rühle (ibid.)
- ¹⁸ "Make no mistake, modern-day terrorism and WMD proliferation are 'Article 5 threats' in NATO's parlance... the new threats are capable of violating NATO's borders and striking the societies of all its members as well as their military forces... This trend is rapidly making NATO's old distinction between Article 4 and Article 5 obsolete. Kugler, Richard (2002), *Preparing NATO to meet new threats: Challenge and Opportunity*, U.S. Foreign Policy Agenda, An Electronic Journal of the U.S. Department of State Vol. 7 No. 1, March 2002.
- ¹⁹ "Turkey feared that the recent emphasis on "new missions" in the Strategic Concept could lead to a weakening of Article 5 and collective defense." Chubin, Shahram & Green, Jerrold D. & Larrabee, F. Stephen (Rapporteur) (1999), *NATO's New Strategic Concept and Peripheral Contingencies: The Middle East Center for Middle East Public Policy*, Geneva Center for Security Policy.
- ²⁰ "The irony of NATO is that is an alliance in search of a purpose, at a time when its biggest member cares less about it, and isn't quite sure what it gets out of it. Moreover, a growing number of NATO's members see it mainly as a status club, but one that with each of their joining becomes even less exclusive." Singer, Peter W. (2003), *New Thinking on Transatlantic Security: Terrorism, NATO, and Beyond*, *Weltpolitik*, January 15, 2003.

- ²¹ “Some authors refer to the North Africa, Arabia, Israel and Iran as the Wider Middle East Emerson & Tocci (*ibid.*); others call the same region including Afghanistan and Pakistan the Greater Middle East.” Asmus, Ronald D. and Pollack, Kenneth M. (2002), *The New Transatlantic Project*, The Policy Review No.115 October 2002.
- ²² “The nature of the new threat we face... the interweaving of terrorism, weapons of mass destruction, and failed and rogue states from Marrakech to Bangladesh...the challenge we face is de facto concentrated in one specific geographic region – the Greater Middle East. That region starts with Northern Africa and Egypt and Israel at the eastern end of the Mediterranean and extends throughout the Persian Gulf to Afghanistan and Pakistan.” Asmus (*ibid.*)
- ²³ “In the Middle East, the transatlantic allies share important interests. These include a powerful interest in assuring stable, affordable supplies of energy from the region, and a common stake in the economic and political reforms that are needed to reduce the region’s role as an importer of WMD and an exporter of terror.” Steinberg, James B. (2003) *An Elective Partnership: Salvaging Transatlantic Relations Survival*, vol. 45, no. 2, Summer 2003, pp. 113–146.
- ²⁴ Asmus (*ibid.*)
- ²⁵ Talbott (*ibid.*)
- ²⁶ “NATO must find a new balance between addressing its traditional, Euro-centric missions and tackling the new global threats, such as terrorism and weapons of mass destruction.” Rühle (*ibid.*)
- ²⁷ Johnson & Zenko (*ibid.*)
- ²⁸ “The debate over mission has been both functional and geographical.” Steinberg (*ibid.*)
- ²⁹ “The concept is one of NATO expansion, just in functional rather than geographic terms.” Singer (*ibid.*)
- ³⁰ According to the Prague Summit Declaration: “NATO’s door will remain open to European democracies...”
- ³¹ “We need to go on the offensive to address the root causes and not just the symptoms of terrorism... We need to think not only in terms of military preemption but political preemption as well.” Asmus (*ibid.*)
- ³² “NATO should assume the military burden in Iraq, and a partnership of the US and the European Union should assume the non-military burden... The EU has also demonstrated a capacity to deal with non-military tasks of ‘nation-building.’ From every perspective – including the future relevance of NATO and the reforging of links among the world’s powers – engaging NATO and the EU in Iraq makes sense...”

