The Insecurity of Security:
NATO and the New Strategic Landscape

Final Report
NATO-EAPC Research Fellowship
November 2002

Professor Dan Caldwell
Department of Political Science
Pepperdine University
Malibu, California 90263
United States of America

Table of Contents

Introduction

In July 2001, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) awarded me a NATO-EAPC Research Fellowship. This document is the Final Report for this fellowship. An Interim Report was submitted in May 2002.

The research on which this Final Report is based resulted from a number of activities supported by the fellowship. These included the following: (1) interviews with officials in the Ministry of Defence and the Foreign and Commonwealth Office in London in December 2001; (2) participation in a colloquium on European security at Stanford University in March 2002; (3) interviews and meetings with various NATO officials in Brussels, Mons, Kosovo and Prague in April 2002; (4) presentation of a draft of Chapter 1 of this report to the European Forum of the Institute for International Studies at Stanford University in June 2002; and, (5) interviews and archival research in London in July 2002.

For their comments on previous drafts of this report, I would like to thank Professor Friedrich Steinhausler, Professor Heinz Gaertner and Ambassador Karel Kovanda. I would also like to thank Ms. Anna Verscheure-Langenberg of the NATO Office of Information and Press for administering this fellowship.

Any shortcomings in the Report are, of course, mine alone.

Dan Caldwell
November 2002

Chapter 1: NATO and the Prague Summit

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) is a collective self-defense organization established in 1949 to protect the Western European states against an attack from the Soviet Union and its Eastern European allies. This was the principal mission of NATO for 42 years --until the USSR disintegrated. Following the demise of communism in Eastern Europe and the disintegration of the Soviet Union, many questioned the need for NATO in the post-cold war world. But events in the past decade have presented new challenges, opportunities and missions for NATO.

At the summit meeting held in Madrid in 1997, the members of NATO extended an invitation to join the Alliance to three former enemies of NATO: the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland. These three countries formally joined NATO at the summit marking the fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the

alliance held in Washington, D. C. in April 1999. In addition to enlarging the membership of NATO, representatives to the conference discussed a number of other issues confronting the Alliance.

In November of this year, NATO will hold another important summit meeting in Prague. Sixty heads of state and 3,000-4,000 governmental representatives are expected to attend the summit. In addition, several thousand journalists and thousands of protestors are expected to attend. It is ironic that Prague is the location of the first NATO summit meeting in an Eastern European country because the Warsaw Pact, the former adversary of NATO, was formally disbanded in Prague. Among the likely issues to be addressed at the summit are European defense issues, operations in the Balkans, the further enlargement of NATO, the newly established NATO-Russia Council, NATO-Ukrainian relations, terrorism, and the growing gap between U.S and European military capabilities. This chapter will briefly describe these issues and what may be discussed at the Prague Summit. The data for this chapter come from a review of various NATO documents, secondary sources, and discussions with NATO and government officials at NATO and SHAPE Headquarters, Washington, D.C., London, Kosovo and Prague in the period between December 2001 and July 2002.

European Defense Issues

The perennial question for the United States and its European allies since the end of World War II was how best to provide for the security of Europe.[1] According to Lord Ismay, NATO was founded with the much quoted purposes "to keep Russia out, the United States in and Germany down." Of course, that was during the cold war, and with the end of the cold war NATO adopted new missions.

Throughout the cold war, there were always tensions between the United States and its European NATO allies, but a common enemy threatening Western Europe did wonders to lessen the tensions between America and Europe. Once that enemy, the Soviet Union, disappeared, policy differences, which to some extent had always been there, became more evident and important.

It is beyond the scope of this chapter to recount the history of European-American differences; however, suffice it to note that by the 1990s, the European states, particularly at the urging of France, wanted to establish an independent capability to intervene in places and times of its, rather than the United

[1] See, for example, Charles Kupchan, ed., *Atlantic Security: Contending Visions* (New York: Council on Foreign Relations, 1998) and James E. Goodby, Petrus Buwalda and Dmitri Trenin, *A Strategy for Stable*

States', choosing. Such a desire was consistent with the general trend toward greater European integration; if Europe were to have a common currency, then it was logical that it also should be moving toward a common defense policy.

For its part, the United States supported European integration; however, it was concerned that a move toward greater defense integration could be at the expense of NATO and by implication, therefore, to the United States. The worst result of greater European defense integration from the American perspective would be to drain resources from NATO to a European military force that would be less effective than NATO.

At Maastricht in February 1992, the European Union began to discuss the possibilities of greater European integration, and at the Western European Union's council of ministers meeting in June 1992, a range of missions for European forces was announced and became known as the Petersberg Tasks after the location of the meeting. These tasks were later incorporated in the Amsterdam Treaty (1997) and included humanitarian and rescue tasks, peacekeeping, peace-making and crisis management. Responding to this initiative, the United States strongly supported the development of a "European pillar" within the context of NATO. Over time, a common approach to European security has emerged. The EU refers to this as the European Security and Defense Policy (ESDP) and NATO refers to it as the European Security and Defense Identity (ESDI). [2]

In order to implement the Petersberg Tasks, Prime Minister Blair and President Chirac announced a "Headline Goal" in 1999 to establish a military force of up to 60,000 troops that should be self-sustaining, deployable within sixty days and sustainable for up to a year. In order to make the achievement of the Headline Goal possible, the European Union would have to "create a wide range of command, control, intelligence, and strategic transport capabilities." [3]

Peace: Toward a Euroatlantic Security Community (Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace Press, 2002).

[2] For a discussion of these two terms as well as a third, the Common European Security and Defence Policy (CESDP), see footnote 4 in Robert E. Hunter, *The European Security and Defense Policy: NATO's Companion--or Competitor?* (Santa Monica: RAND, 2002), pp. 3-4. Also see Edward G. Gunning, Jr., "The Common European Security and Defense Policy (ESDP)," *INSS Occasional Paper* 41 (USAF Academy, Colorado: USAF Institute for National Security Studies, July 2001).

[3] Hunter, p. 64.

Following the attacks of September 11, 2002, NATO invoked for the first time in its history the provisions of Article V of the NATO Treaty. For its part, the United States acted decisively against the Taliban and Al-Qaeda in Afghanistran. Time was of the essence, for there was a major concern that Al-Qaeda could have further plans for inflicting damage on the magnitude of September 11. As a consequence, the U.S. acted without much consultation with its European allies. This caused some in Europe to criticize "American unilateralism," but the Bush administration was willing to accept these criticisms in light of the clear and present danger facing the U.S. Few American allies could coordinate their military operations with the U.S. Even though seventeen of the U.S.' eighteen NATO allies had forces in Afghanistan, only the American and British forces were able to engage in large-scale combined operations.

Since September 11th, there has not been much discussion of the ESDP. Former U.S. ambassador to NATO, Robert Hunter, has noted: "If ESDP goes into the deep freeze for a time, that would not be a bad thing from NATO's perspective; it would put aside the vexatious issues of competitive operational planning; it would restore primacy to NATO on issues of significant importance to allies; and it would help to ensure that the United States would see the relationship with the EU in this area as a matter of cooperation, compatibility, and complementarity, rather than competition" [4]

Whether the ESDP is explicitly discussed at the Prague Summit or not, the underlying issues between Europe and American will be present, as they have since the beginning of the Atlantic Alliance.

The Balkans

Conflict in the Balkans in the early 1990s caused NATO to re-invent itself. As Anthony Forster and William Wallace have noted, "The eruption in 1991 of conflict within the former Yugoslavia provided a long and painful learning process for the European allies and the United States, from which new concepts of joint task forces and peace-enforcement operations have evolved." [5] But this evolution was not easy or smooth and only occurred after the deaths of what the CIA estimated to be 81,500 military personnel and 156,000 civilian deaths in the Bosnia war. In addition, between 900,000 to 1.2 million people fled Bosnia

---

[4] Hunter, p. 176.

as refugees and an additional 1.3 to 1.5 million people were displaced from their homes but remained in Bosnia. [6]

NATO intervened in Bosnia only after the United Nations and the European countries were unable to ameliorate the conflict. The failure of the European states to act effectively made it clear that the European states were not prepared to direct and manage European security; the United States' involvement was still necessary.

Milosevic appeared in 1998 and 1999 to be extending his genocidal policy of "ethnic cleansing" into Kosovo, and by mid-1999 investigators from the U.S. Center for Disease Control calculated that approximately 12,000 Albanians in Kosovo had been killed.[7] These killings concerned those in Europe and the United States, and undoubtedly some policy-makers were reminded of the previous fatalities in Bosnia and were fearful that the number killed in Kosovo could possibly approach that of Bosnia unless action was taken. But who would act? In Bosnia, NATO proved to be the most effective counter to Milosevic. Between March 24 and June 9, 1999, NATO conducted a 78 day bombing campaign against Yugoslavia. [8] At the end of this campaign, Milosevic was driven from office and later was arrested and sent to the International War Crimes Trials in the Hague to stand trial for "crimes against humanity."

There was much debate both within NATO and the United States concerning the advisability of getting involved in the Balkans. Some argued that the Balkans did not directly threaten NATO and/or U.S. interests and that the West should therefore remain uninvolved. Others argued that vital interests were threatened, particularly in Kosovo and Macedonia, because conflict in these areas could easily spread into Greece or Turkey, NATO members. Ultimately, NATO determined that its interests were threatened and intervened into Bosnia, Macedonia and Kosovo.

