



**STRATEGY
RESEARCH
PROJECT**

The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Defense or any of its agencies. This document may not be released for open publication until it has been cleared by the appropriate military service or government agency.

**THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE WESTERN EUROPEAN UNION
FOR EUROPE AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**

BY

**COLONEL (GS) CLAUDIO GRAZIANO
Italian Army**

&

**COLONEL (GS) WOLF-DIETER SKODOWSKI
German Army**

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A:

**Approved for public release.
Distribution is unlimited.**

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 3

USAWC CLASS OF 1997

U.S. ARMY WAR COLLEGE, CARLISLE BARRACKS, PA 17013-5050



19970625 013

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A:
Approved for public
release. Distribution is
unlimited.

USAWC Strategy Research Project

**The Significance
of the
Western European Union
for Europe
and its Relationship
to the United States of America**

by

**Colonel (GS) Claudio Graziano,
Italian Army, Class 97**

&

**Colonel (GS) Wolf-Dieter Skodowski,
German Army, Class 97**

**Project Adviser
Dr. Thomas-Durell Young**

The views expressed in this paper are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Defense of Italy and Germany or any of their agencies. This document may not be released for open publication until it has been cleared by the appropriate military service or government agency.

**U.S. Army War College, Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania/USA
February 10, 1997**

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 8

ABSTRACT

AUTHORS: WOLF-DIETER SKODOWSKI
CLAUDIO GRAZIANO

TITLE: THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE WESTERN EUROPEAN UNION FOR
EUROPE AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO THE UNITED STATES OF
AMERICA

DATE: FEBRUARY 10, 1997 PAGES: 88 CLASSIFICATION: UNCLASSIFIED

Starting with the current situation of Western European Union (WEU) the paper describes the challenges and risks Europe is confronted with, in and around Europe, which require adaptations not only from the European Union (EU) and its designated defense arm, the WEU, but also from NATO and Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE). The paper addresses, thereafter, the United States' role and interest in Europe, which lead to consequences concerning the future role of WEU embedded in NATO as well as in EU, in order to support a burden-sharing between United States and Europe. The paper suggests a future role for WEU, functionally and limited regionally, which complements the missions of NATO and OSCE in the security architecture in and for Europe. In consequence, the United States, as the "world's policeman", would be relieved, which would increase United States' will and resolve to remain committed in Europe since the new relationship would be based on an equal share of risks and responsibilities in a global engagement.

Table of Contents

- 1. Introduction**
- 2. WEU - Its Members, Objectives, Organization and Capabilities**
 - 2.1. The WEU Members**
 - 2.1.1. Rights and Obligations**
 - 2.1.2. Dialogue and Information Arrangements**
 - 2.1. The WEU Objectives**
 - 2.2. The WEU Organization**
 - 2.2.1. Intergovernmental Structure**
 - 2.2.2. Parliamentary Assembly**
 - 2.3. The Military Capabilities**
 - 2.3.1. The Petersberg Declaration and the First Operational Tests**
 - 2.3.2. The Birmingham Declaration**
 - 2.3.3. Forces Answerable to WEU**
- 3. Risks and Challenges in and for Europe**
 - 3.1. The Central European Perspective**
 - 3.1.1. The Central Eastern and South Eastern European States**
 - 3.1.2. Russia**
 - 3.1.3. Ukraine**
 - 3.2. The Southern European Perspective**
 - 3.2.1. General Thoughts**
 - 3.2.2. Strategic Challenges from some Balkan Countries**
 - 3.2.3. The Crisis Arc from the Maghreb to the Arabian Gulf**
 - 3.2.4. North and Equatorial Africa**
 - 3.2.5. Turkey**
 - 3.3. Indivisible European Security**
- 4. WEU / NATO - Organizational Relationships in Change**
- 5. The OSCE in the European Concert**
- 6. The United States and her Interests in Europe**
- 7. The Political and Military Perspective for WEU**
 - 7.1. The Political Perspective**
 - 7.2. The Military Perspective**
 - 7.2.1. First Steps Into a New Future**
 - 7.2.2. Areas for Further WEU Initiatives**
 - 7.2.2.1. Peace Support Operations**
 - 7.2.2.2. A Mediterranean PfP Initiative**
 - 7.2.2.3. Required Changes in Attitude**
- 8. A Renovated U.S./European Partnership for a New Epoch**
- 9. Conclusion**
- 10. Endnotes**
- 11. Bibliography**

The Significance of the Western European Union for Europe and its Relationship to the United States of America

1. Introduction

“For the purposes of strengthening peace and security and promoting unity and of encouraging the progressive integration of Europe”¹ an European security organization was founded in March 17, 1948, known as the Brussels Treaty. Founding members were Belgium, France, Luxembourg, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom. In September 1948, a military organization was set up under the Brussels Treaty known as the “Western Union” or “Brussels Treaty Organization” in reaction to a series of dramatic political events beginning in 1947. These included direct threats to the sovereignty of Norway, Greece, Turkey and other Western European countries, the June 1948 coup in Czechoslovakia² and the illegal blockade of Berlin which began in April of the same year³.

Recognizing that Western Europe alone would not be capable of resisting a Soviet threat, the signatories of the Brussels Treaty opened negotiations with the United States and Canada with the objective of concluding a collective Defense Pact. The Atlantic Alliance came into being, when in Washington on April 4, 1949, the North Atlantic Treaty was signed by twelve countries⁴.

While NATO took on the responsibility to organize Western Europe's defense, the Western Union's⁵ activities as an intergovernmental organization gradually slowed down. Despite the creation of European Political Cooperation, it was still impossible for the European Community to formulate a genuine common security policy going beyond the purely economic aspects. Although in 1954 Italy and Germany were included in the WEU⁶, a long period of hibernation followed for the WEU. Reactivation of the WEU, meanwhile joined by Portugal and Spain was required by the United States's demand for increased European defense efforts, i.e., burden sharing, the cost of which was linked with expensive items such as "Strategic Defense Initiative"⁷. The Western European Union Rome Declaration of 1984 stated that, with the "continuing necessity to strengthen Western security, better use should be made of WEU, not only to contribute to the security of Western Europe but also to improve the common defense of all the countries of the Atlantic Alliance."⁸ Still being far away from having a military organization at its disposal, WEU at least became a forum for regular meetings of European foreign and defense ministers, thereby organizing and coordinating the Western European point of view in a better way.

The unification of Germany and the end of the Soviet empire over half of Europe in 1990 changed the situation totally. Europe was challenged to think about its collective future. Most of the European nations, led by France, agreed that Germany's unification was to be connected with decisive steps towards a real European Union, "to give a more powerful

unified Germany a home in a unified Europe.”⁹ This European Union should not only encompass the old EC members, but all European nations; those just liberated from Soviet dominance and those which deliberately remained neutral in the Cold War era. During this era, the United States, as the remaining super power, adopted more and more a role as the world’s policeman. This started a process which resulted in a strong realization that Europeans had to take more care of themselves.

The above analysis leads to the questions: How can WEU serve in the future as the defense arm of Europe? Which capabilities do as the WEU have and which capabilities need to be developed? Even more important is the question what if the WEU might be an organization that will threaten the existence of NATO and/or that will drive United States and Canada out of Europe.

This will address the question of “Quo Vadis WEU?” and its consequences. This will be introduced by a short description of the current WEU situation, i.e. objectives and organization of WEU. The intensity of the further WEU development, however, is also influenced by the challenges and risks interrelated with enlargement and reinforcement of European unification as well with the situation of those European countries, neither joining EU nor WEU, and those countries at the edge of the European continent. The perspective to these challenges and risks might differ from North to South and from West to East. Based on the origin of the authors, the paper will concentrate on two sides: a Central European perspective, mainly Germany, will deal above all with risks and challenges in

the East and Southeast of Europe. The Southern European perspective, mainly Italy, will especially deal with the risks and challenges stemming from Southern Europe and those being influenced by the arc of insecurities reaching from Morocco to the Caucasus region as well as North Africa.

This will be followed by addressing NATO's future role in Europe, which of course has to be seen in close relationship to the development of the EU and the WEU. In addition, a further organization has importance in the European concert: OSCE. Therefore, some thoughts are necessary about the role OSCE should play. European interests and intentions of the United States, being member of both - NATO and OSCE - of course, need to be reflected as well. This sets the frame and scope to deal with the future role of the WEU in the European context and to answer both of the decisive questions. Is the WEU capable to become the defense arm of Europe? Will the WEU be capable to assume an improved operational capability and might this eventually result in driving United States out of Europe? This provides the foundation for the conclusion, which will discuss possibilities and ways to achieve both: to preserve a close link between USA and Europe on the basis of an ongoing U.S. engagement in Europe, and a stronger and more independent role of Europe in the military field.

2. WEU - Its Members, Objectives, Organization and Capabilities

With its envisioned dual function as the defense component of the European Union and a means to strengthen the European pillar of NATO, the Western European Union is required to play an important role in European defense and security issues. This is reflected in the increasing number of members, associate members and partners, and observers, in the adaptation of WEU objectives to new requirements, and a changed structure in the effort, to improve the WEU's military capabilities.

2.1. The WEU Members

During the last decade, participation in the WEU has expanded dramatically. Until 1989, it had only seven Members, reinforced by Portugal and Spain in 1990. Today, 28 countries attend its meetings as Full Members, Associate Members, Observers or Associate Partners. Some meetings involve only the 10 Full Members; others the 18 Full Members, Associate Members and Observers; others the 28 Full Members, Associate Members, Observers and Associate Partners. Additionally, some specialized meetings are held between the 13 Members and Associate Members.

All Full Members (Belgium, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, United Kingdom) of the WEU are members of NATO and of the EU. The three Associate Members of the WEU (Iceland, Norway and Turkey) are also members of NATO, but they are not EU members. The five Observers (Austria, Denmark,

Finland, Ireland and Sweden), by contrast, are members of the EU, but with the exception of Denmark,¹⁰ are not NATO Allies. The ten Associate Partners (Republic of Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Republic of Estonia, Republic of Hungary, Republic of Latvia, Republic of Lithuania, Republic of Poland, Romania, Republic of Slovenia, Slovak Republic) have all signed Association Agreements with the EU.

2.1.1. Rights and Obligations

The Associate Members and Observers are able to participate in meetings of the Council,¹¹ unless a majority of the Full Members decides otherwise. Associate Members may table proposals, while Observers may only formally speak at the request of the Council. Neither Associate Members nor Observers can block decisions reached by consensus among Members. Associate Partners may only attend alternate Council meetings, and, in line with Associate Members and Observers, may not block decisions of Members.

Associate Members may participate in WEU working groups except for the Security Committee. Observers, although formally only permitted to participate by invitation, may in practice attend all the working groups except for the following: the Defense Representatives' Group (DRG) - also known as the Security Committee; the Space Group; the Special Working Group (SWG), formerly the EuroGroup; and the 13-nation Western European Armaments Group (WEAG). Associate Partners are invited to attend working groups, subject to a Council decision on a case-by-case basis.

Associate Members may nominate officers to serve in the Planning Cell.¹² Observers attend meetings of the Military Delegates Group (MDG), including those which review the activities of the Planning Cell. Associate Partners receive regular briefings from the Planning Cell.

Associate Members are invited to nominate "Forces Answerable to the WEU" (FAWEU)¹³ on the same basis as Full Members. Unless their participation is opposed by a majority of the Full Members, they can participate in military operations, exercises and planning. The Associate Partners, which may associate themselves with decisions made by the Full and Associate Members to carry out the so-called "Petersberg tasks,"¹⁴ have been asked to provide information on forces which they could make available to the WEU. This information will be held alongside lists of FAWEU to invite Associate Partner nations to join WEU operations in accordance with "Petersberg tasks" on a case by case basis.

2.1.2. Dialogue and Information Arrangements

The WEU has informal arrangements for dialogue with Russia and Ukraine and with the six Mediterranean and North African States of Egypt, Israel, Mauritania, Morocco, Syria and Tunisia. In addition, there are arrangements for the exchange of information between the WEU and the North American Allies - Canada and the United States. And the WEU

has entered into a dialogue with Cyprus and Malta, which will evolve in line with the development of links between Cyprus and Malta¹⁵ and the EU.

2.1. The WEU Objectives

As addressed in the introduction, the WEU was founded to support cooperation in the fields of social, cultural, economic and lastly, defense affairs. Especially for the latter point the Articles V and VIII of the Brussels Treaty were the centerpieces.¹⁶ Following the Brussels Treaty, 30 years of “hibernation” for the WEU was ended by the Rome Declaration in 1984, setting two precise objectives for the WEU:

- to define a European security identity, and
- to work gradually for the harmonization of the defense policies of member states.

In 1987, WEU member nations adopted a common stance on European security interests - the so-called Hague Platform - stating that “the construction of an integrated Europe will remain incomplete as long as it does not include security and defence.”¹⁷ In 1991, in the margin of the Maastricht summit, WEU heads of state declared that the WEU was to be considered as an integral part of the development of the European Union and as a means to strengthen the European pillar of NATO.¹⁸

In June 1992, Ministers of the member states adopted the “Petersberg Declaration” (named after the conference location “Petersberg” near Bonn, Germany), aimed at reinforcing the operational role of the WEU by making use of WEU forces in humanitarian

and rescue tasks, including evacuation, as well as peacekeeping and crisis management tasks.¹⁹

2.2. The WEU Organization

The WEU organization comprises both an intergovernmental structure and a Parliamentary Assembly.

2.2.1. Intergovernmental Structure

The highest organ within the intergovernmental structure and between WEU Council Ministers' sessions is the WEU Presidency, which rotates among the 10 Full Members for a period of six months. The main responsibility for the Presidency is to steer further development, to propose and prepare further steps and to translate WEU Council decisions into action.

The Council is the WEU's central decision-making body. It meets at two levels: as the Council of Ministers (in which it brings together Defense and Foreign Ministers), and as the Permanent Council, attended by the Permanent Representatives, or Ambassadors, of the Full members. The Council of Ministers meets twice a year, in the capital of the current Presidency which chairs it; the Permanent Council meets weekly at the Secretariat in Brussels, under the chairmanship of the Secretary-General.

The Permanent Council directs the activities of its subordinate working groups. The Council Working Group, consisting of the deputy Permanent Representatives, prepares its meetings; the Special Working Group brings together representatives of Foreign Ministers and deals with the political aspects of European security problems; the Defense Representatives Group (DRG) covers the military aspects of European security. These, and subsidiary working groups, examine such issues as operational planning, arms control, the functioning of the 'Open Skies' Treaty (which creates an aerial observation regime to enable its 27 signatories to monitor military capabilities and activities), and links with NATO.

Following its move from London to Brussels in 1993 to enable closer links to the EU as well as to NATO, the WEU absorbed some elements of the EuroGroup - a grouping of European Defense Ministers within the framework of NATO. This provided a forum for the exchange of views on political and security issues, and fostered practical cooperation through specialist sub-groups. The Eurogroup's publicity activities directed at North America, now called the Transatlantic Forum, and the following EuroGroup sub-groups, were transferred to the WEU: EuroLog (now called the Western European Logistics Group, aiming at the standardization of the national logistics); WEUCOM, dealing with communications systems, and EuroLongTerm, which examines future operational requirements.

All functions of the former Independent European Programme Group (IEPG), an armaments cooperation body formed in 1976, were also transferred to the WEU, and the body was renamed the WEAG. It is the sole Europe-wide forum for armaments cooperation. The WEAG members countries - Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Turkey and the United Kingdom - aim to promote more systematic cooperation in research and procurement, and to increase the effectiveness of the European defense industrial base.

The WEU Council is supported by its Secretariat and Planning Cell. Staffed by military officers, the Planning Cell develops the WEU's operational planning and gives military advice and information to the Permanent Council. An Intelligence Section has been added to the Planning Cell as well as a Situation Center. Among these new decision-making mechanisms at WEU headquarters, a Politico-Military Group (PMG) was established. PMG deals with political and military issues relevant to the WEU's operational role. The PMG also has the task of developing crisis management structures and procedures for the WEU.

