

NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION
NATO FELLOWSHIP PROGRAMME 1999-2001
INDIVIDUAL RESEARCH FELLOWSHIP

FINAL REPORT ON THE PROJECT

**THE STATE OF HUMAN RIGHTS IN THE MEDITERRANEAN:
SECURITY IMPLICATIONS FOR NATO**

by
Dr. İhsan D. Dađı
Associate Professor of International Relations
Middle East Technical University

CONTENTS

Introduction

1. Human Rights, Security and International Politics

Human Rights and Security

Human Rights and International Security

Human Rights and International Politics

2. The New NATO, the New Task: Human Rights

Defending Values, Securing Peace

Strategic Concepts and Human Rights

3. Mediterranean, Human Rights and Security

The State of Human Rights and Democracy

Challenges and Predicaments

How to Meet the Human Rights Challenge

4. Mediterranean and Human rights: A Challenge for NATO?

Stability, Security and Human Rights

The Challenge of Soft Security

5. NATO's Mediterranean Initiative: Meeting the Challenge?

Introduction

This research explores the relationship between the level of respect for human rights and international security with special reference to Mediterranean. The underlying premise of the research is that international security in general and the security of the NATO area in particular is indispensable from the level of respect for human rights simply because respect for human rights is a security generating value and practice. Following this proposition the research has focused on the Mediterranean region to show the relevance of human rights considerations for security objectives of NATO.

1. Human Rights, Security and International Politics

Human Rights and Security

Human rights are generally grounded on moral values and philosophical preferences. As such they tend to be understood as abstract intellectual endeavors distant from the realities of the world and the daily problems of the people. Yet one has to recognize that human rights both as a concept and set of demands address at a very fundamental problem which has to be resolved prior to forming any viable 'political community'. By the provision of human rights conditions for political legitimacy of a polity is laid down. Thus the legitimacy of a polity is

defined by the general consensus reached on individual rights and freedoms among the state, society and the individual.

Thus the strength of the state is at least partly derived from the legitimacy that it enjoys domestically to resist against external threats. This in fact constitutes the software side of state security that is built by a kind of state-society relationship, which is based on provision of human rights and freedoms. However some tend to portray human rights as a threat to national security. One can legitimately talk of a linkage between human rights and national security, yet the link between the two is a positive one. To guarantee human rights and set up an institutional mechanism to protect them does not weaken national security; on the contrary it strengthens national security. A working human rights regime constitutes one of the prerequisites for providing national security, that is a domestic peace based on a wide-ranged social consensus concerning the legitimacy of a political regime. That is to say that there are two aspects of national security. The first one deals with the conventional pursuit of maximizing national capabilities, that is the hardware side of national security. The other involves building up non-physical capabilities that is the software side of national security, which is built on human rights.

Therefore those who approach politics from a security-centric point of view should keep in mind that demands for human rights are in fact generated from the security concerns of individuals. Thus demands for human rights in its essence reflect the search for physical and moral integrity of individuals. The idea of the inviolability of basic rights and freedoms aims at 'securing' the individual as an independent and moral agent. Thus one can ground human rights on a search for security at individual level with undeniable linkages to security at national and international levels.

Thus there exists a very tight link between 'individual security' put forward as demands for human rights and 'collective security' at national level. It is rather impossible to

reach the objective of national security in countries where systematic and persistent human rights violations take place. To engage in human rights violation in order to eliminate the opposition challenging the regime or the state does not enhance the regime or state security instead harms domestic peace and security by undermining the legitimacy of the political system. Thus maintenance of national security depends on the realization of individual security built on the respect for human rights.

The ultimate objective of national security is to provide necessary conditions for the protection and welfare of the citizens. Security is not an end in itself or an end for the state, it is a value required for the citizenry. Thus the search for security can not be and should not start by breaching the very security of its citizens in term of violating the rights of its citizens.

If a government is involved in systematic abuses of its citizens' rights thus in a way in clash with its own population it weakens not strengthens security of the state. That is to say that state security is partly generated by personal security of its citizens. This part is being widened in the context of transnational linkages and interdependencies.

Human rights are protective of individuals; they protect individuals against threats to their physical existence, well being and dignity. The right to life protects the individual from the threats directed against his/her physical presence. The rights to liberty secure the moral standing and autonomy of the individual. Thus human rights can be reformulated by a reference to 'security' concerns and objectives. Yet it liberates the notion of security from its 'national/collective/ bias. This, in a way, redefines both concepts of human rights and security. As such human rights are grounded not on moral or philosophical arguments, instead a practical and pragmatic base. In this way human rights can be conceived as part of the search for security, not national but individual one. Yet it assumes that individual security is an indispensable part of national and international security.

Once security is conceptualised as national (that is collective) and divorced from its individual components then what would follow is to sacrifice the individual in favour of the collective. Here there are two kinds of problem. First even a collective (national) security interest should reflect and be a sum of individual interest. Interest of the collective could not be against the total sum or 'core' of individual interests. Second, security can not be defined as exclusively 'national'. It could also be started with the individual. Then one can safely argue that the most pressing security demands of the individual are human rights, provision of which enables individuals to be 'immune from external threats, and 'secure'. Thus provision of fundamental human rights protect the rights to life, liberty and property.

On the other hand this perspective grounds security not on physical capabilities of the nation but on domestic peace and harmony. This is to say that the centrality of hardware security is being replaced or at least balanced by a notion of 'software security' that links the degree of legitimacy enjoyed by the state and its capabilities to resist against the external threats or actual aggression.

Liberal democratic theory assumes the priority of individual vis-à-vis the state. The state is an instrument for the well being of the individuals. The state from a liberal political perspective is the agent for the provisions of personal security. Thus liberal democratic theory of the state can be expanded in the field of security issues that may come up with a question; for whom is security? The answer is that the beneficiary of security is the citizen, not the state per se. Thus, security concerns of the state should not damage the security of the citizens on behalf of whom the state seeks the necessary conditions for 'national security'. In sum individual citizens are the very subject and the objective of a search for national/state security.

A human rights based notion of security can be expanded to alliance politics too. If provisions of human rights are a necessary condition for the strength of a country and its

ability to mobilise domestic forces against external threats then there is a point for promoting and encouraging human rights in the allies. The policy of promoting human rights in the allies can be conceived as part of enhancing the power of the alliance by encouraging the formation of a legitimate political authority. Because the long term strength, stability and security would be established through enhancing software security i.e. political legitimacy that is based on human rights.

Human Rights and International Security

By the end of the Cold War the traditional threat of inter-block or nuclear warfare involving the two superpowers and blocks faded away. Instead it has been seen that micro level conflicts may equally be threatening for nations and the globe. Moreover the spread of nuclear weapons technology or the spread of weapons of mass destructions not only among nations but also terrorist groups has become a source of concern. Threats of environmental degradation and massive human rights violations leading to massive flow of refugees have also come up as issues of concern for national and international security. Ethnically based conflicts and fundamentalism of all kinds started to be destabilizing the global order.