Following the Dayton Accords of November 1995, NATO deployed 60,000 troops to Bosnia. As of April 2002, there were 18,000 NATO troops in Bosnia, and this number is supposed to be reduced to 12,000 by the end of 2002. Significant in contrast to U.S. contributions, European NATO members have

---

[5] Anthony Forster and William Wallace, "What is NATO for?" *Survival*, vol. 43, no. 4 (Winter 2001), p. 107.

[6] Cited by Steven L. Burg and Paul S. Shoup, *The War in Bosnia-Herzegovina: Ethnic Conflict and International Intervention* (New York: M. E. Sharpe, 1999), pp. 169-171.

[7] Estimates of the U.S. Center for Disease Control, cited by Louis Sell, *Slobodan Milosevic and the Destruction of Yugoslavia* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2002), pp. 306, 389.

provided 80% of the troops and 90% of the economic aid to Kosovo. NATO officials estimate that NATO (or, if it is able, European Union) forces will be needed in Bosnia until 2008. NATO currently has 34,000 troops deployed in Kosovo, and 1,000 troops in Macedonia. NATO officials estimate that NATO peacekeeping troops will be needed in Macedonia until the end of 2003. The value of the deployment in Macedonia was made clear when a coup was prevented in October 2001.

At the Prague Summit, NATO deployments to Bosnia, Kosovo and Macedonia will undoubtedly be discussed. Members of the current Bush administration were on record as being very critical of peacekeeping. For example, prior to her appointment as National Security Advisor, Dr. Condoleezza Rice wrote:

> The president must remember that the military is a special instrument. It is lethal, and it is meant to be. It is not a civilian police force. It is not a political referee. And it is most certainly not designed to build a civilian society. Military force is best used to support clear political goals, whether limited, such as expelling Saddam from Kuwait, or comprehensive, such as demanding the unconditional surrender of Japan and Germany during World War II. [9]

Once in office, however, President George W. Bush and members of his administration have been far more supportive of peacekeeping deployments due at least in part to the changed nature of the world following September 11. In Bosnia, for example, NATO peacekeeping forces have arrested a number of suspected members of Al-Qaeda. [10] For all of these reasons, it is likely that the continued deployment of NATO peacekeeping forces will be supported at the Prague Summit.

Enlargement

NATO was originally founded as a military alliance with twelve members: Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, the United Kingdom and the United States. NATO membership was extended to Greece and Turkey in 1952, to West Germany in 1955, to Spain in 1982 and to Poland, the Czech Republic and Hungary in 1999. At the present time, therefore, there are nineteen members of NATO.

---

[8] Lord Robertson of Port Ellen, *Kosovo One Year On: Achievement and Challenge* (Brussels: NATO, 2000).

[9] Condoleezza Rice, "Promoting the National Interest," *Foreign Affairs*, vol. 79, no. 1 (January/February 2000), p. 53.

[10] Brian Whitmore, "Bosnia Becoming a Terror-War Asset," *Boston Globe*, February 3, 2002, p. 22.

In 1999, NATO established the Membership Action Plan (MAP) in order to prepare aspiring states for membership in NATO. [11] There are currently nine members of it: Slovenia, Slovakia, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Romania, Bulgaria, Albania and Macedonia. It is very likely that membership will be extended to these states at the Prague Summit meeting. Criteria for membership include: (1) a functioning democratic political system, (2) democratic civil-military relations, (3) treatment of minority populations in accordance with Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) guidelines, (4) commitment to the peaceful resolution of disputes, and (5) a military contribution to the alliance and a willingness to achieve military interoperability with other alliance members. [12]

NATO enlargement has been controversial. The much respected American diplomat and scholar--the "father of containment"--George Kennan has called enlargement "the most fateful error of American foreign policy in the entire post-Cold War era." [13] Critics argued that enlargement was undesirable for four fundamental reasons. First, enlargement weakened NATO because decision-making within the alliance is made by consensus and as NATO grows larger, consensus becomes harder and harder to achieve. Second, enlargement changed the mission of NATO from a military mission to a political mission. Third, there were substantial costs associated with enlargement. The U.s. Department of State estimated that the cost of the initial enlargement was $1.5 billion over ten years and of this, the U.S. share was $400. [14]For example, new members pledge to achieve interoperability with other members' military equipment; however, many new members simply do not have the resources to achieve interoperability. The only way that they can do so is to have the equipment given to them by other members. Lastly, some have expressed concern about Russia's opposition to enlarging NATO membership. To be sure, in the past Russia and President Vladimir

---

[11] "Membership Action Plan," *The Reader's Guide to the NATO Summit in Washington, 23-25 April 1999* (Brussels: NATO Office of Information and Press, 1999), pp. 73-79.

[12] Thomas S. Szayna, "NATO Enlargement: Assessing the Candidates for Prague," *Bulletin*, The Atlantic Council for the United States, vol. XIII, no. 2 (March 2002), p. 2. See also Thomas S. Szayna, *NATO Enlargement 2000-2015: Determinants and Implications for Defense Planning and Shaping* (Santa Monica: RAND, 2001).

[13] George Kennan, "A Fateful Error," *New York Times*, February 5, 1997, p. A 23.

[14] U.S. Department of State, "The Enlargement of NATO," Bureau of European and Eurasian Affairs, October 2002.

Putin in particular were vociferously critical of enlargement; however, Russian leaders toned down their criticism of enlargement and appear to be resigned to accepting it. [15]

In dealing with the transformation of NATO from primarily a Western European military alliance to a broader, more ecumenical political alliance, NATO has created a number of organizations to assist with this transformation. In January 1994, NATO created the Partnership for Peace (PfP) as a means of providing greater interaction between NATO and PfP members. Currently, there are 46 members of PfP: the nineteen members of NATO and twenty-seven other states. In the war on terrorism, PfP has proved to be significant; for example, NATO had conducted military exercises in Uzbekistan since 1996 so it had experience prior to September 11.

In 1994, NATO established the Mediterranean Dialogue which has mostly Islamic states as members, including Algeria, Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Mauritania, Morocco and Tunisia. [16] There is a feeling within NATO that the Mediterranean Dialogue provides a useful forum for NATO discussions with Islamic countries and that it will develop over the next decade into a kind of "PfP-light." Accoding to former U.S. Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbott, "The Mediterranean Dialogue is a tentative first step by NATO toward doing in the Arab world what it …has been doing for the past dozen years in the post-Soviet region: foster modern concepts of domestic governance and cooperative patterns of international behavior." [17]

It is, of course, anyone's guess as to which states will be invited to join NATO at the Prague Summit; however, it is likely that the three Baltic states (Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania), Slovenia, and Slovakia are almost sure to receive invitations to join. Less certain are Romania and Bulgaria; however, Greece, Italy and Turkey have been lobbying for them and both Romania and Bulgaria provided useful assistance to NATO members in the Kosovo operations and in Afghanistan following the September 11th attacks on United States. [18] For example, in the spring of 2002 Romania allowed twenty U.S. military flights to or from Afghanistan to cross Romania each day. [19]

---

[15] Robert E. Hunter and Sergey M. Rogov, "NATO, Russia Can Get Far With Small Steps," *Los Angeles Times*, May 22, 2002, p. B 13.
[16] For a brief description, see "Mediterranean Dialogue," *The Reader's Guide to the NATO Summit in Washington, 23-25 April 1999* (Brussels: NATO Office of Information and Press, 1999), pp. 99-100, and Alberto Bin, "Mediterranean Dialogue," *NATO Review* (Autumn 2001), p. 9.
[17] Strobe Talbott, "From Prague to Baghdad," *Foreign Affairs*, vol. 81, no. 6 (November/December 2002), p. 54.
[18] Radu Bogdan, "Romanian Reflections," *NATO Review* (Summer-Autumn 2000), pp. 23-25.
[19] Peter Finn, "War Boosts NATO Hopes of Two Nations," *Washington Post*, March 26,2002, p. A 1.

Looking beyond the Prague Summit over the long term, NATO officials predict that ten years from now there will be up to thity-five members of NATO, and these will include the current membership plus one or more from the following list of states: Austria, Croatia, Finland, Ireland, Serbia, Switzerland, Sweden, Russia and/or Ukraine. This list alone demonstrates how dramatically international politics has changed since the 1990s when Russia was still the principal antagonist, allied with the Eastern European states. It is even possible that Austria, Finland, Ireland, Switzerland and Sweden which have staunchly proclaimed their neutrality in world politics in the past, may in today's changed political environment become members of NATO sometime in the future.

Russia

Fear of a Soviet-backed invasion of Western Europe was the primary reason that NATO was founded. When the USSR disintegrated in December 1991, some observers contended that the rationale for NATO had disappeared; however, NATO increasingly turned in a political direction. As part of this transformation, NATO reached out to its former erstwhile antagonist, and in 1997, the NATO-Russia Founding Act was signed and the Permanent Joint Council was created. The Council was supposed to "provide a mechanism for consultation, coordination and, to the maximum extent possible, where appropriate, for joint decisions and joint action with respect to security issues of common concern." To date the joint decision-making process has not occurred and many have criticized the Permanent Joint Council as moribund.[20]

The September 11th attacks on the U.S. and the ensuing cooperation between the United States and Russia in many ways transformed the Russian-American relationship. The two countries' intelligence organizations shared information; Russia allowed overflights and supported US basing of its forces in Central Asian military bases. In commenting on this changed relationship, former French Foreign Minister Hubert Vedrine noted that Russia's cooperation following September 11 was remarkable and that it was a confirmation of President Putin's strategic choice to side with the West. He urged NATO to respond "with an equally decisive overture."[21]

---

[20] Heinz Gaertner, "European Security before and after September 11," Paper presented at the Workshop on European Security and Defense Policy, European Forum, Stanford University, March 20-21, 2002.