- Hunter, Robert (2003), America needs Europe to win peace in Iraq, Financial Times July 20, 2003.
- ³³ “Successful ‘nation-building’ must be an important objective for US policymakers and their NATO partners.” Lugar (ibid.)
- ³⁴ Article 24 of the Strategic Concept declares: “Any armed attack on the territory of the allies, from whatever direction, would be covered by Articles 5 and 6 of the Washington Treaty. However, alliance security must also take account of the global context. Alliance security interests can be affected by other risks of a wider nature, including acts of terrorism, sabotage, and organized crime, and by the disruption of the flow of vital resources...” NATO, Strategic Concept; Approved by NAC, Washington, Apr 23–24, 1999.
- ³⁵ Prague Summit Declaration uses rather general wording: “...to strengthen our ability to meet the challenges to the security of our forces, populations and territory, from wherever they may come.”
- ³⁶ “Should NATO ‘go global’ in its military dimension, to address out-of-area problems that may have an indirect impact on the security of NATO’s members but do not necessarily represent an Article 5 attack on the members’ territory?” Steinberg (ibid.)
- ³⁷ There was no clear consensus within NATO on how far NATO’s geographic scope should extend. Most European participants at the workshop felt that NATO should remain focused on Europe and its periphery and argued against any effort to develop a “global NATO.” For most, Europe included the Balkans and parts of the Mediterranean. But it did not include the Middle East or the Gulf. Chubin & Green & Larrabee (ibid.)
- ³⁸ “To fill partial vacuum, NATO may, over time, extend its gravitational field even further...that does not mean there will ever be, or should be, a global NATO.” Talbot (ibid.)
- ³⁹ “NATO should not become a ‘global alliance,’ but it does need to become capable of acting strongly and wisely in other theaters.” Kugler (ibid.)
- ⁴⁰ “Once unthinkable decisions now appear quite natural. So that NATO Ministers can debate seriously the pros and cons of a more direct Alliance role in Iraq, or even in the Middle East, without storms of theological protest.” Robertson (ibid.)
- ⁴¹ “NATO must no longer remain the regional defense Alliance it used to be. NATO must become a global Alliance, ready to defend its member countries’ interests wherever they are at risk. Global challenges require global security – global security requires a global NATO.” Mathiopoulos, Margarita (2003), Recommendations for

a New Transatlantic Charta, The Potsdam Center for Transatlantic Security and Military Affairs.

⁴² Emerson & Tocci (ibid.)

⁴³ "By redefining its strategic mission in order to expand the scope of its measures for Europe's defense, NATO policy may stir fears of European colonialism in North Africa and the Middle East." Moss (ibid.)

⁴⁴ "...without some form of international intervention Israelis and Palestinians will continue to die." Indyk, Martin (2003), a Trusteeship for Palestine, Foreign Affairs May/June 2003, pp.51-66.

⁴⁵ "With NATO about to plant its flag in Afghanistan and discussing a possible role in Iraq, some experts have suggested that the Alliance could provide a peacekeeping force in Israel/Palestine if a settlement is eventually reached." Monaco, Annalisa (2003), NATO peacekeepers in the Middle East, Annali Difesa No.33, CESD NATO Notes, Vol. 5, No. 4, 29 April 2003.

"The Europeans and the US should prepare plans for a NATO-led peacekeeping force to police a final settlement between Israel and the Palestinians ... 'an international force should take over the occupied territories after an Israeli withdrawal'." Evert, Steven (2003), CER Bulletin, Feb-Mar 2003.

⁴⁶ "The ideal solution would be some sort of United Nations presence or NATO presence." Salam al-Marayati, executive director of the Muslim Public Affairs Council in the United States according to Weisman; Weisman, Steven B. (2003) Envoys Hopefully Hit Road on Behalf of Imperiled Map The New York Times , 13 June 2003.

⁴⁷ "Troops (should be) neither peacekeepers nor monitors." Indyk (ibid.)

⁴⁸ "An Atlantic strategy toward the Middle East can get a boost if the United States and European allies redefine NATO's strategic purpose-namely, to protect common interests wherever threatened, not just on European soil. This definition could mean the projection of U.S.-European military power to defend world energy supplies and to thwart weapons of mass destruction." Gompert, David C. & Green, Jerrold & Larrabee, F. Stephen (1999), Common Interests, Common Responsibilities, How an Atlantic Partnership Could Stabilize the Middle East, RAND Review, Spring 1999 Vol. 23, No. 1.

⁴⁹ "In contrast to the Middle East, where the U.S. was reluctant to see European involvement in the Arab-Israeli conflict, in the Gulf the U.S. welcomed European participation." Chubin & Green & Larrabee (ibid.)

⁵⁰ "NATO faces severe institutional limitations on a formal role in Gulf defense, reflecting widespread apprehension on the part of European governments and publics

