

Jan C. Irlenkaeuser

NATO and EU in Transformation

How Can They Assume Responsibility in the Future Global War on Terrorism?

**Kieler Analysen zur Sicherheitspolitik Nr. 14
Januar 2006**



Jan C. Irlenkaeuser

NATO and EU in Transformation – How Can They Assume Responsibility in the Future
Global War on Terrorism?
Kieler Analysen zur Sicherheitspolitik Nr. 14.
Kiel, Januar 2006.

Impressum:

Herausgeber:
Direktor des Instituts für Sicherheitspolitik
an der Christian-Albrechts-Universität zu Kiel
Prof. Dr. Joachim Krause
Westring 400

24118 Kiel

ISUK.org

Die veröffentlichten Beiträge mit Verfasserangabe geben die Ansicht der betreffenden Autoren wider, nicht notwendigerweise die des Herausgebers oder des Instituts für Sicherheitspolitik

© 2004 Institut für Sicherheitspolitik an der Christian-Albrechts-Universität zu Kiel (ISUK).
Die Vervielfältigung ist durch den Herausgeber gestattet.

1. Introduction – NATO and EU in Transformation

At the NATO defense minister's conference in Colorado Springs, in 2003, the Secretary General of the Alliance, Lord Robertson, got a T-Shirt with the printed slogan: "this isn't your daddy's NATO anymore". This is absolutely right and the same could be said about the European Union. A lot has changed since the end of the 1980s. The Soviet Union no longer exists but various threats to western security exist. Terrorism, ethnic wars, failed and weak states as well as the Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) are the new challenges to security policy making in the 21st century. These profound changes have initiated a process of transformation both in NATO and the EU. The tragic events of September 11th had a further strong influence on the desire of both organizations to adapt to the new environment.

The following paper will examine the war on terrorism in broad perspective and not reduce it to simply the military aspect. Therefore, the objectives of the global war on terrorism will be defined, the need for a complex strategy in the war on terrorism will be discussed and important fields of action are going to be examined (military as well as civilian approaches).

2. The objectives of the global war on terror

Like in every war, so is it also true in the war on terror that you first have to define your objectives in order to develop a strategy. Or as Sir Basil Liddell Hart once wrote, as an essence of strategy:

"Keep your object always in mind, while adapting your plan to circumstances"¹

So what are the objectives in the war on terror?

- Capturing Bin Laden, his lieutenants and all other members of Al Qaeda and bring them to justice.
- Protecting the citizens of the NATO and EU member states as well as of other countries from terrorist attacks, such as the ones on September 11th 2001 in New York and Washington or the March 11th attack in Madrid.
- Destroying terrorists infrastructure and save havens where ever they are.
- Destroying lines of support and communication of terrorist organizations.
- Winning the hearts and minds of non-western peoples, especially but not exclusively in the Arab world,
- Promoting democracy and free markets as the best long term tool against terrorism.

3. The need for a complex strategy in the war against terror

The objectives mentioned above make it obvious that the war on terrorism is more than the use of military force. To be effective the international community has to employ various civil and military tools to reach its goal. The National Security Strategy of the United States (2002), the Declarations of the Prague and Istanbul Summits (2002 and 2004 respectively), and the Security Strategy of the

¹ Sir Basil Liddell Hart, Strategy, New York 1990, S. 335.

European Union (2003) all agree that a comprehensive strategy is necessary to gain victory in the war against terror.

Therefore, it seems too necessary to fight terrorism at various levels and try to root out the political and economic factors that support terrorist organizations. In this respect the following analysis of NATO and EU policies will focus on five aspects central to a long term strategy against terrorism:

- Fighting terrorism at home.
- Political cooperation with non-member states, especially in the wider Middle East.
- Military operations in fighting terrorism
- Peacekeeping and stabilization operations.
- Proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

4. Fighting terrorism at home

The first line of defense against all terrorist threats is the nation states. Here the protection of life, limb and property of the citizens has to start. In this respect offensive and defensive measures have to be taken simultaneously. This means that law enforcement and intelligence organizations have to work together in order to detect terrorists before they can take action and protect citizens and critical infrastructure against terrorist attacks and consequences.

The policy of the European Union in the field of anti-terror actions reflects to a large extent the institutional and legal setting of home affairs and justice within the framework of the Union. These policy fields are not fully integrated and under the jurisdiction of the commission rather the member states kept their sovereignty. Nevertheless, some forms of deeper

cooperation have been founded, e.g. Europol or Eurojust. With the action plan for fighting terrorism, which was adopted by the Council of the European Union in September 2001, the Union developed a broad framework for its policy in this regard. The measures proposed by the action plan include²

The attacks in Madrid in March 2004 served as a focal point for the Union, because they showed, that Europe is already in the cross wires of terrorist organizations.

