To be submitted to:
NATO Academic Affairs

Balance of Threat perception
And the prospects of NATO Mediterranean Dialogue

Final Report
For the institutional research fellowship programme
2001-2003

By
Alaa A. H. Abd Alaziz
University of Helsinki

June 2003

Table of contents

Acknowledgements

Chapter One: Introduction:

1.1 The origins of NATO's Mediterranean initiative:

Realism, the dominant theoretical approach of international relations, argues that alliances are merely tools for power aggregation, reflecting either the need to face some threat or the opportunity of achieving some gain. In other words, alliances are simply confined to a third, external party. That is why "balancing" (as behavior and/or as an outcome) is a key factor while explaining from a Realist point of view the origins, performance, endurance, external relations and the end of alliances[1].

Since its inception in the aftermath of World War II (April 1949) and throughout the Cold War, NATO was not an exception to that argument. With the availability of a triangular international context, (while actor A can ally with actor B to face actor C) NATO succeeded in balancing and deterring the Soviet Union and its Warsaw Pact.

However, the post Cold War years have witnessed an important debate over what is called "the rationale of NATO's survival". Some Realist scholars have considered that the transatlantic relationship has gone about as far as it can, paradoxically, other Realist practitioners have insisted that the dissolution of Warsaw Pact and the collapse of the Soviet Union (enemy disappearing) does not mean that NATO is a mission accomplished organization, simply because there are lots of potential enemies already existing (Russia, terrorism, Islamic fundamentalism, rogue states, weapons of mass destruction, etc).

---

1. See for example: Hans J. Morgenthau, Politics among Nations, 4th edition, New York, Knopf, 1967; Kenneth Waltz, Theory of International Politics, McGraw-Hill, 1979.

The idea of NATO's Mediterranean Initiative was generated from this second perspective. It has been a Cold War alliance, searching in its Southern Flank for new enemies, threats and security challenges in order to revive its relevance.

1.2 Historical roadmap of the NATO-Mediterranean dialogue:

At their summit in Brussels in January 1994, NATO heads of state and government stressed that "security in Europe is greatly affected by security in the Mediterranean". They also strongly welcomed "the agreements recently concluded in the Middle East peace process which offer an historic opportunity for a peaceful and lasting settlement in the area… (and) opened the way to consider measures to promote dialogue, understanding and confidence-building between the countries in the region"[2].

During the last ten years, it has been a tradition to refer to the declaration of this summit as the starting point of the NATO-Mediterranean dialogue. Moreover, the abovementioned Brussels declaration was an early message to indicate the linkage between settling the Israeli-Arab conflict and developing the NATO-Mediterranean relations.

In December 1994, NATO foreign ministers expressed their readiness "to establish contacts, on a case-by-case basis, between the Alliance and Mediterranean non-member countries with a view to contributing to the strengthening of regional stability". Accordingly, five Mediterranean countries (Egypt, Israel, Mauritania, Morocco and Tunisia) were invited, on February 1995, to participate in a dialogue with NATO.

NATO did not only take the initiative to begin the dialogue, but also select some Middle Eastern countries to be invited and

---

2. The summit declaration was referring to the Declaration of Principles signed in Washington on 13th of September 1993 by representatives of Israel and the Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO).

exclude others without any agreed or transparent criteria. Furthermore, NATO set, unilaterally, the following five main principles for the dialogue [3]:

  I.   Progressive nature: The dialogue is flexible and progressive in terms of participation and substance, in order to enable the number of dialogue countries to grow and the content of the dialogue to evolve, as appropriate.

 II.   Bilateral character: The dialogue is bilateral in structure. This principle has been welcomed by the Arab dialogue countries to avoid being in the same group with Israel while the Israeli occupation of the Arab lands does not come to an end. For NATO this bilateral formula was important to make the dialogue less vulnerable to disruption due to the ongoing Arab Israeli conflict, the dialogue nevertheless allows for low-level multilateral meetings on a case-by-case basis.

III.   Non- discriminatory: All Mediterranean partners are offered the same basis for cooperative activities and discussions with NATO. Within this non-discriminatory framework, partners are free to choose the extent and intensity of their participation in the cooperative activities. In other words, what is offered to one dialogue country is offered to all the others in the dialogue.

IV.   Complementarity: The dialogue is meant to reinforce other international efforts to establish and enhance cooperation with Mediterranean countries. The European Union's Barcelona process, the Middle East peace process, and efforts by institutions such as the Western European Union (WEU) and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), should be complementary to the Alliance's dialogue.

---

3. Jette Nordam, The Mediterranean dialogue: Dispelling misconceptions and building confidence, NATO Review, Vol. 45, No. 4, July-August 1997. p28

V. Self-funding: Activities within the dialogue take place on a self-funding basis, with the exception of certain information activities.

By and large, those five principles were respected during the first seven years of the dialogue (1995-2001). Accordingly, this period witnessed three major steps forward:

First: the extension of the invitation to Jordan and Algeria to join the dialogue (in November 1995 and February 2000 respectively).

Second: the institutionalization attempt of the dialogue through establishing a Mediterranean Cooperation Group (MCG), following the NATO Madrid Summit in July 1997, and creating an Atlantic contact point in each Mediterranean dialogue country (in January 1999).

Third: the development of the dialogue from a forum of political consultations to a gateway for the Mediterranean dialogue countries to participate or even host specific civil and military activities originally designed for Partnership for Peace (PfP) countries. In this regard an annual Mediterranean Work Programme (MDWP) has been drafted. The MDWP includes activities in the areas of civil emergency planning (CEP), science & environment (SEA), crisis management, defense policy & strategy, small arms & light weapons (SALW), global humanitarian mine action (GHMA), proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD), terrorism, as well as a Mediterranean Dialogue Military Programme (MDMP).

1.3. The structural adjustment of the NATO-Mediterranean relations after 9/11/2001:

Following the events of September 11th 2001, there has been another prominent benchmark (forth step). NATO experts and officials recognize the importance of strengthening NATO-Mediterranean cooperation, both in political and practical

dimensions, in order to fight efficiently the "new" challenges to the security of the member states of the Alliance.

As for the practical dimension of NATO-Mediterranean relations, NATO has decided to upgrade it by further developing cooperation in security matters of common concern through opening additional PfP activities to Mediterranean dialogue countries participation.

On the political dimension, NATO has adopted a sort of "structural adjustment" whereas three of the above-mentioned principles of the dialogue has been developed or even changed.

It was decided; first, to expand the so called "character of the relation", with the aim of developing the dialogue from its original bilateral formula to a multi/bilateral structure. Therefore the Alliance has decided to: 1- Fostering the bilateral dialogue (19+1) by holding two rounds yearly at ambassadorial (political) and working (technical) levels starting from June 2002 (instead of only one annual session from 1997-2001). 2- Creating a new forum of dialogue at a multilateral ambassadorial level (19+7 or NAC+7) which began to work only 42 days after September.11[th4]. 3- Inventing the so called "19+n formula" to involve NATO with, at least, two Mediterranean dialogue countries with the aim of discussing common security concerns.