- about becoming entangled in security commitments and military operations outside Europe. NATO as an alliance will continue to have a strong aversion to any serious military role in the Persian Gulf.” Sokolsky, Richard & Johnson, Stuart & Larrabee, F. Stephen (2001), *Persian Gulf Security: Improving Allied Military Contributions*, RAND, 2001.
- ⁵¹ “The path is open for NATO and the UN to play a constructive role in Iraq.” Caplan, Greg (2003), *a Transatlantic Approach to the Middle East Conflict: Do We Have Enough in Common?* AICGS/DAAD Working Paper Series, American Institute for Contemporary German Studies, Johns Hopkins University, Washington.
- ⁵² “Should NATO remain primarily a military alliance, focusing on facilitating joint military operations to address military threats? Or should it expand its role to include political challenges such as fostering democracy and market economics, and meeting challenges to security (such as terrorism, drug-trafficking and WMD proliferation) that do not rely primarily on the use of military force?” Steinberg (*ibid.*)
- ⁵³ “NATO has experience with peacekeeping and disarmament, an available pool of troops, existing command arrangements and a proven track record of promoting defense reform and civil-military relations in former authoritarian states. There would be many advantages to giving NATO a key role in postwar Iraq.” Gordon (*ibid.*)
- ⁵⁴ Monaco quotes anonymous NATO official: “NATO as a peacekeeping force in the Middle East would not be an impossible outcome provided an agreement is reached and if the two parties require it... under a UN mandate NATO would be the ideal institution to do the job, given the presence of both the US and the Europeans.” Monaco (*ibid.*)
- ⁵⁵ “A diminished reliance on NATO as an institution, particularly in dealing with global security challenges, would push the United States more and more toward the strategy of ‘coalitions of the willing’, diminishing Europe’s influence and enhancing the chances that the United States and Europe would take divergent approaches, to the detriment of both.” Steinberg (*ibid.*)
- ⁵⁶ “If [U.S.] administration is dismissive of NATO when push comes to shove in Iraq, the alliance might never recover, since NATO must be taken seriously by its strongest member if it is to be taken seriously by anyone...America’s allies (are justified in expecting the U.S. to assemble) a genuine coalition of willing, not just a coalition of obedient.” Talbott (*ibid.*)
- ⁵⁷ “NATO has a role in a fast-paced global environment. a starting place would be giving NATO commanders broader contingency-planning authority. A bolder concept

would be to preauthorize subgroups within NATO to act on behalf of the alliance with regard to potential contingencies.” Binnendijk, Hans and Binnendijk Anika (2003), *Mending NATO: How to save the alliance*, International Herald Tribune, May 13, 2003.

⁵⁸ “Clearly, a shift to ‘majority voting’ in NATO remains out of the question....However, a modification of NATO’s working culture that includes the possibility of setting up flexible coalitions, or that includes the possibility of “constructive abstention” appears not only feasible, but indispensable.” Rühle (ibid.)

⁵⁹ Adams, John Quincy, Independence Day Address, July 4, 1821.

BIOGRAPHIES

MADELEINE KORBEL ALBRIGHT is the former Secretary of State of the United States. Prior to her appointment, she served as the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations and as a member of President Clinton's Cabinet and National Security Council. Formerly the President of the Center for National Policy, she has also served as a Research Professor of International Affairs and as Director of the Women in Foreign Service Program at Georgetown University's School of Foreign Service. Albright has also been a Senior Fellow in Soviet and Eastern European Affairs at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, a staff member on the National Security Council (1978-1981). Dr. Albright is the Chairman of The National Democratic Institute for International Affairs and also serves on the Board of Directors of the New York Stock Exchange. She is the founder of The Albright Group LLC, a global strategy firm.

GÜNTHER ALTENBURG is the NATO Assistant Secretary General for Political Affairs and Security Policy. Before joining NATO, he was Head of the Department for Global Issues and the United Nations of the German Foreign Ministry (1998-2001); First Director and Head of the Analysis and Assessment Division of the Federal Intelligence Service, Munich (1997-1998); Head of the UN-Policy Division in the Federal Foreign Office (1992-1997); Deputy Head of the Delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany at the CSCE-Conferences in Vienna and Helsinki (1988-1992). Dr. Altenburg has also served as Permanent Deputy of the Ambassador and Chargé d'affaires at the German Embassy in Beirut

(1980–1983), and as Deputy Head of Division for Disarmament and Arms Control in the United Nations (1983–1984).

UZI ARAD is Director of the Institute of Policy and Strategy (IPS) and Professor of Government at the Lauder School of Government, Diplomacy, and Strategy at Herzliya's Interdisciplinary Center (IDC). Before joining the IDC and between 1975 and 1999, Dr. Arad served with the Mossad in senior positions both in Israel and overseas including the position of Director of the Intelligence Division and then that of Foreign Policy Advisor to Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu. Between 1972 and 1975, he was a professional staff member of the Hudson Institute in New York. Dr. Arad was a Fulbright Scholar at Princeton University.

GUSTAVO DE ARÍSTEGUI is the spokesman for the Popular Party (leader of the majority) in the Spanish Parliament's Foreign Affairs Commission since 2001. From 2000–2001 Mr. Arístegui served as a Member of Parliament. His previous positions include Director of the office of the Minister of the Spanish Home Office (1996–2000); Member of the Executive Committee of the Popular Party (leader of the majority) in the Basque Country (1993–96); and positions in the Spanish Embassies in Tripoli, Libya and Amman, Jordan.

