

## NEW EPILOGUE

This volume on “Western Cooperation, Origins and History” has dealt with the American era in world politics. The American era was inaugurated with President Woodrow Wilson’s decision to enter the First World War on the side of the allied and associated powers in 1917. Despite many predictions to the contrary, the American era is not yet over. It has been characterised by the creation of such international institutions as the League of Nations, the United Nations, ILO, IBRD, IMF and UNESCO. NATO, the principal subject of Part II in this volume, was considered to be the cornerstone of the Alliance of democracies since the onset of the Cold War.

As an historical treatise, it did not present hypotheses followed by analysis and conclusions. It reviewed developments in a circumscribed period – from the outbreak of the First World War in July 1914 to the celebration of NATO’s Sixtieth Anniversary on 4 April 2009. My specific purpose has been to let a selection of important documents speak for themselves. No conclusions are drawn. At best this Epilogue is offering some thoughts for further reflection to the reader after having studied the collected documents on the website with my commentaries in the preceding chapters. Every historical treatise is the product of selection. I focused on international political history and hardly dealt with international economic history. America’s large market and considerable technological and economic strength have been of decisive importance for its position in the world. Globalisation is a phenomenon of the American era, as is the current international economic crisis. At the time of this writing, the impact of the crisis on America’s place in the world cannot be predicted. Economists, I learned, are best in predicting the past. I must leave it to more knowledgeable fellow scholars to write the economic history of Western cooperation.

**On reflection**, there is good cause for surprise about the *endurance of American leadership*.

It grew despite the refusal of the U.S. Senate to join the League of Nations proposed to the world by President Wilson himself. It overcame the crisis of 1956, when Britain and France went to war over the Suez Canal without

consulting Washington. It survived the defeat in the disastrous Vietnam War of the nineteen sixties and the resignation of President Nixon due to the Watergate scandal. It was not affected by the 1973 Middle-East war and the oil crisis. It survived the humiliation of the Carter Administration by the Iranians in the 1979 Teheran hostage crisis. It survived the 9/11 terrorist attack on America and the disastrous war on terror of President Bush in the early twenty-first century. Throughout the sixty years of NATO, American leadership survived the series of crises besetting the Alliance at regular intervals from the beginning. American policies were resisted and vilified, but mostly endorsed after some time. Just be reminded of the early crisis over German re-armament, the rejection of the European Defence Community, the disagreements with John Foster Dulles' roll-back and China policies, President Johnson's non-proliferation policy (in addition to the Vietnam war) and France's withdrawal from NATO, the détente policies of President Nixon/Kissinger, President Carter's approach to SALT and the Neutron bomb, President Reagan's Strategic Defence Initiative and the 2003 crisis over the war against Iraq. During the eight years of President Bush's presidency, there was a significant growth of anti-Americanism in Europe and anti-Europeanism in the United States, both among politicians and the (normally trend-following) intellectuals. Their writings on "the other side" amounted to caricaturing, vilification and gloomy predictions. European (mainly French) authors predicted the end of the American empire. American (in particular neo-conservative) authors predicted the demographic collapse of Europe. With the advent of the new Obama Administration in Washington and the world-wide economic crisis, all of this disappeared like snow for the sun.

Throughout the past ninety years of American leadership and despite theories to the contrary, there were few watersheds, breaking- or turning points in this era except for the Second World War and the peaceful end of the Cold War. Neither the 1973 crisis nor 9/11 turned out to be the watersheds announced at the time. President Bush did not end American predominance in the world, nor did Wall Street. They just ended neo-conservative republicanism and irresponsible global capitalism in America.

Whence the strength and the endurance of American world leadership? Its strength has many sources, such as location (protected by two Oceans), the

scale of its economy, natural resources, a land for immigrants, its open and democratic character and the ethical and spiritual forces of a free society, regularly re-inventing and renewing itself.