A Satellite Center is functioning at Torrejon, near Madrid, to interpret satellite data. However, the center has access only to commercially used imagery. At a later date, the Center will get access to higher quality imagery produced by the Franco-Italian-Spanish HELIOS program²⁰. There is also a WEU Institute for Security Studies, in Paris, to pursue the debate on the future of European security.²¹

2.2.2. Parliamentary Assembly

Established in 1954, the Parliamentary Assembly meets twice a year in Paris. It has discussed a wide range of issues that arise from the Modified Brussels Treaty, and which cover areas over which member States retain full sovereignty. Its members are drawn from national parliamentary delegations. It is the only multinational European parliamentary Assembly with competence for defense matters. The WEU Council reports annually to the Assembly.

2.3. The Military Capabilities

For a long time, WEU had no military capabilities of its own. While the collective defense of Europe was a NATO issue, the stalemate of the Cold War left no real room for activities beside defense planning. However, by the end of the 1980s, the WEU was beginning to consider its role in military operations. From August 1987, when the Iran-Iraq war was in progress, members co-ordinated their mine-sweeping activities in the Gulf. Although this was not a WEU operation as such, the WEU provided a framework for integrating national operations.

In response to Iraq's invasion of Kuwait in August 1990, WEU Ministers agreed, at an extraordinary meeting that month (attended exceptionally by NATO members Denmark, Greece and Turkey), to co-ordinate their naval operations in the Gulf. Officially the WEU

claims this as a contribution to the success of the international community's naval operations in the region. Internally, there is no doubt that this action revealed the WEU's deficiencies in the operational employment of these forces.²²

In June 1991, a NATO Ministerial meeting, in Copenhagen, highlighted the continuing importance of the contribution of European countries to security on the continent. It welcomed moves by member States of the European Community (EC - now the EU) to develop a common foreign and security policy (CFSP). Ministers agreed to develop practical arrangements to ensure that European security and defense measures were transparent and complementary to those of NATO.

The Treaty on European Union, agreed by the EC leaders at their Summit in Maastricht in December 1991, described the WEU as 'an integral part of the development of the Union'. The EU may request the WEU to "elaborate and implement decisions and actions of the Union which have defense implications."²³ EU policy must respect the obligations of member States under the North Atlantic Treaty, and must be compatible with the common security and defense policy established in that framework.

In their Declaration, at the Maastricht Summit, on the role of the WEU and its relations with the EU and with the Atlantic Alliance, WEU member States set out their views on developing a clear European security and defense identity (ESDI), and on a greater European responsibility for defense matters. The Declaration notes that the "WEU will be de-

veloped as the defence component of the European Union and as a means to strengthen the European pillar of the Atlantic Alliance.”²⁴

2.3.1. The Petersberg Declaration and the First Operational Tests

In their meeting at Petersberg in June 1992, the WEU Council issued the Petersberg Declaration, taking therewith important steps, in order to create WEU military capabilities and identify areas for WEU commitment. This was achieved by:

- an agreement to make available military units for tasks conducted under WEU authority - known as forces answerable to the WEU (FAWEU);
- an agreement on the so-called “Petersberg tasks”: Military units of WEU member States, acting under the authority of the WEU, could be employed for military and other operations (humanitarian, rescue, peacekeeping and other crisis management tasks, including peacemaking), in cooperation with the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE - now the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE)) and the UN Security Council;
- an agreement, in order to co-ordinate the “Petersberg tasks,” to establish a Planning Cell which would maintain a list of FAWEU, prepare contingency plans for their use, and make recommendations for command, control and communications arrangements;
- an agreement on the rights of Associate and Observer Members.²⁵

By these agreements the framework was established to identify those areas in which WEU regarded itself competent to act militarily and thereby to provide a European profile. Additionally, limited strategic and operational planning elements were created (the Planning Cell, etc.) and military formations were requested (FAWEU) not only from member states but from other European countries. Additionally - in order to avoid competition with NATO or a duplication of efforts - the Council asked for a report on practical measures necessary to achieve cooperation with NATO and the EU.

Shortly after these agreements the first tests came for the WEU's newly created military capabilities, starting with the Council decision in July 1992 that the WEU should help to enforce the UN trade sanctions and arms embargo against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro). The joint NATO/WEU naval operation, Operation SHARP GUARD, was established in June 1993 to enforce sanctions in the Adriatic Sea. In May 1993, the WEU's Danube Deployment was set up, under the auspices of the OSCE/EU Sanctions Assistance Mission, to assist Hungary, Bulgaria and Romania in enforcing sanctions on the Danube. It turned into a civilian operation using customs and police officers from four WEU states (GE, IT, SP, UK), but was nevertheless controlled by the WEU Council as the highest authority.²⁶

The joint EU/WEU administration of Mostar, in Bosnia, was set up in July 1994 to buttress the Bosniac-Croat Federation (Bosnian Muslims and Bosnian Croats) by reconciling the parties that had been warring in Mostar. The EU asked the WEU to provide the re-

sources to build a unified police force in Mostar as a contribution to this administration. The WEU element²⁷ was, and still is, responsible for monitoring public order and setting up a unified local police force.

2.3.2. The Birmingham Declaration

In consequence of the “Petersberg” agreements and the experiences gained in the first operational requirements, the Council meeting in Birmingham in Spring 1996 aimed at improving WEU's operational development and military capabilities. The WEU Council agreed to set up a “Permanent Situation Center” and an “Intelligence Section” at WEU Headquarters in Brussels. Agreement was found on a more effective exercise policy, and a WEU concept for strategic mobility (airlift etc.) was developed to help in the conduct of Petersberg missions. In order to provide WEU access and capabilities to mount and sustain operations of any significant scale, the relations with NATO were strengthened and the conclusion of a “WEU/NATO Security Agreement” cleared the way for flow of essential classified information between the two organizations. The Council welcomed these steps as signals of growing contacts between the two organizations. The Council agreed on closer practical cooperation with the EU, e.g. joint meetings on Mostar and evacuation planning; WEU's work on African Peacekeeping and anti-personnel mines took into account EU's work in these areas. The Council approved clearer procedures to facilitate the involvement of Observer countries in Petersberg missions, in order to enable WEU to take advantage of their expertise, e.g. on peacekeeping. Further measures should

involve the Associate Partners in WEU's work on operational development, e.g. on African Peacekeeping, exercise policy and humanitarian task force operations.²⁸

2.3.3. Forces Answerable to WEU

Within the WEU, other than the Planning Cell, no permanent military structures exist. No forces or command and control assets are assigned to the organization. However, the WEU can - as mentioned above - call up FAWEU, which are forces potentially available for planning purposes, but not formally assigned as in NATO, and which would be employed on a case-by-case basis. Among these FAWEU, some have been formally identified and offered, namely: the Eurocorps, the Multinational Division Central (MND(C)), the UK/NL Amphibious Force, EUROMARFOR and EUROFOR. Additionally, France and UK have announced to provide existing national joint headquarters in support of WEU operations. The actual use of FAWEU remains a national decision, nevertheless.

The WEU may call up an army corps, formed by France, Germany, Spain, Belgium and Luxembourg, capable of deploying approximately 40,000 soldiers. Additionally, the WEU could make use of another division, made available by France, Italy, Portugal and Spain, with approximately 15,000 soldiers. Nevertheless, one should not overestimate WEU's strategic and operational capabilities. These will remain limited based on the lack of sufficient C4I at WEU's disposal, only very limited strategic lift capacity and insufficient access to strategic intelligence. The use of Combined Joint Task Force (CJTF) HQs

- as agreed with NATO - will provide remarkable improvement. However, a joint and combined employment of about a division equivalent, supported by limited sea and air forces, including logistics and sustainable for a sufficient time, is probably the maximum WEU can manage.²⁹ This is underlined by a PMWG research project, which aimed at the development of "Illustrative Profiles for WEU Missions", referring to "Petersberg missions carried out under the political authority and strategic direction of the WEU for which WEU deems it necessary to call upon NATO assets and capabilities."³⁰ The desired and required assets encompass not only NATO airborne early warning assets (NAEW), Theater joint HQ as well as sophisticated logistics, air and maritime forces, surveillance and intelligence gathering assets, but also replacement/rotation of forces for a longer period of commitment. In other words, operations like Desert Shield/Desert Storm or IFOR/SFOR (Implementation Force/Stabilizing Force) will still require either direct U.S. commitment or NATO employment, to get access to the US resources. This limited WEU strategic and operational capabilities have to be taken into account, when the future development including burden sharing and greater European military independence is discussed.

3. Risks and Challenges in and for Europe

The WEU's situation was previously insignificant and static, because no real need was seen for this organization. As outlined in the previous chapters however, significant progress was achieved since the end of the Cold War "in transforming the WEU from the gentleman's club of a few years ago into a genuinely operational organization." It has still

some way to go.³¹ The course and destination will depend to a large extent on the risks and challenges, with which Europe is confronted. The weight, significance and consequences of these risks and challenges may differ - as already addressed in the introduction - from a Central to a Southern European perspective. In order to bring out the specifics of the perspectives this chapter is split into a Central European and a Southern European part. However, it has to be stressed that this division is, in some sense, artificial. All European countries are more or less affected by all the changes and developments occurring either in or around Europe. In other words, European security is an indivisible concept.

3.1. The Central European Perspective

Central Europe, and especially Germany, had been at the heart of confrontation for more than four decades. It is now in a very favourable situation as far as security is concerned. At the same time Central Europe is confronted with a very dynamic period, full of changes, uncertainties and risks. These risks, but also challenges for Europe's further development, differ from region to region, requiring various actions and responses.

3.1.1. The Central Eastern and South Eastern European States

The most imminent risk category to be realized in Central Europe is the result of the political change processes in Central Eastern and South Eastern Europe and of the renaissance of nationalism and religious fanaticism. The outbreak of hostilities in the former Yugoslavia

(FYUG) meant the return of war to Europe. Taking the variety of unresolved territorial and ethnic problems into consideration, the urgent necessity of a political solution for that region becomes quite obvious. The common military efforts of United States, Europe and countries even from Asia and Africa currently protects a peace in Bosnia Herzegovina which, however, is still unstable and insecure. If Europe, in concert with the USA, eventually fails to make clear that the law of the strongest has to yield to the strength of the law, the Yugoslavian tragedy will expand. Even this, however, might only be a prelude. The case of Yugoslavia reveals how urgently the definition of common political goals in Europe is required. On the other hand, it also reveals that armed forces will still be necessary in the future to take preventive and containing action. Although some may be reluctant to accept this fact, the past few years in Europe have clearly proven that the words of the Prussian King Frederick II unfortunately still characterize the reality of our world: "Diplomacy without weapons is like music without instruments."

The other countries of the Central Eastern and South Eastern European region are still striving to overcome the huge economic problems left by the Communist era. To get out of the rubble of 45 years of a centrally planned economy, with a total exploitation of capital investment and unbelievable exploitation of the ecology and a total lack of investment in infrastructure, will require between 15 and 25 years. The hidden figure of unemployment in the socialist system was approximately 30 %. Therefore, Germany with its Eastern part and the other European countries, will have to face up to many problems, in the process of re-

building Europe, in addition to the work all are involved in maintaining highly complex societies under rapidly changing conditions.

To accomplish the goals, the Eastern European countries need assistance, help, and reassurance from the rest of Europe so as not to be pushed back again into suppression and bullying from their powerful neighbor in the east. All Eastern European countries see in a membership in the European Union the best solution for their economic problems, while NATO is seen best suited for the security aspect. Poland and Czech Republic are driven by another reason. The unification of Germany awakened old anxieties from the past: to be threatened and dominated again by the German neighbor. Today Germany, however, bound and controlled in an enlarged and deepened European Union and in an intact NATO - and thereby the first time in its history - West oriented - would not be regarded as a risk any longer.

For all these countries the perspective to become members of EU and NATO causes stabilizing effects. Consequently, all efforts are undertaken to create the membership prerequisites.³² It is clearly in Central Europe's interest, to include the Central Eastern and Southern Eastern European states into the guaranteed zone of European Union and NATO jurisdiction, to liberate them from the old "Interim Status," thereby finishing a history characterized by the rise and fall of the Ottoman and Habsburg Empire, Hitler's Third Reich and the Soviet Empire.³³

However, those states which desire to be integrated into this zone most urgently, probably remain to a certain extent excluded. The three Baltic states have to be seen to be in the most sensitive position. Over and above NATO relations, they bring into play relations between United States and Russia. Offers to intensify NATO's Partnership for Peace were welcomed by the heads of states of the Baltic states but nevertheless judged insufficient to cope with their security requirements. In fact, their common border with Russia and in the case of Estonia and Latvia the presence of large-Russian-speaking communities explain the reluctance of NATO, and especially the United States, to provide them with a security guarantee that also might cover nuclear aspects.

There can be no doubt that the current status of associated partner in the WEU will not satisfy the security requirements of the Baltic states nor the prospect of EU membership unless this coincides with NATO membership. This indicates the immense problems linked to the membership in the various organizations such as NATO, the EU and the WEU which should be theoretically congruent in the final status, but which could be achieved in different time phases. However, whether this can be actually realized still needs to be shown as the sensitive example of the Baltic states demonstrates. It brings shame to the EU and the WEU, as well as to NATO, that the current situation especially with regard to Russia does not allow more than close coordination and cooperation with the Baltic states,³⁴ but no substantive security guarantees appear likely in the foreseeable future.

3.1.2. Russia

The most important risks are linked with the decay and renovation of the former Soviet Union. All the states that formed the Soviet Union, in particular Russia, are far from being democracies as known in Western Europe and far from economic recovery. They are in an alarming state of instability, not to mention the alarming situation of the Russian military forces.³⁵ Hostility towards the West and market economics in general in Russia as well as in all of the former-Soviet Union following the impoverishment of these countries may even lead to a revival of Communist or extreme Nationalist governments.³⁶ Russia in its present state is in possession of an enormous military potential. Both in the nuclear and in the conventional sector it is, as before, and will continue to be the largest military potential in Europe; even the bad performance at tactical level in Chechnya does not change this fact. Even after the year 2005, Russia will have at its disposal about 3250 strategic nuclear weapons, assuming all disarmament agreements will be technically realized.

Attention must, however, be paid to the conventional potential as well. Russia will retain a projection capability which can be brought to bear only after a prolonged period of preparation and in one direction and which, while it cannot reach in particular to Central Europe including Germany directly, can certainly reach Germany's neighbors in Eastern and South-eastern Europe. For them, therefore, the problem is safety from Russia while Central Europe, being safe in the Western camp, can afford to strive for safety together with Russia.