NATO was encouraged to take such a step when realizing that neither Israel nor the Arab dialogue countries are willing, in

---

[4.] The first NATO-Mediterranean multilateral round was held on October 23rd 2001, the second round was held on January 9th 2002, the third one took place on May 22nd 2002, the forth followed NATO summit in Prague, the fifth was held on June 11th 2003 and it should continue to be organized at least twice-a-year.

fact, to disrupt or even disturb their relations with the Alliance for the sake of the Arab Israeli conflict. [5]

Then, it was decided to neglect the non-discriminatory framework of the dialogue and replace it with the "variable geometry" format, which means, tailoring different configurations for each Mediterranean dialogue state according to its willingness to strengthen the relation with the Alliance. Furthermore, NATO suggested to develop individual cooperation programmes to meet each Mediterranean country's specific requirements as well as NATO's objectives, in order to help promoting a degree of self-differentiation recognizing that the needs and situations of each dialogue country vary and that it is for each one of them to identify the forms of activity and cooperation most suited to their needs [6].

Finally, the self-funding principle was developed through two means: first, granting more NATO financial assistance to intensify Mediterranean dialogue countries participation in MDWP activities. Second, allowing the dialogue countries to use a trust fund mechanism (sponsored by at least one NATO member and one dialogue country) to finance their participation in MDWP activities.

To conclude, the Mediterranean dialogue was designed to evolve, and it certainly has. Over the years it has widened and deepened significantly. However, this paper argues that due to mutual threat perceptions, the dialogue has not yet been able to

5. It worth mentioning here that while the Palestinian people ended, in October 2001, the first year of the continued ALAQSA INTIFADA (uprising) against the Israeli protracted occupation of their lands, all the seven dialogue countries accepted, in the same month, to be engaged together in the (19+7) forum for cooperation with NATO.

6. For more details see the document adopted by NATO summit in Prague in November 2002, entitled "Upgrading the Mediterranean Dialogue Including an Inventory of Possible Areas of Cooperation" in: http://www.nato.int/med-dial/upgrading.htm

free itself from the role of a stepchild of NATO's outreach programmes. It is still an exercise in confidence building rather than a true partnership. In this case, the question is for how long will it remain like this? And what scenarios for the NATO- Mediterranean relation are most likely to happen in the future?

<p style="text-align:center">* * *</p>

The aim of this introductory chapter was to prescribe, as analytically as possible, the origins, developments and current situation of the NATO Mediterranean relations. Chapter two will try to examine, critically, different theoretical approaches to understand this relation, with special reference to the Balance of Threat approach developed by Stephen Walt. The following two chapters will emphasize on the different aspects of mutual threat perceptions of the NATO Mediterranean relation. Chapter five will be devoted to explore the prospects of this relation, first, by tracing the changing forces on both sides and then, by trying to identify the main future scenarios of the NATO Mediterranean relations.

Chapter Two: Theoretical framework:

Even if one accepts that we are witnessing two separate worlds, the abstract world of theory and the real world of policy, it is impractical to ignore the existing interdependence between those two worlds. Practitioners and policymakers do need theoretical approaches and models, basically, to be able to make sense of the flow of information they are facing everyday. As for the academia, they simply can not construct credible and viable theories without knowing what is happening in the real world and/or aiming to change it.

In the following few pages, I will try to find out how the main international relation theoretical approaches contributes to a better understanding of NATO-Mediterranean relations.

2.1 Liberalism and NATO-Mediterranean dialogue:

The main theoretical proposition of Liberalism is that concern for power is always overridden by economic and political considerations such as: the desire for prosperity and the commitment to liberal values (promoting democracy and interdependence, free markets and respecting human rights…etc). In order to meet this desire, a key concept for Liberalism is multilateral cooperation through international institutions[7].

For Liberal scholars, it is not at all difficult to see why states cooperate because it is in their absolute advantage to do so. The problem, rather, is that states have a tendency to cheat, to become "free riders", and what is needed is some mechanism that prevents cheating and allows states to realize their true long-term interest in cooperation[8].

---

7. See for example: Robert O. Keohane, After Hegemony: cooperation and discord in the world political economy, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1994.

[8] Chris Brown, Understanding international relations, Palgrave, 2nd edition, 2001.

From a Liberal perspective, NATO, especially after the fall of the Berlin Wall, is considered one of those multilateral institutions (mechanisms) to promote cooperation in order to enhance and strengthen liberal values beyond the old borders of the alliance. That is why they defend keeping NATO alive and opening its door to new members and partners to further what is called "the fundamental liberal values of the North Atlantic treaty" signed in April 1949.[9]

If history is any guide, one has to recall that during the Cold War, NATO was a military alliance that sometimes took in members with less than sterling democratic credentials because of their strategic values (for example: Portugal 1949, Greece and Turkey 1952). As for the recent years, there is no evidence that NATO took into consideration these "fundamental liberal values" while selecting specific countries to be invited to the Mediterranean dialogue.

Moreover, despite the fact that none of the seven dialogue countries could be seen as democratic[10], NATO, for almost ten years now, has not cared for promoting freedoms, human rights, equal rights for all citizens, the rule of law and free elections in those countries.

During all bilateral and multilateral NATO-Mediterranean dialogue rounds (1995-2003), The Alliance was so keen to strengthen the relations with the ruling regimes (through military cooperation, exchange of classified information and political consultation) not to empower the peoples of the dialogue countries.

---

[9] *"The parties to this Treaty …..are determined to safeguard the freedom, common heritage and civilization of their peoples, founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty and the rule of law"*.

                                    From the preamble of Washington Treaty

[10] Even Israel, which is often described as the only democratic country in the Middle East, is implementing apartheid policies towards 20% of its own citizens because they have an Arab origin.

2.2 Constructivism and NATO-Mediterranean dialogue:

The central insight of Constructivist thought can perhaps best be conveyed by the notion that there is a fundamental distinction to be made between "brute facts" about the world, which remain truly independent of human action, and "social facts" which depend for their existence on socially established conventions. Mistaking a social fact for a brute fact is a cardinal error because it leads to the ascription of a natural status to condition that is, in principle, open to change[11].

Consequently, Constructivism sees "anarchy" in international politics as a social fact because if we treat anarchy as a given , something that conditions state action without itself being conditioned by state action, we will miss the point that anarchy "*is what states make of it*" and does not, as such, dictate any particular course of action[12].

Accordingly, anarchy is neither a brute fact nor synonymous with chaos. It is a social product developed and maintained by those actors that can exert hegemonic influence within the norms of an anarchical framework.

The second important constructivist hypothesis is that identities and interests, that rationalists take as given, are not in fact given but are things we have created. Having created them we could create them otherwise; it would be difficult because we have all internalized the way the world is, but we could make it otherwise[13].

---

[11] Chris Brown, op. cit, p
[12] Alexander Wendt, Social theory of international politics, Cambridge University Press, 1999.
[13] Steve Smith, Reflectivist and constructivist approaches to international theory, in John Baylis and Steve Smith, The globalization of world politics: an introduction to international relations, 2nd edition, Oxford University Press, 2001. p. 244

Constructivist thought is definitely essential on two levels, historically; it sheds lights on how the "invented anarchy" was useful, for the creation and maintenance of alliances such as NATO. Currently, it clarifies that NATO's open door policy has not been motivated by liberal values, but rather by the determination to change or at least adapt identities and interests of the countries NATO is opened to[14].