Thus the concept of security has been changed in recent years. Prior to the end of the Cold War there were views to expand the notion of security beyond a military based conceptualization.¹ These views adopted rather an extended notion of security incorporating social, economic and political prerequisites of national security. While these works served as the ground of a notion of 'total security', to adopt a non-military conception of national/global security had to wait for the post-Cold war era. The Cold War politics of

¹ R. Ullman, *Redefining Security*, *International Security*, Vol.8, No.1, 1983, pp/129-153; B. Buzan, *People, States, and Fear*, London, Wheatsheat Books, 1983.

security was also based on a conception prioritizing the protection of the state against the external threats. Security was defined as a value that penetrable mainly by the outsiders. Now the crises that do not involve warfare and not coming from outside yet threaten the very well being of nations seem to catch the attention of both policy makers and the public at large.

Among them issues of human rights and democratization along side environmental problems can be cited as of global concern in recent decades. Yet in line with the prevalent view power during the Cold War politics of rivalry power was defined as national interest and as such human rights were treated as not part of either security or national interest. On the contrary the politics of human rights was conceived as threatening national security interest. The prevalent approach to human rights in the Cold War era emphasized the ‘incompatibility’ of human rights with national security interests. To put it in a different way the literature debated human rights in the context that whether human rights prevail ‘against’ economic and strategic considerations.² Thus the debate was ‘a priori’ set on the opposing ‘nature’ of both concepts and concerns. As a result human rights was conceptualised in a way that could readily be sacrificed to the demands of national security.

The end of the Cold War gradually changed the attitude towards global nature of human rights issues and its impact on international security leading to a partial emergence of human rights and democracy as a global identity. The changes in the Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union in late 1989 had indeed raised hopes for the future of democracy and human rights. With the ‘third wave of democratization’ in the ‘end of history’ it was expected that the reign of liberal democracy was to prevail all over the world.³ No doubt that drastic fall of communism was an acknowledgement of liberal democracy as a proper political framework for prosperity and freedom. Yet this popular image of liberal democracies did not prevent the

² H. Morgenthau, "Human Rights and Foreign Policy", in K. Thompson (ed.), *Moral Dimensions of American Foreign Policy*, New Brunswick, Transaction Books, 1984, p.344; H. Bull, *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics*, London, 1977.

‘rise of illiberal democracies’ in the rest of the world beyond the broader western alliance.⁴ Even within Europe initial hopes for a world respectful to human rights under democratic rules, was hijacked by the eruption of nationalistic fever particularly in the former federal states of the Communist world, i.e. Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union. But the revival of nationalism and micro-nationalisms did not remove the issues of human rights and democratization out of international agenda. Instead it has reinforced the need for international protections of human, and particularly minority, rights. What the rise of ethnic clashes also showed was the interaction and interdependencies between domestic peace and regional/international security: both secessionism and suppression of ethnic identities proved to be insecurity generating policies for international system.

Thus the post Cold War developments have shown that human rights should be conceived as a necessity for strengthening national and international security, and thus it is an asset not liability. As a result the place of human rights in international politics has also been legitimized by an increasing understanding that international protection and promotion of human rights contributes national and international peace. Thus the debate now seems to be set in a way that human rights and national/international security are complementary concerns and objectives. One does not necessarily excludes the other, instead both can be secured at the same time.

There is a wide agreement today on that human rights have become a global issue within which there has emerged multiplicity of linkages and interconnections that involve, but also transcend nation-states. As a result violations of human rights in one country may create unprecedented consequences for other countries, peoples and individuals. While territorial boundaries are becoming more penetrable, transnational implications of human rights violations turn out to be unavoidable. This adds to the source of tension among the

³ S. Huntington, *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century*, University of Oklahoma Press, 1993, F. Fukuyama, *The End of History and the Last Man*, Hamilton 1992.

states. The most striking case that illustrates how human rights violations turn to have transnational impacts and how they create security threats for other states is massive flow of refugees. The cases of Bosnia, Rwanda, Haiti and recently Kosova clearly illustrated that violations of human rights cannot be contained within national boundaries, and that they have transnational implications which in the end provoke and necessitates regional or international interventions further complicating a basically domestic problem.

This leads to an understanding that the search for global peace and security starts with improving human rights conditions at domestic level since there exists a clear-cut linkage between the national and international security. Therefore while the respect for human rights enhances national security the state that involves in systematic violations of human rights endanger not only national but also international peace and security. Human rights considerations thus give birth to a notion of global security. The link between individual, national and global security justifies a concern about the fate of individuals everywhere as part of a search for global security. Humanitarian intervention then comes as a possibility to prevent massive and systematic human rights violations that threaten both individual and international security.

Yet under normal circumstances there is no obvious connection between human rights and regional, or international, security since the former basically refers to the way in which relations among domestic actors, not international ones, are conducted in practice. Yet, it is still necessary and relevant to investigate the interplay between the two for three reasons. Firstly, behavior of a state in international arena cannot be separated from the way in which it treats its own citizens at home. This is to say that the kind of political regime prevalent domestically strongly influences its policy towards the outside world. In other words there is an undeniable connection between domestic political structure and the attitudes of the state

⁴ F. Zakaria, 'The Rise of Illiberal Democracy', *Foreign Affairs*, November/December 1997.

vis-a-vis the external world. Behavior of a state in international arena cannot be separated from the way in which it treats its own citizens at home. Therefore there is also a positive relationship between peace at home and peace in the world. Global stability and peace cannot be separated from stability and peace within the states that comprise the international system. A government which does not respect its own people's basic human rights may well also be a source of tension and conflict in world politics. Therefore, threats to world order do not come from the internationalisation of human rights, but in the long term, from tyrannical sovereign states. As a result, the inclusion of human rights issues in international relations would not necessarily increase the tension in world politics; on the contrary it may stabilize and standardize behavior of states at home and abroad.

Secondly, violations of human rights do not only harm individuals, groups or the people in the country concerned but may well endanger others particularly regional countries for repercussions of human rights violations cannot be confined within national borders. For instance, flow of refugees that is one of the most tragic outcomes of human rights violations may reach to a massive scale in some cases with grave security implications for the sending and receiving countries damaging both regional and international security.⁵

In fact, in recent years Security Council of the United Nations in its resolutions has come to make a linkage between international peace and security, and humanitarian crisis. Starting with the resolution 688 on Northern Iraq the UN Security Council considered humanitarian crises as 'threat to international peace and security' authorizing use of force under Chapter vii of the Charter.⁶ Furthermore the tendency in international political actors from peace keeping to peace making and peace enforcement, and preventive diplomacy as

⁵ G. Loescher, 'Refugees: A Global Human Rights and Security Crisis', in G. Lyons and M. Mastanduno (ed), *Beyond Westphalia: State Sovereignty and International Intervention*, Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995, pp.233-257.