One must not lose sight of these military facts, because the capability of maintaining a balance of options is the prerequisite for a cooperative security policy with Russia.³⁷ This military potential both nuclear and conventional interrelated with Russia's status of instability, needs to be balanced. This will require an intact NATO and European defence to stay firm and united and to avoid pushing Russia back into confrontation. Russia must be reassured that neither NATO nor EU strive to widen their sphere to Russia's detriment. The EU, in close cooperation with NATO, has to establish a new security order in Europe, convincing Russia thereby that no one in the West intends to threaten Russia. On the contrary the West wants to establish a partnership on equal terms.³⁸

To establish such an order, however, demands first of all an answer to the question: Who belongs to Europe and who not? From a Southern European perspective some may question whether Turkey should be included. From a Central European perspective, some argue that Russia always was a European power, although with large Asian possessions. A clear answer does not necessarily mean a new division of Europe, but it will have an impact on both the European Union and NATO. For Europe, it might help to find a formula for the difficult issue of enlarging versus deepening of European cooperation. This also indicates that the mere mass and weight of Russia would overtax European Union - as well as NATO - and would prevent any further efforts to deepen European cooperation. Additionally, Russia probably would refuse to be governed from the distant Brussels.³⁹

A development of a European Security Architecture is needed including the answer how to include Russia in such efforts without giving Russia a veto or droit de regard. Both NATO and the WEU strive to find ways and means, helping Russia not to feel as the loser of the Cold War but as a partner with equal rights. So, WEU has decided to establish informal arrangements for dialogue, in order to inform Russian foreign and defense ministers on a regular basis about all WEU events and developments of importance.⁴⁰

NATO has offered Russia "to conclude a document which could take the form of a Charter between NATO and Russia".⁴¹ Thereby, relations with Russia should "be made broader, more intensive, and more substantive" and be placed on a more permanent institutional basis to create a stable and enduring security partnership with the Russian Federation, one that is consistent with that country's importance.⁴² Such a relationship is viewed as a key element in the European security architecture and an essential source of stability for the entire Euro-Atlantic area. NATO Military Authorities were therefore tasked by the Defense Ministers to make proposals for the development of closer military relationships with Russia and to identify concrete areas for military cooperation, e.g. to establish permanent Russian military liaison missions to NATO HQ (Brussels), SHAPE (Mons), and SACLANT (Norfolk), and based on the principle of reciprocity, to establish NATO Missions at corresponding Russian institutions and headquarters.

Whatever NATO does, Russia will probably remain suspicious, still psychologically humiliated by the results of the end of the Cold War. This offers the WEU the chance, to

establish a bridge between NATO/EU and Russia through involvement in the preparation of combined military exercises and possibly Russian participation in Petersburg-type operations. Cooperation on security and defense matters should also help to ease tensions that will undoubtedly surface upon enlargement of NATO.⁴³

3.1.3. Ukraine

While most interest of NATO, the EU and the WEU was directed to either Russia or the potential new NATO or EU members in Eastern Europe two countries were almost forgotten: Belarus and Ukraine. Both are confronted with economic problems at least as huge as those in the rest of Eastern Europe.⁴⁴ While Belarus sees a solution in some kind of return to the integration with Russia, Ukraine strives to remain independent, even if the needed support of vital resources from Russia still is high.

Ukraine's strategic worth must not be underestimated.⁴⁵ Direct neighbor of Poland and Slovakia, it serves to some regard as glacis against Russia, while Russia wants to gain Ukraine back into its sphere of control as an important granary, potential provider of various resources, and as a decisive step to "try to re-establish its empire." For 300 years, Ukraine was viewed as part of Russia. Judging by Russia's approach to the issues of Crimea and Sevastopol, the answer is ambiguous, whether Russia will really respect Ukraine as an independent state.⁴⁶

Not only from an Eastern Europe perspective but also from: EU/WEU and NATO perspective it is important to support Ukraine's efforts to preserve its national sovereignty. NATO's enlargement cannot include Ukraine - although this would provide the safest umbrella for Ukraine itself with regard to, (in this case) understandable Russian sensitivities. Therefore, NATO has to try at least to intensify the relationships. NATO Defense Ministers reaffirmed NATO's commitment "to a strong, stable, and enhanced partnership with Ukraine, whose independence and territorial integrity are important factors for overall European stability."⁴⁷ NATO is aiming at still closer practical cooperation, under both PfP and the agreement on enhanced NATO-Ukraine relations concluded in 1995, which may be built on to formalize the relationship. In this context the establishment of a NATO information office in Kiev was welcomed.⁴⁸

The WEU has established similar information links to Ukraine, as to Russia, to keep Ukraine permanently informed. Further steps, e.g. association or even membership are not envisioned, because an expansion of the EU/WEU might result in concerns if Russia is not integrated. Since this - as already addressed - would damage EU, other forms of cooperation is required, to give Ukraine the necessary life assurance; economically as well as from security point of view. Economic assistance e.g. could be provided by a variety of cooperation agreements between the EU and Ukraine. The security aspect could not only be covered by intensifying the "Partnership for Peace" (PfP) program of NATO but also by closer links to the WEU, for example, by some kind of an association status for Ukraine, giving Ukraine the chance to coordinate its security concerns with the other

European states besides the efforts taking place already in line with PfP. To be not exclusively directed to the West, Ukraine could on the other hand agree with Russia on a mutual assistance pact, in the case Russia would be attacked from the West. Although this is far beyond any reality, it would help Russia to overcome the psychological feeling that all efforts of its Western neighbors with the inclusion of Ukraine are only aiming at an isolation of Russia. All in all, a very balanced and cautious approach is needed, to support Ukraine's sovereignty without violating Russia's feelings.

3.2. The Southern European Perspective

The Mediterranean European countries already and more increasingly will play an important role vital for the security of Europe and NATO as a transatlantic defensive alliance of democracies. The reason for this important role are the various risks with which Europe's and NATO's Southern flank are confronted.

3.2.1. General Thoughts

Recently many external changes have affected the strategic scenario around the Southern European countries, with particular regard to Italy. Among these were not only - as already addressed - the political, strategic and geopolitical changes in Continental Europe, the explosion of ethnic and nationalistic rivalries and conflicts, in East and Southeast Europe, especially in the Balkans, but also in Northern Africa, and in the Middle East.

All these changes have highly affected the strategic situation in Mediterranean, increasing threats to the Southern European countries. The Mediterranean is a Region where great differences in living standards and population growth rates between the North and the South occur which are by themselves a cause of instability. Additionally, radicalism, regional crises, ethnic conflicts, underdevelopment and the proliferation of weapon of mass destruction (WMD) significantly increase insecurity.

Strategically, when addressing the Mediterranean, one should not refer just to the Mediterranean basin in the narrow sense, but to a wider area, which stretches from the Western approaches of Gibraltar through the Black Sea to the Caucasus, and through the Suez canal and the Red Sea to the Middle East, the Horn of Africa, right up to the Persian Gulf.

A broad view on the geo-strategic scenario around the Southern part of Europe, shows two belts of crises affecting Europe: one running across the Southern border, the other one spanning to the East. These two belts overlap at the geographic crossroads comprising the Balkans, the Caucasus and the Middle East.⁴⁹

Historically, two geopolitical trends have always consisted in countries such as France, Spain and Italy: one Mediterranean, the other one continental. For this reason these countries are trying in every way to promote Mediterranean links both within the European integration process and within NATO.

During the Cold War, the central region was the key to both NATO and European security. Now the situation has radically changed. While events in Central and Eastern Europe still require attention and effort, all European countries must not neglect the Southern region and the Mediterranean where the priority of security issues has increased considerably.⁵⁰

Italy is placed on the edge of these cross-roads and it is therefore particularly sensitive to stability and security in this region. However, Italy has been used since the end of the World War II to play the uncomfortable role of the Southern NATO's shoulder. Now that threats against Europe are more likely to come from the South and South East rather than from the East, the Italian view may be understandable that this region deserves more attention by all the European Security Organizations, especially by the WEU. Otherwise, Europe would disregard the fact that it is the Southern Region where threats are most imminent like regional crises and conflicts as well as violent extremism and the proliferation of WMD. Additionally, it should be recognized that security is indivisible in the wider European area.

Whatever happens in the East spreads to the South and vice versa. Therefore security and stability in the Southern region cannot remain solely a matter of concern for Italy or other Southern European countries. They are of concern for all of Europe as well as NATO.

In this regard, WEU could represent an important tool for achieving the aim of providing more attention to the South as well as stressing the indivisibility of security in Europe. In addition, the strengthening of the WEU is the best way to prevent the singularization of Italy and the Southern region within both NATO and the EU. Southern European countries' security can be best guaranteed by strong ties within Europe and to the United States. On the other hand, peace and stability in all of Europe are strongly affected by the Mediterranean environment.

3.2.2. Strategic Challenges from some Balkan Countries

These facts provide the reason for Italy's strong support for a quick integration of both, Hungary and Slovenia, into NATO. Following possible NATO membership offered to these countries, it will be eventually possible to create the territorial and operational link between the Central and the Southern NATO/ WEU Region.

Italy also strongly supports a rapid integration of Romania into NATO, though for different reasons. This would not only prove Europe's and NATO's real interest in the Southern area of Europe, but a Romania in NATO and the WEU would also significantly contribute to enhancing peace and stability in the Balkan Area. In addition, it would be possible to reinforce the Southeastern shoulder of the Alliance toward the Black Sea and Ukraine and might be helpful against any reawakened imperialistic Russian dreams of

gaining access to the Mediterranean shores. A further reason is based on Romania's and Italy's common culture and language.

Similar considerations affect Albania, with particular concern to its strategic importance in the Balkan area. However, neither Romania nor Albania, are unlikely to belong to the first new members joining NATO. Therefore, Italy has launched the proposal that NATO's Senior Level Group (SLG),⁵¹ supported by regional experts, develops a "PfP Plus" initiative also called "Reinforced PfP" for these countries. According to these auspices, the SLG recently submitted the first interim report containing initial proposals on how to strengthen the PfP activities through a more effective and intense engagement of the partners. This "enhanced" engagement, in particular for the potential candidates for enlargement, like Romania and Albania, will concentrate on defense planning, "non-Article V" contingencies, CJTFs,⁵² as well as command structure.⁵³ In other words, these countries could be enabled to operate in an environment that represents the future for the WEU as well.

3.2.3. The Crisis Arc from the Maghreb to the Arabian Gulf

Another area which requires attention is the crisis-afflicted arc extending from the Maghreb to the Arabian Gulf. This is one of the world's most dangerous areas. It is an area in which fundamentalism is gaining increasing influence, which also increases its incalculability. This area may result in completely new threats to the security of the vulner-

able industrial societies in Europe. The instability of this region, however, will only become a real threat in combination with another risk category which might be even more relevant and dangerous: the proliferation of advanced weapons, in particular long-range delivery systems in combination with nuclear, chemical and biological warheads. The number of countries in possession of such weapons is increasing. Proliferation must be viewed in combination with the nearly unimpeded proliferation of missile technology. Missiles with a range of somewhat above 1000 km exist, de facto, at the southern coast of the Mediterranean, and by the year 2000 large parts of Central Europe might be within the range of ballistic missiles launched from this region. Therefore, Europe has to deal more thoroughly with the issue of proliferation, and the community of states will have to use all the political means available to prevent proliferation.

For EU/WEU it might be worthwhile to think about some kind of partnership program especially with friendly and moderate states like Israel, Egypt, Morocco and Tunisia, in order to transfer more stability into this region.⁵⁴

3.2.4. North and Equatorial Africa

The imminent instability of large parts of the southern hemisphere, in particular in North and Equatorial Africa represents a further risk category, with which Europe, especially Southern Europe, may be confronted. There can be no doubt that crisis upon crisis might develop there. The reasons for this are economic insufficiency, high population growth, and the actions of weak governments unable to cope with arising ethnic and territorial

conflicts which threaten to lapse into tribalism. Ecological or health disasters and migration could be additional trouble points in the future. The Southern European interests and worries in this area are clearly shown by the number of Peace Support Operations (PSO), these countries were engaged in such as Somalia, Mozambique, Angola, Namibia, Rwanda or Burundi.

The limited success of these missions were caused by insufficient coordination among the force providing countries as well as by the UN structural deficiencies which hampered its ability to lead PSOs. These problems prevented the establishment and enhancement of the necessary unity of efforts to accomplish the respective mission's peace mandate. In Zaire, it was not even possible recently to find an agreement in the United Nations or among Western countries to start a credible military humanitarian effort in time.

According to the potential threats for stability and peace in Europe that could stem from this area of the world, such as illegal and massive immigration, and even more important, the region's inability to fulfill its morale duty and obligation, Africa represents a permanent challenge for the Western countries.

A more capable WEU could play an important role in enhancing peace and stability with political and security means. In particular, WEU forces, supported by NATO capabilities, could carry out more complex PSOs, even if limited in size, acting as the operational arm of the UN.⁵⁵ These thoughts of more independent missions, conducted by the WEU, soon

could become more realistically. The United States does not seem any longer to be interested in being involved in peacekeeping operations in areas that are not considered parts of its vital national interests.

3.2.5. Turkey

In the context of most of the portrayed risk categories, Turkey plays a role of utmost importance. It is the strategic linch-pin of Eastern Mediterranean Security. As a "European" country it serves as a gateway to the Middle East. Turkey offers a democratic model to the Central Asian Countries which have gained independence from Moscow as opposed to the fundamentalistic model of an Islamic republic. Its geostrategic position is indispensable for Europe and in addition to oil and water which will increasingly become a strategic resource.⁵⁶ It is in the interest of Europe firmly to anchor Turkey in the Western camp and it serves Turkey's national interest best to belong to the European family of nations which generally share common values based on democracy and full respect of human rights. To find an agreement on this view among all Europeans may nevertheless become difficult. The ongoing tensions between Greece and Turkey are one drawback. Turkey may even feel unaccepted by the Europeans if Greece remains successful in preventing closer links between Turkey and the rest of Europe, notwithstanding the enlargement of EU with the inclusion of Turkey. Turkey's exclusion from European affairs might support those Turkish forces who would prefer to turn to the Islamic states in Asia. This action would increase the likelihood of risks in that region, which is confronted al-

ready with instability, such as the Kurds' problem in the rectangle of Turkey, Iran, Iraq, and Syria.

In addition, the problem of Cyprus endangers the stability in the Mediterranean Relationships among Turkey, the USA and the EU might be significantly worsened, if Ankara fulfills its threat to attack air defense missile positions on the sites, the Cyprus government has announced to establish along the coast. This example shows the degree of attention the Mediterranean area deserves by the Western countries.⁵⁷

3.3. Indivisible European Security

As already mentioned above, European security is indivisible and thus "Wider Mediterranean Dimension" is a crucial and highly unstable aspect of that. The concept of an equal level of security was never totally accomplished in the past, because of the distinction made between the key "Central Front" and, as already said, the marginalized "Southern Flank." Today, there is the risk that this will be further jeopardized if the focus on enlarging to the East is not coupled with renewed and enhanced attention to the restless South and South East.

The spread of instability across the Mediterranean does not only concern the moderate and friendly countries of North Africa, it affects the whole Balkan region as well and could undermine the prospects for peace and stability in the Near and Middle East. It not

only affects the security of Southern Europe, but the new social and security problems may also destabilize all of Europe.

Recognizing these risks, the EU has endorsed a plan for a substantial economical aid package to the North African countries. In addition, the Barcelona Conference has launched the Euromediterranean Partnership, which represent an overarching political, social and economic framework for the relationship between the EU and the Southern Shore Mediterranean countries.⁵⁸

Parallel to these actions, the OSCE has started to outline a Mediterranean policy based on dialogue with many states of the Southern Mediterranean hemisphere. On this foundation both NATO and WEU are asked to develop ideas and strategies, which on the one hand, deter and prevent extremism and the proliferation of WMD and promote, on the other hand, peace. Consequently, the WEU Council decided in Birmingham in May 1996⁵⁹ to launch a dialogue with some Mediterranean countries on the African Coast. Nevertheless, there are further steps and initiatives needed until this restless region becomes really a sphere of peace and stability.

Taking all challenges and risks, Europe has to work at least into two directions - preventing crises within Europe and along the edges of Europe in East and South from spilling over into all of Europe while, at the same time, promoting peace and stability in those unsafe regions by dialogue and cooperation. Not only Italy or Germany are affected by the

entire risk spectrum, but all European nations because of their interests, their international relations and commitments. "The challenges in the transformed environment cannot be tackled by any country or any of the existing security institutions alone. On the contrary, cooperative and collective approaches are called for. It is thus necessary to develop the apparatus of conflict prevention and crisis management in such a way that in the future it will also be possible to defuse crisis at an early stage below the level of war and violence."⁶⁰ In the following chapters the authors will suggest in which way the different security institutions might be used to achieve this aim.

4. WEU / NATO - Organizational Relationships in Change

For the last five decades, NATO has been the guarantor for Western European's security. So the direction of other organizations - like the WEU - to support or even ensure European security will be significantly determined by the direction NATO will choose to adapt itself to the new security environment.