**On reflection,** *the endurance of NATO is even more surprising.* NATO was an American creation and continued to be shaped by America in its sixty years history. Its enlargement is driven by Washington and continues despite controversies. Its strategies were written in the United States, resisted by the European Allies and approved thereafter. At least two contradictions run through its entire history. The United States wants its European Allies to bear a heavier burden of the military effort, without giving up its leadership position. The European Union members want a more equal partnership with the United States, without carrying more of the financial and military burden. In budgetary terms there is no equal partnership between the United States and the European Union. So it was in the early years and so it remains in NATO at sixty. NATO began as an Alliance to defend the territory of its member states against the threat of Soviet aggression. It survived the Soviet Union by taking up new out-of-area missions and expanding its membership far into former Soviet territory. Both new developments were driven by the United States and reluctantly supported by the European Allies.

**On further reflection,** NATO was most *successful in what it did not have to do:* that is to defend NATO territory against an attack by a third state or alliance. The official line is that NATO was successful according to the old Roman maxim: *si vis pacem para bellum*. In modern NATO language that is: nuclear deterrence worked. The entire organisation with its integrated military structure and its strategic concepts was set up for the purpose of deterring an attack. From our review of NATO strategy we know that nobody really knew what to do in case deterrence would fail. In final analysis we shall never know whether deterrence worked or the Soviet Union never intended to attack. All we know for certain is that the Soviet Union had its own defensive Warsaw Pact and persistently pursued a variety of policies to defeat the West. Remembering what NATO did best will be important knowledge when the enlarged Alliance is facing Russia again.

**On more reflection,** *NATO's record on out-of-area problems* has been problematic from the very beginning. At the time European Allies fought their

terminal colonial wars, they neither asked nor received American support. Ever since the United States sought to enlist its European Allies in support of out-of-area operations or policies, there was no answer at best, and severe criticism at worst. As befits a world power, the out-of-NATO-area list of American interventions and economic sanctions is a long one, covering Central America, Africa, the Middle-East, South East Asia and East Asia. Allied support has nowhere been forthcoming. Washington did manage to enlist European support for the implementation of the 1995 Dayton Peace Agreement and for the air campaign over Kosovo in 1999 and KFOR thereafter. It happened mainly, because the European Union had wanted and failed to end the civil wars in Yugoslavia without American intervention. Since the Strategic Concept of 1999, the Balkans are declared to be part of the Euro-Atlantic area in which NATO “plays the central part.” Still there is no Allied agreement or adequate European military capability for successfully completing the Balkan missions.

When President Bush after 9/11 tried to enlist Allied support for his war on terror, the outcome was dismal failure. The formation of coalitions of the willing only concealed the unwillingness of a majority of Allies to substantially support the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq. Whatever the legal arguments advanced in favour of Operation Enduring Freedom in Afghanistan and against the decision to go to war against Iraq, European Allies’ support for both operations has been minimal.

**On more reflection again, NATO’s record of achievement** in out-of-area operations conducted after the end of the Cold War, is not very promising and for good historical reasons!

Yugoslavia had been an artificial creation of the 1919 Peace of Versailles, masterminded by President Wilson, British Prime Minister Lloyd George, French Prime Minister Clemenceau and Italian Prime Minister Orlando. Russia did not participate in the Conference. Among their successors there is no agreement on the future of the Balkans after the collapse of Yugoslavia. On the ground one can hardly blame the populations for having little respect for the complex variety of army units, police forces, civil authorities, NGO’s and others, all pursuing their own policies without much coordination and no common purpose. Unfortunately, the presence of the “international community” may

temporarily have ended the fighting but has replaced it by chaos, corruption and crime.