As I will clarify in chapter four, the manner in which the Alliance determined the Mediterranean countries invited to the dialogue and excludes others casts deep Arab doubts on NATO's pursuit of diminishing the united Arab identity. Furthermore, the Alliance's insistence on strengthening the multilateral NATO-Mediterranean cooperation (19+7 and 19+n) has been perceived by many Arabs as an intended Western policy aiming at weakening Arab identity and interests.

However, two main limitations are restricting constructivism. First, the loose conceptualization and vague context of basic terms like identity, norms and elite. For example, it is possible to point out that NATO is an organization for states sharing a common identity, but is there really even a broad common identity between a very old member of NATO like Turkey and the other members?

Secondly, as Stephen Walt mentioned, constructivism seems to be agnostic because it can not predict the content of the

---

[14] There are mainly six components of NATO's open door policy:
- NATO enlargement (3 new members in 1999 and seven new members in 2004).
- Partnership for peace (includes 27 states now).
- NATO's Partnership with Russia.
- NATO's partnership with Ukraine.
- The Alliance's Mediterranean Dialogue.
- NATO's South East Europe Initiative.

ideas. Constructivist thought may help in describing the past than anticipating the future[15].

2.3 Realism and NATO-Mediterranean dialogue:

Realism always explains international relations using mainly two analytical concepts: "confrontation" as the dominant feature of what Morgenthau called "politics among nations" and "balancing" as a behavior and/or as an outcome to these politics among states. Obviously, talking about confrontation and balancing means implicitly dealing with terms like "enemy", "threat", "increasing state power" and "aggregation of powers".

Realist thought attaches great importance to the "balance of power". The root idea of this term is that only force can counteract the effect of force, and that in an anarchical world, stability, predictability and regularity can only occur when the forces that states are able to exert to get their way in the world are in some kind of equilibrium[16]. Usually, the balance of power appears in the image of a chandelier. The chandelier remains balanced if the weights which are attached to it are distributed beneath it in such a way that the forces they exert are in equilibrium.

There are two ways in which equilibrium can be disturbed, and two ways in which it can be re-established. The chandelier moves away from the balanced level if one of its weights becomes heavier than the others for indigenous reasons, without this being compensated for. It also becomes unbalanced if, at least, two weighs are moved closer together without compensatory movement elsewhere. In other words, disruptions of the balance of power are both created and potentially rectified by increasing the

[15] Stephen M. Walt, International relations: one world, many theories, Foreign Policy, spring 1998. pp 38-41
[16] Chris Brown, op., cit, p 108

internal power of state, or by alliances, or by some combination of the two[17].

The question remaining here is with whom should states ally in order to protect themselves and serve their interests. Actually, only two options are available. First, to ally with those who can not readily dominate their allies, in order to avoid being dominated by those who can. In other words, to get closer to the weaker side or the less strong powers (balancing behaviour).

Paradoxically, the second option is to ally with the dominant power (bandwagoning behaviour). The logic behind this latest option is either defensive (when the bandwagoner aims to appease another power to avoid an attack by diverting it elsewhere), or offensive (to share the fruits of the victory of the dominant power)[18].

Realism and balance of power thought would have been of great analytical relevance if we are going to study NATO-Mediterranean relation during the Cold War era. In fact, the unipolar international order that followed the fall of Berlin Wall has changed the factors that statesmen consider when deciding with whom and against what to ally. As Walt argues, although power is an important part of the equation, it is not the only one. It is more accurate to say that states tend to ally with or against the foreign power that poses the greatest "threat". He went on to claim that states may balance by allying with other strong states if a weaker actor is more dangerous for other reasons. (The coalition that defeated Germany in the World War I and World War II were vastly superior in total resources, but they came together when it became clear that the aggressive aims of the Germans posed the greater danger)[19].

---

[17] Ibid, p 108

[18] Stephen M. Walt, The origins of alliances, Cornell University Press, 1990. pp 18-21

[19] Ibid, pp 21-22

2.4 Balance of Threat and NATO-Mediterranean dialogue:

Because balancing and bandwagoning are more accurately explained as a response to threats, balance of threat approach suggests four important factors (sources of threat) to be considered in order to better understand balancing and/or bandwagoning behaviors of different actors: aggregate power, geographic proximity, offensive power and aggressive intentions[20].

1-   *Aggregate Power:* the assumption here is that the greater a state's total resources (e.g., military capability, population, social solidarity, industrial and technological development, etc), the greater a potential threat it can pose to others (if all other factors are equal). However, states with great power have the capacity to either punish enemies or reward friends. Therefore a stat's aggregate power may provide a motive to other states for balancing or bandwagoning.

2-   *Geographic Proximity:* the hypothesis here is that powers that are nearby pose a greater threat than those that are far away (if all other factors are equal). Also approximate threats can lead other states either to adopt balancing response (encircling the approximate threat with on alliance or more) or to bandwagoning behaviour (especially when the approximate threat demonstrates its ability to compel obedience).

3-   *Offensive Power:* The idea here is that states with large offensive capabilities are more likely to pose a greater threat than those acquiring defensive capabilities (if all other factors are equal). Most probably, offensive power leads to balancing response aiming to counteract it,

---

[20] For more details and historical examples of those factors, see:
  Ibid, pp 22-26

however, in some cases, bandwagoning becomes the only way when other states are so vulnerable to hold the hope for resisting.

4- *Aggressive Intentions:* all else being equal, perceptions of intent are likely to play such a vital role in alliance choice. States that are perceived as aggressive are likely to provoke others to balance against them. However, when a state is believed to be unalterable aggressive other states may prefer to bandwagon as a protective measure (Finlandization syndrome).

Obviously, the above-mentioned four sources of threat do not answer the important question: when do states tend to balance? And under which circumstances they prefer to bandwagon? Balance of threat approach is offering three parameters in that regard[21].

First, power and weakness[22]: the stronger the state, the more it tends to balance rather than bandwagon and vice versa. However, weak states can be expected to balance when threatened by states with roughly equal capabilities, but they will tend to bandwagon when threatened by great power.

Second, the availability of allies: when threatened by great power, states will choose to bandwagon if they failed to find potential allies that are sharing with them the same interests.

Third: peace and war: history has shown that states tend to balance in peacetime or in the early stages of war, as they seek to deter the threatening powers. But when the outcome of the war appears certain states tend to bandwagon with the winner side.

---

[21] Ibid, pp 29-32

[22] We mean by "power" the total power of the state in all aspects such as: military capability, economic and technological development, social solidarity and political stability.

In order to be able to identify the different aspects statesmen usually considered when deciding, in a certain situation, to balance or bandwagon, I suggest to add two more parameters to the above-mentioned three ones.

First, structure of the world order: the distribution of power among different international actors affects states' decisions to balance or bandwagon. In a bipolar or multi-polar world order, states are more likely to balance because they try to make use of the inter-superpowers rivalries. While in a unipolar world order, states tend to bandwagon.