According to the announcements of the NATO Defense Ministers during the North Atlantic Council (NAC) session in Brussels, December 17 and 18, 1996, NATO has done much "to adapt itself to meet the new security challenges which it faces in the fundamentally changed strategic environment in Europe. At the Summits in 1990, 1991, and 1994, the leaders of the Alliance set out the broad vision of a new NATO and its role in the development of a new European security architecture."⁶¹ The Alliance agreed to ensure that its military effectiveness, to strengthen the transatlantic link, to develop the European

Security and Defense Identity (ESDI) within the Alliance, to expand efforts beyond the core function of collective defense to crisis management; and to foster partnership and cooperation throughout the Euro-Atlantic area. Special emphasis was put on the fact that the Alliance is now preparing for an historic summit in Madrid on 8th-9th July, 1997, which will decide on the first enlargement phase.

The decisions on the internal adaptation focused on three objectives:

- ensuring the Alliance's military effectiveness;
- preserving the transatlantic link; and
- developing, to the satisfaction of all Allies, ESDI within the Alliance.

As part of the development of ESDI, the future command structure will reflect in a better way the increased influence and responsibility of the European countries. The command arrangements within NATO shall permit the preparation and conduct of operations under the political control and strategic direction of the WEU, following a decision by the North Atlantic Council, while maintaining the ability of the overall NATO structure to meet the full range of its responsibilities.

The implementation of the Combined Joint Task Force (CJTF) concept is supportive to these ends. It not only helps NATO gain more flexibility, but it also supports ESDI, by providing WEU more operational capabilities. These added capabilities will allow the Europeans to act militarily independently, if required. "CJTF headquarters are being de-

veloped primarily for operations in non-Article V situations, including operations in which nations outside the Alliance could participate. The employment of CJTFs for Article V operations is also not excluded. In addition, CJTF headquarters could be made available," following a decision by the NAC, for WEU-led operations. "The headquarters of Striking Fleet Atlantic, Allied Forces Central Europe, and Allied Forces Southern Europe have been initially designated as parent headquarters for CJTF nuclei. CJTF trials and exercises will be conducted as soon as practicable, first for NATO operations and subsequently for WEU-led operations." In implementing the CJTF concept, the focus of that effort should be on providing the Alliance with the organization and capabilities necessary to implement the full range of CJTF operations while retaining the capacity for carrying out the Alliance's responsibilities for collective defense.⁶² In addition, the NAC approved arrangements, which may allow WEU to make use of NATO capabilities and assets for WEU-led operations. Finally, the NAC responded positively to the request of the WEU Council⁶³ to become actively involved in the Alliance's defense planning process.

The NAC decisions and agreements have provided the basis for the accomplishment of a dual aim:

Firstly, to allow the improvement of ESDI "grounded on sound military principle and supported by appropriate military planning,...[permitting] the creation of military coherent and effective forces capable of operating under the political control and strategic direction of the WEU,"⁶⁴ giving the Europeans the ability to act independently. This means

specifically to conduct WEU led Petersberg type missions, - if necessary with NATO assets "separable but not separate," to avoid any duplications - if deemed necessary. Despite this progress no one should underestimate the tasks still ahead of NATO and the WEU, to translate these agreements into effective measures. The implementation of the CJTF concept, for example, still requires hard work to define and determine:

- the modalities for embedding the CJTF HQs within the NATO regional commands, including a determination of those staff positions being doublehatted for both NATO and WEU; and
- the assets, systems and means in support of CJTF when chopped to WEU the financial arrangements necessary and the personnel and tools which will be lent to the WEU for CJTF operations.

Secondly, the basis was provided by the recent NAC decision to foster the transatlantic links by a more fair burden and risk sharing,⁶⁵ since the sharing of risks and responsibilities is both tangible and visible. Such an approach will help to shape a binary NATO consisting of an European Pillar capable of acting independently after consultation, and an American Pillar tied more firmly to Europe

The decisions of the last NAC meetings have shown NATO's will and resolve to adapt itself to the new conditions. Many have regarded NATO as a mere military alliance designed to protect Western Europe and to contain Soviet expansionism. Now as the threat has gone they argue NATO should wither away as well, an argument which some in Moscow happily echo. But NATO does not only provide credible defense capabilities in a time of insecurities, projecting stability beyond its area and creating a basis for true partnership. This is accomplished by the Partnership for Peace program which "will expand

and intensify political and military cooperation throughout Europe, increase stability, diminish threats to peace, and build strengthened relationship by promoting the spirit of practical cooperation and commitment to democratic principles that underpin the Alliance.”⁶⁶ This is reinforced by the offer to Russia for a strategic partnership between Russia and a new NATO, regarding Russia as part of Europe and a significant partner without whom security and stability in and for Europe cannot be achieved.⁶⁷

NATO’s integrated military structures help also to prevent the renationalization of national defense policies in Europe and to maintain a safeguard against setbacks on a continent in transition. NATO, however, must not be confined to collective defense since this would mean to maintain at considerable cost an organization exclusively for a case considered rather unlikely to occur in the foreseeable future. Nevertheless, NATO has to preserve credible defense capabilities. Collective defense will remain the foundation and life insurance for all NATO partners, if there were unforeseen setbacks.

NATO should improve its capabilities for crisis management in a broad approach. This is a task for which NATO is perfectly suited since it has everything needed in such a case: A proven political consultation mechanism, a well functioning integrated military command structure including intelligence and communication, and a wide variety of forces.

NATO should not, however, strive to be the one and only institution dealing with crisis management. In cases in which American and Canadian allies may not wish to be in-

volved in European and/or African crises, Europe has to take greater responsibilities. Europe should therefore continue to develop a crisis management capability of its own which will enable the EU and its preliminary defense arm, the WEU, to act independently. This must be achieved without duplication of structures and without weakening of NATO's integrated military structure which will serve simultaneously as a most useful tool if a crisis develops into a situation which will require collective transatlantic defense. The NAC decisions on command arrangements, CJTF, and provision of NATO assets for WEU offer the tools EU/WEU needs for its portion of crisis management.

NATO, capable of collective defense and crisis management, tasks which are now seen to be closely related because the current environment does not permit to separate them artificially, is perfectly capable of projecting stability beyond its current area of responsibility.

NATO's adaptation process is not yet finished, but it has already transformed an organization created for the mutual defense against Soviet expansionism into a formula for the future based on a tripod of capabilities formed by collective defense, crisis management and cooperation. Such a transformed NATO will be an instrument of security politics which has to coordinate with other fora dealing with security related issues such as the EU/WEU, G7, OSCE and UN.

5. The OSCE in the European Concert

Since the dissolution of the Warsaw Pact, Russia has continued to propose the disbanding of NATO and the transfer of European security issues exclusively to the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE). Being member of the OSCE this would provide Russia stronger influence in European affairs while the disappearance of NATO, an old Russian "enemy," would ease Russia's fear of becoming isolated.

As already outlined earlier, an European security organization would be overtaxed by the membership of Russia, based on Russia's mass and power. Including two super powers, the U.S.A. and Russia, would only worsen the situation. Inevitably it would promote U.S. thoughts to turn away from Europe. So what role has OSCE to play in the concert of European organization?

Today's and future crises will not remain regionally limited. This requires a far reaching crisis response coordination and regulation characterized not only by sheer reaction but, wherever possible, by timely preventive political action. While globally the United Nations remains responsible for all peace efforts, the UN could be relieved by a regional player who especially accepts responsibility for the Northern hemisphere. The OSCE is well suited for such a mission. It brings the U.S.A. and Canada, with their European interests, Russia and of course Europe to one table and offers also Ukraine a forum.

Additionally, the OSCE has the necessary organizational prerequisites at its disposal. Renamed from CSCE (Conference for Security and Cooperation in Europe) to OSCE by January 1, 1995, the OSCE was institutionalized as an international organization in line with chapter VIII of the UN Charter. The status allows the OSCE to ask NATO, EU/WEU or CIS for support in the case of peacekeeping measures.⁶⁸

This does not mean, however, that there is a hierarchy or competition between NATO, the EU/WEU and the OSCE - contrary to Russian endeavors to at least subordinate NATO to the OSCE. Rather, they complement one another, working together in a spirit of equal partnership. The OSCE remains the roof under which the 54 participating states seek to agree on the mechanisms for peaceful resolution of conflicts, on norms for safeguarding human rights and the rights of minorities, and on rules governing cooperation between equal partner states.⁶⁹

The decisive weakness of the OSCE remains, however, in reaching decisions only according to the "consent minus one" formula. The OSCE can only carry through decisions if it makes use of other organizations or asks other nations to assume responsibility for the realization. The OSCE's role in the beginning of the Yugoslavian conflict was a clear evidence of the limits of the OSCE. However, the OSCE is a worthwhile model to be developed further. One reason for that is to offer Russia the chance of full participation in the European concert for security and peace. Thereby, Russia would receive an influence reflecting its pride and dignity without allowing its supremacy.⁷⁰ All other thoughts, e.g.

to replace EU and NATO by OSCE, would result in weakening Europe's security. However, the OSCE is in a position to legitimize multinational efforts for crisis prevention and solution, where only NATO and the EU/WEU are capable to play as actors in this field.

6. *The United States and her Interests in Europe*

"Focus", one of the leading news magazines in Germany, published in one of its November 1996 editions an article, titled: "Europe is Disappearing from the U.S. Radarscreen."⁷¹ The article states a basic change in the U.S. political class concerning Europe. In the past, the United States had been interested in a positive image in Europe to preserve the defense alliance. Today, U.S. interest in Europe concentrates mainly on Europe as a supporter for the solution of international crises or as a trade partner. The U.S. presence in Europe has been significantly reduced. Various exchange programs have been drastically cut and many America Houses and U.S. Consulates shut down. The ignorance in the United States about Europe has increased, while at the same time 14 Senators with great Europe and NATO experience were not reelected. Insufficient knowledge about Europe's strong points and weaknesses often result in superelevated expectations about Europe's foreign policy capabilities.

There may exist, in fact, some alarming negative signals about the relationship between United States and Europe. If correct, we are still in the beginning of an erosion process

with good chances to stop that process, if both sides react in time. The official statements leave no doubt about the U.S. interests in Europe. The "strategy of engagement and enlargement is central to U.S. policy toward Europe." European stability is seen vital to U.S. security.⁷² On the other hand, U.S. engagement in other hot spots of the world has increased. After the end of the Cold War with its central focus towards the Soviet Union, which automatically included Western Europe as the central glacis against the expansion of Soviet power, other important "radar bips" are now appearing on the U.S. security radar screen. The only question which arises sometimes is the manner and speed of intervention. The description by John Lewis Gaddis might be right that, "American interventionism has too often become an instinctive, not a considered, response: the United States has tended to jump into situations where the balance of power was not really threatened, and it has tended to do this unilaterally." The United States has "found it difficult to distinguish, in short, between being a global policeman and a global nanny."⁷³ Under the unifying pressure of a common threat Western Europeans supported this U.S. tendency. However, the end of the Cold War has given Europe more options. This might result in different views and approaches to international problems between the United States and Europe, and might be interpreted as signaling serious differences. These differences support those in the U.S.A., who either would like to turn away from world problems in general, and from Europe specifically, to cope with domestic U.S. problems or those who see developments in Europe first of all as "domestic" European affairs.

This initiates the question: what are U.S. interests in and around Europe that still require considerable U.S. engagement? German Defense Minister Volker Ruehe highlighted in a speech in Washington 1995 the significant economic interests the United States still has in Europe: "Even though many Americans are today fascinated by the expanding economies in the Pacific region, Europe remains of major economic significance to the U.S.A.. The figures speak for themselves. For example, over 12 million jobs depend on American exports to Europe and the activities of the more than 4,000 European companies operating in the U.S.A."⁷⁴ Economic cooperation will probably even significantly intensify, if the East and Southeast European countries are successful in stabilizing and improving their economy. They still have a long way to go. But in contrast to Russia, foundations exist on which those countries can build and which have potential to lead those nations directly into the post-industrial age. This offers a prosperous market for U.S. investments and goods.

This scenario will only become true, however, if those European countries feel safe and secure. The official U.S. National Security Strategy strongly supports this view. Therefore, NATO enlargement is wholeheartedly supported by the U.S. government just as the engagement in Bosnia Herzegovina was justified. These actions prevent an expansion of a severe crisis to at least most parts of South and Southeast Europe, which could destroy all achievements reached after the end of the Cold War. Europeans are grateful for the United States' engagement in Bosnia, recognizing that in today's situation they are not yet capable of solving a problem like Bosnia without the support of the United States.

It is not certain how far the American people and their representatives in the Congress share that assessment. In view of its own tremendous domestic problems, many voices are heard that U.S. tax money is wasted on Europe's security while those "wealthy" Western Europeans are not ready to shoulder their portion of the burden. This message has to be understood by the Europeans as well, and all efforts have to be undertaken to assume more responsibility. In this context German Chancellor Helmut Kohl appealed to the Europeans to further develop and intensify the "European Security and Defense Identity" in order to accomplish military tasks independently in specific cases and in close coordination within the Atlantic Alliance.⁷⁵ The United States needs and wants partners that are willing to share responsibilities and burdens on a global basis. "Only if Europe is willing and able to shoulder a larger share of the common burdens and responsibilities, can it expect the United States to continue its commitment in and for Europe."⁷⁶

If Europe is willing to continue on the way to deeper cooperation and integration among European nations, forces and means may be set free to act more independently. On this basis and founded on a functioning partnership and close coordination, Europe is able to help the United States gain more flexibility in using the U.S. military forces stationed in Europe to react militarily outside of the NATO area, if necessary.⁷⁷ The current need to economize the use of the remaining U.S. forces, a shrinking defense budget and increasing worldwide engagements may confront Europeans not only with a more frequent worldwide commitment of European-based U.S. forces, but also with the closure of fur-

ther garrisons in Europe. This should be not misinterpreted by the Europeans as a signal of shrinking U.S. interest in Europe. But it has to be accepted that the American people will not understand the closure of military posts in their own country while garrisons in Europe are maintained. Every European politician would act the same way.⁷⁸

While European understanding for U.S. problems is needed on the one hand, the same is true in the other direction. It should be clear to the USA that only a deeper integrated Europe is able to provide the militarily required support for significant burden-sharing. However, the USA government might not be in clear favor of a European Union with an integrated defense capability, as some U.S. officials admit in informal discussions.⁷⁹ In the current process, the following concerns are expressed by U.S. officials:

- Merging of the EU and the WEU might result in an expansion of security guarantees without any or insufficient U.S. consultation by the Europeans;
- the well proven NATO consultation and decision process will change, if the Europeans agree in advance, to speak with one voice;
- the integrated Alliance structure will be changed and thereby weakened.⁸⁰

U.S. Assistant Secretary John C. Kornblum phrased his critique on a deeper European integration positively when he demanded that “we must capitalize on Europe’s diversity, the source of its strength as well as its challenge. The new Europe must transcend divisions while recognizing the reality that societies increasingly want to retain their identity and individualism.”⁸¹ Admittedly there are some political objectives hidden in this state-

ment. Dealing with various European nations makes it quite easier for the U.S. to find partners and coalitions among the Europeans. This will become much harder if the United States is confronted with a quasi-European block speaking with only one voice.

