

8th Portuguese Atlantic Youth Seminar

Alfeite Naval Academy, Lisbon, 26th July to 2nd August

“War and Peace: UN, NATO and the EU: Partners in Security?”

Summary

Leigh Caraher, USA

Axel Hagelstam, Finland

Sat 26th July:

Arrival

Opening ceremony

Dinner

Sun 27th July:

The Iraqi crisis: Consequences for the European order; Dr. José Manuel Fernandes, Director, Público daily newspaper:

The terrorist attacks on the 11th of September 2001 are the culmination for the change in the European order, which started with the end of the Cold War. The reaction in Europe however was calmer than in the United States; after a short period of complete sympathy, the Europeans soon became somewhat estranged by the furor in the US, and had difficulties perceiving the full effect of the attacks on US society. Despite of this, the nature of the new threats; a combination of failed states with weapons of mass destruction (WMD) and international terrorism were understood on both sides of the Atlantic. This combination comprises both the will in form of fundamentalism, the means in form of suicide attack-capabilities and the technology in form of developed nuclear, biological and chemical weapons programmes, to impose massive destruction on western societies.

The difference in power between the EU and the US lies in the areas of foreign policy and military capabilities, whereas the EU economically is almost equal to the US. The EU does not have a coherent foreign policy, nor does the EU coordinate the military spending of its members, which leads to significant overlapping of and gaps in capabilities. The lack of a coherent foreign policy is best exemplified by the United Nations’ Security Council (UNSC), where the EU is blocked from a seat not by US resistance, but by the unwillingness of France and the United Kingdom to give up their seats in favor of the EU. In order to bridge the gap in military capabilities, the European nations need to invest more and coordinate their investments better.

The war in Iraq and the preceding process that led to the war did not lead to the demise of the UN or of NATO, as was predicted by some. Their ability to function was however badly severed by the “troublemakers” France and Germany, although this as damaged primarily these very states instead of the aforementioned institutions.

The Iraqi crisis: Consequences for the world order; Prof. José Adelino Maltez, University of Technology, Lisbon:

The Atlantic is neither a place nor a sea, but an idea, based on nationalism, democracy, liberty and the rule of law. Since the end of the Cold War, the search for a new world order has led to the concept of peace by law. This idea is based on the concept of winning by being right as opposed to being right by winning, and the ultimate goal of this process is, according to Prof. Maltez, achieving a form of Immanuel Kant’s “perpetual peace”. The process of Globalization is in a state of organized anarchy, and requires international institutions which are able to coordinate and manage the process.

Debate:

During the debate, questions were raised concerning a variety of issues, such as the impact of the rift in Europe created by the Iraq war on European unity and the ability to formulate an common foreign and security policy; how the US might perceive a European federal state; NATO's possible role in post-conflict Iraq; if the role of NATO in the future is global or regional. Professor Maltez said that justice without law is impotent, just as law without power is also impotent. He also emphasized the fact that the EU was born within the transatlantic vision, and the United States was a principal agent in establishing the antecedents of the EU. The US is an economic and security power, while the EU is an economic power. China has the potential to become a serious contender if they can reconcile communist rule with a market economy. The United States seeks partners besides Europe, which is a new situation for Europe. Democratization has historically been preceded by freedom. One of the causes of the current rift within Europe is due to a conflict of interest between small and large states, where small states fear losing power to large states. This surfaced for the first time in Nice in December 2000.

Mon 28th July:**Managing NATO's Security Reform, Colonel Paiva Monteiro:**

Colonel Monteiro gave a brief overview of NATO's history including its origins, enlargements, and major events that had a profound effect on the alliance (i.e. end of the Cold War and German unification). He focused on its post-Cold War evolution through a discussion of the important new initiatives introduced at NATO summits, including the Strategic Concept (Washington Summit 1999) and the new command structure of the alliance (Prague Summit 2002). He mentioned in the discussion that NATO's next enlargement might take place in 2007.

Iraqi Crisis: The implications for the Transatlantic Alliance, Vice Admiral Alexandre Reis Rodrigues:

Two lessons from the Iraqi crisis are that US unilateralism reduces the willingness of Allies to support US action and that Europe must be capable of operating alongside U.S. forces in high intensity conflict, otherwise the European allies could be sidelined. Europe and the United States perceive the same threats and strategies, but it is the implementation of these strategies that create challenges. The essence of NATO transformation is the development of capabilities for joint warfare, which trades technology for force strength. The US strategy of preemptive warfare seeks to dissuade potential proliferators of WMD. The Prague Capabilities Commitment (PCC) is the last chance for narrowing the capabilities gap between the US and Europe; if it fails, NATO could be reduced to a discussion forum. Probably the three most important capabilities needed are strategic air and sealift, precision munitions, and logistics. The NATO Response Force (NRF) is designed for high-intensity conflict with force-entry capability; nuclear, biological, and chemical (NBC) protection; high mobility; and high readiness. US military transformation relies on battlespace awareness of all units, technology, and effective line of command. In order for small countries to contribute, they must pool their capabilities.