⁶ D. Forsythe, *Human Rights in International Relations*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2000; Danish Institute of International Affairs, *Humanitarian Intervention: Legal and Political Aspects*, Copenhagen, 1999, pp.93-94.

instruments of conflict resolution also recognizes the positive link between human rights and national/international security. It seems that human rights are being increasingly considered as an element of international security.

Lastly, an international human rights regime with mechanisms to uphold human rights globally and a genuine interest about the fate of human rights in interstate relations may also contribute to international peace and stability through the formation of a politically homogeneous international system composed of states respectful to human rights. As Aron puts it, a homogeneous international system based on the society of states sharing common principles, i.e. democratic international society, is more conducive to security, peace and order.⁷ From a Kantian standpoint it has also been argued that ‘perpetual peace’ can only be achieved in an international system consisted of ‘republics’. Such a moral proposition can be supported by empirical data confirming that ‘democracies are unlikely to go to war against each other’.⁸

Therefore the search for global peace and security starts with improving human rights conditions at domestic level since there exists a clear-cut linkage between the national and international security. Therefore while the respect for human rights enhances national security the state that involves in systematic violations of human rights endanger not only national but also international peace and security.

Human Rights and International Politics

⁷ R. Aron, *Peace and War: A Theory of International Relations*, London, Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1966, pp.373-403.

⁸ See M. W. Doyle, *Ways of War and Peace*, (New York, Norton, 1997; M. W. Doyle, "Liberalism and World Politics", *American Political Science Review*, Vol.80, No.4, 1986, pp.1151-1169; M. Cochran, 'The Liberal Ironist, Ethics and International Relations Theory', *Millennium: Journal of International Relations*, Vol.25, No.1, 1996, p.29.

By human rights what is referred to is basically physical integrity rights and civil and political rights as understood from a western-liberal perspective. As such human rights essentially deal with the way in which the political structure of a society is organized. It is a constitutional issue that has to be tackled domestically. Thus at first sight it seems to belong to the realm of domestic politics. In the end, protection and promotion of human rights is a step towards the development of a human community that largely depends on the will and pursuit of the people who are affected by the provision of these rights. Therefore it seems that human rights come within the domestic jurisdiction of the political community, that of the state. This is the realm of state sovereignty, which is traditionally regarded as the basis of society of states and where international politics ends.⁹ However, normative and political transformation of inter-national relations is forcing a convergence between the domestic dimension of human rights and the international protection and promotion of them.

One can observe that the concepts of national sovereignty and hence non-intervention which are often thought to limit the active promotion of human rights internationally are becoming more problematic in the face of changing structure of world economy and politics. The principle of non-intervention is derived from an assumption that one can know and distance state's internal and foreign affairs, that there is a domestic realm in which the state has the absolute sovereignty and in which foreign states have no legitimate claim whatsoever.¹⁰ But in contemporary world of politics and economics it is impossible to isolate a state's internal affairs from the effects of other states' or actors' policies and actions. If so then it is not very plausible to talk of the non-intervention principle as a guiding principle or common practice and value of world politics today. In

⁹ H. Bull, "Human Rights and World Politics", in R.Pettman (Ed.), *Moral Claims in World Affairs*, London, Croom Helm, 1979, pp. 79-83.

¹⁰ C.Beitz, "Sovereignty and Morality in International Affairs", in D.Held (Ed.), *Political Theory Today*, Cambridge, Polity Press, 1994, p. 37.

fact the trend in international protection and promotion of human rights has contributed to the blurring boundaries between the domestic and the international.

By the end of the Cold War and disintegration of the Soviet Union adherence to democracy and human rights has indeed become a common political identity worldwide that sets the inspirational and political framework of the new international normative and political order. In short one has to admit that human rights have acquired a moral, legal and political-practical place in the international arena, that in turn establishes the respect for human rights as a precondition for the international legitimacy of national government.¹¹

Yet there are still theoretically and practically based concerns that internationalisation of human rights is not compatible with society of sovereign states. It is observed that relations of sovereign states has traditionally been conducted within the paradigm of the 'morality of states'. This paradigm attaches a moral priority and autonomy to the state whereas the conception of universal human rights presupposes a notion of cosmopolitan human existence on which world politics should be based.¹² Since the moral autonomy of the state is, in practice, formulated in terms of national sovereignty, a cosmopolitan conception of human rights tends to conflict with this idea of sovereign statehood that has been the constituting pillar of the modern international system since the Westphalian peace. Therefore the claims of the state for domestic jurisdiction over its people and resources are in conflict with any kind of external-universal authoritative moral design for national politics, simply because it would be seen as a breach of the state's sovereign rights.¹³

¹¹ J.Vincent, *Human Rights and International Relations*, Cambridge, Cambridge, Up.P. 1986, p.130.

¹² C. Beitz, *Political Theory and International Relations*, New Jersey, Princeton University Press, 1979, p.8; C. Beitz, "Sovereignty and Morality in International Affairs", p.241, in D. Held (ed.), *Political Theory Today*, Cambridge, Polity Press, 1991.

¹³ C. M Ryan, 'Sovereignty, Intervention and the Law: A Tenuous Relationship of Competing Principles', *Millennium: Journal of International Relations*, vol. 26, No. 1, 1998, pp.77-78.

If the state is a moral entity, like the individual, then any external intervention will be a violation of the moral autonomy of the state that is granted by its very existence. Interstate relations thus should be based on mutual agreement on the respect for territorial sovereignty that is derived from the autonomy of states; just like individuals, states have autonomous rights and should be left alone to seek their own ends. Furthermore in an essentially anarchical international system, there is no supreme moral authority (a Sovereign) existing above states to impose a higher morality.

In this paradigm the question and the concern is not the rights of individuals and groups, but states. As autonomous moral entities states enjoy internationally recognised rights; the most basic of which is territorial sovereignty.¹⁴ The proposition that states are morally autonomous entities has been criticised within the tradition of natural rights theory claiming that the rights of states are derived from individual rights and therefore do not have any autonomous moral standing. If the ultimate justification for the existence of states is the protection of the rights of citizens, ‘a government that engages in substantial violation of human rights betrays the very purpose for which it exists’. As a result the government loses not only domestic but also international legitimacy. The liberal argument therefore concludes that the ‘right of autonomy for states is derived from the respect of state for the right of individual’s autonomy’.¹⁵

Within the international normative order one can argue that human rights now constitute the basis on which the international legitimacy of a state is determined. To link international legitimacy to respect of the state for human rights is to link it to domestic legitimacy. That means that international legitimacy is derived from domestic legitimacy

¹⁴ R. J. Vincent, *Human Rights and International Relations*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1986, pp.118, 129; R. J. Vincent, *Nonintervention and International Order*, New Jersey, Princeton University Press, 1974, p.14. For a critique of conventional notion of state sovereignty see D. Forsythe, *Human Rights in International Relations*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2000.