RONALD D. ASMUS is a Senior Transatlantic Fellow at the German Marshall Fund and an Adjunct Senior Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations. He served as a Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs in the Clinton Administration (1997–2000). He has also worked as a Senior Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations, RAND and Radio Free Europe and has written widely on U.S.-European issues on both sides of the Atlantic. Dr. Asmus is the holder of the U.S. Department of State's Distinguished Honor Award; the Republic of Poland's Commander's Cross, Order of Merit; the Republic of Lithuania's Order of the Grand Duke Gediminas (Second Class); and the Republic of Estonia's Order of the Cross of St. Mary's Land (Third Class).

PAVEL BÉM is the Lord Mayor of Prague, an office he has held since November of 2002. Before his election as Lord Mayor, Bém served as mayor of Dis-

trict 6 of the city of Prague (1998–2002). Dr. Bém has served, on two separate occasions (1994–1995 & 1997–1998) as Secretary General of the National Drug Commission in the Cabinet of the Prime Minister. Prior to his career in government, Dr. Bém, a psychiatrist, served as Director of Contact Center Prague (1993), Director of the Foundation for the Support of Mentally Disabled and Drug Addicted Persons (1992), and as Chief Psychiatrist at the Faculty Hospital of Charles University in the Out-patient Treatment Center for Drug Addicts. He has also served as a psychotherapist at the Center for Youth and Family Therapy, something he has done between 1990 and 2002.

MARC PERRIN DE BRICHAMBAUT was appointed Director for Strategic Affairs of the French Ministry of Defense in 1998. Prior to this appointment, he had served as Legal Advisor to the Foreign Ministry (1994–1998), French Ambassador to the OSCE and CFE and CSBM negotiations in Vienna (1991–1994), diplomatic advisor to the French Minister of Defense (1988–1991), counselor to the French Embassy in the United States (1986–1988) and executive assistant to Foreign Ministers Cheysson and Dumas (1981–1986). M. Perrin de Brichambaut is a member of the Conseil d'Etat.

R. NICHOLAS BURNS is the United States Permanent Representative to NATO. Prior to being appointed to his current post, Mr. Burns served as U. S. Ambassador to Greece (1997–2001). From 1995–1997, he served as Spokesman of the Department of State and Acting Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs. a career Senior Foreign Service Officer, Mr. Burns served for five years (1990–1995) on the National Security Council staff at the White House. He was Special Assistant to President Clinton and Senior Director for Russia, Ukraine, and Eurasia Affairs. Mr. Burns has also served as Vice Consul and Staff Assistant to the Ambassador in Cairo (1983–1985), and as Political Officer at the American Consulate General in Jerusalem (1985–1987).

ARIEL COHEN has been, since 1992, a Research Fellow in Russian and Eurasian Studies at the Davis International Studies Institute at the Heritage Foundation. He is also, since 2002, a policy adviser at the National

Institute for Public Policy. Dr. Cohen has been a consultant, advising USAID, The World Bank, The U.S. Government, and Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty. He has frequently testified before committees of the U. S. Congress and regularly appears on major news networks. He has published over 300 pieces and sits on a number of advisory and editorial boards.

OLDŘICH ČERNÝ is Executive Director and co-founder of the Prague Security Studies Institute. Prior to 1989, Oldřich Černý, who holds advanced degrees in both English and Czech, was employed as a translator of foreign literature into Czech and a producer for the dubbing of foreign films into Czech. In 1990, after working as a director and producer of the New York Festival of Banned Czech Films, Mr. Černý was appointed National Security Advisor to the President of Czechoslovakia. Following the split of Czechoslovakia in January of 1993, Mr. Černý was appointed the first Director General of the Czech Foreign Intelligence Service, a post he held until his resignation in 1998. Since 1999, Mr. Černý has served as Executive Director of the Forum 2000 Foundation. Mr. Černý is a member of the PASS Board.

THERÈSE DELPECH is currently Director of Strategic Affairs at the Atomic Energy Commission of France and Senior Research Fellow at the Center for International Studies in Paris. She is also the French Commissioner to UNMOVIC, a member of the IISS Council, a member of RAND Europe's Advisory Board, and an International Advisor to the ICRC. From 1991-1995, she served as a permanent consultant to the Policy Planning Staff of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. She served as advisor for politico-military affairs (1995-1997) to the French Prime Minister Alain Juppé. She chaired the UN Advisory Board for Disarmament Matters in 1999. Ms. Delpech is the author of three books and has been widely published in various periodicals.

JEFFREY GEDMIN is director of the Aspen Institute Berlin. Previously, Dr. Gedmin was a resident scholar at the American Enterprise Institute in Washington DC, where he coordinated and directed the New Atlantic Initiative. He was executive editor and producer of the award winning

PBS television program, *The Germans*, *Portrait of a New Nation*. Dr. Gedmin's articles have appeared in *The New York Times*, *The Washington Post*, *The Wall Street Journal*, *the Weekly Standard*, *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, *Die Zeit*, *Die Welt*, and elsewhere.