Europeans should seriously weigh these concerns. Misinterpreted signals or actions without previous coordination and consultation - especially if they concern security guarantees - can quickly result in alienation with severe consequences for both sides. Europeans should inform U.S. officials including the Congress as completely as possible about the scope and intention of planned measures. It is of greatest importance to the further development of the relationship to treat the U.S.A. as a European-involved power that must be included in the preparation of decisions. This is of special importance if U.S. security guarantees are involved, including the sensitive issue of the U.S. nuclear umbrella provided to the European NATO members. In this regard, U.S. concerns are understandable if an unprepared and uncoordinated enlargement of the European Union and the WEU takes place, leaving the question unanswered which security arrangements are valid for the various members in NATO, the EU and the WEU. In order not to undermine security arrangements there should be no doubt that membership in NATO and EU/WEU should be eventually congruent with a transition phase of incongruent membership. However this demands intense coordination initiated by the Europeans to keep the United States as the main "security provider" informed and satisfied with the new situation. On the other hand, U.S. representatives should develop a deeper understanding for the Euro-

pean integration processes, its mechanisms and consequences, in order to see the benefits of a real European Union for the United States.⁸²

7. The Political and Military Perspective for WEU

7.1. The Political Perspective

In Line with the Maastricht Declaration "the WEU is to be expanded into the security and defense policy arm of the EU - not in competition with the Atlantic Alliance, but rather as its European pillar. The Europeans can thus assume more responsibility for their own security and also take action in crisis situations in which NATO does not play an active role. The indispensable collective defense and security alliance between Europe and North America will remain unaffected by this".⁸³ This formula is differently interpreted in the EU member countries. For example, Italy, Germany, but also the Netherlands, Belgium, Luxembourg and Greece understand this as a process which finally sees the full integration of the WEU into the EU, recognizing nevertheless that this endstate can only be achieved through a step by step approach, realizing after a long period the European vision, as cited in the first sentence of this paper.

The following phases are envisioned by these countries:

- To incorporate into the EU Treaty a general political solidarity clause which would be below the level of a military assistance clause, as well as to incorporate the WEU "Petersberg tasks."

- To give the European Council the power to set policy guidelines for WEU. In this field, the introduction of "constructive abstention" for combined measures could reinforce efficiency and effectiveness.⁸⁴
- To support increased cooperation of the EU and the WEU in the field of crisis management.
- To establish the integration of the WEU into the EU as the specific objective of the EU treaty.
- To develop joint security and defense structures and a gradual movement of an operationally-enhanced WEU towards the EU with the aim of gradual integration into the Union.
- In support of the integration process, to fix a definite timetable for the accomplishment of specific steps as part of a phased approach.
- For a later phase, to transfer politico-military competencies in the field of crisis management from the WEU to the EU supported by developing politico military structures within EU.⁸⁵
- Finally, to terminate the WEU treaty and transfer the remaining WEU responsibilities to the EU.⁸⁶

Other countries, above all the UK, but also France, do not agree with these ambitious plans. Both "seem incapable of overcoming their ideological hostility to the community approach" in foreign and defense policy.⁸⁷ The UK is mainly in favor of the status quo but would accept some adaptations of the EU: "In future, therefore, we (UK) see the

WEU providing political authority and direction for European led operations...the WEU should be able to draw on Alliance assets and capabilities. The WEU needs to become more capable to fulfill its role...We believe that the EU can achieve extension of the security we enjoy...without any need to emerge as an organization with a defense component.”⁸⁸ France would approve as a maximum a limited and closely defined WEU subordination to EU.⁸⁹ Both countries see their national independence threatened by transferring security and defence responsibility to a supranational agency, thereby losing the capability to act independently if national interests - e.g. outside Europe - are touched.

The European Intergovernmental Conference (IGC), initiated in 1996, to define and determine the phases for a European Union with the inclusion of security and defense competencies will probably fail to achieve this objective, even if its work is terminated at the end of June 1997. Under this circumstances, some countries like Germany are already thinking about a “third Maastricht.”⁹⁰

Significant parts of the visionary sentence of the Brussels Treaty of 1948 (“For the purposes of strengthening peace and security and promoting unity and of encouraging the progressive integration of Europe”) will, therefore, continue to wait for their eventual realization. The final step towards a real political union, which will be incomplete without a clear defense competency for the EU, will probably not be accomplished in the foreseeable future. “At present it is difficult to envisage agreement to bring the WEU into the EU framework..., but it is important not to relinquish this as an EU goal,” because

otherwise the EU will fail to become a real and serious player in the world's security arena.⁹¹

7.2. The Military Perspective

While the political perspective for the WEU remains unclear, its operational capabilities start to become more apparent.

7.2.1. First Steps Into a New Future

Reluctant to accept further WEU progress in moving closer to the EU, the United Kingdom and France,⁹² however, are strong supporters of improved WEU operational capabilities for European and national reasons, because both are confronted with insufficient military capabilities for their still far-reaching military engagements.

As already mentioned, it was agreed by all WEU member states that collective defence should remain a NATO responsibility in line with Article IV of the modified Brussels treaty,⁹³ because defence of Europe would overtax the WEU's capabilities. So the Petersberg Agreement gave the foundation of new tasks for the WEU including the provision of planning elements (WEU Planning Cell) and forces (FAWEU),⁹⁴ as well as other steps already addressed in previous chapters.

On this basis, the WEU is now trying to build up its crisis management functions and tools. These mechanisms were tested for the first time in a planning exercise, named "WEU-CRISEX 1996," dealing with a peacekeeping operation in line with Article VI of the UN Charter. The exercise involved not only the complete WEU organization with the Planning Cell as the core of the planning process, but also HQ EUROKORPS as well as the Ministries of Defense of the various WEU nations.⁹⁵ Experiences and results gained are currently being transferred into procedures to enable appropriate reactions in the future. This shall also provide the prerequisites to support the UN with a limited contingent, if asked, or to conduct rescue and evacuation employment as tested the first time in the exercise "TRAMONTANA '94."⁹⁶

As mentioned in Chapter 4, NATO agreed to support the WEU on the basis of the general decisions of the NAC session in Berlin, June 1996,⁹⁷ with:

- command, control, communications and computer elements and personnel by the provision of CJTF HQs, and
- provision of "separable, but not separated," NATO assets, in order to enable WEU to lead operations, in the case NATO has decided not to act.

While these decisions help to sharpen the European profile and to release U.S.A. from the burden of a permanent crisis engagement in and for Europe, thereby fostering the partnership, further areas were identified to strengthen WEU militarily.

With the introduction of "constructive abstention,"⁹⁸ The WEU will achieve more flexible and in-time reactions. The current obligation only to act on the basis of unanimity prevented WEU operations in Zaire,⁹⁹ although France, Belgium and other countries had been willing to employ forces. The objections of some WEU partners, however, stopped this effort.

In November 1996, the WEU Council agreed on steps to establish a Western European Armaments Organisation (WEAO). The Council acknowledged that only common efforts in the design and procurement of armament goods would result in reducing the burden on the national defence budgets while providing the armed forces in the various European countries with the technological sophisticated equipment needed. This is also a profound effort to achieve progress in standardizing equipment given "the profusion of peacekeeping and peace-enforcement operations being carried out within multilateral frameworks in countries often very far from base."¹⁰⁰ The final objective of the WEAO effort is the establishment of an European Armaments Agency (EAA), responsible for directing, coordinating and supervising the European armaments industry.¹⁰¹

A third step, to improve WEU capabilities, is to be seen in increasing multinational efforts among European national armed forces. Although not basically caused by the WEU, WEU will benefit nevertheless from the process that increasingly interlocks European armed forces. Examples of relationships exist in the multinational forces like EURO-KORPS, with French, Belgian, Spanish, Dutch, Luxembourg and German soldiers, Mul-

tinational Division (Central) with British, Belgian, Netherlands and German soldiers, or the German/Netherlands Corps, which leads all Netherlands Army Forces from a Headquarters on German soil. Within the same conceptual framework and in order to achieve greater versatility in crisis management in the Southern Region, France, Portugal, Spain and Italy established a European divisional sized land force (EUROFOR) and a European maritime force (EUROMARFOR).

These forces, which are all NATO assigned, may operate jointly or independently to accomplish missions in support of crisis management and the Petersberg tasks. All forces are “not standing” formations. They will be not available at once, but their various national elements will be provided to HQ EUROKORPS, EUROFOR etc. based on national decisions. Similarly, the EUROMARFOR is not a permanent force, but will be activated for contingency operations, committing those ships that will be provided by the various national navies.¹⁰² Despite still existing deficiencies this multinational approach will result in an increased and common understanding of European security, will sharpen the ESDI profile and will hamper national solo efforts.¹⁰³

These initial promising steps need to be followed by further measures to increase the WEU's military capabilities. With the support by CJTF and other NATO assets, the WEU will improve its strategic and operational functions. However, that must be accompanied by a restructuring of the WEU Planning Cell. Neither the amount of personnel nor the planning resources of the Cell will be adequate to exercise planning, command and con-

trol.¹⁰⁴ In this context it might be helpful to determine NATO's ACE Reaction Force Planning Staff (ARFPS)¹⁰⁵ as one of those assets, provided to WEU on request. This crises experienced staff might assist at least as an interim solution, in providing badly needed additional WEU planning capabilities. This action also would foster the relationships between the WEU and NATO.

Especially for rare and expensive operational key asset force multipliers like air refueling, reconnaissance means etc., and for specific key functions like air defense, logistics etc., it might be worthwhile to spend more effort in establishing a "Multinational Task Sharing" concept. This concept would require the WEU nations only to concentrate on specific tasks/assets, while the integration and close coordination would cover the whole military spectrum. Although this is still a visionary thought, initial steps have been seriously initiated, keeping in mind increasing budget constraints.¹⁰⁶

To be able to react quicker to crisis management requirements, a permanent WEU force deserves careful attention. This permanent WEU formation would demonstrate the WEU countries' resolve to continue deeper integration and to establish capable tools for the accomplishment of Petersberg type tasks.

The size of the formation should not exceed the division level,¹⁰⁷ because it is difficult to imagine that the WEU would be able to lead independently larger operations without involvement of US or NATO capabilities. In addition, this level would not overburden the

military resources of the force contributing nations. And finally this level matches most of the requirements of PSOs. The military results in Somalia would have been more promising, if the WEU had been able to employ an already well trained and prepared division. This action would have guaranteed unity of effort, instead of peacemealing different forces of European countries, arduously coordinated only after the start of the commitment in Somalia.

7.2.2. Areas for Further WEU Initiatives

7.2.2.1. Peace Support Operations

The WEU sees its military engagement, foremost in crisis management, in line with the Petersberg tasks. In this context, Peace Support Operations (PSO)¹⁰⁸ will be required. PSO as defined in endnote 108 may encompass traditional Peace Keeping Operations (PKO), based on the agreement of the opposing parties and strict neutrality of the PKO forces, as well as wider framed PKOs, also named “second generation PKO,”¹⁰⁹ like the Bosnia commitment of IFOR/SFOR, allowing use of force in case of noncompliance of a party with the agreed rules. The end of the spectrum of PSO is marked by Peace Enforcing Operations (PEO), conducted against the will and resistance of a party. In general, these differences of PSOs will also determine size and intensity of the specific operation with direct influence to the military organization needed to successfully accomplish the mission.¹¹⁰

This was to be seen in an operation like Desert Shield/Desert Storm which could be called a PEO in accordance with the definition outlined in endnote 108. The success of

the operation was based largely on the close co-operation and long practiced command and control mechanism among allies, as only NATO could offer it. Desert Shield/ Desert Storm was a NATO operation in all but name. "NATO is the only organization in the world capable of carrying out another enforcement action on the scale of Desert Storm."¹¹¹

The second generation PKO in Bosnia, with its level of risks and the amount of forces needed to implement peace, proved that the United Nations with its lack of command and control capabilities as well as the WEU, with only limited command and control systems, had been overtaxed. Consequently, NATO was asked to take over that mission. The well suited and trained NATO C4I apparatus, from the North Atlantic Council (NAC) through SACEUR to COMAFSOUTH down to COMIFOR in Sarajevo, although in a new environment, in fact succeeded where the UN failed. Both, Bosnia as well as Somalia with a PSO changing from PKO to almost PEO, showed that those kind of challenges demand a sophisticated military organization like NATO to carry out such complex missions.¹¹²

If conditions for traditional PKOs exist, an organization like NATO might not be necessary. In this case, both an UN International Military Staff (IMS) and standby forces at the UN's disposal, could represent a sufficient answer for future peace missions.¹¹³

In addition to the political activities required as a prerequisite for the conduct of PKOs,¹¹⁴ it will be necessary, nevertheless, that the military forces, provided from the various na-

tions, be committed under a unified command and with an efficient organization of C4I at its disposal. Faced still with the probability of a return to a hostile environment, intelligence activities assume particular importance in order to prevent any threats and to react in time to any changes in the parties' behavior.¹¹⁵

This makes the WEU the obvious choice to support the UN, since former UN Secretary General's, Butros-Butros Gali, idea to establish UN stand-by forces still needs time to become reality. Above all, PKO crisis settlement either in Europe or - more probable - at Europe's borders offers a good chance for commitment with the additional advantage, that Europe would directly benefit from the results of crisis determination.

The WEU may be accepted in regions, for example, where NATO including U.S. forces might not be welcomed, because especially a U.S. commitment could trigger suspicion or would not find the agreement among some of the 120 developing countries in the General Assembly of the UN.¹¹⁶

This might be true for large parts of Africa. The problem of how to establish a permanent framework for some kind of "African Peacekeeping," has been a long time discussion among international organizations such as the UN, OAS and EU. In this context, the EU has recently requested the WEU to draw up specific measures that could help establish African/WEU capabilities under the auspices of UN.¹¹⁷ Consequently, a WEU military delegation was sent to Senegal in Fall 1996, in order to explore possible forms of coop-

eration between the WEU and the OAS, complementing an EU initiative on the ministerial level, to discuss African peacekeeping with South African Defense Committee (SADC).¹¹⁸ Even though this concept might require some time before being actually implemented, the WEU nevertheless has shown that it is an accepted and welcomed partner in Africa.

In other regions the WEU might be the more desired force, if a PKO commitment is required. Russia probably could never accept a direct NATO involvement of any kind in areas of its former Empire, an area that has been suffering for many, unsolved and bloody crises and ethnic conflicts especially in its Southern part, where Islamic revivalism merges with gigantic population explosion.¹¹⁹

Charged either by the UN or by the OSCE, the WEU could even include Russian, Ukrainian or other CIS forces in its employment package - similar to Russia's and Ukraine's engagement in IFOR/SFOR - for a PSO in those regions, fostering thereby the links to the East and preventing isolation in support of peace and stability in the whole of Europe.

In line with Petersberg type tasks and as part of PSO, the WEU also decided to increase its engagement in humanitarian assistance. The WEU Council blessed a proposal to assist humanitarian land-mine clearance operations and "act as a forum for WEU nations to assemble a coherent package of military assistance to develop local training capabilities and

to disseminate information on detection and clearance of land mines".¹²⁰ Furthermore, the WEU Council initiated generic planning for humanitarian and emergency relief operations aiming at the establishment of a WEU Humanitarian Task Force to be employed on request of the EU. Discussions between WEU and EU authorities have already started about scope and details of such a force.¹²¹ Italy delivered already an example of how such kind of humanitarian aid operation might be conducted, when, in operation "PELICAN," EU goods were distributed by two Italian logistical battalions, assisting Albanian authorities to reestablish acceptable humanitarian conditions. In consequence, the dangerous and insecure situation in Albania was stabilized and the continuation of refugee movement into West Europe significantly reduced.¹²² The WEU's engagement with police forces of various European nations in Mostar demonstrated the WEU's resolve to commit itself even beyond military requirements and to provide support to the EU in the state building part of crisis management¹²³.

7.2.2.2. A Mediterranean PfP Initiative

Complementing NATO in another area as an important part of crisis management and crisis prevention, the WEU might also launch an initiative to establish a Mediterranean derivation of Partnership for Peace (PfP). WEU members including countries like Slovenia, Romania, and Cyprus, belonging to the wider Mediterranean area, could cooperate closely with countries such as Israel, Egypt, Jordan or some of the Maghreb states to provide not only symbolic but also substantive reassurance for the stability of a restless region.¹²⁴

In this context, the WEU could play a fundamental role as a bridge between Europe's Southern neighbors and Europe itself. The WEU could open doors to countries that have sometimes perceived NATO as an unfriendly factor in their area. The WEU, embedded in the EU as well NATO, could thereby export Western values and views into the whole Mediterranean (hemisphere region). As a result, the WEU would assume the responsibility to promote a "Mediterranean PfP," acting as NATO's pillar in the South and complementing it in support of NATO crisis management, peacekeeping and humanitarian assistance under the auspices either of the United Nations or the OSCE.