[21] Quoted by Robin Wright, "Russia Co-Chairs NATO Meeting," *Los Angeles Times*, December 8, 2001, p. A 18.

NATO's "decisive overture" was offered and accepted on May 14, 2002, at a meeting held in Reykjavik, Iceland, to prepare for the Prague Summit. A new organization was established--the NATO-Russia Council–to cooperate in the war on terrorism, arms control and crisis management. According to NATO Secretary General Lord George Robertson, "Together, the countries that spent four decades glowering at each other across the wall of hatred and fear now have the opportunity to transform Euro-Atlantic security for the better." [22] British Foreign Secretary Jack Straw was similarly ebullient saying that the agreement marked the "funeral of the cold war," which he pronounced "kaput." [23] Many claimed that this agreement would allow for even greater cooperation in the war on terrorism.

Ukraine

With a population of 52 million--somewhat less than France and the United Kingdom--and its geographic position between Russia and Europe, Ukraine is an important actor in world politics. NATO has recognized this significance by working to integrate Ukraine into various NATO-affiliated organizations. In 1994, Ukraine became the first member of the former Soviet Commonwealth of Independent States to join the Partnership for Peace program. At the 1997 Madrid Summit, NATO and Ukraine signed an agreement that noted: "an independent, democratic and stable Ukraine is one of the key factors for ensuring stability in Central and Eastem Europe and the continent as a whole." [24] This charter also established the NATO-Ukraine Commission which is supposed to meet at least twice a year at the level of the North Atlantic Council.

At the Washington Summit of 1999, the nineteen members of NATO met with Ukrainian President Leonid Kuchma. This was the first summit-level meeting within the framework of the NATO-Ukrainian Commission. [25]

Anti-Terrorism

The attacks on the United States on September 11 resulted in a hitherto unanticipated reaction from America's European allies. Ever since the founding of NATO in 1949, the assumption was that if

---

[22] Quoted by Todd S. Purdum, "NATO Strikes Deal to Accept Russia in a Partnership," *New York Times*, May 15, 2002, p. A 1.
[23] Ibid.
[24] Quoted by Ihor Kharchenko, "The New Ukraine-NATO Partnership," *NATO Review* (September-October 1997), p. 27.
[25] "NATO and Ukraine," *The Reader's Guide to the NATO Summit in Washington, 23-25 April 1999* (Brussels: NATO Office of Information and Press, 1999), pp. 97-98/

Article V calling for the members of NATO to come to the aid of other members were ever to be invoked, it would be the European states calling on the United States for its assistance.

On September 12, the day after the attacks, the Canadian ambassador to NATO went to Secretary General Robertson and suggested that NATO invoke Article V in defense of the U.S. [26] NATO members acted quickly and unanimously to come to the aid of the U.S. in the following ways: [27]

- enhanced intelligence sharing, both bilaterally and within NATO;
- blanket overflight clearances for US and other NATO aircraft;
- assistance to allies and other states that might be subject to terrorist threats as a result of their cooperation with the United States;
- measures to provide increased security for US facilities in Europe;
- backfilling certain allied assets in the NATO area that might be required elsewhere for the campaign against terrorism;
- access for the United States and other allies to ports and airfields on NATO territory;
- the deployment of standing NATO naval forces to the Eastern Mediterranean, and;
- the deployment of five NATO airborne early warning-and-control systems (AWACS) to US airspace so that American AWACS could be used abroad.

The last of these measures resulted in more than 200 support personnel coming to the United States, and the AWACs planes logged more than 3,000 hours patrolling American skies and protecting American airspace during the six months that they were deployed in the United States. [28]

Taken together, the above measures provided tangible and valuable assistance to the U.S. and underscored both the military and political importance of NATO--even to the world's sole superpower.

In Afghanistan itself, sixteen of the United States' eighteen NATO allies provided military assistance, again providing tangible support for the United States. British, Canadian and German units conducted operation on the ground; British and French planes conducted reconnaissance in the air; the Royal Navy deployed its largest naval task force since the Falklands War and French and Italian naval units patrolled the Indian Ocean. [29] Despite these involvements, U.S. forces dominated operations in Afghanistan. For example, the United States flew ninety percent of the sorties and delivered 99% of the precision-guided munitions. There were several reasons for U.S. dominance. First and foremost was the

---

[26] For a discussion of the implications of NATO's decision to invoke Article V, see Christian Tuschhoff, "The Ties that Bind: Allied Commitments and NATO before and after September 11," Paper presented at the Workshop on European Security and Defense Policy, European Forum, Stanford University, March 20-21, 2002.

[27] Philip H. Gordon, "NATO After 11 September," *Survival*, vol. 43, no. 4 (Sinter 2001), p. 93.

[28] U.S. Department of State, "NATO Basics," Bureau of European and Eurasian Affairs, October 2002.

[29] Talbott, p. 55.

experience of the Kosovo bombing campaign which, though ultimately effective in forcing Milosevic to resign, was a frustrating experience for American policy-makers. [30]

Terrorism will undoubtedly be discussed prominently at the Prague summit meeting. Prior to 9/11, terrorism was not discussed in the NATO Council; after 9/11 it has been discussed at every meeting of the council. Clearly, NATO needs to now think about what prior to September 11 was unthinkable: an attack on Chicago, Los Angeles, London, Paris or Berlin. As part of these discussions, NATO officials need to think about how to protect its forces against biological, chemical and nuclear weapons. According to various officials, the U.S. is prepared to table proposals focusing on anti-proliferation at the summit. In addition, an action plan for anti-terrorism will be discussed with members of the Partnership for Peace.

Capabilities

Lord Robertson called attention to defense expenditures of NATO members and noted the commitment of various members by examining the percentage of gross domestic product (GDP) committed to defense spending. The nineteen members of NATO as of 1999 devoted the following amounts to defense:

Table 1: Defense Expenditures by Percent of GDP in 1999 [31]

Belgium	1.5%	Luxembourg	0.8
Canada	1.2	Netherlands	1.8
Czech Rep.	2.3	Norway	2.2
Denmark	1.6	Poland	2.1
France	2.7	Portugal	2.2
Germany	1.6	Spain	1.3
Greece	5.0	Turkey	5.5
Hungary	1.6	UK	2.6
Iceland	---	US	3.1
Italy	2.0		

Of the nineteen NATO members, eight had defense expenditures less than two percent of their gross domestic product, and these included such key members as Canada (1.2%), Belgium (1.5%), Germany (1.6%) and the Netherlands (1.8%). Total current U.S. defense spending is $380 billion and this is greater than the other 18 members of NATO combined, which equaled $159 billion in 2001. [32]

---

[30] Benjamin S. Lambeth, *NATO's Air War for Kosovo: A Strategic and Operational Assessment* (Santa Monica: RAND, 2001).

[31] *NATO Review* (Autumn 2001), p. 34.

[32] Daniel N. Nelson, "New Dimensions of Transatlantic Relations," Paper presented at the Workshop on European Security and Defense Policy, European Forum, Stanford University, March 20-21, 2002.

Lord Robertson noted that Europe was becoming a "military pygmy" and faced a choice of "modernization or modernization" and warned, following the onset of military operations in Afghanistan, that there is a danger that NATO "is so unbalanced that we may no longer have the ability to fight together in the future." [33] *New York Times* columnist Thomas Friedman picked up this theme and contended that "we are increasingly headed for a military apartheid within NATO" and that this imbalance could ultimately result in the end of NATO. [34]

In the Kosovo campaign, the following military capabilities proved to be crucial: (1) many large transport aircraft, (2) precision-guided bombs and missiles, (3) large numbers of special operations forces, and (4) secure, encrypted communications. The United States NATO allies were found wanting in these capabilities. For example, in the Kosovo air campaign, Europeans flew 40% of the missions but could not fly at night and their communications were not secure. Such shortcomings led Lord Robertson to campaign for a build-up in European defense capabilities. These same capabilities proved to be crucial in military operations in Afghanistan, and the non-American members of NATO were found wanting. France wanted to send troops to Afghanistan but did not have the military transport planes to get them there. Germany had to charter Ilyushin transport planes from Uzbekistan to get its military forces to Afghanistan. [35] In short, the Europeans found themselves in the uncomfortable position of having to hitchhike to the battlefield.

The increase in American defense spending following the September 11th attacks exacerbated the asymmetry between U.S. and European defense spending. U.S. defense spending was increased by $50 billion following the attacks, to reach 3.8% of the U.S. GDP. This was twice as much as nine NATO members. The Pentagon's research and development budget for fiscal year 2003 called for expenditures of $53.9 billion and this was more than "seven times more per soldier on next generation technology than the whole European Union." [36]

Former director of the International Institute for Strategic Studies, Francois Heisbourg, has noted that combined the defense budgets of the European countries are equal to about sixty percent of the United

---

[33] Steven Erlanger, "U.S. Officials Try to Assure Europeans On NATO," *New York Times*, February 3, 2002, p. A 7; Steven Erlanger, "Europe's Military Gap," *New York Times*, March 16, 2002, p. A 1.
[34] Thomas L. Friedman, "The End of NATO?" *New York Times*, February 3, 2002, p. A 15.
[35] Friedbert Pflueger, "European Sniping at American Is Overdone," *International Herald Tribune*, February 21, 2002.
[36] Alexander Nicoll, "US Military Might Gains Greater Power from Anti-Terror Campaign," *Financial Times*, February 7, 2002, p. 12.