HIS ROYAL HIGHNESS PRINCE EL HASSAN BIN TALAL has initiated, founded and is actively involved in a number of Jordanian and international institutes and committees. He co-chaired the Independent Commission on International Humanitarian Issues (ICHI), 1983 and is currently President and Patron of the Arab Thought Forum, President of the Club of Rome, Moderator of the World Conference on Religion and Peace. In April 2002, His Royal Highness joined the Board of Nuclear Threat Initiative (NTI). His Royal Highness is founding member of the Parliament of Cultures and the author of seven books.

VÁCLAV HAVEL is the former President of the Czech Republic. A writer and dramatist, his work was banned in communist Czechoslovakia. A staunch advocate of human rights, he was jailed several times for his beliefs. Havel was one of the first Spokesmen for Charter 77 and a leading figure of the Civic Forum and the Velvet Revolution of 1989. Following the Velvet Revolution, he took office as the last President of Czechoslovakia, a position from which he resigned in 1992 prior to the dissolution of Czechoslovakia. In 1993, he was elected the first President of the Czech Republic, an office he held until his term-limit expired in February of 2003.

BRUCE JACKSON is the founder and President of the Project on Transitional Democracies. He is also the President and Co-Chairman of the U. S. Committee on NATO. From 1979 to 1990, Bruce Jackson served in the United States Army as a Military Intelligence Officer. From 1986 to 1990, he served in the Office of the Secretary of Defense in a variety of policy positions pertaining to nuclear forces, strategic defenses, and arms control. Upon leaving the Department of Defense in 1990, Mr. Jackson joined Lehman Brothers, where he was a strategist in the firm's proprietary trading operations. Between 1993 and 2002, Mr. Jackson was Vice

President for Strategy and Planning at Lockheed Martin Corporation. He also founded and served as Chairman of the Board of the Committee for the Liberation of Iraq.

KAREL KOVANDA has been Head of the Czech Delegation to NATO and WEU since 1998. For 12 months prior to this appointment, he functioned as a Deputy Foreign Minister. From 1993–1997 Mr. Kovanda served as the Permanent Representative of the Czech Republic to the United Nations. He represented the Czech Republic on the UN Security Council in 1994 and 1995, serving as the Council's President in January of 1994 and in April of 1995. In 1996, he served as Vice-President, and from January to May 1997, as President of the UN Economic and Social Council. After the dissolution of Czechoslovakia and the formation of the Czech Republic in January 1993, he was appointed Political Director responsible for bilateral relations with countries of Europe and North America.

ADAM MICHNIK is the editor-in-chief of *Gazeta Wyborcza*, the biggest daily in Poland. a historian and co-founder of KOR (Committee for the Defense of Workers), Mr. Michnik was detained many times between the years 1965–1980. a prominent “Solidarity” activist during the 1980's, he spent a total of six years in Polish prisons for activities opposing the communist regime. Mr. Michnik was a member of the Round Table Talks in 1989 and a member of the first non-communist parliament (1989–1991) in Poland.

JOSHUA MURAVCHIK is a resident scholar at the American Enterprise Institute. a specialist in U.S. foreign policy and international relations, he has written extensively about democracy, human rights, the role of ideas and ideologies in international politics, and America's role in the post Cold War world. Mr. Muravchik serves as an adjunct scholar at the Washington Institute on Near East Policy and is an adjunct professor at the Institute of World Politics. He is a member of the editorial boards of *World Affairs* and the *Journal of Democracy*. In 1992, he served on the Commission on Broadcasting to the People's Republic of China.

ONUR ÖYMEN was elected, in 2002, a Member of Parliament, Deputy for Istanbul Republican's Party. From 1997–2002, he was the Permanent Representative to NATO. From 1995–1997, he served as Undersecretary of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Dr. Öymen has also served as Turkish Ambassador to both Germany and Denmark. Prior to being named Ambassador to Denmark in 1988, Dr. Öymen was head of the Policy Planning Department. He has served as a counselor to the Turkish Embassies in Nicosia, Prague, and Madrid in 1974, 1980, and 1982, respectively. In 1978, he was a Special Advisor to the Minister for Foreign Affairs. In 1972, he was the Head of Section of the Policy Planning Department.