Debate:

In the discussion on nation-building, the Admiral noted that Iraq has all the characteristics to resist democratization. The UN is seen as an indispensable organ for conflict resolution, but it is tied down at the moment by resistance among certain members with veto power. The UNSC does not reflect the division of power in the world today, which leads to situations where it is circumvented by more effective actors. In response to a question on where NATO might intervene, Admiral Rodrigues said that these decisions are made by the North Atlantic Council on a case by case basis; therefore, it is not possible to tell specifically where it would or would not intervene. The Mediterranean Dialogue is limited to its current status and function because of the instability in the

region. The PCC poses a serious challenge for European allies because of their lack of coordination in defense spending. The NRF was designed as a tool for NATO transformation and as a way to prevent the division labor between the US and Europe in high-intensity and low-intensity conflict respectively. Given NATO's history, both speakers felt that NATO would have a greater challenge implementing decisions, rather than making them, after the next round of enlargement. Preemption has always been accepted, but requiring a direct threat. The questions that arise are who and how defines the threat and where to prove the case. NATO suffers more from internal fissures than from external security threats. NATO's main area of expertise was not seen to be in the field of anti-terrorism and non-proliferation activities, but has some useful tools that can be used together with other national capabilities.

The future of the ESDP: a political perspective; Dr. Carlos Gaspar, office of the president of the republic:

The history of the ESDP is as old as the history of the EU itself. Its current form has its origins in the end of the Cold War, in European military incapacity as demonstrated by the Balkan conflicts, and in US reluctance to intervene in situations that should be taken care of by the European states. The ESDP is at present more than just an identity, but less than a European army. The policy is a legal framework for the EU to act militarily in situations where NATO as a whole is not involved, and the core of the policy is in the Petersberg tasks and in the tentative security concept for the EU presented by High Representative Javier Solana this year. The greater global responsibility of the USA requires greater capabilities of the EU, and there is an urgent need to go beyond the Petersberg tasks, although the ESDP is not mature enough for this yet. The ESDP can be compared to the European Monetary Union (EMU), in the sense that both are immensely complicated and controversial processes, but one has recently been established despite of this. Two central questions for the future of the ESDP is the state of the transatlantic relation and its relationship with NATO. Significant changes in ways of thinking has occurred on both sides of the Atlantic; in the USA the opposing Jacksonian and Wilsonian thoughts have merged, and in Europe Gaullist and Federalist thinkers have joined together. The Iraqi war created a deep division within the EU, which makes a common policy impossible at the moment. This must be overcome, in order to establish a Common Security and Defence policy (CFSP) and a strong European identity within NATO. The alternative is the breakup of the Western alliance.

The future of the ESDP: a military perspective; Lt.Col. Pereira da Silva, representative for the Joint Chiefs of Defence Staff:

Lt.Col. da Silva gave a brief overview of the results of the last seven EU-presidencies, and specifically the central contributions of these to the Headline goal process which started with the Helsinki summit in 1999. This included a detailed report on the development of the force structures and the EU Rapid Reaction Force (EURRF), which is to be fully operational in 2003. Significant shortfalls in the EU-capabilities can be identified in the same areas as within a NATO-context, i.e. command and control, force protection, logistics, strategic transport and rapid deployment. Lt.Col. da Silva emphasized that the common capabilities as such do not create a European army, but only the capability to act together if needed. The three main aspects being discussed at the moment are article 5-like collective defence statute for the EU, common funding and assets, and terrorism.

Debate:

The ESDP is dependent on the cooperation of the three main powers in Europe (France, Germany and UK). The development of the ESDP has not been hampered by the recent Iraqi crisis. The talk about creating a European Security and Defence Union is exaggerated, but not without merit. Creating double structures is not in anyone's interest, but is brought forward by France from time to time for political reasons. If the ESDP is developed in a direction opposed to the USA, the

American reaction will be to divide Europe and make the EU compete for allies. However, the EU could not afford and could not unite around an anti-American policy, and would therefore be divided by itself by such a policy. When the new members join the EU, the ESDP will be harder to manage. The contribution of the new members is more important politically than militarily. Lt.Col. da Silva stated that the purpose of the EU is to build a cohesive, common small Europe, as opposed to a “greater Europe” ranging beyond the Baltic in the north, the Iberian Peninsula in the west, and the Balkans in the east. France and the UK are as indispensable in security cooperation, as France and Germany were for economic cooperation. The EURRF is to consist of 60.000 ground forces, plus naval and air forces.