States. As a result, one would expect the Europeans to achieve 60% of the American capabilities; however, in fact the Europeans have approximately ten percent of the U.S. capabilities in strategic reconnaissance and theater-level command, control, communications, computers and intelligence (C4I), less than twenty percent of the U.S. airlift capacity, and less than ten percent of precision-guided, air-deliverable ordnance. [37]

Three former high-level, American policy-makers--John Deutsch, Arnold Kanter and Brent Scowcroft--in 1999 called attention to the problem of transatlantic defense cooperation and the increasing technological gap between Europe and the United States.[38] They proposed that American and European defense firms cooperate and consolidate in order to achieve benefits in efficiency and economies of scale. While such admonishments are eminently reasonable, they are often eclipsed by short-run advantages to individual firms, and there is little evidence that the advice offered has been followed.

Conclusion

NATO's Prague Summit meeting of November 2002 promises to be, like the Washington Summit of 1999, one of the most important in the Alliance's history because it will mark the continued transformation of NATO's central mission from collective defense to politics and security. The most important public outcome of the summit will be to enlarge NATO's membership by up to seven new members. Also important will be the increased participation of Russia in NATO and discussions of means to coordinate and plan for ways of dealing with terrorist threats, including the use of weapons of mass destruction, to both the United States and Europe. And, of course, the members of NATO meeting in Prague will need to grapple with the resources and capabilities devoted to NATO's changing missions. As Secretary General Robertson noted at a NATO defense ministers meeting in May: [The Prague Summit] "must be a watershed in our efforts to ensure our forces are properly organized and equipped for their future missions, even if that means additional resources for defense and security, and indeed substantial changes of priority within our defense programs." [39]

---

[37] Quoted by David S. Yost, "The NATO Capabilities Gap and the European Union," *Survival* 42 (Winter 2000-2001).

[38] John Deutsch, Arnold Kanter, and Brent Scowcroft, "Saving NATO's Foundation," *Foreign Affairs*, vol 78, no. 6 (November/December 1999), pp. 54-67.

[39] Thom Shanker, "Rumsfeld Urges NATO to Beat Terrorist Forces to the Punch," *New York Times*, June 7, 2002, p. A 8.

Chapter 2: NATO, Terrorism and Cooperative Security

When the three airplanes crashed into the Pentagon and the World Trade Towers on September 11, 2001, the post-cold war era ended and a new one began. But uncertainty characterized this new era. As I saw the planes crash into the twin towers, I was first astonished, then my astonishment was replaced by anger, fear and eventually resolve. I was also reminded of the day after the first nuclear weapon was dropped on Hiroshima. On that day, when a then young political science professor, Bernard Brodie picked up his copy of *The New York Times*, he read the headline: "First Atomic Bomb Dropped on Japan; Missile [sic] Is equal to 20,000 Tons of TNT; Truman Warns Foe of a 'Rain of Ruin.'" Brodie read just two paragraphs of the story and then told his wife, "Everything I have written is obsolete."[40] On September 11, I felt similar feelings.

I thought that surely experts on terrorism would have some answers. A friend told me that one of the world's leading experts on terrorism met with his colleagues several days after the attacks. He was asked what his views of the attacks were given his twenty years of experience studying terrorism. He thought a moment and replied, "Nothing in my years of study prepared me for this kind of attack, and I really do not know what is going to happen."

Another nuclear strategist with whom I talked in the days after the attacks noted succinctly, that we lived in a "fool's paradise" prior to September 11, and that things would never be the same. Of course, he's right—for better or worse.

The September 11th attacks killed more American than were killed at Pearl Harbor, and most of those killed were civilians, in contrast to the surprise attack on Pearl Harbor. In ten years of fighting in Vietnam, the United States lost 58,167 citizens. On the single day of September 11th, the U.S. lost five percent of the number of citizens lost in the Vietnam War. It is the greatest loss of life resulting from hostilities since the Civil War.

I have no doubt that the September 11th attacks will displace the Cuban missile crisis has the focal point of study and analysis in political science and international relations for decades ahead. In addition, the attacks will profoundly influence the way in which Americans think about foreign and defense policy, just as Pearl Harbor cast its shadow over the decades of the cold war. In a similar way, Japan's surprise

---

[40] Fred Kaplan, *Wizards of Armegeddon* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1983), pp. 9-10.

attack on Port Arthur in the Russo-Japanese War caused Russians to fixate on the problem of surprise attack.

The importance of the attacks is undeniable, but how should the attacks influence our thinking about security in the North Atlantic region? This chapter is an initial attempt to explore the implications of terrorism for NATO and the relevance of thinking about cooperative security to the analysis of terrorism. The chapter is divided into three parts: (1) the "new terrorism" and NATO, (2) cooperative security, and (3) the prospects for dealing with terrorism cooperatively.

The "New Terrorism" and NATO

Terrorism is as old as recorded history. Numerous examples of terrorism can be found in the Old Testament, the common sacred text of Islam, Judaism and Christianity, so the phenomenon is hardly new; however, recent manifestations of terrorism are characterized by some new elements. In this section of the chapter, I will focus on definitions of terrorism, recent terrorist acts in NATO countries and the characteristics of what some have called "the new terrorism."

Long-time student of terrorism and former RAND analyst Brian Jenkins has defined terrorism as "the use or threatened use of force designed to bring about a political change."[41] Walter Laqueur defines it as "the illegitimate use of force to achieve a political objective when innocent people are targeted."[42] More recently, Jessica Stern has defined terrorism as "an act or threat of violence against non-combatants with the objective of exacting revenge, intimidating or otherwise influencing an audience."[43] In his definition, Bruce Hoffman calls attention to the psychological dimension: "Terrorism is fundamentally the use (or threatened use) of violence in order to achieve psychological effects in a particular target audience, fomenting widespread fear and intimidation."[44] We will return to the psychological dimension later in the chapter. Note that these analysts as well as most others who study terrorism exclude from their definitions large-scale massacres carried out by guerilla groups or militaries employing guns, machetes or other small arms. In addition, killings carried out by para-military groups motivated by ethnic hatred—for example,

---

[41] Brian Jenkins quoted by Jonathan R. White, *Terrorism: An Introduction* (Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole, 1991), p. 5.
[42] Walter Laqueur, *The Age of Terrorism* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1987), p. 72.
[43] Jessica Stern, *The Ultimate Terrorists* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2000), p. 11.
[44] Bruce Hoffman, "The American Perspective," *Survival* 42-2 (Summer 2000), p. 166.

Bosnian Serbs, Islamic radicals in Algeria, Rwandan militias and the Vietcong—are not defined as within the scope of conventional terrorism attacks.[45]

From 1925 through 1998, there were twelve cases of terrorism in which more than 100 people were killed; these are listed in table 1. Aggregate statistics on terrorism compiled by the RAND Corporation and St. Andrew's University reveal that the number of terrorist acts have declined in recent years: 484 (1991), 343 (1992), 360 (1993), 353 (1994), 278 (1995) and 250 (1996). [46] These figures show that the total for 1996 was the lowest number in twenty-three years. That is the good news. The bad news is that over time terrorism has become more lethal. In the 1970s, 17% of terrorist attacks killed someone; in the 1980s this increased to 19% and in the 1990s to 22%. As table 1 shows, the worst loss of life in a single terrorist event from 1983-2000 was the bombing of an Air India airliner over the Irish Sea in January 1985 that killed 329 people. To place the September 11th attacks in context, the loss of life in these attacks was more than nine times this. And, as British Prime Minister Blair has noted, more British citizens died in the World Trade Center than any other terrorist act in British history, including the attacks from the IRA over decades. A tragic characteristic of the "new terrorism" is that it is becoming significantly more lethal.

Terrorist acts are also increasingly targeted against either Americans or the United States itself. In its calculations of the sixteen most serious terrorist attacks from 1983-2001, the *Economist* calculates that fifty percent of these were targeted on Americans or the United States. [47] In my calculations contained in table 1, there were twenty-five acts of terrorism from 1983-2001, and of these twelve were directed at American targets. The four statements that Osama bin Laden has issued (1992, 1996, 1998 and 2001) focus primarily on the United States and Americans. Bin Laden told one interviewer: "You say I am fighting against the American civilians. My enemy is every American who is fighting against me even by paying taxes." [48] The new terrorism is increasingly directed against American targets.

Another aspect that distinguishes the "new terrorism" from "conventional terrorism" (if that is not an oxymoron) are the characteristics of the terrorists themselves. Traditionally, terrorists were young, single, uneducated and recent arrivals in the United States. The nineteen perpetrators of the September 11th

[45] Richard A. Falkenrath, "Confronting Nuclear, Biological and Chemical Terrorism," *Survival* 40-3 (Autumn 1998), p. 52.
[46] Bruce Hoffman in Ian Lesser, et al., *Countering the New Terrorism* (Santa Monica: CA: RAND Corporation, 1999), p. 11.
[47] See "The Killing Fields," *The Economist* (September 15, 2001), p. 18.

attacks were for the most part older and more mature; several were married and had children; some were educated; and most had lived in the United States for several years. Mohammed Atta, the suspected leader of the attacks, was 32 years old, had studied urban planning in Germany for seven years, had lived in the U.S. for several years, and his objective was to kill as many Americans as possible. He was clearly different than the traditional terrorist.