¹⁵ Forsythe, *Human Rights in International Relations*, pp.3-25, 217-235; Beitz, *Political Theory and International Relations*, p.81.

and thus states do not have an autonomous moral standing divorced from their domestic political institutions and processes, respected by the international community.

In sum elements of contemporary international society entail a loosening of the absolutist conception of state sovereignty so that human rights are included in the discourse of international relations without endangering the very existence of the society of states. Development of a normative order of international relations, economic interdependencies and the increasing levels and importance of transnational relations have transformed an atomic view of states in world politics and, to some extent, have weakened both the autonomy and sovereignty of the contemporary state.¹⁶ Shifting power centres in the contemporary world alongside national, regional and international agencies have spread sovereign power to these different levels of governance.

2. The New NATO, the New Task: Human Rights

Defending Values, Securing Peace

NATO has an interest in incorporating issues of human rights and democracy into its strategic planning for at least two reasons. Firstly, in the post-military threat environment in Europe, NATO should recognize the linkages between the level of respect for human rights and international security. The linkage is particularly pressing because the renewed debate on NATO's out-of-area responsibilities and new tendency to play a role in peace-keeping or peace-making operations are directly linked to human rights related issues like national minorities, refugee flows and repressive governments.

¹⁶A. Rosas, 'State Sovereignty and Human Rights: Towards a Global Constitutional Project', *Political Studies*, Vol.43, No.1, 1998, pp.79-95; Forsythe, *Human Rights in International Relations*, pp. 21-23.

Secondly, following the end of the Cold War, the growth of intra-state conflicts and border disputes, tension in inter-ethnic relations, slow progress in democratization, in sum, the persistence of instability in and around Europe where the crises are proved to be difficult to contain within national borders the NATO should be prepared to take further peace-keeping/peace making undertakings. In fact there is a legacy of NATO for defending democracy and human rights.

Since the Washington Treaty NATO has always claimed to defend the common values of the member states as well as their territories. The confrontation with the Warsaw Pact countries during the Cold War was often justified by a reference to defend the ‘free world’ and liberties cherished by it. Yet this did not change the power politics of inter-block rivalry of the Cold War. However defending liberties and promoting values and institutions of the ‘free world’ remains to be an essential mission of NATO given the recent assertiveness of the NATO leaders during the Bosnia and Kosova crises.

As such there is an increasing tendency to see NATO as the vanguard of democracy and human rights even in the out of its treaty responsibilities. Kosova is a case in this direction. NATO, it is said, could protect the world from ‘conflicts outside the treaty area stemming from unresolved historical disputes and the actions of undemocratic governments and sub-state actors who reject the peaceful settlement of disputes.’¹⁷

As a result it seems that after the Cold War and the demise of a Soviet threat NATO moves to be a ‘values Community’ as described by Poul Cornish.¹⁸ In this new milieu it seems that the Alliance has become more concerned about the treats to its core values. ‘Maintenance of democratic order’ is often cited as a rational for assertiveness of NATO in the non-article 5 task definition. It seems that NATO is moving from a collective defense

¹⁷ M. Smith, G. Timmins, ‘The EU, NATO, and the Extension of Institutional Order in Europe’ *World Affairs*, ,Vol.16, No. 2, 2000, p. 80.

¹⁸ P. Cornish, ‘A Strategic Concept for the Twenty-first Century’, *Defense Analysis*, Vol.15, No.3, 1999, p. 241-261.

organization based on the defense of the allied territory to a Euro-Atlantic politico-military power in defense of common values such as liberty, democracy, human rights and the rule of law. Thus it is now increasingly perceived that repression, economic failure and human rights abuses leading to massive refugee flows and environmental degradation could, though indirectly, affect the security and stability of the NATO area. Thus in short one can observe that in the post Cold War era the ‘new NATO’ has become an institution that intervenes to protect certain principles and values, a power for peace-making and post-conflict peacekeeping, and a model for developing democratic national security structures.¹⁹

NATO as an organisation committed to protect and promote ‘free world’ is bound to pay attention to ‘democratic peace theories’. The linkage between domestic form of government and foreign policy behavior has been thoroughly explained in recent years. The distance between the domestic and the international has been narrowed as a result of growing economic and political integration among states and peoples. Thus the search for security starts with securing the domestic area. Then it comes human rights and democracy. Lying down domestic pre-requisites for international peace requires an interest in the state of human rights and degree of democracy.

Yet one should not consider democracy as a political condition determined by the presence of electoral politics. Moreover the respect for fundamental human rights setting the boundaries of public authority is an essential component of democracy. Thus it must not only be a formal democracy but a working liberal democracy so that it could set the basis for a sustainable domestic component of democratic peace.

Strategic Concepts and Human Rights

¹⁹ D. Nelson, ‘Post-Communist Insecurity’, *Problems of Post-Communism*, Vol. 47, No. 5, 2000, p. 31.

At their Rome summit, in November 1991, NATO's heads of state and government adopted a new strategic concept, which stated that 'it is now possible to draw all the consequences from the fact that security and stability have political, economic, social, and environmental elements as well as the indispensable defense dimension. Managing the diversity of challenges facing the Alliance requires a broad approach to security.' Thus in response to the post Cold War politico-security environment the 1991 strategic concept developed a 'broader' concept of security for NATO that includes instabilities and insecurities prompted by human rights violations.

NATO's leaders declared in 1991 that 'security and stability do not lie solely in the military dimension' and decided to enhance the 'political component' of the Alliance.²⁰ This was admittance that software security is an essential part of alliance security. The treatment of the political as a relevant part of security meant that 'stability', 'well-being' and 'economic collaboration' among the Allies to be promoted.²¹

After 8 years of experimentation with the 1991 document the 1999 Strategic Concept observes that 'the last ten years have also seen ... the appearance of complex new risks to Euro-Atlantic peace and stability, including oppression, ethnic conflict, economic distress, the collapse of political order.'²² Here the alliance declares that issues of software security threaten peace and stability in the NATO area. This can also be taken as a move on the part of NATO to take systematic and wide spread violations of human rights as threats to alliance security even if they take place outside the alliance area.

Among the 'purpose and tasks of the alliance' the 1999 strategic concept commits NATO 'contribute to effective conflict prevention and to engage actively in crisis management, including crisis response operations'. Here NATO clearly defines a role that

²⁰ 'The Alliance's Strategic Concept', Brussels: NATO, November 1991; P. Cornish, 'A Strategic Concept for the Twenty-first Century', p. 241.

²¹ Cornish, 'A Strategic Concept for the Twenty-first Century', p.245.

²² A. Cragg, "A new Strategic Concept for a new era", *NATO Review*, 47/2, Summer 1999, p. 19.

goes beyond its conventional task definition that requires a constant interest in the state of human rights in the peripheral states. The strategic concept also talks of ‘fostering democracy’ as a means for reaching the objective of peace and stability. This assumes that promotion of democracy and human rights is an element of promoting the alliance security. This assumes the validity of democratic peace theory; democracy as means for eliminating war-like behavior of states.