The histories of Afghanistan and Iraq offer other good reasons why NATO's out-of-area operations are unlikely to achieve the intended results. In their present borders, the two countries are the products of British colonial rule and victims of Western and Russian interventions. In their Islamic culture, Western armies are perceived to be enemies by definition, whatever their good intentions. Britain drew the border between Pakistan and Afghanistan right through the tribal area of the Parthians. The Taliban belong to the Parthians and receive their training mostly in the madrassas (Koran schools) of Pakistan. The borders drawn by Britain for Iraq are equally troublesome. Civil war between the Shiites in the South, the Sunni's in the centre and the Kurds in the north was to be expected after the removal of Saddam Hussein and the presence of a Western invasion army-under-strength thereafter. Trying to impose Western style democracy by force (officially now in support of the government in power) is bound to fail. David T. Jones refers to the two out-of-area operations as *Mission Creep*, "the organizational equivalent of the 'Peter Principle'."<sup>1</sup> It stands for the illusion that NATO can do out-of-area peace-making operations because of the fact that it has military forces capable to do defensive operations.

**On ongoing reflection,** *Western democracies, do not really master the art of dealing with non-democratic regimes.* In time of peace they conduct policies of appeasement or détente. Their non-democratic Allies in war or conflict are elevated to the ranks of functioning democracies. The examples are well-known. The Grand Alliance turned Stalin into benign Uncle Joe. Beginning with Stalin every new Soviet leader was declared to be a reformer. In the war between Iraq and Iran, Saddam Hussein became respectable. President Bush and former Chancellor Schröder looked in President Putin's eyes and saw a true democrat. When East-West détente broke out in the nineteen sixties, Brezhnev's Russia became a progressive example of "really existing socialism." The result of such policies was blindness to the reality of totalitarian and other non-democratic regimes. The collapse of the Soviet system by peaceful civil resistance came as a complete surprise to our NATO politicians, intellectuals

---

<sup>1</sup> "NATO at Sixty-Time for Reassessments," E-Notes *Foreign Policy Research Institute*, March 2009.

and statesmen. It was only after the end of Europe's division that we began to understand the absurdities with which Western democracies had accepted to live during the Cold War.

In time of war Western democracies tend to use overwhelming force to achieve unconditional surrender of the non-democratic enemy state or regime. Total war and totalitarian regimes are responsible for, probably, the most devastating and cruel century in human history. After the end of totalitarianism in Europe, retreat from total war requires a critical review of the approaches to war in the Alliance of democracies. The 1999 Air campaign against Serbia over Kosovo is a recent example for serious and critical reflection.

**On final reflection,** it is important to realise how much the Western Alliance of democracies has been an exception rather than an example in world politics – in space as well as in time. During the ninety five years of the American era, the Alliance of democracies has known internal peace since 1950 for its original member states and only a few years for some of the newer member states. Throughout the whole period its principal members have been involved almost permanently in wars, some of them protracted and impossible to win. Out-of-area wars bear some unfortunate resemblance to Europe's colonial wars in the nineteenth century when a measure of peace prevailed among the great powers on the European continent.

Western cooperation as reviewed in this volume has not been a success story, but an exceptional example of decent international relations between a small number of states within the same civilization. NATO should not be looked at as a candidate for a global security role. It has proven its worth as an Alliance in the Cold War, but still has to prove its worth as a collective defence organisation for its current 28 member states.

Western cooperation developed and grew on the ruins and in reaction to total war, ethnic cleansing, genocide and immense human suffering. It made a difference for the better in the Euro-Atlantic area but it has not made the world a better place to live in peace and freedom.

\*\*\*

## IN THE MISTAKEN BELIEF....

A year after publication of the second revised edition of this book, the Heads of State and Government adopted a new "*Strategic Concept for the Defence and Security of the Members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation*", meant to guide the next phase (of ten years) in NATO's evolution.<sup>2</sup> They did so in the firm belief that: "The greatest responsibility of the Alliance is to protect and defend our territory and our populations against attack, as set out in Article 5 of the Washington Treaty. *The Alliance does not consider any country to be its adversary.* However, no one should doubt NATO's resolve if the security of any of its members were to be threatened." The Concept's view on relations with Russia is formulated in paragraph 33:

"NATO-Russia cooperation is of strategic importance as it contributes to creating a common space of peace, stability and security. NATO poses no threat to Russia. On the contrary: we want to see a true strategic partnership between NATO and Russia, and we will act accordingly, with the expectation of reciprocity from Russia."