The new terrorism had profound implications for both the practice and study of international relations. One of the central topics in the field of international relations for both academic analysts and practitioners concerns the "actors" of world politics. States, as we know them, began to emerge in the aftermath of the Thirty Years War, and have been the central actors in world politics for the past three and a half centuries. Terrorism questions the assumption that states are the central actors, as Warren Christopher noted in his memoirs:

> What had happened at Khobar Towers was different in ways I had understood as an intellectual matter before my visit to Dhahran, but which I now felt viscerally, as if I had been an intended target. The enemy was not a state but a person or collection of people without an identifiable face. We had no knowledge of what they stood for or where they made their home. While we surmised that their motive derived from some extreme form of Islamic ideology and that they might be the willing tools of a rogue state, that suspicion, even if confirmed, led to no obvious conclusion as to how to anticipate or prevent such attacks in the future. [49]

A world in which states were not the central actors was a very different world from the one in which states had been the essential actors. Consider one of the most important concepts of international relations, deterrence. [50] As many have pointed out, as a concept and means of trying to prevent unacceptable behavior, deterrence is as old as humanity. Parents have practiced deterrence for millennia, telling their children, "Do not do x, because if you do, we will do y." In a like manner, leaders of one country would tell the leaders of another, "Do not attack my country, because if you do, my country will attack yours." With the advent of nuclear weapons, deterrent threats became more frightening; the leaders

---

[48] *Los Angeles Times* (September 15, 2001), p. A 16.
[49] Warren Christopher, *Chances of a Lifetime* (New York: Scribner, 2001), p. 230.

[50] There are many analyses of deterrence; wo of the best are: Patrick M. Morgan, *Deterrence: A Conceptual Analysis*, 2nd ed. (Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1983) and Alexander L. George and Richard Smoke, *Deterrence in American Foreign Policy: Theory and Practice* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1974).

of the United States and the Soviet Union told one another, "Do not attack my country, or my country will destroy your country." NATO was founded to deter a Soviet-Warsaw Pact attack on Western Europe.

There are, of course, states that support terrorism; the seven states that the United States has identified as supporters of terrorism are Iraq, Iran, Sudan, Syria, Libya, North Korea and Cuba. To the degree that these states can be linked to terrorist acts, they can be held responsible for those acts; however, it is increasingly difficult to establish such a link. In the case of the Pan American airplane that was bombed over Lockerbie, Scotland, two Libyan intelligence officers were charged and tried for the bombing rather than Libya. This characterized the way in which the United States attempted to deal with terrorism prior to the September 11th events. The U.S. sought to treat terrorist act as violations of laws and employed a law enforcement as its response.

One of the discontinuities that terrorism introduces into contemporary international relations is the difficulty of identifying who can be held responsible for acts of terrorism. Just as former Secretary of State Christopher noted in the quotation above, states often cannot and should be held responsible.

If states are not the perpetrators of terrorism (as is the case increasingly), then there are profound problems with some of the central concepts of security; consider, for example, the theory and practice of deterrence. One of the most important assumptions of deterrence is that "wars are generated by a process of reasoned calculations and can be prevented by the same means."[51] Terrorists who are not sponsored by a particular state, may not think in the same ways that state-based actors reason and calculate. Retribution cannot be inflicted upon opponents who cannot be identified and located. In addition, "deterrence has proved to be more credible among opponents of comparable capability than between unbalanced adversaries."[52]

The stability of deterrence rested, essentially, on a foundation of fear. Terrorism, like deterrence, is dependent on fear. Osama bin Laden and his followers in the September 11 attacks sought to inculcate a sense of fear among the American public in hopes of creating mass panic. And such panic, in turn, could lead to economic, political and social dislocations. The freefall of the stock market following the attacks

---

[51] John D. Steinbruner, *Principles of Global Security* (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution, 2000), p. 35.

[52] Ibid., p. 36.

showed both the degree to which the American and international economies are interdependent and the way in which mass panic could cripple the U.S. economy.

Although fear played a central role in both the cold war and the new post-September 11th international systems, it had very different results. In the cold war deterrent system, fear essentially promoted stability, and was essential for deterrence to operate successfully. Traditional national security was therefore dependent upon a feeling of insecurity; indeed, during the cold war, to some extent security was increased by insecurity. [53] That is no longer the case.

Whereas Franklin Delano Roosevelt said, "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself," proponents of the assured destruction variant of deterrence argued, in essence, "The only thing we have to fear is the absence of fear itself." In the context of the war on terrorism, fear leading to mass panic is clearly a threat to stability and order. A central question, if not the central question, at present is how to deal with the fear that most Americans (and to a lesser extent, citizens of other NATO member states) feel to a greater or lesser degree.

Cooperative Security

Human beings have always sought greater security through cooperation. From the earliest human family and tribal based communities, people have banded together to reduce their fears and to increase safety. The classical political philosophers noted this fact in their works. For example, in *The Leviathan*, Thomas Hobbes noted that the state of nature, which generations of political realists have compared to the international system, was "nasty, brutish and short," and to escape the dangerous anarchy of this system, people formed political communities which could not have functioned without cooperation. In this sense, cooperation was essential for security.

Villages and eventually cities were developed in part to provide security for their residents. Initially, walls around cities provided security. Around the third millennium B.C., wall-less cities arose in Mesopotamia. [54] The great cities of antiquity, Rome and Alexandria, flourished when walls were not needed to provide security; commerce and trade flourished in this environment; however, when the

---

[53] Dan Caldwell, "The Insecurity of Security: The Changing Relationship of Threats to Security in a Globalized World," Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, San Francisco, August 30-September 2, 2001.

[54] Joel Kotkin and Fred Siegel, "Attacks Threaten Future of Cities," *Los Angeles times* (October 14, 2001), p. M 6.

barbarians threatened, security declined along with the great cities. Mohammed Atta, the suspected leader of the September 11th attacks, studied urban planning in Germany for seven years. It is possible that he realized the importance of cities in the evolution of human beings sense of security and sought to attack one of the United States and the contemporary world's greatest cities to shake Americans' sense of security and to instill a feeling of fear and even panic.

How can Americans and the citizens of other NATO member states regain a sense of security in the face of the new (at least to Americans) fear-inducing threat of terrorism? One way to do so is to seek greater cooperation with one another. Since the disintegration of the Soviet Union and the end of the cold war, a number of security analysts have focused on the need and advantages of "cooperative security" and have produced both a significant body of literature on this subject as well as some experience in translating the theory into actual diplomatic practice. [55]

Three questions are considered in this section of the chapter: What is cooperative security? What are the elements of cooperative security? How does the cooperative security approach apply to combating terrorism?

Ashton Carter, William Perry and John Steinbruner—the three people who have contributed the most to the development of cooperative security—defined it as "in essence, a commitment to regulate the size, technical composition, investment patterns, and operational practices of all military forces by mutual consent for mutual benefit." [56]

A major study of collective security sponsored by the Brookings Institution focuses on five principal elements: "(1) the establishment of strict controls and security measures for nuclear forces, building on agreements of the recent past; (2) a regime for the conversion of defense industries whose excess capacity could lead to unwarranted global weapons proliferation and thus exacerbate international instability; (3) cooperative agreements regulating the size and composition of forces to emphasize defensive configurations and also to restrict the flow of dangerous technologies; (4) articulation of an

---

[55] For the principal works that outline the major elements of the cooperative security approach, see Ashton B. Carter, William J. Perry, and John D. Steinbruner, *A New Concept of Cooperative Security*, Brookings Occasional Papers (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution, 1992), Janne Nolan, ed., *Global Engagement: Cooperation and Security in the 21st Century* (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution, 1994); Ashton B. Carter and William J. Perry, *Preventive Defense: A New Security Strategy for America* (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution, 1999) and John D. Steinbruner, Principles of Global Security (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution, 2000).

internationally supported concept of effective and legitimate intervention, in which the use of force is always multilateral and elected only as a last resort; and (5) the promotion of transparency and mutual interest as the basis for monitoring agreed-upon constraints, including those on the diffusion of advanced technologies." [57]

In the conclusion of the major Brookings study on cooperative security, Janne Nolan and John Steinbruner "highlight the near-term priorities for security building in areas in which cooperative approaches are already embedded or could benefit from greater emphasis. These include (1) the denuclearization of the former Soviet Union, (2) agreements on conventional force deployments in Europe, (3) new security partnerships, (4) instruments for controlling technology diffusion, (5) the integration of existing control regimes, (6) conflict prevention and mediation, (7) conversion of excess defense capacity, and (8) defining a new leadership role for the United States in promoting nonproliferation and security cooperation." [58]

To what extent are these goals still relevant following the September 11th attacks and how would they help to combat terrorism?

The principal elements and near-term priorities of the cooperative security approach include those listed as follows in italics. [59] For each of these, I have indicated the degree to which they are relevant in the United States' and NATO's new war against terrorism.

1. *Establishment of strict controls and security measures for nuclear weapons, including the denuclearization of the former Soviet Union.* [60]

The successes in denuclearizing the former Soviet Union are some of the most significant accomplishments of the Clinton Administration. The world would be a far more dangerous place if Belarus, Ukraine and Kazakhstan still possessed nuclear weapons. Due to the foresight of both those in the executive and congressional branches of government, the United States assisted with the removal and/or dismantling of nuclear weapons and fissile materials from the three non-Russian former Soviet republics.

