

The Role of the United States in the New Security Order in Europe

Peter W. Galbraith

The United States' ties to Europe are strong, and the United States' role in Europe remains central not just to the integration process, but also to the future and the security of this continent as a whole.

To begin, it is helpful to remember that the United States is a nation of immigrants. It has been called the first universal nation because people have come to it from every country on earth. But, although most of today's new American citizens are from Latin America and Asia, the majority of our citizens still trace their ancestry back to Europe—more than a million of them to Croatia alone. Europe has given us the basis of our civilization and culture. In return, twice in this century the men and women of our armed forces have fought and died on its soil to preserve its liberty and freedom.

The lessons we learned from these conflicts still shape U.S. policy toward Europe today. After the First World War, we tried to detach ourselves from the affairs of this continent. The Second World War taught us that we no longer had the luxury of doing so. This is why, on June 5, 1947, at Harvard University, President Harry S. Truman's newly appointed secretary of state, George Marshall, delivered a speech in which he proposed a generous program of economic aid for the nations of European countries still ravaged by the effects of the war. Marshall's address was modest and plain; it lasted less than 12 minutes. In arguing for the provision of assistance to Europe, he proposed only one condition—that these nations be willing to cooperate in charting their own economic recovery. Though few recognized it at the time, it became one of the most important speeches of the post-war era.

The Marshall Plan, as it came to be known, laid the foundation for our continued post-war engagement in Europe. It was followed by the creation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Today this same alliance, NATO, remains the heart of our European strategy. No alliance in history has ever been more successful in deterring aggression.

During its first 50 years, NATO provided the security that permitted the shattered econo-

mies of Europe to rebuild. It also helped former adversaries to reconcile. In this and many other ways, it thus helped make European unity possible. More than just a military alliance, NATO is really a community of interests, which is why it both preceded and outlasted the Cold War. It is also why the United States and its allies decided to preserve the alliance after the Berlin Wall fell. And it is why neither we nor any of our allies would even think about leaving NATO or settling for a watered down substitute—and why so many others now wish to join.

The fundamental goal of our policy toward and our engagement in Europe remains what it was a half century ago. We want to build a peaceful, democratic, and undivided transatlantic community. We also wish to extend this community eastward, so that the new democracies can enjoy the same peace and prosperity that western Europe has experienced for the last 50 years.

The role of NATO

Of course, NATO is not alone in this. Many organizations are also doing their part to assure the prosperity and security of Europe. The European Union is expanding. The World Trade Organization and the OECD are accepting new members. The OSCE is promoting democracy and helping to resolve conflicts from the Caucasus to the Balkan. But NATO is taking the lead, just as it has for the past half century, because NATO is the only organization in Europe with real military might, the only one capable of providing the confidence and security upon which our other goals depend.

But we recognize that, if NATO is to endure, it must change with the times. It must now become the foundation of a wider community that spans both sides of the Atlantic Ocean. The United States believes that, to keep Europe secure and free, to enable it achieve the kind of future we all want, the NATO alliance must continue to change. We believe that NATO must now do for central and eastern Europe what it did fifty years ago for western Europe: help eliminate old hatreds, foster democracy, spur economic recov-

ery, and deter conflict. This is why NATO must—and will—accept new members.

This summer, the leaders of the member nations of NATO will meet in Madrid to discuss enlarging the alliance in order to make it stronger, broader, more cohesive, and more effective. Not every nation that wishes to join will be able to do so right away. Some may not be able to join at all. But this does not mean that some nations will be winners and others losers. All nations interested in a peaceful and democratic Europe—whether or not they are in NATO—will win.

After the Madrid meeting, we expect accession negotiation—that is, talks leading to membership in NATO—to begin with a number of central European nations. We hope to complete these negotiations by the end of this year. Then we will need time to complete what may be the most important part of the process: working with our parliaments and our peoples to gain acceptance of these new members.

Each time the Alliance wishes to admit a new member, it must gain the votes of two-thirds of the United States Senate. Our Constitution requires the approval of such a majority any time we wish to ratify a treaty—and this includes making the changes necessary to the treaty that created NATO. Gaining such a majority will not be easy or automatic. Our Senate will surely scrutinize the records of all the candidates for membership carefully. Both these Senators and the American people will expect no less than that the candidates for membership meet western standards before they are admitted to the club.