In its declaration on combating terrorism of March 25th, 2004 the Union identified five strategic goals, in regards to home affairs and law enforcement for its fight against terrorism:

- Reduce the access of terrorists to financial and other economic resources.
- Maximize capacity within EU bodies and member states to detect, investigate and prosecute terrorists and prevent terrorist attacks.
- Protect the security of international transport and ensure effective systems of border control
- Enhance the capability of member states to deal with the consequences of a terrorist attack³

To date the Union has implemented measures to fight global Terrorism by

² For a in deeper analysis of the EU action plan against terrorism see: Wilhelm Knelangen, Die Europäische Union und die Bekämpfung des Terrorismus, in Martin H. W. Möllers, Robert Chr. van Ooyen Jahrbuch öffentliche Sicherheit 2004/05, Verlag für Polizeiwissenschaft, Frankfurt 2005, pp. 403-413.

³ European Council, Declaration on Combating Terrorism, March 25, 2004, p. 9.

using the following tools, which sometimes not only serve anti-terrorism efforts but rather the fight against organized crime:

- Strengthen the European Police Agency (EUROPOL), but which still is not a European equivalent to the American FBI. Its tasks are more in coordinating the member states police forces and facilitating information sharing.
- Founding of EUROJUST, the European criminal prosecution agency. This agency nevertheless is not comparable with the national prosecution offices.
- Making European passports machine readable by 2006.
- Fighting the financing of terrorist organizations.

The Union wide arrest warrant is a first step to enhance the capabilities of the EU in its fight against terrorism. The real world implications of these developments have to be evaluated in the years to come.

It is important to notice that the European Union is not capable of directing the member states efforts in combating terrorism, in fact this is the primary duty of the national governments. The EU can serve as a coordinating body to facilitate cooperation for example in information sharing and so on and it has been doing so for a number of years.

With the appointment of Gijs de Vries as the first counter-terrorism coordinator of the Union a step in the right direction was taken. The task of the counter-terrorism coordinator is not to set up a new institutional framework for the EU to combat terrorism (e.g. an own EU-Counter-terrorism center), but to monitor

the developments within the Union and in the international community. "So, we are not in the business of creating a new institution, or a new bureaucracy, we are in the business of making sure that the commitments entered into will be carried out as planned."⁴ This demonstrates the limited role of the Union in this policy field.

For the North Atlantic alliance law enforcement and homeland security and so on are not part of its primary "jurisdiction" and core competences. Nevertheless, NATO is working with non-member states from the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC) to coordinate their efforts in this regard, for example through the Euro-Atlantic Disaster Response Coordination Centre.⁵ The NATO/ EAPC-Program serves more as a political tool and in giving limited assistance to some states that are lacking the needed resources and are challenged by terrorism and Islamic extremism. Particularly important is the cooperation with states in former Soviet Union (such as Armenia, Azerbaijan or Tajikistan) and on the Balkans.

5. Political cooperation with non-member states, especially in the wider Middle East

The region of the wider Middle East ranging from Morocco in the West to Afghanistan in East is a key field in the fight against Terrorism. The political and economic situation in many of those countries is far from being satisfactory,

⁴ Summary Transcript of Joint Press Briefing, Javier Solana, EU High Representative for the CFSP, Gijs de Vries, Counter-terrorism co-ordinator, Brussels, 30 March 30th, 2004, p. 2.

⁵ NATO, About the EADRCC – Euro-Atlantic Disaster Response Coordination Centre [<http://www.nato.int/eadrcc/home.htm>].

by western standards. The rise of militant political Islam in most of those countries poses a significant threat to western security, because it could destabilize the region and make it a seedbed for terrorism. Both NATO and EU developed programs to work with nations from the respective area.