Second, the vulnerability of state: states are more likely to bandwagon, the less democratic and more economic dependent they are. Balancing is a sort of challenging and aggressive attitude which requires rational social support to be sustained and reviewed. A functioning democracy is the only way to secure such revisable public support. Similarly, balancing requires a sort of mutual dependence between threatening and threatened states.

To conclude, the theoretical model of this paper is based on the following:

- States form alliances or partnerships with alliances to respond to threats not to power accumulation.
- There are four sources of threat: aggregate power, geographic proximity, aggressive power and aggressive intentions.
- The response to these sources of threat depends on five parameters: state's power, the availability of allies, war and peace, the structural of world order and the vulnerability of state.
- States' responses to these sources of threat appear in balancing policies or bandwagoning policies or hegemonic policies or a combination of two or more of these polices.

2.5 "Hegemony" as a crucial analytical concept:

Although, the regular and frequent practice is that states respond to threats through balancing and/or bandwagoning, there is a third way for the only super power that followed the dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1991. Described as "hyper-puissance", the United States has neither an equivalent power to seek to balance nor a more powerful state to tend to bandwagon. Accordingly, "hegemony" in all its forms became a key factor in understanding both American foreign policy and the external policy of a military alliance led by the United States like NATO.

Despite the fact, that etymologically the word "hegemony" is derived from the Greek word "hegeisthai" which means "to lead", Gramsci conceptualise at least two meanings of hegemony: domination and leadership[23].

   a)   Hegemony as a sort of domination or imperialism means to put (by using force and/or coercion) one state or more under direct or indirect political control of a powerful country aiming to exert commanding and seeking obedience.
   b)   Hegemony as a kind of leadership or influence means to transform the behaviour of other states towards predetermined, self-chosen goals. This transformation is not based on the use of force or coercion but on the systemic spread of the values and views of the hegemonic power.

Accordingly, hegemony could be seen as a coercive relation between a sufficiently powerful actor using material forces

---

[23] Antonio Gramsci, Selection from the Prison Notebooks, edited and translated by Quintin Horare and Smith Geoffrey, New York: International Publishers, 1971.

and/or soft political influence on one side[24], and a weaker partner lacking any credible allies and tend to bandwagon the hegemonic power on the other side.

Against this conceptual background, some analysts defined what is called "institutionalization of hegemony" which refers to a situation in which a state is sufficiently powerful to establish, maintain and influence a collective institution and the rules that govern the internal and external relation of this institution[25].

*   *   *

The following two chapters will try to examine the ability of the balance of threat theoretical model to explain mutual perceptions of NATO-Mediterranean relation with special reference to the hegemonic policies exerted by the Alliance towards the Middle East in general and the Mediterranean dialogue countries in particular.

---

[24] See: Robert Cox, Labor and hegemony, International Organization, Summer, 1977. pp 385-424
[25] See: Jushua Dapaah-Agyemang, The changing partners of hegemony and security in West Africa: The case of Ghana and Nigeria, Helsinki University Printing House, 2003. p 38

Chapter Three: The Mediterranean threat to NATO
(Alliance's perception)

NATO's involvement in the Mediterranean goes back to the Cold War. At the time, the Alliance perceived security in the Mediterranean as little more than an extension of the East-West confrontation and viewed it in terms of the threat of Soviet intrusion in the region. As such, the Mediterranean was important to NATO primarily in military terms, a fact reflected in it being identified as the Alliance's "Southern Flank"[26].

The profound changes to the European security environment that resulted from the end of the Cold War led NATO to recognize the interdependence of European and Mediterranean security and, therefore, to consider the latter on its own merit. Whereas NATO's old strategic concept (approved in Rome in November 1991) continues to emphasize the threat imposed by the Soviet Union, the Alliance's new strategic concept (approved in Washington in April 1999) reflects a geographic shift away from a preoccupation with a threat in central Europe to a more divers set of threats, many of which are located in or emanate from the Mediterranean region. This southern prominence reinforced the need for NATO to develop a substantive security relation with countries of the Mediterranean basin[27].

Then, the events of 9/11/2001 highlighted the need for NATO to move closer to the Mediterranean to forge a genuine partnership to be able to respond to threats generating from the region such as terrorism, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) and threatening of vital resources supplies.

---

[26] Alberto Bin, Enhancing NATO's Mediterranean Dialogue, NATO Review, Spring 2003.
[27] For mare details see: Ian Lesser & Others, The future of NATO's Mediterranean initiative: evolution and next steps, Rand Publications, 2000. pp 17-19

Although NATO is approaching the Mediterranean, during the last decade, to prevent or respond to sources of threat, it is clear to the Alliance that those threats are not identical to the balance of threat theoretical model as clarified in chapter two. In other words, there is no Mediterranean (or even Middle Eastern) state aggregating offensive power and holding, at the same time, aggressive intentions towards NATO or its member states[28]. Nevertheless, there are sub-state actors and even individuals in the region that have enough power, proximity and aggressiveness to attack the leading country of Alliance as they did in September 2001.

3.1 Proliferation of WMD and their means of delivery:

NATO's new strategic concept puts greater emphasis on the threat posed by WMD. It stresses that nuclear, biological, and chemical (NBC) weapons have become a matter of "serious concern" and that threats from these weapons can pose a direct military threat to Allies' populations, territory, and forces (Paragraph 22). It also notes that Alliance forces must have the capability to address the risks associated with the proliferation of NBC weapons and their means of delivery (Paragraph 53h). Reflecting this new emphasis, the Alliance launched at the Washington Summit a new five-part WMD initiative designed to ensure that NATO will be able to counter the risks posed by WMD in the coming years[29].

While the new strategic concept does not single out any country or group of countries for special attention, it is widely believed that many active and potential proliferators are located around or near the Mediterranean littoral. Frequently, Western literatures refer to six Middle Eastern countries producing or

---

[28] Even Iran is not an exception in this regard.
[29] Ian Lesser, op. cit., p 19

acquiring or developing one sort or more of WMD and their means of delivery (Israel, Iran, Iraq, Libya, Syria and Egypt)[30].

American and British officials still insist that the proliferation of WMD and their means of delivery was the main reason for the Anglo-American occupation of Iraq in April 2003. They also claim that this proliferation is the reason why they are threatening Syria and Iran vigorously. Moreover, the so-called "WMD-related terrorism" has become great concern for NATO, which means to prevent any terrorist group from acquiring or developing NBC weapons.

The Issue of the WMD is such a clear example to clarify how the threat perceptions along the two shores of the Mediterranean are contradictory. While NATO members are focusing on the assumed WMD possessed by Iraq, Iran and Syria, the only Arab concern in this regard is the Israeli WMD, bearing in mind that Israel:

- Possesses sophisticated nuclear capabilities and has the most advanced nuclear program in the Middle East.
- Possesses offensive chemical and biological weapons programs (producing and stockpiling).
- Possesses the 4,800 km-range Jericho-3 and its improved space launcher the Shavit-1.
- Is the only country in the Middle East that refused to sign both the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) and the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention (BWC). It also refused to ratify both the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC) and the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT)[31].