---

[56] Carter, Perry and Steinbruner, *A New Concept of Cooperative Security*, p. 6.

[57] "The Concept of Cooperative Security," in Nolan, *Global Engagement*, p. 10.

[58] Janne E. Nolan and John D. Steinbruner, "Transition Strategy for the 1990s," in Nolan, *Global Engagement*, p. 574.

[59] This list is a summary of Nolan, *Global Engagement*, pp. 10, 574.

In addition, the U.S. assisted Russia itself with the dismantling and safe-keeping of its nuclear weapons. Despite this success, much remains to be done.

There are an estimated 10,000 scientists in the former Soviet Union with the knowledge of how to create a nuclear weapon. A number of those are currently gainfully and legally employed through funds provided by the cooperative program in denuclearization funded by the United States. There are another estimated 5,000 scientists in the former USSR with the knowledge to created biological and chemical weapons. While some of these are employed with U.S. funds, many are not and may be tempted to work for Iraq, Iran, North Korea or other states which have conflicting goals with the U.S. and NATO More could be done to address the employment of former Soviet scientists in the CBW field.

The proponents of the cooperative security field in the past have focused primarily on Russia and its nuclear weapons as the single most important threat facing the U.S. This was certainly true during and immediately after the cold war, but is no longer true today. Indeed, the United States and Russia are cooperating with one another extensively in the war on terrorism. Nevertheless, much remains to be done to make nuclear weapons safer. For example, experts believe that Pakistan has between twenty to fifty nuclear weapons and that the safety mechanisms called "permissive action links" (PAL) are not installed on these. On the assumption that centralized governmental control of nuclear weapons is desirable, the United States could provide Pakistan, India and other countries that request them rudimentary PALs. [61]

2. *Cooperative agreements regulating the size and composition of forces.*

Cooperative agreements are definitely needed in the post-September 11th environment; however, these agreements will most likely involve the build-up of military forces rather than their reduction, at least until the United States and it s allies against terrorism conclude that terrorism is under control and that the threat from terrorism is reduced. Proponents of cooperative security did not have in mind military build-ups when they proposed this principle, but cooperation is just as necessary for military build-ups as decreases.

3. *Articulation of an international supported concept of effective and legitimate intervention in which the use of force is always multilateral and elected only as a last resort.*

---

[60] Carter and Perry place great emphasis on this and describe the Clinton Administration's efforts to denuclearize the former USSR in *Preventive Defense.*

[61] I first proposed this in ""Permissive Action Links: A Description and Proposal," *Survival (May/June 1987), pp. 224-236*.

Cooperative security calls for the integration of the planning and implementing of security policies by sates allied with one another. Many of the security threats, as conceived in broad terms, such as population growth, environmental degradation, cyber-warfare and terrorism can only be effectively dealt with on a multilateral basis. The unilateralist approach favored by the George W. Bush Administration during its first eight months in office was temporarily shelved following the attacks on the United States on September 11. Even though the United States is the world's last remaining superpower, even it cannot "go it alone;' the cooperation of other states will be essential to dealing with these threats, and such cooperation must go beyond that of the past. For example, terrorist cells in Europe and Muslim countries cannot be identified and dealt with short of unprecedented international cooperation, and this fragile coalition will not stay together unless its members perceive genuine cooperation and that military force is only used as a last resort.

4. *Cooperative security calls for new security partnerships.*

Proponents of cooperative security probably did not have in mind new partnerships with repressive regimes and/or nefarious individuals and organizations, but the war on terrorism and the threat that it poses to American society has driven the United States to conclude "new partnerships" that it would not have contemplated prior to September 11. It is a changed world, as the condemnations of the 9/11 attacks by Muhammar Kadafi and Hezbollah demonstrate.

5. *Advocates of collective security call for a new leadership role for the United States and NATO in promoting nonproliferation and security cooperation.*

Gone are the days of the President of the United States Ronald Reagan saying that proliferation of nuclear weapons is other states' business. In a world in which terrorists are actively seeking control of nuclear weapons, nonproliferation becomes vital, and the United States both as the "world's last remaining superpower" and the biggest target of international terrorism has a vital interest in controlling the spread of nuclear weapons. The future challenge will be to continue to shape American security policies so that they are responsive to the changing conditions and realities of the future.

There are some of the principles of the cooperative security approach that do not appear nearly as important after September 11th as before. For example, cooperative security advocates called for further agreements on conventional force deployments in Europe. Ironically, terrorism could contribute to the

achievement of this objective because there will be substantial pressure on American and European military forces, and some of these may have to be moved from Europe to the Middle East and South Asia to meet the demands of missions there. Cooperative security proponents have also called for the conversion of excess defense capacity to civilian uses. This is not an objective that is likely to be important for some time due to the increased threat to American and NATO interests.

Cooperative security proponents focus primarily on Russia as the principal security threat confronting the United States. Steinbruner, for example, points out in the conclusion of his book, *Principles of Global Security*, published in 2000: "A dedicated U.S. policy to achieve transformation would necessarily focus on Russia as the most urgent and most consequential application."[62] In their call for a new security policy for the U.S., Ashton Carter and William Perry build their proposals on the foundation of cooperative security and focus primarily on the American-Russian relationship. I suspect that these analysts would no longer make the claim for the preeminence of this relationship in the aftermath of September 11. Indeed, the relationship has changed significantly with Russia now cooperating with the United States in allowing overflights of Russia to American bases in Uzbekistan. Who would have thought that such cooperation would be possible?

Cooperative security was developed as a new way of thinking about the threats and opportunities facing the United States and NATO in the future. This approach emphasized different elements than the traditional approach to the study and implementation of security. The events of September 11 have changed the security priorities of the United States, and it is tempting to go back to the traditional security approach; however, that is not viable because the same threats that existed on September 10th including environmental degradation, demographic pressures and cyber-threats still exist today. To be sure, they are given different priority, but they remain and must be dealt with in the future. The cooperative security framework provides one means to begin to thank about how the United States and NATO might deal with the vastly complicated and threatening world of the twenty-first century. Steinbruner has noted: "As Soren Kierkegaard once observed, life is understood backward but lived forward. Thinking forward under uncharted circumstances is risky, confusing, and contentious but must nonetheless be attempted."[63]

---

[62] S*Principles of Global Security*, p. 227.
[63] Ibid., p. 22.

Table 1: Chronology of Major Terrorist Acts, 1983-2001

Date	Event	Suspect(s)	US as Target?	# Killed	# Wounded
4/83	US Embassy, Beirut		Yes	63	
10/83	US Marine Barracks, Beirut	Hezbollah	Yes	299	
1/85	Air India over Irish Sea			329	
1986	Attack on German disco US bombing of Libya	Libya	Yes	2	200
1987	Bombing of S. Korean plane			117	
1987	Car bomb in Sri Lanka			113	
10/88	Pan Am 103/Lockerbie	Libya	Yes	270	
1989	Bombing of Avianca plane			107	
9/89	UTA flight over Chad			170	
2/93	World Trade Center bomb	Al-Qaeda	Yes	6	1.000
1993	Bombings in Bombay			235	
7/94	Jewish Center, Argentina			96	
10/94	Suicide bus bomb, Tel Aviv	Iran		23	
3/95	Tokyo subway sarin attack	Aum Shinrikyo	12	5,500	
4/95	Federal building in Okla.	Tim McVeigh	Yes	168	
6/96	Al-Khobar towers	Iran & Al-Qaeda?	Yes	19	500
1996	Truck bomb, Colombo	Tamil Tigers		1,400	
11/97	Tourists in Luxor, Egypt			62	
8/7/98	US Embassies in Kenya	Al-Qaeda	Yes	224	5,500
8/98	Omagh town bomb			29	
9/99	Moscow apartment			118	
10/00	*USS Cole*	Al-Qaeda	Yes	17	
9/11/01	Pentagon	Al-Qaeda	Yes	120	
9/11/01	World Trade Center	Al-Qaeda	Yes	5,200	
9/11/01	United Airlines	Al-Qaeda	Yes	92	

Chapter 3: The US, Europe and the War on Terrorism

> As deadly as the World Trade Center disaster was, it could have produced a hundredfold more victims if the terrorists had possessed nuclear or biological weapons. And the future threat could come from hostile nations as well as terrorists. [64]
>
> Former US Secretary of Defense William Perry

The United States is now at war, and Europe is not. That is a fact of international life and does much to explain the differences between the United States and Europe at the present time, just as the threat posed by the Soviet Union to Europe did much to explain the differences between the US and Europe during the cold war. In the cold war, the USSR threatened; now terrorists threaten. What can the United States and Europe do to meet this contemporary threat? What effect has the war on terrorism had on US-European relations? This chapter will address the United States' and European approaches to international relations and the war on terrorism.

The United States' Approach to International Relations

Journalists, politicians, historians and political scientists all anthropomorphize world politics by imputing human-like actions to states in international relations. Thus, one commonly reads that the "United States decided" or "France acted," or some such other short hand way of referring to a country's behavior. Napoleon simplified the problem of referring to France's actions by stating simply, "I am France." Of course, it is difficult to escape such shortcuts. In the United States' case, it is both fair and relatively accurate to refer to the actions of a particular presidential administration in simplifying actions "by the United States."