In the Summit Declaration, the adoption of the Concept was mentioned first:

"We have adopted a new Strategic Concept that lays out our vision for the Alliance *for the next decade*: able to defend its members against the full range of threats; capable of managing even the most challenging crises; and better able to work with other organizations and nations to promote international stability."<sup>3</sup>

*NATO's vision was not shared by the Russian Foreign Minister, who had been allowed to address the conference. In his view European security had been seriously weakened "across all parameters" over the past twenty years, "because the choice was made in favour of the policy of NATO expansion."* Few, apparently understood what Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov meant. They would find out within a few years, when President Putin decided

---

<sup>2</sup> Full text in Document II. 7. 1.

<sup>3</sup> In Document II. 7. 2.

to invade and annex the Crimea. Former KGB officer Putin inherited the Soviet view of national security: NATO was its principal threat and Russian domination over the near-abroad was to be restored to undo the greatest catastrophe of the Twentieth Century. NATO's approaches to Russia, as we discussed already in Part II, Chapter 5 were based on self-serving illusions.

*Contrary to the 2010 Strategic Concept and the Summit Declarations of 2010 and 2012<sup>4</sup>, the Alliance continued to have Russia as its main adversary.* It took NATO far too long to realise. Almost light-heartedly, NATO admitted Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Bulgaria and Romania, in addition to Poland, Slovakia, Czech Republic and Hungary in the mistaken belief that Russia would happily accept and thereafter strengthen the very special NATO-Russian Partnership. Just as light-heartedly, defence budgets were cut and the requirements of NATO's new Eastern Front neglected. For a time, NATO members even seriously considered admitting Georgia and Ukraine to their alliance. The war against and the dismemberment of Georgia in 2008 did not wake them up; the invasion and annexation of Crimea and the "hybrid war" against Ukraine did wake them up to the political reality. According to the 2014 NATO Summit Declaration<sup>5</sup>:

"We, the Heads of State and Government of the member countries of the North Atlantic Alliance, have gathered in Wales at a pivotal moment in Euro-Atlantic security. Russia's aggressive actions against Ukraine have fundamentally challenged our vision of a Europe whole, free, and at peace."

Russia's aggressive actions were a wake-up call from a *dream* "of a Europe, whole, free, and at peace". Still, during NATO's dreams, political reality had changed in two respects.

*First, three former Soviet republics and seven former Central and Eastern European satellites from Russia's 'near-abroad' are now member states of NATO and "no one [Russia in particular] should doubt NATO's resolve if the security of any of them were to be threatened."* For all ten of them, the continuing Russian threat was the principal reason for seeking admission. To each of the ten new member states the commitment of article 5 of the Treaty of Washington, applies as it did to the West German Republic during the Cold

---

4 Texts in Documents II. 7. 2-3.

5 Tekst in Document II. 7. 4.



War era. More specifically: All member states of NATO are obliged to come to the assistance of these new members whenever Russia would consider similar aggressive actions (as against Ukraine) or any other attack against any of them. To this end, NATO must adapt its strategy towards the creation of a credible, conventional deterrence against Russian aggression.<sup>6</sup> As NATO learned in 1950, a credible deterrent requires an integrated military structure, the presence of American forces and a forward defense posture.<sup>7</sup>

*Second*, NATO was caught unprepared by the new type of hybrid warfare by Russia, when the "little green men" began to appear in the Crimea in 2014. There were no contingency plans and there was no consensus on how to defend the new member states against Russian aggression; Russia, though, was no longer considered to be an adversary. The majority of European member states spend less than 2% of GDP<sup>8</sup> on defense. Threat perceptions diverge widely between East, South and West European members.