3.2 Terrorism and Islamic fundamentalism:

---

[30] For a recent briefing see: Gitty M. Amini, Weapons of Mass Destruction in the Middle East, NTI, February 2003. www.nti.org

[31] Ibid.

Although NATO's new strategic concept referred to terrorism as one of the new challenges facing the Alliance, the events of September 2001 changed terrorism from what was essentially a domestic, law-enforcement concern, into an international security problem that requires a broad spectrum of political, economic, and law-enforcement measures, as well as military engagement.

NATO's new military concept for defense against terrorism sets out four categories of possible military activity by NATO. These are anti-terrorism; consequence management; counter-terrorism; and military cooperation. In this context, anti-terrorism means defensive measures to reduce vulnerability, including limited response and containment actions by military forces and such activities as assuring threat warnings, maintaining the effectiveness of the integrated air defense system and providing missile defense. Consequence management means post-attack recuperation and involves such elements as contributing planning and force generation, providing capabilities for immediate assistance, providing coordination centers, and establishing training capabilities. Counter-terrorism means the use of offensive measures, including counter-force activities, both with NATO in the lead and with NATO in support of other organizations or coalitions involving Allies. And military cooperation covers among other things cooperation with Russia, Ukraine, PfP partners, Mediterranean dialogue countries and other countries, as well as with other organizations[32].

All the Mediterranean dialogue countries have actively participated in the cooperative activities to fight terrorism, mainly through providing NATO member states with valuable information regarding personnel, financing institutions and training facilities. However, both the Alliance and the Mediterranean dialogue

---

[32] Christopher Bennett, Combating Terrorism, NATO Review, Spring 2003.

countries are not satisfied with this cooperation at least for three reasons:

First, from the Alliance perspective, while Arab political regimes are trying their best to help NATO member states in combating terrorism, these regimes are adopting internal policies that generate terrorists (non democratic political life+ enabling Islamic fundamentalists to shape the value system of the people= committing violence towards the regime itself and the international powers supporting this regime). The dilemma here is that NATO needs these regimes to continue cooperating with them, but these regimes are, unintentionally, exporting terrorism to the Alliance's member states.

Second, for some Western influential officials and intelligentsia, the main problem is inherited in Islam itself and terrorism is just one dangerous symptom. As Willy Claes, the former NATO Secretary General, said in the mid nineties "NATO had at last found an enemy, a global threat capable of replacing the defunct Soviet threat: Islam". According to this non-NATO official perception, it is so difficult for the Alliance to consider the Arab Mediterranean dialogue countries partners in combating terrorism.

Third, there is a significant disagreement between NATO and the majority of the dialogue countries over the root causes of terrorism. While the Arabs believe that the unresolved Israeli-Arab conflict and the American hegemonic and imperial policies towards them is the root causes of their violence, NATO and its member states still insisting that "there is no justification for terrorism". This reflects, once more, the contradicted perceptions along the two shores of the Mediterranean.

3.3 Threatening of vital resources supplies:

NATO's new Strategic Concept included the following reference which mainly concerning oil supplies: "Alliance security must also take account of the global context. Alliance security interests can be affected by other risks of a wider nature… and by the disruption of the flow of vital resources"[33].

Two years after the adoption of this strategic concept an important study conducted by the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) concluded that the world will find itself dependent for many years on unstable oil-producing nations, around which conflicts and wars are bound to swirl. The study went on to say "Oil fuels military power, national treasuries, and international politics. It is no longer a commodity to be bought and sold within the confines of traditional energy supply and demand balances. Rather, it has been transformed into a determinant of well-being, of national security, and of international power."[34]

As vital as the Persian Gulf is now, its strategic importance is likely to grow exponentially in the next 20 years. Nearly one out of every three barrels of oil reserves in the world lie under just two countries: Saudi Arabia with 259 billion barrels of proven reserves and Iraq with 112 billion (Those figures may understate Iraq's largely unexplored reserves, which according to U.S. government estimates may hold as many as 432 billion barrels). By 2020, the Gulf will supply between 54 percent and 67 percent of the world's crude[35]. (No wonder that, two years after conducting the above-mentioned CSIS study Iraq has been invaded and totally occupied by Anglo-American forces).

---

[33] See: The Alliance's Strategic Concept, paragraph 24, in: www.nato.int/docu/pr/1999.htm
[34] Robert Dreyfuss, The thirty-year itch, Mother Jones, March/April 2003 in: www.redrat.net/BUSH_WAR/dreyfuss.htm
[35] Ibid.

The Mediterranean is as important as the Gulf in this regard, simply because 65 per cent of Europe's oil and natural gas imports pass through the Mediterranean, and over 3,000 ships cross the sea every day, along with major pipelines connecting North and South shores.

But, the question is remaining unanswered: from NATO member states' points of view are there really threats surrounding the Middle Eastern oil supplies? One possible answer is: yes, simply because there is a possibility that one of the "rogue states" decides to control oil resources in the Gulf (as Iraq did in August 1990).

Second possible answer may be: it is not the supply as such; rather, it is the financial and macroeconomic repercussions of the supply. For example: Iraq decided in November 2000 to switch its oil exports revenues from dollar to euro and during the last year there has been a serious discussion in Iran to adopt the same policy. Furthermore, there were suggestions inside OPEC to switch its international transactions from a dollar standard to a euro standard. The effect of such switch would be that oil consumer nations would have to flush dollars out of their reserve funds and replace these with euros. In such case, the consequences to the American economy will be catastrophic[36].

Third possible answer is: to secure oil resources, it does not mean to have free access to them; rather to control these resources (as the case with the Iraqi oil nowadays). Controlling oil resources is not only a matter of pricing, but, it is a matter of managing world economy. For example: today two-thirds of Gulf oil goes to the West. By 2015 three-quarters of that oil will go to Asia, particularly to China.[37]

3.4 Migration:

---

[36] For more details see: William Clark, The euro effect: the real reason for the war in Iraq, in: www.ratical.org/ratville/CAH/RRiraqWar.htm
[37] Robert Dreyfuss, op. cit.

This is obviously a European concern within NATO. At the moment, there are almost six million immigrants from South Western Mediterranean alone (the Meghreb region) residing in the European Union.

There is an obvious imbalance between the two shores of the Mediterranean in terms of demographic figures, both in terms of population and in terms of age. The Southern Mediterranean countries' population is expected to reach 260 million by the year 2025. Whereas the total population of all the fifteen EU members is expected to be roughly 300 million not long after the end of the 21st century. The steady and sharp decline of the mortality rates in the Southern Mediterranean countries were not matched by a similar kind of reduction in the fertility[38].

Moreover, in the Southern Mediterranean 45% of the population is under the age of 15, whereas this percentage is only 25% in the North. As it can be understood from the figures, European nations are aging and decreasing in population. This huge population growth has the potential to increase the already existing heavy burden of the Mediterranean cities, by furthering the problems of poverty, urbanization, scarcity of resources and many other socio-economic problems.