The George W. Bush administration entered office in January 2001 emphasizing the need for unilateral action by the United States in international relations. To be sure, this approach was not unique to the Bush administration; the Clinton administration had refused to sign the Land Mine Treaty, and the U.S. Senate had defeated the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, both agreements that had broad international support. But the new Bush administration seemed to revel in taking advantage of the dominant position of the United States in world politics by disassociating itself from a number of popular international

---

[64] William J. Perry, "Preparing for the Next Attack," *Foreign Affairs*, vol. 80, no. 6 (November/December 2001), p. 31.

agreements, including the International Criminal Court, the Protocol to the Biological Weapons Treaty and the Kyoto Treaty on global warming.

Following the terrorist attacks on the United States of September 11, 2001, President Bush called for international cooperation against the clear and present danger facing the United States. In his speech the day after the attacks, President Bush requested other countries to assist the US in combating terrorism. September 11th transformed President Bush from a devout unilateralist to a multilateralist, but like many "fox hole conversions," this transformation proved ephemeral. When the US responded to the attacks on October 7, 2001, by attacking the Taliban and Al-Qaeda in Afghanistan, the US acted only with the significant assistance of British forces. Ultimately, seventeen of the United States' eighteen NATO allies would have advisors or troops in Afghanistan, but these were not in large numbers. For all intents and purposes, the Afghan operation was an American operation. The near complete return to a unilateral position by the United States was marked by the publication a year after the September 11th attacks of "The National Security Strategy of the United States:"

> While the United States will constantly strive to enlist the support of the international community, we will not hesitate to act alone, if necessary, to exercise our right of self-defense by acting preemptively against … terrorists, to prevent them from doing harm against our people and our country…"[65]

The problem, of course, is that to combat terrorism effectively requires international cooperation. Even the "world's last remaining superpower" simply cannot effectively fight terrorism by itself. In an important article in the *Financial Times*, Sir Michael Howard, one of the most respected historians in the world wrote:

> Terror will continue and worse, widespread sympathy with terror. But American power placed at the service of an international community legitimized by representative institutions and the rule of law, accepting its constraints and inadequacies but continually working to improve them: that is a very different matter. It is by doing this that the US has earned admiration, respect, and indeed affection throughout the world over the past half century. But if that relationship is to continue, and respect to overcome hate, the US must cease to think of itself as a heroic lone protagonist in a cosmic war against 'evil,' and reconcile itself to a less spectacular and more humdrum rule: that of the leading participant in a flawed but still indispensable system of cooperative global existence. [66]

Following the rapid and relatively inexpensive victory by the United States in Afghanistan, American leaders looked on the world's horizon and saw ominous clouds on the political horizon: the Arab-Israeli

---

[65] *The National Security Strategy of the United States (2002)*, available on the *New York Times* website: www.nytimes.com

[66] Sir Michael Howard, "Smoke on the Horizon," *Financial Times*, September 7-8, 2002, p. iii.

conflict in the Middle East, problems over Kashmir between the two newest nuclear weapons states of India and Pakistan, but the most ominous threat to members of the Bush administration appeared to be emanating from Iraq.

The history of Iraq is problematic and contentious. The Ottoman Empire controlled the area that is now Iraq from the 1500s until the end of World War I. Then the League of Nations granted a mandate to Great Britain to oversee the newly created Kingdom of Iraq. The British brought in a member of Syria's Hashemite royal family who was named King Faisal I of Iraq in 1921. The Kingdom of Iraq lasted until 1958 when King Faisal II was killed in a coup by the military. Five years later, the Baath ("renewal") Party took over. [67] Saddam Hussein who had gone into exile following a failed coup attempt in 1957 returned to Iraq following the takeover of the Baath Party. In July 1979, Saddam took over the presidency of Iraq and has exercised brutal, repressive power throughout his near quarter century reign. His regime has brutally repressed both the Kurds and the Shiites, including the use of poison gas. From 1980-1988, Iraq fought a brutal war with Iran in which there were more than a million casualties. In this war, Iraq used mustard gas, tabun and sarin poison.

In August 1990, Iraq attacked and occupied its fellow Arab neighbor, Kuwait. At the time, experts estimated that Iraq possessed ten percent of the world's proven oil reserves, Kuwait another ten percent and Saudi Arabia twenty-five percent. Thus by taking control of Kuwait, Saddam controlled one-fifth of the world's oil reserves, and had he been able to gain control of Saudi Arabia's oil fields, he would have controlled almost half of the world's oil. That, more than any idealistic support for the Kuwaiti monarchy, is why the United States, joined by thirty-one other countries, opposed Iraq and ultimately defeated Iraq forcing it to withdraw from Kuwait.

In order to end of the Gulf War, Saddam Hussein agreed to a number of United Nations resolutions that called for comprehensive inspections and partial disarmament by Iraq. The UN sponsored inspections conducted by the UN Special Committee (UNSCOM) took place from April 1991-December 1998, and duing this period 1,015 sites in Iraq were surveyed and 272 separate inspections were carried

---

[67] This brief history corresponds to that presented by James Fallows, "The Fifty-first State?" *The Atlantic Monthly* (November 2002), p. 60.

out. [68] More Iraqi weapons were destroyed by UNSCOM than were destroyed during the Golf War, including 40,000 munitions for chemical weapons, 411 tons of chemical warfare agents and 48 SCUD missiles. That's the good news, but there is bad news as well; namely, that Iraq as of mid-2002 possessed forty percent of the weapons that it had prior to the Gulf War; that experts believe that Iraq possesses stocks of chemical and biological weapons; and that Iraq has pursued a vigorous program to develop nuclear weapons. In September 2002, British Prime Minister Blair presented impressive evidence that Iraq possesses substantial chemical and biological weapons, ballistic missiles and that it is working on developing nuclear weapons. [69] In addition, the International Institute for Strategic Studies has concluded that Iraq could assemble nuclear weapons within several months of obtaining fissile sources (highly enriched uranium or plutonium) from foreign sources.

This was the political environment in which the Bush administration considered what to do about Iraq. Even before the attacks on the US of September 11th, the Bush administration was trying to decide what to do about Iraq; the terrorist attacks underscored the importance of Iraq. [70] Just as Pearl Harbor and the Cuban missile crisis cast their shadows on the twentieth century, the attacks of 9/11 will cast their shadow on the twenty-first century. American actions in Afghanistan were both impressive and relatively effective: impressive in that some 300 special forces operators were able to work with the Northern Alliance and to call in airstrikes on Taliban and Al-Qaeda targets, forcing them to surrender or flee. US forces were able to achieve a victory in Afghanistan, a feat that alluded the British in the nineteenth century and the Soviet Union in the last part of the twentieth. With access to technology, US forces were the modern equivalent to the conquistadors of the sixteenth century. But, of course, two of the principal targets of the US manhunt in Afghanistan remain at large: Osama bin Laden and the head of the Taliban, Mullah Mohammed Omar.

The US victory in Afghanistan and the unilateralist preference of the Bush administration coupled with the trauma of September 11th resulted in the administration calling for a new national security strategy

---

[68] These data are taken from *Iraq's Weapons of Mass Destruction: The Assessment of the British Government*, September 2002, p. 40; available at www.number-10.ac.uk.

[69] *Iraq's Weapons of Mass Destruction;* also see Warren Hoge, "Blair Says Iraqis Could Launch Chemical Warheads in Minutes," *New York Times*, September 25, 2002, p. A1.

[70] For an excellent overview of issues related to Iraq, see Kenneth M. Pollack, *The Theatening Storm: The Case for Invading Iraq* (New York: Random House, 2002).

for the United States that differed in radical ways from previous US strategy. The new strategy called for pre-empting threats against the US rather than waiting to receive the first blow. In addition, the new strategy rejected one of the foundations on which American defense strategy had been built since World War II--deterrence. In the view of the Bush administration:

> Traditional concepts of deterrence will not work against a terrorist enemy whose avowed tactics are wanton destruction and the targeting of innocents; whose so-called soldiers seek martyrdom in death and whose most potent protection is statelessness. The overlap between states that sponsor terror and those that pursue WMD compels us to action. [71]

Europe

Of course, everyone knows where Europe is, but Americans–and I might add Europeans--are not sure what "Europe" is. Is it a collection of sovereign states including most importantly Germany, the United Kingdom and France? Or is it a collection of semi-sovereign fifteen states integrated in the European Union? Or is Europe a product of one of the most successful alliances of all time, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)? Let us consider each of these alternatives.

The United Kingdom is the United States' closest ally due to both their common culture and history. The relationship between the two countries became even closer during World War II when President Franklin Roosevelt and Prime Minister Winston Churchill referred to the "special relationship" between their two countries. Despite some differences during the cold war (most notably differences over the British-French-Israeli Suez invasion), the US and the United Kingdom remain very close allies. In the war on terrorism, Prime Minister Tony Blair has been the strongest supporter of the United States. The British government issued a paper summarizing the case linking Al-Qaeda to the attacks on the US on September 11th and also distributed a report on Iraq's weapons of mass destruction. [72] Blair has paid a political price domestically for his support of the US; he is regularly portrayed in the British press as "Bush's poodle." [73]

If the United Kingdom is the United States' closest ally and principal supporter in its current campaign against Iraq, Germany has become its harshest critic. This has been a role traditionally played by

---

[71] *The National Security Strategy of the United States* (2002).
[72] *Iraq's Weapons of Mass Destruction*
[73] Warren Hoge, "Tony Blair's Role: Statesman, or Poodle?" *New York Times*, September 26, 2002, p. A 14.

France, but in the German election held in September 2002, Gerhard Schroeder campaigned on a platform very critical of the US. This is a new role for Germany.