*Needed: a new policy of containment.*

*Putin Russia's policies must be properly analyzed and assessed, for NATO to develop an adequate **new policy of containment**.* Much can be learned from George Kennan's Long Telegram from Moscow in 1946 – on how to enter upon a policy of patient but firm containment, designed to confront the Russians with unalterable counter-force at every point where they show signs of encroaching upon the interests of NATO member states.<sup>9</sup> Much can still be learned from Western illusions during the era of East-West détente,<sup>10</sup> that is: how not to repeat the same mistakes.

*Wrote Russian author Mikhael Shiskin: "We are back to the Soviet times of total lies. The government renewed the social contract with the nation under which we had lived for decades: we know that we lie and you lie and we continue to*

---

6 See Documents II. 7. 5 and 6. (PISM Bulletin and Meeting Ministers of Defence in June 2015.

7 Cf. Part II, Chapter 1.

8 Cf. Document II. 7. 11.

9 Paraphrased from p. 87 in Part I, Chapter 5 *supra*. The telegram can be found in Document I.5.1.

10 Cf. my second volume in this series: *The Illusions of Détente*. The détente period of the cold war:1968-1989.

lie to survive." [...] "President Putin has achieved everything a dictator could strive for. His people love him; his enemies fear him. He has created a regime that rests not on the shaky paragraphs of a constitution but on the unshakable laws of the vassal's personal loyalty to his sovereign, from the bottom to the top of the pyramid of power." Still as Michael Shiskin wrote: "The formula for saving any dictatorship is universal: create an enemy, start a war."<sup>11</sup>

Putin's basic lie is to blame the West for the collapse of the Soviet Union. In reality, the collapse of that absurd construction resulted from the revolt of courageous citizens to "attempt to *live within the truth*." As Vaclav Havel explained: "There are no terms whatsoever on which it [the living within the lie] can coexist with living within the truth, and therefore everyone who steps out of line *denies it in principle and threatens it in its entirety*."<sup>12</sup>

*Putin's basic lie is also related to typical nineteenth century ideologies of imperial nationalism:* Russia, in order to be recognized as a great power, must dominate its near abroad and thus recover lost territories. It must be active in areas of conflict and thus support its Syrian ally in the civil war. The revival of this ideology is a direct challenge to the ideas behind the enlargement and the new non-article 5 missions of NATO. The North Atlantic Alliance and the European Union are an effort to overcome nationalism by a system of multilateral cooperation; and European unification built on reconciliation, solidarity and unity. Putin's European peace order can be built only on submission to Russian hegemony. The Western and European peace order can be built only on mutual consent.

*The required new policy of containment must be comprehensive.* It obviously needs the military component of territorial deterrence and defense. It must confront Moscow's geopolitical ideology with the dynamic counter attraction of living within the truth, respecting human dignity and seeking multilateral cooperation by consent. It should substantially reduce dependence on Russian primary products (oil and gas).

---

11 From: "Russia, Ukraine and Europe have been into Vladimir Putin's black hole of fear", The Guardian 18 September 2014; and "How Russians Lost the War", in The New York Times May 8, 2015.

12 In the essay "The Power of the Powerless", Vaclav Havel or Living in Truth. Edited by Jan Vladislav. Faber and Faber 1986.

*NATO should renounce the 1997 Founding Act* - a dead letter already - and follow-up agreements with Russia. It would be wise to clearly distinguish between the European peace order built on NATO and European unification, as against the illusionary peace order built on the Final Act of Helsinki (1975) and the Charter of Paris (1990). CSCE was a non-binding act by which the West acquiesced in Soviet territorial and political hegemony over East and Central European countries. The Charter of Paris was a concession to Soviet President Gorbachev, by which the West agreed to call fundamental change, peaceful continuity. It would be wise to dismiss the mistaken belief that Russia no longer is our major adversary. Whereas Russia has repeatedly violated the principles of the Final Act of Helsinki and the Charter of Paris, the two documents can be quietly filed as left-overs from a bygone era.