This demographic imbalance, coupled with the stagnant economies and rapidly increasing unemployment of the Southern Mediterranean states creates migratory pressures towards the Northern Mediterranean. It seems that unless the equally advantageous economic, social and cultural conditions of the North are realized in the South, migration would continue to be one of the major concerns in the Mediterranean area[39].

---

[38] Emreya B. Ormanci , Mediterranean security concerns and NATO's Mediterranean dialogue, paper submitted to NATO in fulfillment of the individual research fellowship 1998-2000. p 17
[39] Ibid, p 17

3.5 Soft threats:

It was mentioned in NATO's new strategic concept that "security of the Alliance remains subject to a wide variety of military and non-military risks which are multi-directional and often difficult to predict. These risks include uncertainty and instability in and around the Euro-Atlantic area and the possibility of regional crises at the periphery of the Alliance, which could evolve rapidly. Some countries in and around the Euro-Atlantic area are facing serious economic, social and political difficulties. Ethnic and religious rivalries, territorial disputes, inadequate or failed efforts at reform, the abuse of human rights, and the dissolution of states can lead to local and even regional instability... Such conflicts could affect the security of the Alliance by spilling over into neighboring countries, including NATO countries"[40].

Chapter Four: NATO's threat to the Mediterranean
             (perceptions from the dialogue countries)

---

[40] See: The Alliance's Strategic Concept, paragraph 20, op. cit.

It is difficult to identify a common threat perception for all the seven Mediterranean dialogue countries. The absence of any agreed concepts of threat or common security among these countries find its roots on the following:

First, Lack of institutionalization**:** For more than half a century, NATO members enjoyed an institutional forum providing them with accumulating rich experience of "negotiating and compromising" culture, which enable those members to formulate a genuine threat perception. On the contrary, there is no single regional arrangement gathering the seven Mediterranean dialogue countries. Even for the six Arab Mediterranean dialogue countries, the last nine years (1995-2003) did not witness any sort of consultation among them to elaborate a common threat perception whether within or outside the Arab League formula.

Second, Lack of common interests**:** A long bloodshed conflict between Israel and some Arab states with six main military confrontations, along with many inter-Arab disputes (example: Algeria vs. Morocco over Western Sahara) make it so much difficult to have sort of common security interests for all Mediterranean dialogue countries.

Third, Lack of democracy**:** Linkage between democracy and security is so close. Undemocratic regimes are more qualified to elaborate policies aiming to "maintain in power" rather than formulating and modifying national defense policies needed to deal with specific risks, threats and challenges. This is the reason why we usually notice a considerable gap between threat perception expressed by state rulers on one hand and public opinion on the other hand in every single Arab Mediterranean dialogue country.

Differences in scale, depth and speed of cooperation between every Mediterranean Dialogue country and NATO during the

period 1995-2003, seem as a natural and logic development of the reality of the three above-mentioned "lacks"[41].

However, we will try to draw a roadmap of an Arab threat perception "under construction", which appears contradictory to the one belongs to the Alliance.

4.1 Western hegemony or American imperialism:

When General Jay Garner landed in Iraq in April 2003 and arrived in bombed and looted Baghdad he declared: "This is a great day". He indicated, later on, that the American occupation will not last for ever: "We will be here as long as it takes". But history teaches the Arabs that "as long as it takes" can be a very long time indeed. When the United States invaded the Philippines and Puerto Rico in 1898 on the same pretext of "liberating" their peoples, the US soon ended up replacing the former Spanish colonial power. In the Philippines it put down nationalist resistance and then did not leave until 1946, and continued to interfere in the country's affairs thereafter. Up till today the US is still occupying Puerto Rico[42].

So, it is hard to avoid the thought that the United States, in this phase of neo-imperialism, is shouldering what Rudyard Kipling called "the white man's burden". Or what the great powers saw in the beginning of the twentieth century as their sacred mission of civilizing people seen as incapable of running their lives in the difficult conditions of the modern world. Should not this convince the Arabs to come to a conclusion that NATO member states are merely threatening powers?

One has to recall here that the Arab world is unique among other parts of the globe for two basic reasons. First, it is home to the world's largest oil reserves as mentioned before. Second, it is

---

[41] A detailed comparison is provided in table no.1 attached.

[42] Ignacio Ramonet, Transition to an empire, Le Monde Diplomatique, May, 2003.

the area where the Zionist enterprise is realizing its ambitions. Both reasons served as sources of tension between the Arabs and NATO member states.

As for the Gulf oil, it is not only important to the United States for its share of the US oil supply (other sources have become more important over the years), but it would allow the United States to maintain a lock on the world's energy lifeline and potentially deny access to its global competitors. As Chas Freeman, the former US ambassador to Saudi Arabia under the first president Bush, concluded: "the administration believes you have to control resources in order to have access to them, even if this required taking over the Arab oil fields and bringing in Texans and Oklahomans to operate them"[43].

Regarding Israel, it is true that Saddam Hussein's regime has violated numerous human rights and UN resolutions. There can be no arguing with that and no excuses can be allowed. But what is so monumentally hypocritical about the official US position is that literally everything the US has accused the Ba'athists of has been the stock in trade of every Israeli government towards the Palestinians and the Arabs since 1948. Torture, illegal detention, assassination, assaults against civilians with missiles, helicopters and jet fighters, annexation of territory, , mass killing (as in Qana, Jenin, Sabra and Shatilla to mention only the most famous), denial of rights to free passage and unimpeded civilian movement, use of civilians as human shields, humiliation, punishment of families, house demolitions on a mass scale, destruction of agricultural land, expropriation of water, illegal settlement, economic pauperization, attacks on hospitals, medical workers and ambulances, killing of UN personnel, to name only the most outrageous abuses: all these, it should be noted with emphasis, have been carried on with the total, unconditional support of the United States which has not only supplied Israel with the weapons for such practices and every kind of military and intelligence aid, but also has given the country

---

[43] Robert Dreyfuss, op. cit.

upwards of $135 billion in economic aid on a scale that beggars the relative amount per capita spent by the US government on its own citizens[44].

In April 2002, NATO Secretary General, Lord George Robertson said that "without a breakthrough in the Middle East peace process, a major obstacle to normalizing Western relation with the Arab world will remain". These words reflect a comprehensive understanding by the Alliance's highest official of how the Arabs perceive the relation between Israel and the West. Arab peoples know that it was a NATO member state which gave the Zionists the right to create a nation state in Palestine[45], they know also that it was another NATO member state which agreed to help Israel to be the first and only owner of nuclear weapon in the Middle East, they also know that it is a third NATO member state which guarantee the security of Israel for the last five decades despite the continuing Israeli aggression to its Arab neighbors.

Once more, should not this convince the Arabs to come to a conclusion that NATO member states are merely threatening powers?

4.2 The Israeli occupation of the Arab lands:

When the French philosopher Ernest Renan wrote:"A nation is a group of people united by a mistaken view about the past and a hatred of their neighbors", he was perfectly describing Israel.