First steps have already been taken in this direction. For instance, the Italian multinational brigade in Bosnia assumed under its tactical control an Egyptian battalion. As Beniamino Andreatta, Italian Minister of Defense said in October 19, 1996 during a conference in Cairo: "I see no better evidence than Bosnia to prove that military cooperation can work among us, that the PfP concept can work in the Mediterranean region."¹²⁵

7.2.2.3. Required Changes in Attitude

Sharpening the profile of the WEU by these portrayed steps demands changes in the attitude of politicians and people away from a pure national view to a thinking in European terms, even if some countries are reluctant to accept that. Especially crisis management and the commitment of European forces led by the WEU inside and outside of Europe means new challenges for European governments and societies. Inherent in a crisis re-

sponse is agreement on common political goals even if they are not directly linked to national interests. It means being prepared to act at a very early stage of a crisis - as Europe should have learned from the former Yugoslavia - and the will to sustain commitments. It means the acceptance of risks and casualties. There is no such thing as a "no risk intervention". "Quick in - quick out" is by no means the normal case. Crisis management means to act decisively and not to follow false concepts like impartiality or dual key which do nothing but harm.

Conflict prevention means more than the Cold War reactive strategy which left the initiative to the aggressor and the need to regain the initiative in the course of events during a conflict. Crisis management means a lot of change for the EU/WEU - as well as for NATO - and the more so since the nature of crises and conflicts will increasingly be supra-regional and broader than the military confrontation we were used to.

8. A Renovated U.S./European Partnership for a New Epoch

When German Chancellor Helmut Kohl in 1990 looked at "the future of Europe even beyond the year 2000, he saw the Americans still present in Europe as a matter of course. If the Europeans allowed the Americans to leave, it would be a great defeat - a defeat on the scale of Wilson's failure to keep the United States engaged in Europe after World War I."¹²⁶ This remark is still very true even after the unforeseen radical changes brought about by the end of the Cold War. However, Europeans and North Americans should try

to formulate a new Atlantic declaration¹²⁷ which takes into account that the scope of international politics became both broader and geographically wider. It will result in an architecture which will include a reformed NATO with wider responsibilities, but without doing any damage to NATO's capability to defend collectively. One need not to mention that such an approach can only be successful if all NATO-members are willing to the same degree to share risks and responsibilities without reservation. Such a general preparedness, however, is a mandatory prerequisite for the functioning of all international arrangements. Nations who seek a special role which reduces their risks jeopardize both the cohesion, as well as efficiency, of the respective body and thereby weaken their own influence within the organization. The approach to think about a new Atlantic declaration, a new transatlantic grand strategy deserves, therefore, careful consideration.

Under this umbrella a stronger and more independent European pillar can be developed, which is capable of acting as a real partner, helping the world's leading super power to prevent or contain crises around the globe. International, as well as the domestic, problems and challenges will increase for both: United States and Europe. If only in the field of crisis management some kind of burden sharing could be achieved, both - U.S. and Europe - would significantly benefit. For example, one could imagine that the EU/WEU will become in a step-by-step process the organization responsible for crisis management and stability transfer in Europe and along Europe's borders including larger parts of Africa, backed up, if necessary by NATO.

This would give the U.S.A. the chance, to concentrate more on other hot spots around the world, which may threaten Western societies. But also these engagements will be conducted mostly by multinational forces, because U.S. politicians will more and more hesitate to commit U.S. forces unilaterally,¹²⁸ unless the nation's security is directly threatened. The reason for this is to be seen in the fact that people (especially those of democratic states) will likely not understand and accept why their sons and daughters have to be sacrificed and the tax money spent, while other countries remain uncommitted. This is particularly true, when other states will profit from a solution of a crisis.

Under the prerequisite of a multinational engagement it might be worthwhile to think of the employment of already multinational well trained and exercised assets and personnel such as NATO is able to provide. While the WEU will be supported - if required - in and around Europe by NATO personnel and assets, the same could become true in support of U.S. engagements. The NATO area of responsibility should not prevent this, because NATO has already stepped over the Rubicon by its IFOR/SFOR employment in Bosnia. Using NATO as the core or skeleton, it is much easier to incorporate forces of other nations, too, and nevertheless to achieve acceptable military operational results, as IFOR just has demonstrated¹²⁹. This mutual military assistance between United States and Europe would contribute significantly to fostering American/European links. Additionally, this new form of burden sharing would help the United States reduce the tremendous financial burden , caused by its world wide engagement. As a further consequence this

burden sharing would create more willingness among U.S. politicians and people to understand and accept European positions.

With a strengthened WEU, able to conduct limited operations independently in a small area of responsibility, and Europeans in NATO, willing to support the U.S.A. also in regions far outside of Europe, the United States will be kept in Europe, because both - U.S. and Europe - share not only the same values and heritage, but more important, the same responsibilities and risks.

9. Conclusion

In 1992 a study project at the U.S. Army War College researched the WEU's capabilities, not ruling out that a WEU integrated in a unified European Union might replace NATO in the future with the consequence of U.S. withdrawal from Europe.¹³⁰

The paper's intent was to show that in all foreseeable likelihood this will not happen. Neither has the WEU the capability to replace NATO, to say nothing about insufficient nuclear capabilities even if France would transfer its assets under WEU control, as once announced. Nor have the EU and WEU the will to disband NATO and drive the United States out of Europe. On the contrary, confronted with the global problems as sketched in the previous chapters both the United States and Europe need even closer partnership.

This research paper tried to bring out WEU's current situation, which has significantly improved since WEU's reemergence in the late 1980s. This reemergence was triggered

by the U.S. demand for more European efforts for real burden sharing, Germany's unification, which embedded this Central-European state into a tighter European organization to ban the specters of the past and last, but not least, the end of the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact, which not only finished the Cold War but also gave way for the return of crises and conflicts around the world, frozen in the East-West-confrontation. This required not only a stronger U.S. commitment outside the Northern hemisphere, but at the same time, required Europe's readiness to shoulder a bigger portion of security responsibilities. As shown, the WEU has started to develop operational planning as well as employment capabilities to enable Europe more scope of action. However, as addressed in chapter 3, risks and challenges in and around Europe would overtax the capabilities of an organization like the WEU, to ensure security. Therefore, it was only consequent that Europe decided together with the United States to adapt NATO, a well tested and tried alliance, to the new requirements in a two-pronged approach: with a stronger European identity within NATO and a more capable European organization outside NATO, but closely linked by sharing the same assets and support through NATO headquarters, planning capabilities etc. This realizes suggestions, published by Thomas-Durell Young in 1991, when he recommended linking NATO and the WEU to respond more effectively to the new risk categories of which the Gulf War was the first example.¹³¹ The overarching security complex for Europe is completed by OSCE, which provides inter alia the forum for Russia and Ukraine to participate in European security affairs and prevents their isolation and exclusion from the rest of Europe.

It was shown that the United States still has vital interests in Europe and that the U.S. political elite wants to continue the U.S. engagement in and for Europe. This must be supported, however, by conceding the United States the right to be included in the preparation of internal European decisions, particularly if U.S. security guarantees for the European allies are touched. However, the world's policeman needs relief, not in order to return to isolation, but because of the heavy burdens the policeman must fear.

Therefore, it was recommended to consolidate the WEU's development as an organization, serving more and more as Europe's defense arm and foremost, as an organization of operational military effectiveness. The accomplishment of the first objective still has to wait, because some nations remain reluctant to transfer national defense responsibilities to a supranational organization, knowing that thereby an important and visible tool of national independence would for ever wither away.

The other objective is realizable. However, the WEU must not be overstrained by the amount and scope of missions and initiatives, each WEU Council produces, diluting the required concentration on crisis management. The authors see the WEU as an organization complementing NATO and the OSCE in concert with European and transatlantic security institutions. Therefore, measures were suggested that help to intensify European integration and identity by deepening and widening multinationality. These measures will per se accelerate the development to more supranational defense and so improve WEU's operational crisis management capabilities, functionally and regionally limited. Func-

tional limits are given by the scope of a crisis or humanitarian task which the WEU will be employed for (PSO up to not more than division equivalent), while regional limits refer to employment in Europe and along European borders with the inclusion of larger parts of Africa. NATO will support, if necessary, and back up these engagements should a crisis spill over. In addition NATO could be used for crisis management outside of the Northern hemisphere. The projected overall effect is that the United States and Europe would cooperate as real partners with the aim of fair burden-sharing, acknowledging that both have interests everywhere, which demands corresponding common responsibilities and engagements.¹³²

10. Endnotes

¹ Article VIII of the Treaty of Economic, Social and Cultural Collaboration and Collective Self-Defence, referred to as the Brussels Treaty, signed at Brussels on March 17, 1948 and amended by the "Protocol Modifying and Completing the Brussels Treaty" at Paris on October 23, 1954, which enabled Germany and Italy to join.

² Supported by the USSR a communist coup d'état was conducted in Czechoslovakia in February 1948, which brought the Communists to the power, overturning the democratically elected government.

³ Stalin ordered June 24, 1948 the total blockade of Berlin (West), in order to enforce the withdrawal of the Western allies (USA, UK, France) from Berlin; almost a year later Stalin gave up.

⁴ Signatories were Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, Norway, the Netherlands, Portugal, the United Kingdom and the United States; Greece and Turkey became members in 1952, the Federal Republic of Germany in 1955.

⁵ Renamed in Western European Union (WEU)

⁶ See endnote 1.

⁷ Hutchison, John M., "The WEU, What Potential to Replace NATO?", Study Project U.S. Army War College, Carlisle, PA/USA, April 1992, p. 16.

⁸ See Articles 3 and 4 of the "Rome Declaration", Rome, October 27, 1984.

⁹ See Zelikow, Philip; Rice, Condoleezza, "Germany Unified and Europe Transformed", Cambridge, MA/USA, 1995, p. 365.

¹⁰ Denmark would qualify for full membership of the WEU, but has elected not to become a Full Member..

¹¹ See details for function and responsibilities of the Council and the following mentioned Groups in chapter 2.2. "The WEU Organization."

¹² So far three associated members have decided to delegate civilian and military representatives to the Planning Cell; these are Iceland, Norway and Turkey; see: Hye, Bem F., Chief of Staff Planning Cell Western European Union, "Operational Capabilities and Future Development," briefing given to the FINABEL meeting in Bruges/Belgium, June 19, 1996.

¹³ FAWEU is addressed in more detail in chapter 2.3. "The Military Capabilities."

¹⁴ "Petersberg Tasks" are addressed in more detail in chapter 2.3. "The Military Capabilities."

¹⁵ Malta's Government has recently decided not to intensify cooperation with WEU/EU and has canceled its already announced participation in NATO's PfP program.

¹⁶ The article asks the member states "to afford the Party so attacked all the military and other aid and assistance in their power" - an assistance which reaches farer than that of NATO - and to convene immediately "(a) the request of any of the high contracting parties, the council [highest organ of the WEU] ...in order to permit them to consult with regard to any situation which may constitute a threat to peace, in whatever area this threat should arise, or a danger to economic stability WEU," see Brussels Treaty, amended by the Protocol modifying and completing the Brussels/BE Treaty, signed at Paris on October 23, 1954, published by WEU Press & Information Service, Brussels/BE.

¹⁷ WEU Press & Information Service, "History, Structures, Prospects," Brussels/BE, June 1995.

¹⁸ WEU Press & Information Service, "WEU Related Texts Adopted at the EC Summit, Maastricht - 10 December 1991," Brussels/BE.

¹⁹ WEU Press & Information Service, "Western European Union Council of Ministers, Bonn, 19 June 1992 -Petersberg Declaration," Brussels/BE.

²⁰ WEU Press & Information Service, "History, Structures, Prospects," Brussels/BE, June 1995, p. 19.

²¹ The Institute has a threefold role: to carry out studies for the WEU Council and for the WEU Parliamentary Assembly; to make the public aware of European security problems; to organize meetings with institutes in member countries; see: *ibid*.

²² See Young, Thomas-Durell, "Preparing the Western Alliance for the Next Out-Of-Area Campaign: Linking NATO and the WEU," Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College, Carlisle, PA, April 1991, pp. 9-11

²³ WEU Press & Information Service, "WEU Related Texts Adopted at the EC Summit, Maastricht - 10 December 1991," Brussels/BE.

²⁴ *Ibid*.

²⁵ WEU Press & Information Service, "Western European Union Council of Ministers, Bonn, 19 June 1992 -Petersberg Declaration," Brussels/BE.

²⁶ See: Hye, Bem F., Chief of Staff Planning Cell Western European Union, "Operational Capabilities and Future Development," briefing given to the FINABEL meeting in Bruges/Belgium, June 19, 1996.

²⁷ Since 1995 also with the participation of Finland, Austria and Sweden.

²⁸ WEU Press & Information Service, "Western European Union Council of Ministers, 7 May 1996 - Birmingham Declaration," Brussels/BE.

²⁹ Bagger, Hartmut (CHOD Germany), "Standortbestimmung" (Definition of the Position), lecture given at the Information Meeting for retired Generals and Admirals, Radebeul/GE, September 30, 1996.

³⁰ Western European Union/PMWG, "Illustrative Profiles for WEU Missions" (WEU Restricted), Brussels/BE, September 1996.

³¹ Smyth, Patrick, "WEU meeting to consider practicalities of EU links," "The Irish Times," Dublin/IRL, November 18, 1996.

³² Ruehe, Volker (German Defense Minister), "Mut zur Verantwortung - Deutschland und der Frieden in Europa" (Courage for Responsibility - Germany and the Peace in Europe), lecture given at St. Katharinen Church, Hamburg, February 5, 1996; published in: Press- and Information Office of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany (Presse und Informationsamt der Bundesregierung) No. 15, Bonn, February 14, 1996.

³³ Kremp, Herbert, Editor of "Die Welt" (leading German Newspaper) in a lecture given at Springer Haus, Berlin, October 24, 1995.

³⁴ Kissinger, Henry, "Memorial Speech in Honor of Joseph Kruzel" given at The German Command and General Staff Academy (Fuehrungsakademie), Hamburg/GE, addressing security challenges in and for Europe; published in "Bundeswehr Aktuell", Nr. 81/32. Jahrgang, Bonn, November 21, 1996 (Joseph Kruzel, responsible for European affairs in US DOD died in a car accident near Igman mountain, Sarajevo, August 1995 during a peace mission in preparation of the Dayton agreement).

³⁵ The Russian military is so dispirited and impoverished that officers have been forced to sell their blood to afford basic necessities, Russia's defense minister Igor Rodionov told in a newspaper interview. "In the centuries-old history of the Russian officer corps, they have never suffered such humiliation." - Rodionov, Igor (RUS Defense Minister), interview published in *Nezavisimaya Gazeta*, Moscow, December 16, 1996. The financial problems extend even to Russia's most elite military divisions, the nuclear forces. In a rare press conference, Gen. Igor Sergeyev, commander of Russia's strategic nuclear forces, said his men were also suffering financially. "We haven't paid people since September, to say nothing of October, November and December" - Sergeyev, Igor: published in *Nezavisimaya Gazeta*, Moscow, December 16, 1996.

³⁶ Marsh, Nicholas, "The Future of NATO" linked from UK/Government.

<"<http://www.cityscape.co.uk/users/hl03/arc.htm>">, January 02, 1997.

³⁷ As also explained later in this chapter this policy has to be based on three elements: cooperation in the Partnership for Peace; cooperation beyond PFP and development of a political framework for a security partnership as offered by North Atlantic Council in Berlin 1996; see Ruehe, Volker, "Strategic Partnership between NATO and Russia," Statement given at MOD Bonn, September 18, 1996.