Only the EU and not NATO are involved in the Middle East peace process as an institution. But the North Atlantic Alliance launched its Mediterranean Dialogue Program (MD) long before international terrorism became the major aspect of international security. Partners of the MD are Algeria, Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Mauritania, Morocco, and Tunisia. The program seems to be modeled after the example of the alliances *Partnership for Peace* program, although it is less sophisticated and of course does not include the perspective of membership. The Objectives are to enhance security, foster cooperation between NATO and the participating nations in the field of security policy. The form of cooperation are bilateral (26 + 1) or multilateral (26 + n) contacts, where the partners can decide on their own how intensive the interaction is supposed to be. But there was a distinctive call for a stronger and more effective NATO policy towards the Region. As the than chairman of the NATO Military committee Gen Harald Kujat pointed out: „[T]he Mediterranean Dialogue will have to become much more relevant. While again a political issue, NATO may be needed in accordance with its policy to expand stability”.⁶

With the Istanbul Cooperation Initiative, which was launched at the NATO summit

in Istanbul in June 2004, NATO has put more emphases on the MD. The core aspects of the initiative are, to:

- Enhance security and stability through transatlantic engagement.
- Provide advice to partners on defense reform, defense budgeting, defense planning and civil- military cooperation.
- Promote military-to-military contacts in order to advance interoperability.
- Fighting terrorism and proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.⁷

This concept shows clearly that a broad approach in fighting terrorism with politico-military aspects is to be employed by the Alliance.

The approach of the EU is defined wider and does not only take security aspects into account but also political, economic and social ones. The Union has launched its own program of cooperation with nations in the Mediterranean area (Algeria, Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Lebanon, Morocco, Palestinian Authority, Syria, Tunisia and Turkey). This so called Barcelona Process, which was launched in 1995, is aimed at enhancing the cooperation between the EU and the partner states. The Barcelona process has the objective of creating a common area of peace and security. Therefore it employs different types of tools:

- “The definition of a common area of peace and stability through the reinforcement of political and security

⁶ Harld Kujat, NATO's New Capabilities, 22. October 2002 [<http://www.nato.int/ims/2002/s021007e.htm>].

⁷ NATO, NATO elevates Mediterranean Dialogue to a genuine partnership, launches Istanbul Cooperation Initiative, June 29, 2004 [www.nato.int].

dialogue (Political and Security Chapter).

- The construction of a zone of shared prosperity through an economic and financial partnership and the gradual establishment of a free-trade area (Economic and Financial Chapter).
- The rapprochement between peoples through a social, cultural and human partnership aimed at encouraging understanding between cultures and exchanges between civil societies (Social, Cultural and Human Chapter)".⁸

The EU works with its partners regarding the above mentioned aspects in bilateral and regional perspective. In addition to the Barcelona Process the EU has established association agreements with most partners in order to enhance the political and economic cooperation with the region, which are the most important part of the Barcelona process⁹

Terrorism is expressively not included in the tasks of the Barcelona process, but a successful development there would indirectly significantly enhance the western position in the global war on terrorism, because reforms in the states of the Middle East could lead to a weakening attractiveness of radical Islamic organizations.

Up to date it appears that the Mediterranean Dialogue and the Barcelona Process have some strategic objectives in common, but they operate mostly in different policy fields, so far.

⁸ European Union, Euro-Mediterranean Partnership/Barcelona Process [http://www.europa.eu.int/comm/external_relations/euomed/index.htm].

⁹ European Union, Euro-Mediterranean Association agreements: The Partnership is moving forward [http://www.europa.eu.int/comm/external_relations/euomed/news/memo04_275.htm]

But a competition could arise if both organizations are not able to develop a comprehensive division of labor.

6. Military operations in fighting terrorism

Military operations against terrorists are so far a task probably best handled by the Alliance rather than by the EU, although there is no official division of labor. Military capabilities of the EU are still too weak to give it a credible military option and the Union is yet to conduct its first military operation in the war on terror.

For NATO fighting terrorism is primarily a task of the member states, with the alliance in a supporting role. At the Prague summit of 2002 the NATO countries agreed on a "military concept for defense against terrorism". The document lays out four different types military options NATO wants to be able to conduct if necessary: "

- **Anti Terrorism, essentially defensive measures.**

This includes tasks like intelligence sharing, standardization of procedures and threat assessment etc., rescue operations, as well as air and maritime protection.

- **Counter Terrorism, primarily offensive measures, which could be executed either with NATO in the lead or in a supporting role**

When NATO takes the lead, operations could be the deployment of special operations forces or even large scale conventional forces. In other cases, when the alliance has only a supporting role, its primary tasks would be as a coalition

enabler, provider of intelligence information, logistical support etc.

- **Consequence Management, which is deals with, and reduces the effects of a terrorist attack once it has taken place.**

Consequence Management is seen as a primarily civilian task. But NATO wants to provide support for authorities of the member states, in all the fields where military experience, know-how and hardware could be helpful in limiting the effects of a terrorists attack (e.g. in the case mass civil casualties or contamination with chemical agents). Joint training and exercises of military and civilian first responders is another import aspect of NATO consequence management approach (for example the exercise “Dacia 2003” in Rumania).