---

[44] Edward Said, A Monument to Hypocrisy, AL-AHRAM Weekly, February 13, 2003.
[45] When British Foreign Secretary Arthur J. Balfour declared in November 1917 that: " His Majesty's Government view with favor the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, and will use their best endeavors to facilitate the achievement of this object". For more details see: Avi Shlaim, The iron wall: Israel and the Arab world, The Penguin Press, 2000. p 7

The Zionist movement, which emerged in Europe in the last two decades of the nineteenth century, aimed at the national revival of the Jewish people in what is believed as its ancestral home. Zionism was in essence an answer to the Jewish problem that derived from two basic facts: the Jews were dispersed in various countries around the world, and in each country they constituted a minority. The Zionist solution was to end this anomalous existence through establishing an independent Jewish state preferably in Palestine which has a religious significance for the Jews (Zion is one of the biblical names of Alquds or Jerusalem)[46].

The historical outcome of this Zionist solution was the creation of two inter-linked practical problems. First, having decided to take over a country (even if it was not declared independent as the case with Palestine at that time) it means that you turned out to be a colonial power. Second, having decided for the Jews not to be a minority in their new home, it means that you have either to get rid of the indigenous people in Palestine or to adopt an apartheid policies in dealing with them (or both ways).

Fifty five years after the establishment of the state of Israel, which embodied the Zionist solution, the same two problems (occupation and apartheid) still constitute the essence of the Israeli-Arab conflict. Accordingly, any "real" solution to this conflict should include two integrated steps. First, Israel has to withdraw from all the Arab lands it has occupied since 1948 and thereafter. Second, crating one democratic multi-ethnic state in Palestine opened for all Palestinian and Jews all over the world to live in peacefully.

Unfortunately, NATO, Israel, the Arab political regimes and almost the entire international community are dealing with the protracted Israeli-Arab conflict from different perspective. They

---

[46] Ibid, pp 1-2

are all seeking superficial settlement not a long term solution. For example: negotiating only the Israeli withdrawal from the lands it has occupied since June 1967 means that we are neglecting the root cause of the whole conflict (occupying most of the Palestinian lands in 1948). Another example: the insistence on the two-state solution is a racial set back to what Ze'ev Jabotinsky called for, eighty years ago; when he wrote about the necessity of creating an iron wall separating Jewish people and Arab indigenous people.

NATO's frequent trails to use the MDWP to involve both Arabs and Israelis in military and political joint cooperative activities are just an indication to show the wrong hidden assumption the Alliance is adopting towards the Israeli- Arab conflict. NATO believes that engaging both parties in a confidence building measures will lay down the foundations for regional peace in the Middle East. A mechanism which did not work during the last decade and will continue to fail in the future, simply, because it does not recognize the root causes of the conflict.

The Arabs will continue to consider Israel a great source of threat. It is an approximate state aggregating offensive power, holding aggressive intentions towards them and occupying their lands. They will also continue to perceive NATO member states as a source of threat as long as those members insisted to keep on supporting Israel.

4.3 Economic disparities:

The World Health Organization reports that the biggest killer in the world today is not coronary thrombosis or cancer, but "deep poverty" in which more than one thousand million is living today. Had Karl Marx lived to experience this phenomena at the beginning of the 21st century, he might have written "the

emergence and spread of transnational companies gives you a new world order founded upon the principles of free trade and economic deregulation, the decline of the nation state especially in the peripheries and the re-emergence of sharp class struggles[47].

The Mediterranean has had a very poor rate of growth in Gross Domestic Production (GDP) per capita. Out of all Southern and Eastern Mediterranean countries, only Egypt, Israel and Tunisia have exceeded 2% growth since 1975. The Mediterranean region also has long been characterized by a high level of absolute and relative poverty with more than 32% of population live on less than $2 a day (those who live under the poverty line in morocco for example are more than two-thirds of the whole population) . In 2001, the unemployment rates have reached 17% in Egypt, 18% in Tunisia, 25% in Morocco and 28.7% in Algeria. The average illiteracy rate in the Arab Mediterranean countries has reached 43% in 2000. Most of the peoples, especially in rural areas, have no excess to safe drinking water, sanitation or medical care. In Egypt, only 2% of the population is getting 40% of the national income, while 86% is fighting for only 26% of the national income.

Of course, this depressing picture is an outcome of internal long-lasted socio-economic policies that failed to achieve human or sustainable development in the whole Arab world. However, what urges most of the Arabs to think about their socio-economic backwards as a kind of threat is the international support of such internal policies. Western pressures, during the last fifteen years, over the Arab states to implement market economy policies (a- economic stabilization b- structural adjustment c- liberalization of trade and investment movements…) have added to the old international disparity between a rich North and a poor South a

[47]For detailed analysis see: Chris Harman, Economics of madhouse: capitalism and the market today, London: Bookmarks, 1999. For concise overview see: Galal Amin, Arabs and Muslims and the global order, AL-AHRAM Weekly, December 26, 2002.

much more dangerous one. The internal disparity, in every single Mediterranean country, between a minority of rich elite getting richer and the poor majority living under poverty line is getting more and more serious.

Chapter Five: What prospects ahead?

5.1 The changing NATO:

It is widely believed that of all the international institutions created after World War II, none has played a greater role in the security of Europe than the Atlantic alliance. Formed in 1949 in

order to provide a security link between allies in Europe and North America, the alliance developed an integrated command structure that, together with its decision-making process and military cooperation is unique. The steady fact here is that throughout the first four decades of its history NATO was shaped mainly by Cold War threats and challenges.

Since the fall of the Berlin Wall, and particularly since the break-up of the Soviet Union, the Euro-Atlantic security environment has been contrasting sharply with that of the Cold War. Concern about large-scale interstate war has given way to minor worries about transnational challenges and risks such as terrorism and ethnic violence.

In response to this dramatic change, there were three schools of thought on how the new security environment should be dealt with. The first school considered that the transatlantic relationship has gone about as far as it can, so, it is more convenient for the Euro-Atlantic community, at this stage, to keep NATO as a forum for consensus-building while cooperating individually to address the new emerging threats. In such case, if a NATO member state decided to form a war coalition, the assistance it will receive from any other member will not be different in kind from any other assistance received from a non-member state (This was, after all, how the Gulf war 1991, the Afghanistan war 2001 and the war against Iraq 2003 was fought)[48].

The second school of thought is so much concerned about what it calls "the unfinished agenda of the Cold War". I wants the biggest and fastest possible NATO expansion in order to bring all Central and Eastern European countries into the alliance. It, then, wants to integrate Russia and Ukraine into a wider European security system within NATO. It prefers a kind of division of labour in which NATO takes care of this old agenda, Europeans concentrate on peacekeeping and Americans fight the big wars of

---

[48] This is called "Perle School" maybe because Richard Perle, the former chairman of the Pentagon defence policy board, is a prominent supporter for transforming those ideas into real policies.

the new security environment (That is why, the Kosovo war in 1999 was a NATO operation)[49].

Only the third school wants Europeans to involve themselves beyond their shores. It takes a somewhat more sanguine view of the old agenda. It views NATO as the natural defense arm not only of Europe but of everything affecting the West, and therefore, wants it to be the main instrument for dealing with the challenges of the new agenda (proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, terrorism and so on)[50].