*The Security of East and Central European Member States.*

The original member states of NATO, and Germany in particular, should realize that East and Central European perceptions of Russia are shaped by *The Worst of the Madness*<sup>13</sup> they suffered in the Twentieth Century. "This is the region that experienced the worst of both Stalin's and Hitler's ideological madness." The two dictators: "shared contempt for the very notions of Polish, Ukrainian, and Baltic independence, and jointly strove to eliminate the elites of those countries." After the defeat of Germany in 1945, the East and Central European States continued to experience Soviet ideological madness until 1989. Putin Russia's greatest defect is the complete unwillingness to deal with its dark totalitarian past; unlike Germany. As Anne Applebaum continues: "The reluctance of intellectuals on the left to condemn communism; the fact that Stalin was allied with Roosevelt and Churchill; the existence of German historians who tried to downplay the significance of the Holocaust by comparing it to Soviet crimes; all of that meant that, until recently, it was politically incorrect in the West to admit that we defeated one genocidal dictator with the help of another." And: "As a result, we liberated one half of Europe at the cost of enslaving the other half for fifty years." The Western member states must realize the extent to which their policies towards Russia

---

<sup>13</sup> Anne Applebaum, 'The Worst of the Madness'. New York Review of Books. November 2010. See Document II. 7. 7 On my website. Quotations are from this article.

have been conducted at the expense of the East and Central European states and in some cases still do.

Putin Russia's aggressive policies are bound to raise the worst fears in East and Central European member states. After Putin's contempt for Ukrainian independence, they rightly fear the same for themselves. After the two Minsk agreements between France, Germany, Russia, Ukraine and Belarus, they fear further Western appeasement towards Russia, if not collusion between these major European powers at their expense, as happened so many times in the past. Only NATO under American leadership can relieve those fears by formulating and implementing a new policy of containment. Collective self-defence must be restored to first priority over whatever other missions NATO added after 1990. Putin's Russia is not the same as the Soviet Union. It is moved by revenge, hatred and corruption, not by communist ideology. It is ruled by a nasty dictator, not by the politburo of a one-party totalitarian regime.

## **THE MIDDLE-EAST QUAGMIRE.**

*The Middle-East – from Pakistan to Morocco – was a creation of Western (and Russian) expansion, the Peace Treaties after the First World War and the decolonization of the French and British empires. With the exception of Israel and Lebanon, Islam is the majority religion and democratic government never had a chance to develop, not even in Turkey.*

The area has a very long and turbulent history. It was the birth place of great civilizations and many religions; among them the faith of the Jews, the Christian Faith and Islam.

Within the present borders, none of the sovereign states in the area are older than a hundred years. The Western-inspired efforts to turn them into viable and democratically ruled nation states failed practically everywhere. They were an area of concern, thereafter an object of East-West conflict in the Cold War and only very recently a direct threat to the security of the Atlantic Alliance.

The record of Western intervention in the area is a dismal one of confusion and failure. The most recent failures are at the origin of the direct threat to the security of the Atlantic Alliance. Among them are the war against terror in Afghanistan/Pakistan, the Iraqi war, the air-war to remove Gadhafi in Libya and the most recent involvements in the Syrian civil war.

*The nature of the threat to the Alliance is completely different from the nature of the Russian threat. The threats from the Middle-East are in the category of a "new type of war", I tried to describe in the Prologue to this volume.<sup>14</sup> Basis for terrorist operations are the so-called failed states, where public authority has degenerated so much that they have become training- and operation grounds for attacks, assaults and suicide-missions.*

Since the failure of the so-called "Arab Spring" the number of failed states has grown substantially; with Iraq, Syria, Libya, Yemen and others. Money to buy weapons is in abundant supply. Formation in the more extremist versions of Islam can be found in Madrassahs (Koranic schools) and Mosques financed by Saudi—Arabia. The single, most serious threat is coming from dying state Syria, scene of a cruel and complex civil war since 2011. The Assad terror regime is to be held responsible for one of the cruellest civil wars in which more than 300.000 have been killed, many more wounded and more than half of its population of 23 million displaced.