Open discussion: The reform of the United Nations Security Council; Dr. Ricardo Borges de Castro, Lusíada University:

Is the UNSC to be reformed or retired? The open discussion on the topic covered a wide range of questions and views on the role and form of the UNSC, but without reaching an answer to the question of how to make it work. The general spirit of the discussion was that a world forum is the only actor that can give legitimacy to the use of force, and it must be able to implement its decisions, but that the forum also must represent the division of power in the world. The current setup of the UNSC was seen as inadequate and outdated, but it is better than nothing. The roles and power of the USA, China, India and Russia were pondered upon, as well as possible ways of achieving a balance of power in the world.

Tu 29th July

Workshops on Terrorism:

Two workshops led by Dr. Francisco Bossa Dionisio and Member of Parliament Rodrigo Ribeiro discussed the definition of and the ways to fight terrorism and the role of international and regional organizations in today’s world. Reports on the conclusion on the workshops will be presented separately.

The Transatlantic relations: a European perspective; Prof. Maria Carrilho, MEP:

The transatlantic relationship is not in such a grave danger as sometimes is suggested. The relationship has several aspects, such as the everyday relationship, the political-sociological relationship, and the geostrategic relationship. The EU and the USA also have a joint responsibility for the world economy, and are economically so interdependent, that a conflict between them would be disastrous for both parties as well as for the rest of the world. The EU is built around the concept of soft power, and is therefore dynamic and appealing for non-European partners. The situation in the EU is not so much that there is a will to create a front opposed to the US, but instead there is a lack of motivation for taking the new aspects of the transatlantic cooperation seriously.

The Transatlantic relations: an American perspective; Mr. William J. McGlynn, US-embassy:

The UN lacks military capabilities for peace-enforcing, and its role in relation to other international organizations. The European relationship is the most important one for the US in terms of foreign policy, but current divisions are not to be underestimated. However, there is promising day-to-day work going on, as well as successful cooperation in peacekeeping, counter-terrorism, NATO enlargement and post-conflict management. The reluctance of the US to support the International Criminal Court (ICC) is based on concerns over the limited political oversight over the court, the broad assignment, and the probability of “nuisance suits”. The US has not been actively engaged in the process of EU enlargement other than in the case of Turkey, where the US supports a Turkish EU-membership. There are also other centers of power growing outside both the US and Europe, so we will probably both feel smaller as these continue growing.

Debate:

The following debate was concerned with a wider array of issues than the original title, and concentrated on issues such as the CFSP, Old and New Europe, Iraq, Israel-Palestine etc. The CFSP of the EU is the most difficult part of the integration process. The CFSP is still very far in the future; although the ideas are there, the materialization of them will take time. The common security policy is also dependent on the foreign policy, since you cannot have the one without the other. According to Mr. McGlynn the US administration is not likely to change its policy on the Kyoto-protocol, but it is an evolving debate. He also guessed that a next round of NATO-enlargement could be relevant in three to five years, and would probably concern South-Eastern Europe. Prof. Carrilho stressed the importance of post-conflict reconstruction and peace operations in situations like Iraq and Afghanistan. The need for a Palestinian state is something that all large powers involved in the conflict agree upon, which is different from earlier attempts at solving the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

Wed 30th July

Visit to CINCSOUTHLANT (JHQ West)

Visit to Parliament

Thu 31st July**Speech by Mr. Alan Lee Williams, Chairman of the ATA:**

By 2020 to 2030, Mr. Williams predicted that 15 states would have the capacity to build WMD, that the US will still be the most prominent country, but its hegemony will have waned. This is also the US assessment, and it sees this time as an opportunity to shape the environment to reflect Euro-Atlantic interests. This is the basis for preemption policy. The UK-US alliance has caused a rift within Europe, which has increased anti-Americanism. The French have always been concerned over the Anglo-Saxon dominance of NATO. The discussions within NATO over the support for Turkey during the Iraq crisis were moved out of the North Atlantic Committee by the Secretary-General, because it was dominated by French resistance which made any decisions impossible. He warned against destroying the reliance in effort to build better balance within. NATO has shifted from collective defense to collective security, which the reason for out-of-area action. The Iraq crisis has had important implications within the US and the UK. The US is still upset with France and Germany, and the value of NATO is being questioned in some circles. In the UK, the Labour Party is split down the middle over this issue. In the future, Mr. Williams sees a real threat in going to war without unity.

Debate:

Russia will get stronger and will be a better partner, but it will never be a full member of NATO. The Achilles heel of NATO is the desire of its members for security, but unwillingness to accept the real defense budget costs. Mr. Williams predicted that in 2030 the world will be more multi-polar, China will be the most prominent power in Asia and a peer competitor of the US, and other powers will try to balance China. India has all the attributes of a great power, and Kashmir would be near settlement in 2030. Indonesia has some attributes, but lacks leadership capabilities.

YATA presentations

Excursion to Lisbon

Fri 1st August

Seminar conclusions and reports

Workshop reports

Closing session

Trip aboard a Navy vessel