Although there are a lot of differences between those three schools, what is more important is what is common, which is the determination to keep NATO alive, in order to play the role of "control and management among the allies". When Javier Solana, the EU representative for the common foreign and security policy, tried to bridge the pond among the allies over the recent war against Iraq, he emphasized that alliances bind, they allow for and legitimize leadership by providing a forum for talking and for listening, for defining common tasks and identifying the means to accomplish them. He went on to say: "most of us would prefer to be called an ally or a partner than a tool in a box".

But what if, on the long run, NATO could not play this new role of control and management? There is a possibility that the Atlantic alliance may gradually evaporate, and then, the world may enter a new phase of American hyper-hegemony. That is why, understanding the present and anticipating the future of NATO is extremely important.

5.2 The changing forces in the Mediterranean countries:

---

[49] This view is widely supported by members of the American National Security Council.
[50] Such school is loudly promoted by the current NATO Secretary General Lord/ George Robertson and EU High Representative for the Common Foreign and Security Policy, Javier Solana.

How far back does one trace the sense of humiliation and deeply injured dignity at western hands that has been such a formative element of Arab awareness and self-image for decades? Do we need to go as far back as the 1917 Balfour Declaration, or to 1948 war, the dispossession of the Palestinians and the resounding and humiliating defeat of the combined armies of the Arab world, or as recently as the Six-Day war, the resounding defeat of Egypt, Syria and Jordan in June 1967 at Israel's hand, resulting in the occupation of Sinai, the Golan Heights and all that remained of the historic land of Palestine. The humiliations have been piled one on top of the other ever since[51].

Similarly, how many decades should we return back in order to trace the continued humiliation and oppression of the Arab peoples at Arab rulers' hands.

Injured dignity lies at the heart of all rebellions. Throughout history human beings have revealed an enormous capacity to bear, and cope with the harshest forms of oppression and exploitation. It is only when they perceive these as "injustice", however; when the implicit or explicit compact between oppressor and oppressed appears to have been shattered and violated by the oppressors; when the exercise of power appears lawless and arbitrary - it is then that people rise up[52]. That is why, understanding the present and anticipating the future of the internal dynamics and social struggles in every Mediterranean Arab country is extremely important.

5.3 The future of NATO-Mediterranean relation:

Coming back to the guidelines illustrated by the balance of threat theoretical approach, we may conclude with the following eight points:

---

[51] Hani Shukrallah, We are all Iraqis now, The Guardian, March 27, 2003.
[52] Ibid.

1) For the peoples of at least six Mediterranean dialogue countries (the Arabs), it has been clear that NATO member states are sources of threat. As the recent Anglo-American invasion to Iraq (March 2003) has shown, NATO member states are aggregating offensive power, gaining geographic proximity and their intentions are perceived as highly aggressive.

2) For the most influential NATO member states, especially after the events of 9/11/2001, the Mediterranean region has been apparently source of different sorts of threats (mainly: proliferation of WMD, terrorism, Islamic fundamentalism, migration and threatening vital resources supplies).

3) Against this background, NATO member states have adopted hegemonic policies toward the Mediterranean and Middle Eastern region, wither through dominance (the Iraqi model) or influence as the case with all other countries in the region.

4) On the other hand, the six Arab Mediterranean dialogue countries have been predisposed to bandwagon. According to the five parameters identified in chapter two, those countries tend to bandwagon because they are facing three internal problems and three external difficulties. Internally, they are weak, economically dependent and non-democratic. Externally, they are interacting within a unipolar international order where there is no chance to make use of the inter-superpowers rivalries. They also suffer from the non-availability of potential allies. Moreover, they are experiencing a relatively permanent state of war (with Israel since 1948 and with Iraq since 1990) which raises the tendency to bandwagon.

5) So, it is really difficult to consider the NATO-Mediterranean dialogue and cooperation a sort of partnership relation, because partnership requires a kind of relative symmetry between partners. Therefore, I claim that NATO-Mediterranean dialogue and cooperation can perhaps best be conveyed by the notion that it is an

asymmetrical relation between the Atlantic hegemony and the Mediterranean bandwagoning.

6) Both sides of this asymmetrical relation are either changing or subject to change. NATO is gradually transforming into a tool of control and management among the allies themselves which may affect the solidarity of the Alliance[53]. While the peoples of the Mediterranean dialogue countries are getting more and more ready to change fundamentally both internal and foreign policies of their current ruling regimes.

7) The short and medium term scenario will be simply a continuation of what we have today. Within the current NATO-Mediterranean relation, the Alliance's member states are enjoying their hegemony over the region and seeking to widen and deepen it. On the other hand, the non-democratic ruling regimes in the Mediterranean dialogue countries know that in the absence of any internal support of their policies they have to seek the support of NATO member states in order to remain in power.

8) The long term scenario will be totally different. When the peoples in the Southern and Eastern Mediterranean countries rise up, they will not accept to bandwagon with the Western hegemonic policies and then the terms of reference and practical measures of the NATO-Mediterranean relation will inter into a new historical phase of confrontation.

*   *   *

---

[53] Marco Cesa, From hegemony to ambivalence: NATO's transformation and European stability, Final report of NATO Fellowship Programme, 1999.

Table 1: State of cooperation between NATO and Mediterranean Dialogue (MD) Countries (1995-2003)

Israel	Jordan	Algeria	Mauritania	Egypt	Morocco	Tunisia
Invited to be MD Country in Feb. 1995. The only MD country to organize and host in Tel-Aviv Nationally Sponsored Military Activities open for 19+7 starting from 2000. The first MD country to sign Security Agreement with the Alliance in April 2001. Started cooperation with NATO Maintenance and Support Agency in 2002. Has the most extensive and efficient scientific cooperation with the Alliance's Science Committee.	Invited to be MD Country in Nov. 1995. King of Jordan is the only MD Country leader to visit NATO HQ tow times in April 2000 & June 2002. The only MD country participating in Israeli Nationally Sponsored Military Activities starting in Tel-Aviv in 2000. The first Arab MD to sign Security Agreement with the Alliance in May 2001. Started cooperation with NATO Maintenance and Support Agency in March 2002.	Invited to be MD Country in Feb. 2000. Algerian President visited NATO HQ in Dec. 2001 & Dec. 2002. Hosted in March 2001 NATO Mobile Training Team. Expected to sign Security Agreement with the Alliance within this year. Express readiness to cooperate and participate in PfP activities, joint military exercises and non-article 5 operations.	Invited to be MD Country in Feb. 1995. Expressed the hope to be a PfP country (2000). Signed Security Agreement with the Alliance (2001). Hosted in June 2001 NATO Mobile Training Team. Reciprocal visits for high military official are extensive.	Invited to be MD Country in Feb. 1995. Participated in more than one hundred selected NATO military, scientific and academic activities (1997-2002) on a case by case basis.	Invited to be MD Country in Feb. 1995. The most active MD Arab country in scientific cooperation with the Alliance. Participated in limited MDMP activities.	Invited to be MD Country in Feb. 1995. Participated in limited MDMP activities.