- **Military Co-operation.**¹⁰

Military Co-operation is a more a strategic than operational or even tactical aspect of the fight against terrorism. It is aimed at bringing NATO member and/or partners, such as Russia or Ukraine into a dialogue about military aspects in the war on terror.

What has been done so far?

Although the EU has conducted or is conducting military operations so far, like EUFOR in Bosnia, or Operation ARTHEMIS in the Democratic Republic of Congo, one cannot consider them as

part of the global war on terror. Nevertheless, they might have a limited and indirect effect on it.

The Alliance has conducted two specific anti-terror operations (Active Endeavor and Eagle Assist) and contributed largely to the peace building in Afghanistan.

- **“Operation Eagle Assist” was the deployment of NATO AWACS aircrafts to the United States in order to protect U.S. airspace.** The operation was conducted between 2001 and 2002.
- **“Operation Active Endeavor”** is carried out by forces form the NATO's Standing Naval Forces and designated to monitor shipping the eastern Mediterranean. In March 2003, escorting civilian ships through the Strait of Gibraltar was added to the operation and the states of the MD were invited to join forces with NATO in this regard.
- In **Afghanistan** NATO members have actively contributed to the military operations. The International Stabilization Force (ISAF) has, since its creation, been under the command of a NATO member state and since 2003 lead by the alliance herself. This marks a turning point in NATO’s history because it is the first operation outside the Euro-Atlantic area.

So far NATO has played an important, but over all minor part in the military fight against global terrorism. But this does not say anything about the contributions individual members, especially the United States made to this effort.

7. The Proliferation of weapons of mass destruction

¹⁰ NATO, Military Concept for Defense against Terrorism [<http://www.nato.int/ims/docu/terrorism.htm>].

The proliferation of weapons of mass destruction is a very important factor in today's international security environment, which is deeply intervened with the problem of terrorism. Just imagine the consequences of a terrorist organization, like Al Qaeda acquiring those deadly weapons. NATO and EU have declared the fight against proliferation the status of a principle task. But on an operational level their possibilities are limited.

NATO can serve as a transatlantic consultation forum to bridge differences among members, especially between the U.S. and some of the major European partners such as France or Germany. The latest transatlantic dispute about how to deal best with Iran and its nuclear weapons program illustrates the necessity of dialogue.

NATO is trying to strengthen its capacities regarding WMD and operates a WMD center in the Division of Defense Planning and Operations of its Brussels headquarters. Its tasks are mainly to foster Alliance-wide coordination, ensure common understanding of the problem and how to deal with it, support NATO committees dealing with issues of proliferation, improve intelligence and information sharing about WMD and enhance military readiness in regard to WMD.¹¹ But this NATO strategy, due to fact of the limited abilities of the Alliance in this regard, is more a defensive one aimed at reducing vulnerability of member states and forces and not an offensive counter-proliferation approach. For the EU, non-proliferation has more a political aspect, which is incorporated

into its overall strategy of creating a stable and peaceful security environment. Additionally, the Union has with its jurisdiction over most parts of the civilian nuclear energy sector not only the responsibility but also has the tools to influence especially the export policy of member states.

The economic power the EU can be and is used, as an instrument to foster non-proliferation, especially by offering incentives to states willing to set aside suspicious nuclear activities. In detail, non-proliferation policy for the Union has the following aspects:

- In the political dialogue with third countries the Union is trying to strengthen global non-proliferation, as one could see in recent months with regard to Iran. These efforts have so far not produced satisfactory results so far because the Iranian government continues with its enrichment program.
- Implementation of safeguard systems within the Union, participation of Union members in the different international non-proliferation regimes and regulations to control the exports of dual-use items and technology.
- Assistance programs which are aimed at diminishing the risk of further proliferation. For example the Union initiated cooperation with Russia and other states from the former Soviet Union and participated in the Korean Energy Development Organization (KEDO). The Organization was aimed at providing North Korea with two light water reactors if the

¹¹ NATO Review, Interview with Ted Whiteside: Head of NATO's WMD Centre, in: NATO Review, Vol. 49, 2001, No. 4, p. 22-23.

regime would be willing to stop its own nuclear program.¹²

So far this civil orientated program has not been too successful, but one can not take the Union in responsibility rather the difficulty lies in the nature of the problem. The activities of NATO and EU, as different as they are, show that both organizations are aware of the problem and are therefore involved in the global fight against proliferation. This can be seen as a part of a wider strategy, not only to combat terrorism but also to prevent so called rogue states from posing a threat to international security. This specific policy field shows clearly that neither organization can solve the problem on its own and that both depend on other powerful actors, such as the United States, to make progress.