OLIVIER ROY is Research Director in the Humanities & Social Sciences sector of the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique in Paris and has been a consultant with the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs since 1984. He undertook several journeys in Afghanistan during the Mujahideen resistance to the Soviet invasion of 1979 and then embarked on numerous trips to the ex-Soviet Central Asian republics, notably Uzbekistan and Tajikistan. He was Special Representative of the Organization for Security & Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) in Tajikistan in 1993 to 1994 and headed the OSCE Mission to Tajikistan in 1994. Dr. Roy has delivered lectures and seminars at leading institutions in Europe and the United States, and is the author of numerous articles and books.

JAN RUML is a senator in the Senate of the Czech Republic currently serving as vice-chairman of the Senate. Mr. Ruml has held a number of positions in the public service of the Czech Republic including roles as former Minister and Deputy Minister of the Interior, as a member of the Czechoslovak Federal Assembly, and as a Deputy of the Parliament of the Czech Republic. Mr. Ruml is co-founder of the Union of Freedom, a political party of which he was the first leader. Mr. Ruml was also a signatory to Charter 77.

ZE'EV SCHIFF has been covering strategic developments in the Middle East for Haaretz for almost 50 years. He has covered every war and every major Israeli military operation since the Six-Day War. Recently, he has written

extensively on the war in Iraq, Iran's drive for nuclear capability, and the Palestinian truce. He was co-author of "Israel's Lebanon War," (1984) and "Intifada" (1990), and recently had a paper published by the James Baker Institute for Public Policy, titled "Weapons of Mass Destruction: The view from Israel." Schiff is currently a senior fellow at the Washington Institute for Near East Policy. Earlier this year, he was the recipient of the Haim Herzog Prize for special contribution to the state of Israel.

CRAIG ROBERTS STAPLETON has been the U.S. Ambassador to the Czech Republic since 2001. Prior to assuming his duties in the Czech Republic, Mr. Stapleton was a real estate executive, serving since 1982 as President of Marsh and McLennan Real Estate Advisors, Inc. Mr. Stapleton previously served on the Board of Directors of a number of publicly traded U.S. companies, including Alleghany Properties, Cornerstone Properties, Security Capital Corporation, Sonoma West, and T.B. Woods. He was a partner of President Bush in the ownership of the Texas Rangers from 1989–98. He served on the Board of the Peace Corps under President George H. W. Bush.

CYRIL SVOBODA is Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Czech Republic, an appointment he has held since 2002. From 1998–2002, Mr. Svoboda was Chairman of the Petition Committee of the Czech Parliament's Chamber of Deputies. Since January of 2001, he has been the Chairman of the Committee for the Rules of Procedure and Immunity of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe. Between 1992–1996, Mr. Svoboda was Deputy Minister of Justice of the Czech Republic. In 1996, he was appointed Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs for issues related to EU accession. Svoboda has been a member of the European Commission for Democracy through Law since 1994 and has, since 1997, been the Commission's Deputy Chairman.

JIRÍ SCHNEIDER is the head of the Policy Planning Department at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Czech Republic, a post he has held several times: 1993–1994, 1999–2001, and since the beginning of 2003. In 2002, Mr. Schneider served as an International Policy Fellow at the Open Society Institute in Budapest. From 1995–1998, Mr. Schneider served as the Ambassador of the Czech Republic to Israel. Mr. Schneider is a for-

mer MP of the Czechoslovak Federal Assembly (1990–1992). Prior to 1989 and his entry to public service, Mr. Schneider was employed as a forestry surveyor. He serves as a part-time lecturer at Charles University, New York University in Prague, and to PSSI's Robinson-Martin Security Scholars Program. Mr. Schneider is a member of the PASS Board.

ALEXANDR VONDRA is the former Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs for Security Policy. From 2001–2003, he served as the Czech Government Commissioner for the Prague Summit of NATO. From 1997–2001, Mr. Vondra served as the Ambassador of the Czech Republic to the United States. From 1993–1997, Mr. Vondra served as First Deputy Minister of International Affairs of the Czech Republic. He served as Foreign Policy Advisor to President Václav Havel (1990–1992). Vondra, a co-founder of the Civic Forum movement and a signatory and former spokesman for Charter 77, participated in the activities of Czechoslovakia's democratic opposition, focusing on editorial work in the samizdat and cooperation with opposition groups in Central and Eastern Europe. Mr. Vondra is currently the Coordinator of PASS and the GMF Transatlantic Fellow.

MICHEAL ŽANTOVSKÝ is the Czech Ambassador to the State of Israel and the former Coordinator of PASS. In 1996, he was elected to the Czech Senate for a six-year term. During his tenure as Senator, he was elected three times to serve as Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Security. He was also twice elected to the presidency of his political party, the Civic Democratic Alliance. Between 1992 and 1997, Žantovský served as first the Czechoslovak Ambassador, and later the Czech Ambassador to the United States. From 1990 till 1992, Mr. Žantovský served as Press Secretary and Spokesman for President Václav Havel. As a journalist, translator and writer, he was a founding member of the Civic Forum and a founding member of the Czech chapter of P.E.N.