Furthermore the Strategic Concept sets out the ‘security challenges and risks’ the Alliance should be prepared to confront. Among the possibilities the document mentions are uncertainty and instability generated by ‘ethnic and religious rivalries’ and ‘the abuse of human rights’. ‘The uncontrolled movement of large numbers of people’ was also mentioned as a threat for NATO members. Security and stability of NATO area requires an interest in wider environment focusing not only on military issues but also software security that include state of human rights.

Non-Article 5 tasks of crisis management and crisis response became one of fundamental security tasks of the new NATO according to the 1999 document. In this context NATO peacekeeping in the Balkans has become a long-term commitment. The IFOR mission ended in one year but SFOR has an open-ended commitment, as does KFOR.²³ The question of how NATO will undertake peace operations and crisis management in light of its post cold war experiences in Europe tells us that NATO in its new task posture has to take human rights violations as an issue. Simply because these operations are generally prompted by a civil strife that involves systematic and widespread human rights violations.

47. "The Alliance's Strategic Concept", *NATO Review*, 47/2, Summer 1999, pp. D7-D13.

²³ N. Fiorenza, ‘New NATO’, *Armed Forces Journal*, Sep2000, Vol. 138, No. 2, p. 76-81; D. S. Yost, *NATO Transformed: The Alliance's New Roles in International Security*, Washington: United States Institute of Peace Press, 1998.

3. Mediterranean, Human Rights and Security

The State of Human Rights and Democracy

Southern and Eastern countries of Mediterranean in particular are still at some distance from resolving overall human rights questions and democracy measured by political freedoms and civil liberties. Despite the differences in many areas Mediterraneans share a heritage of authoritarianism, which remains as a historical residue in some societies while an actual practice in some others.

Looking at Southern and Eastern Mediterranean, human rights as understood within liberal tradition do not constitute an element in shaping political regimes. The lack of democracy coupled with economic conditions creates obstacles for the provision and protection of civil and political rights. A quick look at human rights records of these countries display the scope and the depth of the problem. If one starts reviewing human rights conditions and the level of democracy gets the following picture according to the reports issued by Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch and Freedom House.²⁴

In Libya hundreds of political prisoners, including prisoners of conscience remains in detention, many without charge or trial. Torture, especially during incommunicado detention, continues to be reported. The authorities fail to protect hundreds of sub-Saharan Africans from racist attacks, reportedly leading to the killings of dozens of Africans. Not surprisingly Freedom House puts Libya in the top category of ‘not free’ countries.

²⁴ The following information and observations on particular countries are compiled from the reports prepared by Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch and Freedom House. For the reports see web pages of these human rights NGOs, <http://www.amnesty.org>, <http://www.hrw.org>, <http://www.freedomhouse.org>.

Amnesty International reports that repression of human rights defenders in Tunisia escalated in recent years. Furthermore journalists and political activists are targeted by the police. Torture and ill treatment in police stations and prisons remains widespread and at least two detainees died in police custody in the year 2000. Dozens of prisoners of conscience remain arrested. Up to 1,000 political prisoners, most of them prisoners of conscience, remained detained. Trials of political detainees continue to violate international standards for fair trial. Freedom House ranks Tunisia as a 'not free' country.

Algeria continues to be a country of violence perpetuated by both government forces and Islamic terrorist groups. No concrete measures were taken by the authorities to bring to justice members of the security forces and paramilitary militias responsible for human rights violations in 2000 or in previous years. No independent investigations were carried out into thousands of killings, massacres, "disappearances", abductions and reports of torture in recent years. Algeria is regarded as a 'not free' country as far as political freedoms and civil rights are concerned.

As for Morocco Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch observe that hundreds of political arrests were made in recent years and more than 60 political prisoners sentenced after unfair trials in previous years continues to be detained. There are continued reports of torture of detainees and demonstrations are often repressed with excessive force. The failure to bring those responsible for human rights violations to justice remains a major concern. Morocco is a 'partly free' country according to Freedom House.

Amnesty International claims that in Lebanon in the year 2000 hundreds of people, including students and suspected opponents of the government, were arrested on political grounds. A dozen of the student demonstrators received unfair trials before the Military Court. Amnesty International also reports of torture and ill treatment. Freedom House considers Lebanon as a 'not free' country.

In Syria while restrictions on freedom of expression were relaxed to some extent dozens of people were arrested during 2000 for political reasons. Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch report that hundreds of political prisoners, including prisoners of conscience remains in detention without trial or serving long sentences passed after unfair trials. Cases of torture and ill treatment of political detainees continue. Syria is in the top category of 'not free' countries as far as political rights and civil liberties are concerned.

In Egypt according to Amnesty International figures thirty prisoners of conscience were sentenced to between six months' and five years' imprisonment in the year 2000. While hundreds of suspected supporters of banned Islamist groups were released in the last years, thousands of others, including prisoners of conscience, remained held without charge or trial. Some others served sentences imposed after grossly unfair trials before military courts. Torture and ill treatment of detainees continued to be widespread. According to Freedom House Egypt remains as a 'not free' country.

Amnesty International claims that in Turkey human rights defenders continues to face harassment and intimidation in Turkey. Writers, politicians, religious leaders, human rights defenders and many others were tried and imprisoned for exercising their right to freedom of expression, particularly when they expressed opinions on the Kurdish question or the role of Islam. Amnesty International reports that torture remains widespread and the perpetrators are rarely brought to justice. According to the ratings of Freedom House Turkey is a 'partly free' country.

According to Amnesty International figures more than 300 Palestinians were killed by the Israeli security forces in the year 2000 and more than 2,500 Palestinians and Israelis were arrested for political reasons. Scores of detainees were ill treated. Hundreds of Palestinians were tried before military courts in trials whose procedures fell short of

international standards. Houses in the Occupied Territories continued to be demolished as a result of a discriminatory policy that denied most Palestinians building permits. Yet Israel is cited as a 'free' country according to Freedom House.

Among the nine Southern and Eastern Mediterranean countries mentioned, based on the level of political rights and civil liberties enjoyed, there is only 'free' country according to Freedom House, that is Israel. Two countries, Turkey and Morocco, are ranked as 'partly free'. The remaining six are regarded as 'not free'. If respect for human rights and democratic governance are conducive to national and international peace and stability then the case of Southern and Eastern Mediterranean poses a great challenge.

Challenges and Predicaments

The Islamic fundamentalist challenge further complicates the domestic political process, and postpones the demolition of authoritarian regimes in the region. The countries that face powerful oppositions of radical Islamist, like Algeria, Tunisia, Morocco and Egypt, are tempted to clamp down on almost all opposition groups and inevitably involved in violations of basic human rights such as indefinite detention, disappearances, death in custody, press censorship, torture etc. Thus Islamist challenge and the repressive response of the states have dramatically increased the cases of human rights violations.