³⁸ This is especially important on the background of the ongoing warnings of an imminent threat by NATO, caused through NATO's intention of enlargement. So Russian Defense Minister Igor Rodionov continues to see NATO as a potential military threat for Russia and the CIS because NATO insists on extending its influence to the East, thereby trying to reduce the significance of Russia and the CIS. The Russian Defense Minister announced these charges during a conference for military cooperation among CIS, held in Moscow; Report of INTERFAX News Agency December 25, 1996.

³⁹ A high ranking RUS officer of Russian General Staff thought it not imaginable to be governed from European Union capital and NATO HQ Brussels/BE, if RUS would be member of EU or NATO respectively. This answer he gave during talks between a Russian Delegation and a German Delegation, November 1993 in Wolgograd/RUS.

⁴⁰ See also Chapter 2.1.2. "Dialogue and Information Arrangements."

⁴¹ North Atlantic Council, Final Communiqué of the North Atlantic Council in Defense Ministers Session, held in Brussels/BE, December 17 and 18, 1996.

⁴² Ibid.

⁴³ See Western European Union/Political Committee, "Relations between the WEU Council and Assembly; Report on "The future role of WEU," Reply to the annual report of the Council," Brussels/BE, November 1996.

⁴⁴ A comprehensive, yearlong study of poverty in Ukraine has determined that 29.5 percent of the country's citizens are living in poverty; published in "The Ukrainian Weekly" December 1, 1996, Vol. LXIV, No. 48.

⁴⁵ Pirozhkov, Serhiy, "Geopolitical Realities in the Euro-Atlantic Area: A Ukrainian Perspective," in: NATO Defence College, "Peacekeeping Challenges to Euro-Atlantic Security," edited by Ernest Gilman, Detlef E. Herold, Rome 1994, pp. 9-11.

⁴⁶ Brzezinski, Zbigniew, "Dinner Address to Ukraine's First Five Years of Independence," given at the National Press Club on December 12, 1996; published in "The Ukrainian Weekly," December 22, 1996, Vol. LXIV, No. 50.

⁴⁷ North Atlantic Council, Final Communiqué of the North Atlantic Council in Defense Ministers Session, held in Brussels/BE, December 17 and 18, 1996.

⁴⁸ Ibid.

⁴⁹ See Stato Maggiore Della Difesa (Italian Defense General Staff), "Modello di Difesa" (New Defense Model), Rome/IT, September 1995.

⁵⁰ Stato Maggiore Della Difesa (Italian Defense General Staff), "Overview on the Italian Defence Policy," Briefing given on the occasion of the visit of German CHOD General Hartmut Bagger, Rome/IT, July 2, 1996.

⁵¹ SLG is part of the Principal NATO Committees addressing NACC and PfP activities; see NATO Office of Information and Press, "NATO Handbook," Brussels/BE, 1995, pp.99-102.

⁵² For details on non-Article 5 missions and CJTF concept see chapter 4. NATO- An Organization in Change.

⁵³ Stato Maggiore Della Difesa (Italian Defense General Staff), "NATO Enlargement and PfP," Talking point 30th IT/UK Staff Talks, Rome/IT, October 22, 1996.

⁵⁴ For details see chapter 7.2.2.2. A Mediterranean PfP Initiative.

⁵⁵ For more details see chapter 7.2.2.

⁵⁶ Naumann, Klaus, (since April 1996 Chairman Military Committee of NATO; previous Chief of Defense Staff, Germany), "On Security And Co-operation," Lecture given during the 6. International Antalya Conference, Antalya/TU, November 4, 1995.

⁵⁷ See the statement of the Turkish foreign minister as published in Corriere della Sera, Milan/IT (US edition), January 14, 1997.

⁵⁸ Stato Maggiore Della Difesa (Italian Defense General Staff), "Security in the Mediterranean," Talking Points for 30th IT/UK Staff Talks, Rome/IT, October 22, 1996.

⁵⁹ WEU Press & Information Service, "Western European Union Council of Ministers," 7 May 1996 - Birmingham Declaration," Brussels/BE.

⁶⁰ German Federal Ministry of Defense, "White Paper 1994," Bonn/GE, April 1994, p.37.

⁶¹ North Atlantic Council, Final Communiqué of the North Atlantic Council in Defense Ministers Session, held in Brussels/BE, December 17 and 18, 1996.

⁶² Ibid.

⁶³ This request was adopted by the WEU Council during its meeting in Ostend/BE on November 19, 1996.

⁶⁴ Stato Maggiore Della Difesa (Italian Defense General Staff), "Overview on the Italian Defence Policy," Briefing given on the occasion of the visit of German CHOD General Hartmut Bagger, Rome/IT, July 2, 1996.

⁶⁵ Kohl, Helmut, "Sicherheit fuer ein kommendes Europa" (Security for a future Europe), lecture given at the 33. conference for security policy, Muenchen, February 3, 1996; published in: Press- and Information Office of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany (Presse- und Informationsamt der Bundesregierung) No. 15, Bonn, February 14, 1996.

⁶⁶ NATO Office of Information and Press, "NATO Handbook," Brussels/BE, 1995, p. 51.

⁶⁷ Ruehe, Volker, "Strategic Partnership between NATO and Russia," statement given at MOD Bonn, September 18, 1996.

⁶⁸ Government of the Federal Republic of Germany: "Jahresbericht 1995" (Annual Report 1995) linked from Germany/Government < <http://www.bundesregierung.de/.bin/lay/inland/bpa/bro/jahresbe/00000775.htm> > December 26, 1996.

⁶⁹ Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, "Annual Report Europa 2000," linked from Germany/Government < <http://www.government.de/.bin/lay/inland/bpa/bro/euro2000/00000079.htm> > December 26, 1996.

⁷⁰ Naumann, Klaus, "Neue Herausforderungen für die deutsche Sicherheitspolitik und die Bundeswehr" (New Challenges for German Security Policy and German Armed Forces), lecture given in Berlin, January 8, 1996.

⁷¹ Weidenfeld, Werner (Professor for Political Research, University of Munich, and Coordinator for U.S. German Cooperation in GE Foreign Ministry): "Europa verschwindet vom Radarschirm der USA," in FOCUS, German Newsmagazine, No. 45, November 4, 1996, p. 106.

⁷² The White House, "A National Security Strategy of Engagement and Enlargement," Washington, February 1996, p. 35.

⁷³ Gaddis, John Lewis, "The United States and the End of the Cold War," New York, 1992, p. 208.

⁷⁴ Ruehe, Volker, "America and Europe - Common Challenges and Common Answers", Lecture given at Georgetown University on March 2, 1995, Washington D.C.

⁷⁵ Kohl, Helmut, "Sicherheit fuer ein kommendes Europa" (Security for a future Europe), Ibid.

⁷⁶ Ruehe, Volker, "America and Europe - Common Challenges and Common Answers," Ibid.

⁷⁷ Ruehl, Lothar, "Deutschland als europäische Macht" (Germany as European Power), Bonn 1996, p. 196.

⁷⁸ So French President Chirac decided to withdraw most of the French troops from Germany to avoid an even more drastical closure of posts in France in consequence of the significant reduction of French forces. This decision was even made without prior consultations with the German Government.

⁷⁹ Based on German MOD resources especially representatives of U.S. State Department are unofficially not in favor of a European Union with the inclusion of a defense component.

⁸⁰ These U.S. concerns were expressed by Assistant Secretary John C. Kornblum in his address to the Atlantic Council, Washington, October 8, 1996.

⁸¹ Kornblum, John C., "Address to the Atlantic Council," Washington, October 8, 1996

⁸² This view is shared by a "Strategic Outreach Roundtable" discussing European Union's common foreign and security policy; see: Ginsberg, Fraser Cameron Roy; Janning, Josef, "The European Union's Common Foreign and Security Policy: Central Issues ... Keyplayers," Strategic Outreach Roundtable and Conference Report, Washington D.C., May 10, 1995, p.3.

⁸³ WEU Press & Information Service, "WEU Related Texts Adopted at the EC Summit, Maastricht - 10 December 1991," Brussels/BE.

⁸⁴ While today EU and WEU decisions or measures require unanimity, this would change with "constructive abstention;" those countries, which do not like to support specific actions directly abstain from voting allowing thereby the other countries to launch measures as deemed necessary.

⁸⁵ Bundesregierung der Bundesrepublik Deutschland (Government of the Federal Republic of Germany): "Weitere Entwicklung der EU" (Further Development of EU) linked from Germany/Government < <http://www.bundesregierung.de/.bin/lay/ausland/news/presse/pm96121301.html> > December 26, 1996.

⁸⁶ Bundespresseamt (Federal Press Office of the Federal Republic of Germany): "Europa 2000", linked from Europe/WEU <<http://www.bundesregierung.de/.bin/lay/inland/bpa/bulletin/bu96112607.html>> December 26, 1996.

⁸⁷ Ginsberg, Fraser Cameron Roy; Janning, Josef, "The European Union's Common Foreign and Security Policy: Central Issues ... Keyplayers," Strategic Outreach Roundtable and Conference Report, Washington, D.C., May 10 1995, p. 22.

⁸⁸ UK Ministry of Defense, "Statement on the Defense Estimates," Chapter One: "Defense Policy," London/UK, 1996.

⁸⁹ Bundespresseamt (Federal Press Office of the Federal Republic of Germany): "Europa 2000", linked from Europe/WEU <<http://www.bundesregierung.de/.bin/lay/inland/bpa/bulletin/bu96112607.html>> December 26, 1996.

⁹⁰ Stato Maggiore Della Difesa (Italian Defense General Staff), "Inter-Governmental Conference on the European Security and the Future of the WEU," Talking Points for 30th IT/UK Staff Talks, Rome/IT, October 22, 1996.

⁹⁰ See also UK Ministry of Defense, "Statement on the Defense Estimates," Chapter One, Defense Policy, London/UK, 1996.

⁹¹ Ginsberg, Fraser Cameron Roy; Janning, Josef, "The European Union's Common Foreign and Security Policy: Central Issues ... Keyplayers," Strategic Outreach Roundtable and Conference Report, Washington, D.C., May 10 1995, p. 17.

⁹² France's interest in WEU has decreased, since France had recognized that its initiative to create an enlarged WEU, "independent of the United States and NATO, as a supplement for NATO and particularly for Washington's leadership position of the Western Alliance in Europe" has failed (Young, Thomas-Durell, "Preparing the Western Alliance for the Next Out-of-Area Campaign: Linking NATO and the WEU," *ibid.*, p. 16) also as a result of NATO's adaptation to the new challenges; consequently France decided end of 1995 to return into NATO's military part of the organization.

⁹³ Western European Union, "Brussels/BE Treaty, as amended by the Protocol modifying and completing the Brussels/BE Treaty," Paris/F, October 1954.

⁹⁴ WEU Press & Information Service, "Western European Union Council of Ministers, June 19, 1996, Petersberg Declaration," Brussels/BE.

⁹⁵ Bundespresseamt (Federal Press Office of the Federal Republic of Germany): "Europa 2000," linked from Europe/WEU < <http://www.bundesregierung.de/inland/bpa/themen/euro9605.html> > December 26, 1996.

⁹⁶ This multinational exercise with Spanish, French, Italian and German Forces intended to train the evacuation of European citizens out of a crisis area South of the Mediterranean. All participating nations regarded the exercise as a success; see: Deutscher Militaerischer Vertreter im MC/NATO (German Military Representative to the Military Committee/NATO), "Report on Exercise TRAMONTANA '94," Brussels/BE, November 25, 1994.

⁹⁷ Press and Information Office of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany (Presse- und Informationsamt der Bundesregierung), "Bulletin: Ministertagung des Nordatlantikrates am 3. Juni 1996 in Berlin" (North Atlantic Council Meeting of the Foreign Ministers at June 3, 1996, in Berlin), No. 47, Bonn, June 12, 1996.

⁹⁸ For detailed explanation see endnote 84.

⁹⁹ In November 1996 hundred of thousands Rwanda refugees, herd together in camps in Zaire, tried to escape skirmishes between Rwanda rebels and Zaire troops. Without protection and suffering starvation the refugees needed humanitarian and military assistance from the outside.

¹⁰⁰ Western European Union/Political Committee, "Relations between the WEU Council and Assembly; Report on "The future role of WEU;" Reply to the annual report of the Council", Brussels/BE, November 1996, p. 33.

¹⁰¹ WEU Press & Information Service, "Western European Union Council of Ministers," November 19, 1996 - Ostend Declaration," Brussels/BE.

¹⁰² See also Stato Maggiore Della Difesa (Italian Defense General Staff), "New Defense Model," Rome/IT, September 1995.

¹⁰³ Ruehe, Volker, "Mut zur Verantwortung - Deutschland und der Frieden in Europa" (Courage for Responsibility - Germany and the Peace in Europe), lecture given at St. Katharinen Church, Hamburg, February 5, 1996; Ibid.

¹⁰⁴ Stato Maggiore Della Difesa (Italian Defense General Staff), "Overview on the Italian Defence Policy," Briefing given on the occasion of the visit of German CHOD General Hartmut Bagger, Rome, July 2, 1996.

¹⁰⁵ See NATO Office of Information and Press, "NATO Handbook," Brussels/BE, 1995; The ARFPS, becoming operational April 1993, was established on demands of a couple of nations to "balance and control" UK's lead function for the ACE Rapid Reaction Corps (ARRC); in order to stress its independence (and to avoid a quasi subordination under the Deputy SACEUR (provided by UK), ARFPS was established *at* and not within SHAPE, directly subordinate to SACEUR himself. A further reason for this construction was the - to that time unfulfilled - hope that France would see this as a chance to join NATO in the area of crisis management.

¹⁰⁶ Stato Maggiore Della Difesa (Italian Defense General Staff), "Overview on the Italian Defence Policy," Briefing given on the occasion of the visit of German CHOD General Hartmut Bagger, Rome, July 2, 1996

¹⁰⁷ See also chapter 2.3.3. Forces Answerable to WEU.

¹⁰⁸ PSO is a term to describe those military operations in which UN- sponsored military forces could be used. Even though differences do exist in how PSO are defined either in different national or international doctrines, it is general true that PSO include conflict prevention, peace making, peacekeeping, humanitarian aid operations, peace enforcement and peace building. Chapter VI and VII of the UN charter represent both the pillars and the limits for a wide range of peace operations. See Hillen III, John, "UN Collective Security; Chapter Six and a Half," Parameters, Vol. XXIV, No. 1, Spring 1994. See also Charter of the UN, chapter VI: Pacific Settlement of Disputes; chapter VII: Action with respect to Threats to the Peace, Breaches of the Peace and Act of Aggression, published in: U.S. Army War College, Department of National Security and Strategy, Course 2, Volume III, Academic Year 1997, pp. 159-186; see also for the definition of PSO: Esercito Italiano (Italian Army), "Manuale per le Operazioni di Mantenimento della Pace e per Interventi Umanitari," Pub. 903, pp. I/4-I/5. (Manual for Peacekeeping and Humanitarian Aid Operations); see also FM 100-23, Peace Operations, pp. 12-13. see also North Atlantic Treaty Organization, "NATO Doctrine for Peace Support Operations", Brussels/BE, February 28, 1994, Draft, Introduction, para. 4.

¹⁰⁹ MacKinlay, John "Improving Multifunctional Forces," Survival, Vol. XXXVI, No. 3, Autumn 1994.

¹¹⁰ The Army Field Manual, vol. 5: Operations Other than War; Part 2: "Wider Peacekeeping," HMSO, London, 1995.

¹¹¹ Marsh, Nicholas, "The Future of NATO" linked from UK/Government.

<"<http://www.cityscape.co.uk/users/h103/arc.htm>">, January 02, 1997.

¹¹² See Permanent Mission of Italy to North Atlantic Council, "Italian Military Interventions in Peacekeeping Operations," Brussels/BE, 1996.