PARTICIPANTS

** PASS Advisory Board Member*

*** PASS Board Member*

GUNDUZ AKTAN

Columnist, Former Director
of the TESEV Institute
Ankara

ISHAK ALATON

Chairman of the Board, Alarko
Holding A. S.
Istanbul

MADELEINE K. ALBRIGHT*

President, The Albright Group, LLC.
Washington, DC

ABDULLATIF ALREFAEE

Head of the Department
of International Relations,
Ministry of Defense
Kuwait City

GÜNTHER ALTENBURG

Assistant Secretary General
for Political Affairs
and Security Policy, NATO
Brussels

UZI ARAD

Director, Institute for Policy
and Strategy
Herzlia

RONALD D. ASMUS*

Senior Transatlantic Fellow,
The German Marshall Fund
of the United States
Washington, DC

ARTHUR AVNON

Ambassador of the State of Israel
to the Czech Republic
Prague

PAVEL BÉM

Lord Mayor of the City of Prague
Prague

ANTONÍN BERDYCH**

President, Association
for International Affairs
Prague

MARC PERRIN DE BRICHAMBAUT
Director for Strategic Affairs,
Ministry of Defense
Paris

PETR BROD
Director, BBC Czech Republic
Prague

SHLOMO BROM
Senior Research Associate, The Jaffee
Center for Strategic Studies
Tel Aviv

R. NICHOLAS BURNS
U.S. Permanent Representative
to NATO
Brussels

CHRISTOPHER CALDWELL
Senior Editor, The Weekly Standard
Washington, DC

OLDŘICH ČERNÝ**
Director, Prague Security Studies
Institute
Prague

ARIEL COHEN
Research Fellow, The Heritage
Foundation
Washington, DC

ERIKA CSEKES*
Attorney at Law, Csekés, Világi,
Drgonec & Partners
Bratislava

THÉRESE DELPECH
Director, The French Atomic Energy
Commission (CEA), Direction
of Strategic Affairs
Paris

THOMAS DINE
Director, Radio Free Europe/Radio
Liberty
Prague

GABRIEL EICHLER*
CEO, Benson Oak
Prague

STEVEN EVERTS
Senior Research Fellow, Centre
for European Reform
London

HYNEK FAJMON
Member of the Parliament
of the Czech Republic
Prague

EVA FILIPIOVÁ
Director, Middle East and North
Africa Department,
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
of the Czech Republic
Prague

IVAN GABAL
Consultant and Analyst, Gabal
Analysis & Consulting
Prague

JEFFREY GEDMIN*
Director, Aspen Institute Berlin
Berlin

MARCUS GERHARDT

Vice Chairman, Civility Program,
Foreign Policy Centre
London

HIRSH GOODMAN

Senior Research Associate, Jaffee
Center for Strategic Studies
Tel Aviv

MARCELA GŮRLICHOVÁ

Advisor to the Prime Minister
of the Czech Republic
Prague

KARL-THEODOR ZU GUTTENBERG

Member of the German Bundestag
Berlin

AHMET K. HAN

Academician and Resident Fellow,
Istanbul Bilgi University, Graduate
School of Social Sciences
Istanbul

HRH PRINCE EL HASSAN BIN TALAL

The Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan
Amman

VÁCLAV HAVEL*

Former President of the Czech
Republic
Prague

MARK A. HELLER

Principal Research Associate,
Jaffee Center for Strategic Studies
Tel Aviv

JIRÍ HUML

Deputy Director for Management,
Česká Pojišťovna a.s.
Prague

JANA HYBÁŠKOVÁ

Ambassador of the Czech Republic
to the State of Kuwait
Kuwait City

BRUCE JACKSON

President, Project on Transitional
Democracies
Washington, DC

JOSEF JAŘAB

Member of the Senate of the Czech
Republic,
Chairman, Senate Committee on
Foreign Affairs,
Defense and Security
Prague

ROMAN JOCH

Director, Civic Institute
Prague

ELY KARMON

Senior Research Scholar,
International Institute for Counter-
Terrorism
Herzlyia

KAREL KOVANDA

Permanent Representative
of the Czech Republic to NATO
Brussels

DANIEL KUMERMANN

Ambassador of the Czech Republic
to the State of Israel
Tel Aviv

ERAN LERMAN
Director, The American Jewish
Committee,
Middle East Office
Jerusalem

PETR LUŇÁK
Information Officer, Public
Diplomacy Division, NATO
Brussels

PETR MAREŠ
Deputy Prime Minister for Research
and Development, Human Rights
and Human Resources
Prague