The United Nations, the Western Alliance and the Arab world completely failed to deal with the war. The Assad regime – in control of barely 20% of Syrian territory – is supported by Russia, Iran and the Hezbollah in Lebanon. A divided and impotent coalition of oppositional forces receives some Western support. An offspring of Al-Qaida, called the Islamic State (IS)<sup>15</sup>, is in control of mainly desert land in Syria and Iraq; they rule with destructive and excessive terror – attracting jihad fighters from all over the world. A coalition of Western and Arab states carries out air strikes against the IS, but not in support of the Assad regime. The latter and the IS are on record for using chemical weapons and other weapons strictly forbidden under international law. The impotence of the "international community" is the outcome of the intra-Islamic conflict between

---

14 on pages 14-24 supra.

15 IS (Islamic State), ISIS (Islamic State in Iraq and Syria), ISIL (Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant); all the same.

Sunni's and Shi'ites (Saudi-Arabia, Egypt, Turkey vs. Iran) and the continuing adversary relationship between Russia and the West.

*Present-day Turkey is part of the problem rather than of the solution.* Turkey in August 2015 requested a meeting of the North Atlantic Council, "in view of the seriousness of the situation after the recent terrorist attacks, and to inform Allies of the measures it is taking."<sup>16</sup> Turkey had decided to join the coalition in the air-strikes against IS and at the same time launched far heavier air attacks against Kurdish targets in Iraq and Syria. NATO expressed support and solidarity for the Turkish fight against terrorism, but the attacks on the Kurds were not mentioned. The policy of Turkey in the current Middle-Eastern wars is at best problematic, at worst cynical. The Syrian and Iraqi Kurds have so far been the only successful ground-forces against the IS. Turkish participation in the fight against IS terror is minimal. The attacks on the Kurds were meant primarily to outlaw the Kurdish Democratic Party (HDP) after President Erdogan had failed to win a two-third majority in the latest elections as a result of HDP's victory. In the conflict between Sunni's and Shi'ites, Turkey is on the side of the Sunni's and thus opposed to Iran and the Assad regime in Syria. It probably has the largest number of Syrian refugees on its territory, many of them allowed to continue to Europe. Jihad fighters can transit Turkey to and from IS in Syria and Iraq. Turkish treatment of its Kurdish, Armenian and other Christian minorities continues to be a major and unsolved problem. Turkish designs on the lost Ottoman territories in the Middle-East are unspoken but not absent. In brief: Turkey's position as a NATO ally is no longer self-evident; it needs to be critically re-examined.

*The Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action concluded between Iran, the United States, Russia, China, France, United Kingdom, Germany and the European Union was finally concluded after years of negotiations.*<sup>17</sup> In exchange for Iran not pursuing the production of nuclear weapons, the six major powers and the EU will gradually lift the economic sanction on Iran. According to the signatories the deal is a major diplomatic breakthrough as it reduces the chances of war. According to current Israeli Prime Minister Netanyahu it is "a bad mistake of historic proportions." The malignant comments of Iranian

---

<sup>16</sup> Text of the Council Declaration in Document II. 7. 8.

<sup>17</sup> Full text of the program in document II. 7. 9.

supreme leader Ali Khomeini on the United States and Israel after the agreement on the Plan of Action, are not promising. Ever since Ayatollah Khomeini came to power in 1979, the Islamic priests' republic has become a major problem to the United States and a threat to Israel.<sup>18</sup>,

In the latest U.S. State Department's Report on Terrorism<sup>19</sup>, Iran is still referred to as a state sponsor of terrorism (since 1984), primarily to Palestinian groups in Gaza, to Hezbollah in Lebanon, to various groups in Iraq and in support of the Assad regime in Syria. Iran's principal instrument is the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps-Qod Force (IRGC-QF); having world-wide intelligence operations. In conflicts between Sunni's and Sh'ites, the Iranian regime supports the latter; in Islamic terrorist operations against Israel and the West, IRGC-QF also cooperates with Al-Qaida and other Islamic terrorists. In the category "new types of war", Iran continues to be part of the security threat to NATO.