The rules for admitting new members to NATO are set out in Article 10 of the North Atlantic Treaty, which says simply: "The Parties may, by unanimous agreement, invite any other European state in a position to further the principles of this Treaty and to contribute to the security of the north Atlantic area to accede to this Treaty." Of course, the criteria for membership are more complicated than this simple sentence would suggest. The new members of NATO must be similar to the current members. That is, they must be democracies with market economies and a commitment to respect human rights. Civilians must be in control of their militaries, and they must have sorted out disputes over their borders as well as disputes over the rights of minorities within their borders. The nations we consider for membership must also share our most fundamental values and aspirations for Europe and the world, including support for the expansion of democratic principles and respect for human rights.

NATO has always been a dynamic alliance; it has always been willing to take in qualified new members. So the process of enlarging NATO will not end in Madrid. NATO's doors will remain open to those not invited to join this year. They will remain open, among other things, in order to provide an incentive for continued democratic reform throughout the region. The steps that nations must take to prepare for membership—strengthening democracy and building trust with their neighbors—have already given central Europe greater stability than it has seen in this century. The promise of NATO enlargement, in other words, is already helping to bring Europe together.

But, to keep this promise alive, those of us who are already members of the alliance have certain obligations that are not always pleasant. One of them is to be honest with those who aspire to join us. We have to be clear about what they must do to meet the political and military conditions for membership. And we have to be candid about their shortcomings. Some people may see this as interference in the internal affairs of another country. But these people are mistaken. Whenever we speak out, we speak as friends and with the best of intentions. After all, only by speaking out openly and honestly can the members of NATO continue to encourage the spread of democratic institutions and values across this continent.

I say this because, painful as it is to admit, not every nation in central and eastern Europe will be able to meet the conditions for membership right away. Croatia, for one, still has progress to make before it can contemplate membership in the Partnership for Peace, much less NATO. It has recently taken some significant steps toward this goal by sending Zlatko Aleksovski to the Hague and by signing the Agreement on Return with UNTAES and the United Nations High Commission for Refugees. But it must go further in meeting the commitments it has made under the Erdut and Dayton Agreements. These include cooperating with the War Crimes Tribunal and enabling the return of people—that is, of *all* Croatian citizens, regardless of their ethnicity—to their homes, where they must be able to live in the conditions of safety and security that every western democracy attempts to guarantee to its citizens.

The USA and Croatia

And here I want to digress for a moment in order to make something absolutely clear: Namely, that the United States has no double stan-

dards where Croatia is concerned. We are not holding it to a different or higher standard from its neighbours. Rather, we have the same standards for all. These standards are the ones I enumerated above for membership in NATO—a respect for democratic principles, a respect for the human rights of all its citizens, and full compliance with its obligations under international agreements and international law. They are, I should add, the same standards by which we measure ourselves. The United States is a far from perfect society and we do not expect perfection from a nascent democracy like Croatia. We do, however, expect its actions to match its words; we also expect it to fulfil the promises it has made.

We emphasize, in particular, the right of everyone to return to their homes because this right is essential to the success of peace agreements in Croatia and in neighbouring Bosnia-Herzegovina. Thanks largely to the war in the former Yugoslavia, more Europeans have died violently in the last five years than in the previous forty-five. Now, in both countries, if peace is to take hold, people must be able to return to their homes, while those who have been indicted as war criminals must be arrested and prosecuted. Only if the parties to the peace agreements in this troubled region of the world truly honor them can we expect lasting peace and security on the European continent.

Of course, the United States' interest in Europe goes far beyond the Dayton and Erdut Agreements. It even goes beyond NATO and European security. Our goal is also to promote prosperity. Over the past fifty years, the United States and Western Europe have built the largest economic relationship in the world. It now supports more than 14 million jobs on both sides of the Atlantic and our economies are increasingly integrated. This arrangement benefits us both in equal measure. Our aim now is to extend the benefits of this economic relationship and integration throughout this continent.

Our vision of open trade and investment across the Atlantic extends not just to central and eastern Europe, but also to the newly independent states of the former Soviet Union as well. For all of Europe's new democracies, stability depends on prosperity, and prosperity depends on a willingness to open markets to the products, goods, and services of others. Prosperity also depends on a free and fair trading system, one in which business decisions are based on economics, not politics, and in which an agreement, once

reached, remains inviolate. These are the rules of the road for western market economies.