In those countries whose political leaders don't consider conciliatory measures but military ones the fear of fundamentalism is used as a pretext for militarisation of society increasing influence and power of security forces in governmental process. Harsh measures taken against terrorists make the scope of human rights even narrower. In Egypt, for instance, security forces have extraordinary power to keep suspects under detention without trial, and any association with a 'terrorist organisation' could be enough for death penalty.

In Algeria, Tunisia and Morocco participation of Islamist opposition in political process is banned, in Egypt seriously restricted. Civil liberties as a whole have become target as a means to curb radical Islamist movements. The way by which Islamist opposition is handled in Algeria weakens the reformists, moderates and gradualists within the Islamist groups. It has led them to conclude that more revolutionary means are needed in order to get to power.

Political repression is nowadays fashionably justified in order to bar the fundamentalists thought likely to capture power through electoral politics. But such a policy creates a vicious circle between the persistence of authoritarianism evaporating popular support for existing regimes and hence further radicalization of politics. The fears of fundamentalism prevalent in the West are being skillfully manipulated by authoritarian leaders in the region. The impression that the West has exempted Southern and Eastern Mediterranean from the global drive for democratization and human rights provides the present governments with an supposedly international support for not democratizing the system, which in turn justifies the anti-western stand of the fundamentalists. This is a process that fuels inter-states, inter-civilizational and intra-state frictions. If Huntington is right in his prediction for clash of civilizations the perceived open-ended support of the West for secular- authoritarian states of Muslim World in the face of Islamic revival would certainly be the breaking point for an uncompromising confrontation between radical Islam and the West.²⁵ Such a break will also destroy any hope that remains for integration of 'Islamic' movements and states with the international system, and stick the former to their 'revolutionary' deeds and discourse.

²⁵ S. Huntington, "The Clash of Civilizations?", *Foreign Affairs*, Vol.72, No.3, 1993; S. Huntington, *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*, New York, Simon&Schuster, 1996.

The threat of Islamic fundamentalism in the Muslim part of Mediterranean is a transnational phenomenon that is considered to be likely to destabilize the whole region.²⁶ In fact there seems to exist a kind of common fate in resisting the spread of fundamentalism. Even the success of it in any regional country would make the spread easier. Bearing such a prospect in mind the Arab Maghreb Union, for instance, coordinate their security policies. Current leaders of the Islamic Conference Organization seems to have adopted a similar strategy of containing radical Islamic movements and maintaining present political regimes by coordinating their policies against them. But if policies that are geared to prevent fundamentalist take-overs leave the people to chose between fundamentalists and dictators nobody should expect improvement in human rights conditions.

Fundamentalism of sorts, religious or racist, stimulates and justifies the presence of each other. In Southern Mediterranean, Islamic fundamentalists point to the revival of racist prejudices, attitudes and imposed limitations on Muslim migrants in Europe so as to vindicate their position and arguments; and conversely growing number of foreigners and their distinct life style increase the appeal of racists in the North. In contemporary international politics rights of minorities have taken a high profile interest not only out of respect for ethnic nationalisms but out of fear that minority related issues can not be confined within the country concerned, but likely to pose regional, even international security risks. In a polity in which minority rights are not respected a social and political tension and furthermore an armed conflict becomes inevitable. When conflict arises it quickly spills over neighboring countries at least in the form of population movements. Mediterranean region is not free of ethnic tension, conflicts, and resulting ethnic migration; Mauritians, Palestinians, Kurds, the Balkan Turks, Cypriots, Bosnians, Serbs, Albanians

²⁶ H.B. Yahia, "Security and Stability in the Mediterranean: Regional and International Changes", *Mediterranean Quarterly*, Winter 1993, pp.6-14.

etc. Disintegration of Yugoslavia and resulting ethnic clashes have revealed the need for a world in which the fears of ethnic groups being oppressed by majorities are eliminated through establishing plural polities that guarantee the rights of minorities.

Population flows do not always result from ethnic conflicts; revolutionary regime changes and economic hardship may also lead to mass population movement. Particularly in the South both of these exist; a possible fundamentalist takeover in North Africa would create thousands, may be millions of migrants seeking refuge in the North.²⁷ Anxiety that French and Spanish governments have expressed regarding such a prospect on the other side of the Mediterranean is to a very large extent based on the concern that such a population movement would destabilize their own countries, a problem that actually France faces now. North African migrants in France disturbs demographic structure in some areas, serve as a support base for opposition groups (mainly Islamic) in North Africa and even threatens French democracy through providing an excuse for racist-ultra nationalist movements at home. Furthermore the perceived threat of fundamentalism penetrating into the migrant communities in France leads the government to the strict measures to curb this process, but this, in the end, may create doubts about plurality of French democracy and serve as a vindication for National Front's enmity towards foreigners.

Furthermore Northern Mediterranean countries of NATO, like Spain, France and Italy, faces accusations of human rights violations in their treatment of immigrants and asylum seekers. For instance Amnesty International reports persistence of police brutality, notably involving asylum-seekers and others of non-European origin. Conditions in holding areas for asylum-seekers were also described by Amnesty International as inhuman and degrading. Refugees continued to be subject to a form of prolonged administrative detention. Concerning Spain Amnesty International also reports the cases of racist violence

²⁷ J. Farley, "the Mediterranean: Southern Threats to Northern Shores", *The World Today*, February 1994, pp.33-36.

against foreign workers, mainly from North Africa. Allegations of race-related ill-treatment by police officers increased. A large rise in the numbers of undocumented foreign nationals arriving on southern shores prompted claims that the Spanish authorities were failing to provide basic humanitarian care and that detention facilities were inhuman and degrading. A new law came into force that according to Amnesty International severely restricted the rights of undocumented immigrants, fined companies for transporting them, and provided for an accelerated expulsion procedure.

Being aware of the anxiety about population movements some regional states exploit immigration release both as a foreign policy weapon and a solution for domestic economic hardship such as unemployment and lack of foreign currency; remember the Albanians feeling to Italy. Unless a sustained economic development is achieved it is hard to stop economic refugee flows, which is not acceptable any more by receiving countries of the North. The division of the Mediterranean between wealthy North and poor South is a refugee generating fact. As the European Union members of Mediterranean countries adopt stricter immigration policies the right for seeking refugee for political reasons is greatly threatened too. So there is a need to address the root cause, that is the prevailing political and economic conditions in the south. Without attempting to resolve the root cause imposing strict immigration policy is going to hamper the state of human rights for Southern people.

Human rights violations that generate flow of refugees do not only create inter-state tension and conflict, but an outside intervention might also be provoked leading to further deterioration of regional stability. The war in Bosnia posed a threat to destabilize neighboring countries as a result of pouring refugees there and an outside force NATO under the UN umbrella heavily involved in the conflict. Earlier, following the Gulf War the exodus of thousands of Iraqi Kurds into Turkey had led to the intervention of multilateral

forces setting up safe heavens leading to actual disintegration of Iraq. Ethnic conflicts and resulting civil war with thousands of victims and refugees in Rwanda pulled back France, the former colonial power, into Rwandan domestic affairs. Waves of refugees resulting from the military takeover in Haiti also constituted one of the reasons for American intervention within a UN mandate. Most recently the fleeing Kosovars from the violence of the Serbian forces was among the grounds on which NATO air operation was based.