## **BACK TO THE DRAWING BOARD?**

NATO's security environment in 2015 is quite different from the one described in the Strategic Concept of 2010.

NATO no longer is without identifiable adversaries as it claimed to be in 2010. The luxury of "a broad concept of security" and non-article 5 missions must be given up in favour of the original concept of collective defence against Russia and against the network of Islamic terrorism, in particular the IS and the IRGC-QF. A new Strategic concept should deal with these two threats to the security of the Alliance<sup>20</sup> and with the defence expenditures necessary to that end.

NATO will have to focus on its primary task as a defensive alliance of twenty eight European and North American member states against attack,<sup>21</sup> keeping in mind why the Alliance was born according to the Preamble of the Treaty:

*"The Parties to this Treaty reaffirm their faith in the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and their desire to live*

---

18 Cf. page 17 and 18 *supra* in this volume

19 Over the year 2014, published in June 2015. On Iran: p. 283-86.

20 See p. 231ff. *supra*. Discussing the concept of defense against terrorism.

21 Cf. Document II. 7. 10 on NATO's past and current operations. Review of Defense Expenditures can be found in Document II. 7. 11.

*in peace with all peoples and all governments. They are determined to safeguard the freedom, common heritage and civilization of their peoples, founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty and the rule of law. They seek to promote stability and well-being in the North Atlantic area. They are resolved to unite their efforts for collective defense and for the preservation of peace and security."*

NATO has been and should remain an alliance of democracies. Its purpose is not only to defend borders, but also to safeguard the freedom and the common heritage of their peoples. Both Russia and the IS employ their "fifth columns" to weaken or destroy freedom and Western civilization. Russia does it through Russian minorities in the near-abroad and with its FSB officers. The IS employs Jihadists from the West returning home and migrants from the Middle-East. Russia destabilizes neighboring countries and intervenes in the Syrian civil war, in order to restore lost territory and great-power status. The IS sows death and destruction with the ultimate aim of establishing Islamic rule under Sharia. Russia destabilizes to conquer. IS fighters (and Islamic terrorism) kill and destroy to earn eternal life for themselves.

Their threats are different in nature and require different strategies. Coping with them requires commitment and contingency planning. It makes no sense to admit additional member states which are either indefensible or ruled by corrupt and undemocratic regimes.

As I wrote in volume V, *The United States should lead in the effort to abolish nuclear weapons*. A first step in that process should be for NATO to revise the strategic concept by basing deterrence no longer "on an appropriate mix of nuclear and conventional capabilities", but on conventional capabilities only. Given the nature of the threats to the Alliance, such a revision is realistic. Following the agreement reached with Iran, it would strengthen the Non-Proliferation regime by good example.<sup>22</sup>

NATO should remain an Atlantic alliance. As in the past, the security of Europe needs American leadership and an American guarantee.

---

<sup>22</sup> On p. 231 of: *Neither Justice nor Order*. 2014. Chapter 6. Quote is from par. 16 in the Strategic Concept of 2010.



Defending an alliance of democracies needs spiritual strength in addition to military power and political acumen. Western civilization has appeared and developed together with the Christian Faith.<sup>23</sup> A radical secular West is bound to be deprived soon of the population and the strength to safeguard the freedom and the common heritage of their peoples.

\*\*\*\*\*

---

<sup>23</sup> To paraphrase T.S. Eliot, *Christianity and Culture*. A Harvest Book 1976.