This is why the United States also supports the enlargement of the European Union. We believe that the prospect of EU membership will also help strengthen both democratic and economic reforms in central and eastern Europe. We hope the enlargement of the EU proceeds swiftly. But, while the expansion of the European Union is important, we should not forget that the security NATO provides has always been critical to the prosperity the EU promises. As the EU expands, only NATO can make sure that a united Europe maintains its strongest link to America.

NATO, after all, is not just a military organization but a political one as well. As such, it is and will remain the anchor of the United States' commitment to and engagement in Europe. This is because, as the President of the Czech Republic, Vaclav Havel, pointed out on his recent visit to Washington, it is NATO that provides the catalyst for strengthening the values and institutions that Americans and Europeans have in common—democracy, rule of law, respect for human rights, and tolerance of ethnic and religious differences.

The European scene

The United States remains engaged in Europe because it wishes to finish the project it began with the Marshall Plan fifty years ago—making war in Europe impossible. The two world wars fought in this century cost the lives of more than half a million Americans. In the Cold War that followed, we spent the equivalent of more than thirteen trillion dollars. The enlargement of NATO is a central part of our attempt to ensure that Europe will be a more peaceful place in the next century than it has been in this one. And if Europe is safer and more prosperous, the United States will be too.

This vision of a united, prosperous, and democratic Europe is not new. It has existed for decades. Fifty years ago another great figure in history, Winston Churchill, gave a speech in which he laid out goals strikingly similar to those I have mentioned. This is what he said: "It is not our task or wish to draw frontier lines, but rather to smooth them away. Our aim is to bring about the unity of all the nations of all Europe. We seek to exclude no state whose territory lies in Europe and which assures to its people those fundamental liberties on which our democratic civilization has been created."

He went on to say: "Some countries will feel able to come into our circle sooner and others later, according to the circumstances in which they are placed. They can all be sure that, whenever they are to join, a place and a welcome will be waiting for them at the European council table."

After World War II, there was no shortage of vision. But across half of Europe, there was a shortage of opportunity. Today, both the vision

and the opportunity exist. The United States is working to expand this new, trans-atlantic community of like-minded nations—a community of nations that, as Churchill said, assure to their peoples the liberties on which European civilization—our mutual civilization—has been created. I very much hope that Croatia will become part of it. ■

The Expansion of NATO and the New European Security

Radovan Vukadinović

The security question has been dominant after every great conflict to erupt in Europe. The peace of Versailles was an expression of attempts to build a security system that would remove Germany as a danger and was later to lead it into a still greater military adventure. Yalta was supposed to mean the creation of a new security system after World War II, based on the bi-polar division of the continent, and yet led to the cold war. The cold war, on the other hand, closed with the dismantling of the Berlin Wall and the endeavours of NATO to build a permanent security system in Europe in the new post-cold war conditions.

This great enterprise, which is already being called the biggest and most far-reaching decision of NATO, can be looked at on several levels.

Politically: this is a proof of the readiness and power of the alliance to establish wide coordinates for the new security system; strategically; it is the expression of a desire that the destinies of Europe and the USA be closely linked together and that at the present moment barriers should be placed in the way of any possible instability from Russia, and, finally, economically, this is the result of a conviction that an expansion of NATO can lead to important economic benefits to the military industrial complex, especially that of the USA.

The Political Will to Enter the Euro-Atlantic Alliance

All the new democracies, after the overthrow of the old socialist system, at once announced their wishes to become integral parts of the new European security system in which NATO would have the leading military and political, and the EU the leading economic role. Although there were certain hesitations about what was better and simpler, entry into NATO or getting closer to or membership of the EU, all the new democracies have these aims clearly marked in their political platforms, and there is no going back from them. Convinced that the road to prosperity leads through membership in the organised mechanisms of western action, the new democracies are ready to accept all the demands made on them, certain that the price to be paid for drawing closer to Europe is still lower than that of being left out of the European radius of integration.

Western policy at the beginning did not wish to irritate Russia by announcements of new memberships in NATO, and insisted on a gradual approach and a careful selection of candidates, right up to the moment the political actors in Central Europe started to display impatience. Then the idea of Partnership for Peace was launched, as a kind of waiting room for full NATO membership.