Survey of Southern Mediterranean countries has showed that the software side of security is lacking in the region with regional and international implications. Human rights related problems in the countries of the region drastically increase the degree of both national and regional security. Possibilities of drastic regime changes with dramatic social, political and security turmoil can be reduced by enhancing the soft-ware security of regional states, i.e. better respect for human rights and liberties.

In the Southern shore of Mediterranean there exists a vicious circle between persistence of authoritarian regimes not allowing full political participation for opposition groups, and actual and, future waves of migration and refugee flows. In such cases the obvious destination for refugees is Western European countries whose increasingly strict immigration policies reflect the recognition of population movements including refugee flows as a wider security threat for Western Europe while reducing the ability of oppressed people to seek for safety. The recognition of the security implications of population movements and refugee flows requires to address the root cause, that is violations of basic human rights by the states in Southern Mediterranean.

How to Meet the Human Rights Challenge

The presence of authoritarian regimes denying basic human rights, ethnic minorities from North to South demanding their minority rights, religious and racist fundamentalism complicating the prospect for democratization, and economic hardship particularly in the South pressuring for immediate and radical solutions draw a Mediterranean picture that threatens the stability of whole region, and is not very promising for global prospect for democracy and human rights.

Mediterranean countries, first of all, should come to see the fact that regional peace, security and stability is closely tied to observation of human rights, violation of which has implications going beyond one particular country. When the issue is taken as a regional one than there is a need to establish an institutional framework with its principles and mechanisms to observe developments and deter human rights violations. NATO's Mediterranean initiative can pave the way for mutual understanding, cooperation and democratization in the region. Proposals for a Conference on Security and Cooperation in Mediterranean, the Mediterranean Forum or the Five + Five framework can provide such a platform. Especially a Helsinki type mechanism with its guiding principles, encompassingly wider dimensions and follow-up meetings would constitute an encouraging and deterring regional mechanism for the future of human rights.²⁸ Such an attempt should naturally recognize the differences among Mediterranean countries but also get straight in reaching consensus on the basics. The EU member of Mediterranean countries should lead the process of institutionalizing the CSCM because they have the highest stake at regional stability. They are highly sensitive to developments in North Africa and the Balkans. In fact a trade off exists between the North that is interested in containing immigration flows and establishing regional stability, and the South that is in desperate need for economic

²⁸ V.Ghebal; "Toward a Mediterranean Helsinki- Type Process", *Mediterranean Quarterly*, Winter 1993, pp.49-58.

development for which the Northern help is needed . The North can contribute economic development while the South provides domestic conditions for regional stability.

In this context, economic development of the non-democratic countries in the region is crucial to prepare the conditions for advancement in human rights, which would be encouraged by further integration of those countries economically into Europe and the world at large. Building economic interdependencies and institutional linkages would help promotion of global values and prevent authoritarian tendencies to revive tribal nationalism or religious fundamentalism. Furthermore the world at large should not exempt the development of pluralistic political regimes in the region. Particularly in the Muslim part of the Mediterranean, democratization-fundamentalism dilemma should not be exaggerated. Any sign of double standard would weaken moral as well as political standing of democracy, human rights and the West in the region. Authoritarian regimes would naturally exploit the fear of fundamentalism that prevails in the West to enhance and prolong their regimes. But, in long term, the demands for representative politics can not be barred by internal repression and international toleration of it. In the process of organizing a Mediterranean forum the parties should be careful not to target any particular country or group. The impression that such attempts to create a regional institutional body are solely geared to confine the spread of radical Islam will be damaging the cause itself. Political Islam should not be portrayed as the common enemy since this will strengthen them not only in the Muslim countries of the South but in North Mediterranean countries where millions of Muslim live.

In short, the Mediterraneans should recognize the fact that in order not to be isolated from the international community in contemporary support for human rights they should keep an eye not only on provision of human rights in their own country but also see the wisdom of setting up regional organizations to oversee the developments in this area.

The Mediterranean is too small a region to avoid transnational repercussions of human rights violations.

4. Mediterranean and Human rights: A Challenge for NATO?

Stability, Security and Human Rights

The collapse of Warsaw Pact eliminated virtual monopoly of military threat in considerations of security matters, hence enabling NATO to develop a broader security concept whose primary concern is with ‘instability’ within and around the European hinterland. In this new ‘post-military threat’ environment the risk of instability is generally attributed to political and economic transition of East European countries. Yet, not only ‘transition’ to market economy and pluralist politics but ‘non-transition’ too breeds the seeds of instability particularly as in the case of Southern Mediterranean countries.

Hence, the kind of political regime and the form of state-society relationship lay at the heart of the stability-instability problem determining, to some extent, prospect for international peace. This is to say that, at the end of East-West conflict, international security is increasingly becoming dependent on domestic peace that is in turn heavily influenced by the level of respect for human rights. Societies surrounding Western Europe like those of the Balkans, Eastern Europeans and Southern Mediterranean are particularly susceptible to domestic turmoil and vulnerable to the anomalies of transition and change. Thus, the need emerges for a European organization capable of confronting the challenges of transition and instability in the region. Here NATO comes up as an organization that have a stake at promoting the respect for human rights in the world and in the periphery of Europe.

These observations can be expanded to the Mediterranean region as a whole. There violations of human rights and lack of democratic political process, particularly on the Southern and Eastern shores, breeds the sources of regional as well as domestic instability, hence poses a security threat of non-military sort to the Northern states and their alliance: NATO. Thus, it can be safely argued that the state of human rights in the Mediterranean countries concerns not only regional countries but also wider European security as a whole.

The Mediterranean region is often described as an area of increasing instability and a source of concern, particularly among the nations of NATO's southern tier. Thus some approach Mediterranean security in terms of political turmoil and socio-economic pressures, and by accompanying instability and tension. Santis- As such for the southern Mediterranean countries security is also a matter of domestic stability. Therefore, instabilities generated by socio-economic and political turmoils are likely to have an impact on the security and well-being of the European member countries of NATO. Therefore in the post Cold War geopolitics of the Mediterranean security of NATO's European area can not be managed and realised without considering security and stability of North Africa and the Middle East. Thus a Mediterranean dimension comes in as an element of (in)security of NATO's Euro-Atlantic area.²⁹

Some may consider Mediterranean as a dividing line, separating the European North from an "arc of crisis" located in the South. Yet this does not prevent the North from insecurity generating influences of the South in terms of illegal immigration flows. Thus one needs to develop rather a comprehensive notion of security in the light of emerging security interdependencies.³⁰

If there is a strategic acceptance that regional crises are likely to affect Allied security alongside direct threats, then the Mediterranean comes up as a critical region with its

²⁹ R D. Asmus, F. S. Larrabee, I. O. Lesser, 'Mediterranean security: new challenges, new tasks', *NATO Review*, WEBEDITION, No. 3 May 1996, Vol. 44 - pp.25-31.

insecurity generating features. It is clear that NATO has developed a strategic concept that deals with regional crisis and conflicts, e.g. IFOR and SFOR

The Challenge of Soft Security

The post-Cold War world has seen the emergence of numbers of problems in the Mediterranean as potential source of instability. Among those one significant source of conflict and instability is ethnic nationalism and religious fundamentalism. The end of the Cold War added to the release of ethnic and religious tensions in the wider Mediterranean area. The situation in the former Yugoslavia proved how ethnic and religious differences can result in war and continued tension.