8. Peacekeeping and Stabilization operations

War torn countries as well as weak and failing states pose an imminent threat to western security because they can be a seedbed or even a safe haven for terrorism. Therefore, it is of utmost importance to NATO and the EU to work with member states and other international organizations, such as the United Nations, in bringing peace, stability and the rule of law to those countries. In the last decade peacekeeping and peace enforcement operations have consumed not only a

great deal of time but also resources especially of the North Atlantic Alliance. The EU just very recently became a more or less independent actor in this field as it took over the SFOR mission, in Bosnia and Herzegovina from NATO, which is now called EUFOR.

Probably the best example of peacekeeping and stabilization operations as an integral part of the global fight against terrorism is the ongoing ISAF mission in Afghanistan. Here NATO countries and since 2004 the Alliance herself as an organization has played the leading role in stabilizing the country, especially the capital Kabul. The overall objective of the international community lies in bringing peace to the country and preventing Taliban and Al Qaeda forces from regaining power. This task cannot only be managed by ISAF but needs additional forces provided by the U.S. and other countries, such as the United Kingdom or Australia, in the operation Enduring Freedom, with today about 18.000 soldiers committed to combating Al Qaeda and the Taliban. The mere presence of troops, who ever might provide them, nevertheless will not be enough to achieve the ambitious goals for the future of Afghanistan. Rather supporting economic reconstruction and political development is necessary. Here the EU and its member states play a significant role in providing humanitarian aid to the Afghani people and working with them in development projects not only in Kabul but also outside of the capital in the provinces, for example Germany supports development projects in the northern province of Kunduz, with civil experts guarded by a detachment of German Soldiers. Other nations have or

¹² Currently the Light Water Reactor Program is suspended due to the fact that North Korea seems to be unwilling to cooperate, with the international community by definitely setting a side their ambitions for nuclear weapons. See press release KEDO, KEDO Extends Suspension of LEWR Project, November 26, 2004 [http://www.kedo.org/news_detail.asp?NewsID=29].

plan similar projects in other parts of the country.

The European Union has strongly committed itself to help the Afghani people. The EU is the largest donor to Afghanistan. For example the Union gave 44% of all total pledges made for the time span from 2002 to 2006, reaching about two billion Euros, at the January 2002 donor conference in Tokyo.¹³

As the general elections of 2004 have shown, the political stabilization of Afghanistan will be a very challenging task for the decades to come. Today NATO forces are heavily engaged in civilian projects, so called civil-military cooperation (CIMIC), in order not only to promote the welfare of the Afghani but rather to establish a more positive environment for NATO forces to operate in. The military aspect of the international presence nevertheless is essential to the civilian reconstruction and democratization efforts, because security is the basis for economic and political development. Or as the German scholar Alexander von Humboldt noted, as early as the 18th century: "Without security there is no liberty" ("Ohne Sicherheit ist keine Freiheit").

In Afghanistan one can notice a division of labor between NATO and EU. While the Alliance is working mostly in the field of security, but not exclusively as CIMIC projects show, the Union is supporting the economic and political agenda in the country.

9. Conclusion

To come back to the question mentioned in the title of this paper: It seems that NATO and the EU are taking their share of responsibility in the global war against terrorism. The two organizations have an implicated division of labor, not only for political reasons but for practical ones, they both have their specific capabilities which the other has not. If one looks at them, it becomes clear, that in most important parts, they compliment each other quite well, which means that so far an informal division of labor is taking place between both of them.

This however does not mean that NATO is reduced to a pure military role; neither has the EU only capabilities in the field of justice and home affairs. They both work actively and effectively in the international political arena, especially when it comes to cooperating with non-member states and support for a comprehensive long strategy against terrorism. If NATO and the EU continue to see the fight against terror as a complex task and not only as a law enforcement or military problem, they can keep on playing a significant and responsible part in the global war on terrorism, only together and not against each other they can be successful. Today there is no need and there are no resources for duplicating existing infrastructure and capabilities.

¹³ European Union, Fact sheet – EU Aid to Afghanistan [http://europa.eu.int/comm/external_relations/us/sum06_03/afghan.pdf].