WILLIAM F. MARTIN
Senior Advisor to the Deputy
Secretary of Defense, Chairman
of Washington Policy and Analysis
Washington, DC

MARGARITA MATHIOPOULOS
CEO, European Advisory Group,
Chairman of the FDP National
Committee on Foreign and Security
Policy
Berlin

JOSHUA MURAVCHIK*
Resident Scholar, American
Enterprise Institute
Washington, DC

PETR NEVICKÝ
Chairman of the Board, Ness Czech
Republic
Prague

ONUR ÖYMEN
Member of the Turkish Grand
National Assembly
Ankara

MARTIN PALOUŠ
Ambassador of the Czech Republic
to the U.S.
Washington, DC

JÍŘÍ PEHE
Resident Director, New York
University in Prague
Prague

ROUZBEH PIROUZ
Chairman, Civility Project, Foreign
Policy Centre
London

PETR PITHART
President of the Senate of the Czech
Republic
Prague

RUPRECHT POLENZ
Member of the German Bundestag
Berlin

ROGER ROBINSON*
President and CEO, Conflict
Securities Advisory Group, Inc.
Washington, DC

OLIVIER ROY
Research Director, French National
Center for Scientific Research
Paris

BARRY RUBIN

Director, Global Research in
International Affairs Center
Herzliya

JAROSLAV ŠEDIVÝ

Former Minister of Foreign Affairs
of the Czech Republic
Prague

JAN RUML

Vice President of the Senate
of the Czech Republic
Prague

LURIE SPENGLER

Director, Central European Advisory
Group
Prague

JACQUES RUPNIK*

Research Director, Center for
International Studies and Research
Paris

WESTON STACEY

Executive Director, American
Chamber of Commerce
Prague

ÖZDEM SANBERK

Former Director of the Turkish
Economic and Social Studies
Foundation
Istanbul

CRAIG R. STAPLETON

Ambassador of the United States
of America to the Czech Republic
Prague

ZE'EV SCHIFF

Editor, Ha'aretz
Tel Aviv

CYRIL SVOBODA

Minister of Foreign Affairs of the
Czech Republic
Prague

JIŘÍ SCHNEIDER**

Director, Policy Planning
Department,
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
of the Czech Republic
Prague

FRANTIŠEK ŠULC

Senior Editor, Lidové noviny
Prague

DAN SCHUEFTAN

Senior Fellow, The National Security
Studies Center,
Haifa

AMIN TARZI

Editor, Radio Free Europe/Radio
Liberty
Prague

KAREL SCHWARZENBERG*

Former Chancellor of the President
of the Czech Republic
Prague

BŘETISLAV TUREČEK

Editor and Publicist, Právo
Prague

LUBOŠ VESELY**

Senior Research Fellow,
Association for International Affairs
Prague

TERRENCE VALESKI

General Manager, Eurotel Praha,
spol. s r. o.
Prague

ALEXANDR VONDRA**

Transatlantic Fellow, The German
Marshall Fund of the United States
Prague

JIRÍ WEIGL

Director, Chancellory of President
of the Czech Republic
Prague

MICHAEL ŽANTOVSKÝ**

Coordinator, Program of Atlantic
Security Studies
Prague

JAN ŽIŽKA

Editor, Euro
Prague

STAFF AND ORGANIZERS

PASS - Antonín Berdych, Oldřich Černý, Jiří Schneider, Luboš Veselý,
Alexandr Vondra, Michael Žantovský (Coordinator)

PASS EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT - Jan Havránek

PSSI - Corbin P. Miller (Deputy Director)

LOGISTICS AND CATERING MANAGEMENT - Vlastislav Vilímek

ARRIVALS MANAGER - Jan Černý

DRIVERS - Jaroslav Bican, Jiří Barančík, Roman Brandejský, Luděk Kočvara

VOLUNTEERS - Cyril Bumbálek, William Campbell, Jan Gallas, Radko Hokovský,
Kateřina Křížová, Romana Lantorová, Katherine R. Maher, Tomas
Mascardo, Timothy J. Mara, Rhianon N. Miller, Petr Netuka, Tereza
Novotná, Elizabeth A. Parr, Dagmar Nehněvská, Alice Savovová, Pavel
Sáňka, Gabriela Selecka, Sarah Troup, Dalibor Tomko, Veronika
Zdeňková, Markéta Zuzanáková

PRESS SECRETARY - Pavlína Kostková

SENATE STAFF - Eva Baránková, František Hodík, Milan Kopal, Petr Kysela,
Vojtěch Mašek, Zdeněk Sakal, Jiřina Stará, Jan Šedivý, Stanislav Topinka

LORD MAYOR'S OFFICE LIAISON - Jana Vávřová

CALIGRAPHY - Dana Pšenicová