The United States defeated, occupied and de-nazified Germany in the late 1940s. As the cold war between the United States and the USSR developed, Germany became one of the most volatile areas in the world. In 1948, the USSR and East Germany closed the *Autobahn* access to West Berlin; in 1961 the Berlin Wall was built, one of the most visible symbols of the cold war. For its part, the United States considered Germany, and Berlin in particular, to be an outpost of freedom, a sentiment voiced by President Kennedy when he visited Berlin proclaiming "Ich bin ein Berliner." At the height of the cold war, the US had 440,000 soldiers stationed in West Germany. Even fifty-seven year after the end of World War II, the US still has 120,000 military personnel stationed in Europe and 70,000 of these are stationed in Germany.

During the past several years, Schroeder has portrayed Germany as becoming a "normal nation-state" similar to Britain or France. He has spoken of a "German way" in foreign policy which has made some people with memories of the old German *Sonderweg* ("special way") nervous.[74] In the September 2002, Chancellor Gerhard Schroeder faced a tough challenger and a difficult election. At the same time as the election campaign, President Bush was making the case to attack Iraq, a position that was very unpopular throughout Europe, including Germany. Perhaps reflecting or even responding to German public opinion, Schroeder announced that Germany would not participate in any invasion of Iraq, even if it was conducted under the United Nations' auspices. [75] Widening the rift between Washington and Berlin, a member of Schroeder's Social Democratic Party and cabinet, reportedly compared the political tactics of President Bush concerning Iraq to those of Hitler. These remarks created a major split between the US and Germany which the American government did not appear to be anxious to repair. [76]

Writing in the *International Herald Tribune*, John Vinocur wrote: "For the first time since 1945, Germany's leadership has moved to totally separate its policy from that of the United States on an issue of

---

[74] Timothy Garton Ash, "Europe Has One Voice. And Another and Another," *New York Times*, September 22, 2002, p. 4.
[75] Steven Erlanger, "Germans Vote in a Tight Election in Which Bush, Hitler and Israel Became Key Issues," *New York Times*, September 22, 2002, p. 14.
[76] Steven Erlanger, "Moves by Germany to Mend Relations Rebuffed by Bush," *New York Times*, September 24, 2002, p. A 1; John Hendren, "Rumsfeld Makes Case Against Baghdad to NATO," *Los Angeles Times*, September 25, 2002, p. A 9.

war and peace. The subject is Iraq…"[77] Knowledgeable commentators in the US claimed that "U.S.-German relations were at their lowest level in decades"[78] and the *New York Times* editorialized: This was the first time since World War II that a leader of a major ally won an election by campaigning against American policy."[79]

Since the end of World War II, France has consistently been the principal critic of American foreign policy within the western alliance. President Jacques Chirac has called for a United Nations ultimatum to Iraq calling for inspections without authorizing the use of military force. Should Iraq not comply with this ultimatum, then the use of force would require a second UN resolution. This position was opposed by the Bush administration that wanted one resolution authorizing inspections and the use of force if necessary. Asked if the western alliance were breaking down with the US and Britain on one side and Germany and France on the other, Chirac replied, "It's not Schroeder and I on one side, and Bush and Blair on the other; it's Bush and Blair on one side and all the others on the other side."[80]

Other French leaders were similarly critical of US policy toward Iraq. Foreign Minister Lionel Jospin called on the US not "to yield to the temptation of unilateralism."[81] In late September 2002, US Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld presented the case for attacking Iraq to NATO and French Defense Minister Michele Alliot-Marie responded by noting that a war with Iraq could cause conflict among Muslims and could give other countries a justification for attacking preemptively. "I think this is extremely dangerous because it could open all sorts of possibilities."[82]

President Chirac has made it clear that France would not simply follow Washington's lead uncritically. "In life, you know, one must not confuse friends with sycophants. It's better to have only a few friends than to have a lot of sycophants. And I'm telling you that France considers itself one of the

---

[77] John Vinocur, "German Position on Iraq Could Be Destabilizing for Allies," *International Herald Tribune*, September 7-8, 2002, p. 3.
[78] Jeffrey Fleishman, "Schroeder Softens Tone in U.S., *Los Angeles Times*, September 24, 2002, p. A 3.
[79] "Germany Speaks," *New York Times*, September 24, 2002, p. A 30.
[80] "French Leader Offers America Both Friendship and Criticism," *New York TimesI,* September 9, 2002, p. A 9.
[81] "French Foreign Minister Blasts Washington's Texas Foreign Policy," Agence France-Press (Paris), Febraury 20, 2002.
[82] Hendren, Rumsfled Makes Case Against Baghdad to NATO," p. A 9.

friends of the Americans, not necessarily one of its sycophants. And when we have something to say, we say it." [83]

Beginning with the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648, Europe has consisted of nation-states. But these states acted in some ways that were enormously destructive; to wit World Wars I and II. In the aftermath of these most destructive wars in human history, the leaders of Europe sought to create structures and processes that would prevent a third cataclysmic war. Postwar statesmen founded the European Coal and Steel Community to increase functional cooperation between Germany and France in the production of steel. Later, the European Economic Community was founded and this developed into the European Community and most recently the European Union. This integrated community of nation-states is a second way of thinking about Europe.

Chris Patten, the European Union's Commissioner for External Relations, has stated, "The European Union is 15 individual states. Foreign policy goes to the heart of what it means to be a sovereign state. The wonder is that we manage to develop common positions on as many issues as we do." [84]

The European Union did not act effectively in response to the crises in Bosnia and Kosovo. Partially as a result of these failures, the EU has adopted plans for a common defense policy, including plans for a rapid reaction deployment force. The US has generally been lukewarm to the creation of this force believing that it could detract from resources that would otherwise go to NATO.

A third way of thinking about Europe is to consider it as a product of one of history's most successful alliances, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). Lord Ismay noted that the purpose of NATO was threefold: "To keep the Russians out, the Germans down and the Americans in." NATO not only succeeded in achieving these objectives, it contributed to the demise of communism in both Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union itself.

NATO was founded in 1949 with twelve members; in 1952 Greece and Turkey joined, followed in 1955 by Germany, Spain in 1982, and Poland, the Czech Republic and Hungary in 1999. Most observers believe that an additional seven European states will be invited to join at the Prague Summit in November 2002. NATO was established in accordance with the UN Charter that allows for the creation of collective self defense organizations.

---

[83] "French Leader Offers America Both Friendship and Criticism," p. A 9.

When the European Union did not take effective actions to stop the genocide in Bosnia, NATO intervened and stopped the killing. When Slobodan Milosevic threatened to extend his genocidal policies to neighboring Macedonia, NATO deployed a small force to deter him. This force has been remarkably successful in achieving its objective, and there is now some consideration being given to ending the Macedonian deployment.[85] When Milosevic continued his genocidal policies in Kosovo, NATO again reacted with a seventy-eight day bombing campaign that stopped the killing in Kosovo.

In essence, as the German analyst Joseph Joffe has pointed out, NATO can be thought of as two separate organizations: "NATO I" sought to deter the Soviet Union from invading Western Europe and "NATO II," as demonstrated in Bosnia and Kosovo, seeks to build peace and stability in the Balkans. [86]

Conclusion

The relationship of the United States and Europe--whatever we consider that to be--has already been significantly affected by the war on terrorism and will be even more greatly affected if the United States attacks Iraq. The bilateral relationship between the US and Germany, for example, has been significantly tarnished and may not ever return to the close relationship that the two countries enjoyed throughout the cold war. Due to Prime Minister Blair's support of President Bush's policies toward Iraq, the ":special relationship" between the US and UK may survive an attack on Iraq, but that could be at the cost of Britain's relations with other European states, most notably France and Germany.

The unilateral invasion of Iraq by the United States and the United Kingdom could fundamentally change the relationship between the US and Europe. For half a century that relationship was cemented by the most successful alliance in history, NATO. If the US and UK "go it alone," they could be ostracized by other European states.

Europeans consider the war on terrorism and the war against Iraq to be related, but separate issues. Europeans were united in the sympathy and support for the United Sates following the September 11th attacks. The day after the attack, *Le Monde's* headline read "We are all Americans." A year after the attacks, while there is still sympathy for the victims of the attacks, there is not substantial European support for extending the war on terrorism to Iraq.

---

[84] Chris Patten quoted by Ash, "Europe Has One Voice," p. 4.
[85] "NATO May Declare Victory in Macedonia," *Wall Street Journal*, September 6-8, 2002, p. A 1.

As the attacks in the US, Yemen and Indonesia demonstrate, terrorism is now truly global and its targets are no longer limited to the United States and Americans. The only way to confront such a threat is multilaterally; no one state–even the single most powerful country in the world today--can confront and lessen the threat of terrorism. Even an international coalition cannot ever eradicate terrorism; any time an individual is willing to commit suicide for the cause, it is impossible to stop such homicidal actions.

The United States, assisted by the United Kingdom, can attack and defeat Saddam Hussein's forces; however, such a victory could be short-lived if the costs of the attack include the US-European alliance that has kept the peace for more than half a century and at the cost of the world's economy that, despite its shortcomings, has provided increasing prosperity for the world's population since the end of World War II. An attack on Iraq could result in major disruptions in the world's oil supply and this, in turn, could have significant ripple effects on the world economy given the central place of oil in the international economy.

---

[86] Joseph Joffe, "The Alliance is Dead. Long Live the New Alliance," *New York Times*, September 29, 2002, p. 3.