See also North Atlantic Council in Cooperation (NACC) Politico- Military Steering Committee (PMSC) Ad Hoc Group (AHG) on Peacekeeping (PK), cited by Stato Maggiore Della Difesa (Italian Defense General Staff), Rome/IT, 1996.

¹¹³ Boutros Boutros-Ghali's report offers several recommendations relating to military force and PE. In particular he advocates the creation of armed forces under Article 43 of the UN Charter which would be available to the UN on a permanent basis as a means of deterring breaches of the peace. Boutros Boutros-Ghali, "An agenda for Peace," New York, United Nations, January 31, 1992.

¹¹⁴ First of all, as a prerequisite for employing military units in such an operation, it is necessary to achieve consent among the conflicting parties. Subsequently, the plan for peace must find previously agreement and has to be transformed in a clear mandate for the military forces. A general lesson learned from past experiences teaches us that a precondition for PKO must be a clear and achievable aim. Military forces alone cannot bring about peace, but can only provide the necessary security conditions for political and diplomatic initiatives and reconciliation between the disputing parties. Extracted from North Atlantic Council in Cooperation (NACC) Politico- Military Steering Committee Ad Hoc Group on Peacekeeping, cited in:

Stato Maggiore Della Difesa (Italian Defense General Staff), "National papers about lessons learned in PKO," Rome/IT, September 1996.

¹¹⁵ See The Army Field Manual, vol. 5: Operations Other than War; Part 2: "Wider Peacekeeping," HMSO, London, 1995.

¹¹⁶ See Tozzi, Claudio; Jablonsky, David, "Peacekeeping: A Cold War Solution, A Post Cold War Dilemma," Strategy Research Project, US Army War College, Carlisle, PA/USA, 1996; see also McKinley, John "Improving Multifunctional Forces," *Survival*, Vol. XXXVI, No. 3 (Autumn 1994), pp. 153- 154.

¹¹⁷ WEU Press & Information Service, "Western European Union Council of Ministers," Birmingham, 7 May 1996 - Birmingham Declaration," Brussels/BE.

¹¹⁸ WEU Press & Information Service, "Western European Union Council of Ministers," Ostend, 19 November 1996 - Ostend Declaration," Brussels/BE.

¹¹⁹ The ethnic and religious problems especially in the Southern region of the former USSR are well described in: Scholl-Latour, Peter: "Das Schlachtfeld der Zukunft" (The Battlefield of the Future), Berlin, 1996.

¹²⁰ WEU Press & Information Service, "Western European Union Council of Ministers, Ostend, 19 November 1996 - Ostend Declaration," Brussels/BE.

¹²¹ WEU Press & Information Service, "Western European Union Council of Ministers," Birmingham, 7 May 1996 - Birmingham Declaration," Brussels/BE.

¹²² Agnetti, Pino, "Perche' ci andiamo" (Why we are going), *Missione*, Military Review no. 5 (1994), pp. 4-6.

¹²³ WEU Press & Information Service, "Western European Union Council of Ministers," Birmingham, 7 May 1996 - Birmingham Declaration", Brussels/BE.

¹²⁴ Stato Maggiore Della Difesa (Italian Defense General Staff), "Overview on the Italian Defence Policy," Briefing given on the occasion of the visit of German CHOD General Hartmut Bagger, Rome/IT, July 2, 1996.

¹²⁵ Andreatta, Beniamino (Italian Minister of Defense), "The Political and Strategic Dimension of the Euromediterranean Cooperation," Center for Political and Strategic Studies, Al Aharam University, IL Cairo/EGYPT, October 19, 1996.

¹²⁶ Zelikow, Philip; Rice, Condoleezza, "Germany Unified and Europe Transformed," Cambridge, MA/USA, 1995, p. 256; Rice and Zelikow refer to a remark of Chancellor Helmut Kohl during a meeting with President George Bush in Washington, April 1990.

¹²⁷ This idea is also addressed by Ginsberg, Fraser Cameron Roy; Janning, Josef, "The European Union's Common Foreign and Security Policy: Central Issues ... Keyplayers," Strategic Outreach Roundtable and Conference Report, Washington D.C., May 10, 1995, p. 3.

¹²⁸ Reschke, Joerg, "Perspektiven der US-Europaeischen Beziehungen aus amerikanischer Sicht" (Perspectives of the US-European Relationships from American View), *Der Mittler-Brief*, 11. Jahrgang, Nr. 4/4. Quartal 1996, Bonn, p. 7.

¹²⁹ Beside many NATO member nations a significant number of countries, belonging to the NACC, including Russia, have participated in IFOR, too, and will continue their participation in SFOR.

¹³⁰ Hutchison, John M., "The WEU, What Potential to Replace NATO?," Study Project U.S. Army War College, Carlisle, PA/USA, April 1992.

¹³¹ Young, Thomas-Durell, "Preparing the Western Alliance for the Next Out-of-Area Campaign: Linking NATO and the WEU," *ibid.*, pp. 14-19.

¹³² This would set an end to the attitude of those European nations, "who have interests everywhere, but responsibilities nowhere, [which] run the serious risk of relying on others for their protection with little or no influence as to the manner in which these conflicts are handled." *Ibid.*, p. 20.

11. Bibliography

Agnetti, Pino, "Perche' ci andiamo" (Why we are going), *Missione*, Military Review no. 5 (1994).

Andreatta, Beniamino, "The Political and Strategic Dimension of the Euromediterranean Cooperation," Center for Political and Strategic Studies, Al Aharam University, IL Cairo/EGYPT, October 19, 1996.

Bagger, Hartmut, "Standortbestimmung" (Definition of the Position), lecture given at the Information Meeting for retired Generals and Admirals, Radebeul/GE, September 30, 1996.

Boutros- Ghali, Boutros "An agenda for Peace," New York, United Nations, January 31, 1992.

Brussels Treaty, amended by the Protocol modifying and completing the Brussels/BE Treaty, signed at Paris on October 23, 1954, published by WEU Press&Information Service, Brussel/BE.

Brzezinski, Zbigniew, "Dinner Address to Ukraine's First Five Years of Independence," given at the National Press Club on December 12, 1996; published in "The Ukrainian Weekly," December 22, 1996, Vol. LXIV, No. 50.

Bundespresseamt (Federal Press Office of the Federal Republic of Germany): "Europa 2000," linked from Europe/WEU < <http://www.bundesregierung.de/nland/bpa/themen/euro9605.html> > December 26, 1996.

Bundesregierung der Bundesrepublik Deutschland (Government of the Federal Republic of Germany): "Weitere Entwicklung der EU" (Further Development of EU) linked from Germany/Government < <http://www.bundesregierung.de/bin/lay/ausland/news/presse/pm96121301.html> > December 26, 1996.

Deutscher Militaerischer Vertreter im MC/NATO (German Military Representative to the Military Committee/NATO), "Report on Exercise TRAMONTANA '94," Brussels/BE, November 25, 1994.

Esercito Italiano (Italian Army), "Manuale per le Operazioni di Mantenimento della Pace e per Interventi Umanitari," Pub. 903, pp. I/4-I/5. (Manual for Peacekeeping and Humanitarian Aid Operations); see also FM 100-23, Peace Operations

Gaddis, John Lewis, "The United States and the End of the Cold War", New York, 1992.

German Federal Ministry of Defense, "White Paper 1994," Bonn/GE, April 1994.

Ginsberg, Fraser Cameron Roy; Janning, Josef, "The European Union's Common Foreign and Security Policy: Central Issues ... Keyplayers," Strategic Outreach Roundtable and Conference Report, Washington D.C., May 10, 1995.

Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, "Annual Report Europa 2000," linked from Germany/Government< <http://www.government.de/.bin/lay/inland/bpa/bro/euro2000/00000079.htm>> December 26, 1996.

Government of the Federal Republic of Germany: "Jahresbericht 1995" (Annual Report 1995)linked from Germany/Government< <http://www.bundesregierung.de/.bin/lay/inland/bpa/bro/jahresbe/00000775.htm>> December 26, 1996.

Hillen III, John, "UN Collective Security; Chapter Six and a Half," Parameters, Vol XXIV, No. 1, Spring 1994.

Hutchison, John M., "The WEU, What Potential to Replace NATO?," Study Project U.S. Army War College, Carlisle,PA/USA, April 1992.

Hye, Bem F., Chief of Staff Planning Cell Western European Union, "Operational Capabilities and Future Development;" briefing given to the FINABEL meeting in Bruges/Belgium, June 19,1996.

Kissinger, Henry, "Memorial Speech in Honor of Joseph Kruzel" given at The German Command and General Staff Academy (Fuehrungsakademie), Hamburg/GE, addressing security challenges in and for Europe; published in "Bundeswehr Aktuell," Nr. 81/32. Jahrgang, Bonn, November 21, 1996.

Kohl, Helmut, "Sicherheit fuer ein kommendes Europa" (Security for a future Europe), lecture given at the 33. conference for security policy, Muenchen, February 3, 1996; published in: Press- and Information Office of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany (Presse- und Informationsamt der Bundesregierung) No. 15, Bonn, February 14, 1996.

Kornblum, John C., "Address to the Atlantic Council," Washington, October 8, 1996.

Kremp, Herbert,Lecture given at Springer Haus, Berlin, October 24, 1995.

Marsh, Nicholas, "The Future of NATO" linked from UK/Government <"<http://www.cityscape.co.uk/users/hl03/arc.htm>,"> January 02, 1997.

MacKinlay, John "Improving Multifunctional Forces", Survival, Vol. XXXVI, No. 3, Autumn 1994.

NATO Office of Information and Press, "NATO Handbook," Brussels/BE, 1995.

Naumann, Klaus, "Neue Herausforderungen für die deutsche Sicherheitspolitik und die Bundeswehr" (New Challenges for German Security Policy and German Armed Forces), lecture given in Berlin, January 8, 1996.

Naumann, Klaus, "On Security And Cooperation," Lecture given during the 6. International Antalya Conference, Antalya/TU, November 4, 1995.

North Atlantic Council, Final Communiqué of the North Atlantic Council in Defense Ministers Session, held in Brussels/BE, December 17 and 18, 1996.

North Atlantic Council in Cooperation (NACC) Politico- Military Steering Committee Ad Hoc Group on Peacekeeping, cited in: Stato Maggiore Della Difesa (Italian Defense General Staff), "National papers about lessons learned in PKO", Rome/IT, September 1996.

North Atlantic Treaty Organization, "NATO Doctrine for Peace Support Operations," Brussels/BE, February 28, 1994.

Permanent Mission of Italy to North Atlantic Council, "Italian Military Interventions in Peacekeeping Operations," Brussels/BE, 1996.

Press and Information Office of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany (Presse- und Informationsamt der Bundesregierung), "Bulletin: Ministertagung des Nordatlantikrates am 3. Juni 1996 in Berlin" (North Atlantic Council Meeting of the Foreign Ministers at June 3, 1996, in Berlin), No. 47, Bonn, June 12, 1996.

Reschke, Joerg, "Perspektiven der US-Europäischen Beziehungen aus amerikanischer Sicht" (Perspectives of the US-European Relationships from American View), Der Mittler-Brief, 11. Jahrgang, Nr. 4/4. Quartal 1996, Bonn.

Rodionov, Igor, Interview published in Nezavisimaya Gazeta, Moscow, December 16, 1996.

Rodionov, Igor, Interview for INTERFAX News Agency December 25, 1996 .

Ruehe, Volker, "America and Europe - Common Challenges and Common Answers," Lecture given at Georgetown University on March 2, 1995, Washington D.C.

Ruehe, Volker, "Mut zur Verantwortung - Deutschland und der Frieden in Europa" (Courage for Responsibility - Germany and the Peace in Europe), lecture given at St. Katharinen Church, Hamburg, February 5, 1996; published in: Press- and Information Office of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany (Presse und Informationsamt der Bundesregierung) No. 15, Bonn, February 14, 1996.

Ruehe, Volker, "Strategic Partnership between NATO and Russia," Statement given at MOD Bonn, September 18, 1996.

Ruehl, Lothar, "Deutschland als europäische Macht" (Germany as European Power), Bonn, 1996.

Pirozhkov, Serhiy, "Geopolitical Realities in the Euro-Atlantic Area: A Ukrainian Perspective," in: NATO Defence College, "Peacekeeping Challenges to Euro-Atlantic Security", edited by Ernest Gilman, Detlef E. Herold, Rome 1994.

Scholl-Latour, Peter: "Das Schlachtfeld der Zukunft" (The Battlefield of the Future), Berlin, 1996.

Sergeyev, Igor, Interview published in Nezavisimaya Gazeta, Moscow, December 16, 1996.

Stato Maggiore Della Difesa (Italian Defense General Staff), "Inter-Governmental Conference on the European Security and the Future of the WEU," Talking Points for 30th IT/UK Staff Talks, Rome/IT, October 22, 1996.

Stato Maggiore Della Difesa (Italian Defense General Staff), "NATO Enlargement and PfP," Talking point 30th IT/UK Staff Talks, Rome/IT, October 22, 1996.

Stato Maggiore Della Difesa (Italian Defense General Staff), "Modello di Difesa" (New Defense Model), Rome/IT, September 1995.

Stato Maggiore Della Difesa (Italian Defense General Staff), "Overview on the Italian Defence Policy," Briefing given on the occasion of the visit of German CHOD General Hartmut Bagger, Rome/IT, July 2, 1996.

Stato Maggiore Della Difesa (Italian Defense General Staff), "Security in the Mediterranean," Talking Points for 30th IT/UK Staff Talks, Rome/IT, October 22, 1996.

The Army Field Manual, vol. 5: Operations Other than War; Part 2: "Wider Peacekeeping," HMSO, London, 1995.

The Ukrainian Weekly, December 1, 1996, Vol. LXIV, No. 48.

The White House, "A National Security Strategy of Engagement and Enlargement," Washington, February 1996.

Tozzi, Claudio; Jablonsky, David, "Peacekeeping: A Cold War Solution, A Post Cold war Dilemma," Strategy Research Project, US Army War College, Carlisle, PA/USA, 1996.

UK Ministry of Defense, "Statement on the Defense Estimates," Chapter One, Defense Policy, London/UK, 1996.

U.S. Army War College, Department of National Security and Strategy, Course 2, Volume III, Academic Year 1997, Carlisle, PA/USA.

Weidenfeld, Werner, "Europa verschwindet vom Radarschirm der USA," in FOCUS, German Newsmagazine, No. 45, November 4, 1996.

Western European Union/PMWG, "Illustrative Profiles for WEU Missions" (WEU Restricted), Brussels/BE, September 1996.

Western European Union/Political Committee, "Relations between the WEU Council and Assembly; Report on "The future role of WEU," Reply to the annual report of the Council," Brussels/BE, November 1996.

WEU Press & Information Service, "History, Structures, Prospects," Brussels/BE, June 1995.

WEU Press & Information Service, "Western European Union Council of Ministers, Birmingham, 7 May 1996 - Birmingham Declaration," Brussels/BE.

WEU Press & Information Service, "Western European Union Council of Ministers, Bonn, 19 June, 1996, Petersberg Declaration", Brussels/BE.

WEU Press & Information Service, "Western European Union Council of Ministers, Ostend, 19 November 1996 - Ostend Declaration ,", Brussels/BE.

WEU Press & Information Service, "Western European Union Council of Ministers, Rome, 27 October 1984 -Rome Declaration," Brussels/BE.

WEU Press & Information Service, "WEU Related Texts Adopted at the EC Summit, Maastricht - 10 December 1991," Brussels/BE.

Young, Thomas-Durell, "Preparing the Western Alliance for the Next Out-Of-Area Campaign: Linking NATO and the WEU," Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College, Carlisle,PA, April 1991.

Zelikow, Philip; Rice, Condoleezza, "Germany Unified and Europe Transformed," Cambridge,MA/USA, 1995.