The resurgence of nationalism, most notably in the Balkans, is a great threat for the stability and security in the region. Other potential conflicts exist between ethnic minorities who think that their rights are not respected and the central governments that tend to see ethnic differences as a potential source of threat along the Mediterranean coast. The ethnic mix of the Southern Europe in particular poses a great challenge for regional peace and security. Knowing the bloody outcome of ethnic tension in this part of the Mediterranean the issues of human and minority rights gain a vital importance. Thus provision of full human rights can be conceived as a mechanism to prevent outbreak of ethnic conflicts threatening security of the NATO area.

Fundamentalist movements of all kind pose a threat to stability in many countries in the region. The impact of religious fundamentalism on the stability and security in the Mediterranean is twofold. First the basic premises of Islamic fundamentalism conflict with the principles of democratic governance leading to fears among the secular sections of

³⁰ J. Solona, 'NATO and the Mediterranean', *Mediterranean Quarterly*, March 1997.

populations. Thus the presence of an 'Islamic fundamentalist' movement poses a threat on social peace and harmony laying down the ground for concern about the future of the country under an Islamic government and thus provoking the search for fleeing to the North. Second, the presence of Islamic fundamentalism constitutes an excuse for authoritarian governments in the region to continue their repressive governments thus creating the very basis of human rights violations against Islamic opposition and again prompting the waves of refugee flows towards the North. One can observe that Islamic fundamentalism has in recent decades risen in Algeria, Egypt, Tunisia and Morocco and is spreading. As such it constitutes a threat not only to domestic political stability, but also to broader Mediterranean security.

Yet the Alliance should avoid over-emphasising the threat posed by Islamic fundamentalism. This may legitimise the view that NATO is looking for a new enemy to legitimate itself in the post cold war crisis of the 'absence of the enemy'. This would make cooperation between NATO and Islamic countries of Mediterranean very complicated.³¹. While current regimes are likely to use the fear of fundamentalism to secure and strengthen authoritarian state, as a result increasing the repression inflicted on the Islamists, the Islamists would be vindicated in their claim that NATO comes and repress the Islamic forces paving the way for a clash of civilizations.

Furthermore numerous economic and social problems especially in the SM pose in various ways security threats for the NATO area. Economic poverty, increase in population coupled with political instability and uncertainty turn into pressures in the NATO countries of France, Italy, Portugal, and Spain in the Mediterranean. The resulting illegal immigration is creating social tensions and economic concerns within the NATO members of the NM.

³¹ Asmus, Larrabee, Lesser, 'Mediterranean security: new challenges, new tasks', pp.25-31.

Migration across the Mediterranean is an important area that shows how social and economic problems and political pressure on Europe's southern periphery could have a direct effect on the stability and security of European countries. Immigrant communities in the North pose growing economic, political and social problems for their home countries.

Therefore economic and demographic pressures worsen the prospects for stability in the Mediterranean. Lack of economic development and increase in population fueled by political pressure a large number of immigration to the North is expected creating concerns among the Southern members of NATO especially.

There is a common concern about population explosion in the North Africa that is expected to grow from 65 million to 142 million by 2025 with enormous implications on the life standards in the region. This is clearly seen as a threat by the Northern states with an increasing likelihood for massive migration flows.³² Thus to prevent such a possibility, and if this possibility is perceived as a threat, then provisions of basic welfare standards and human rights regime are essential to keep the southern people secure and prosperous in their home countries.

In this context of blurring territorial boundaries between the North and the South one can clearly observe that Europe could be increasingly exposed to the spill-over effects of political repression and violence from the Mediterranean conditions. Thus human rights related security challenges for NATO in the MED region have to be recognised.

One of the ways of responding this challenge is that Southern Mediterranean countries should not be exempted from the global drive for protection of human rights and provision of democratic models. Regional diversity and heterogeneity among the Mediterranean countries can be considered both as a source of richness and lack of binding communality that justifies the call for a common ground bringing the countries of the region

³² Ibid.

together. These can be human rights. Human rights can be a set of principles shared by the countries of the region that also contributes to the formation of similar polities that enjoy domestic legitimacy and eliminates clashes between state and society, state and ethnic groups and society and ethnic minorities.

5. NATO's Mediterranean Initiative: Meeting the Challenge?

Recognizing the need for a comprehensive definition of security in the context of broader Mediterranean NATO Foreign Ministers initiated a dialogue to contribute strengthening of regional stability in December 1994 between NATO and the Mediterranean countries including Egypt, Israel, Morocco, Mauritania, Tunisia and later Jordan.³³ In line with the initiative the 1991 Strategic Concept had stated that 'the stability and peace of the countries on the southern periphery of Europe are important for the security of the Alliance'.

NATO's Mediterranean initiative should be managed to encourage provisions of human rights and promote democracy in these countries. Human rights and democracy can be formulated as a stability generating value in the Mediterranean without alienating current governments. NATO's initiative and bilateral contacts can be used to push for a gradual improvement in human rights and democracy in the med. Yet NATO is bound to be sensitive to the domestic nationalistic reactions against the western involvement concerning domestic issues given the history of western colonialism in the region.

NATO's Mediterranean dialogue should also be enhanced not by ignoring human rights dimension of regional/international security but by inserting it as a security generating aspect. Thus for the Mediterranean region the NATO should be conceived not

only as a defense organization but also as a security organization which is to promote software security along side the hard-ware one.

In short the policy suggestion of this research is that NATO and the West should take human rights issues seriously through investigating the implications of human rights for international security in the new international "order" particularly with reference to NATO's Mediterranean dialogue. To conclude one can say that there exists a relationship between the level of respect for human rights, domestic (in)stability and the security risk for NATO members. The basic premise is that instability in the region is fundamentally linked to human rights conditions, and unless democratic political regimes respectful to human rights are formed, domestic and regional stability, hence security of wider Europe cannot be secured.

³³ For a detailed discussion of the Mediterranean initiative's purposes and the various reactions to it in the dialogue countries, see F. S. Larrabee and C. Thorson, *Mediterranean Security: New Issues and Challenges*, Santa Monica, CA: RAND, April 1996.