

Position on
NATO 2020

by

**Reinhard Bütikofer, Ulrike Lunacek, Indrek Tarand, Franziska Brantner and
Tobias Heider (Green SEDE WG)**

15/11/2010

NATO's new Strategic Concept aims to turn the transatlantic alliance into a modern security organisation. In order to remain relevant in the 21st century, NATO needs to more than just maintain transatlantic cooperation and U.S. interest in European security.

In general, Greens have different views on NATO and European Security. This paper will focus on specific points that the NATO2020 strategy puts on the table.

I. Nuclear Weapons

If NATO wants to become a forward-looking security organisation of the 21st century, it should significantly contribute to Global Zero. It would be a huge setback, if 21 EU-NATO members, along with a US President who made nuclear disarmament a priority, are unable to make a contribution. As State Parties of the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), NATO members are obliged to implement the Final Declaration adopted at this year's Review Conference. We therefore expect NATO's new strategic concept to comply with its members' commitments on nuclear disarmament. We demand the following steps in order to implement the 22 actions on nuclear disarmament:

(a) Strong commitment to reduce the prominence of nuclear weapons in national defence doctrines - this does not solely pertain to the U.S.; French and British nuclear weapons must also be addressed and national modernization plans should be stopped;

(b) End the outdated concept of nuclear sharing because the only reason for its creation was the threat posed by the Soviet Union. US tactical nuclear weapons should be withdrawn from Europe. At the same time NATO members should also negotiate with Russia to encourage the removal of more than 2000 tactical nuclear weapons stationed in the western part of the country. The European Nuclear Weapons Free Zone must swiftly become a reality in order to encourage similar steps in other regions;

(c) The new concept should renounce the first strike doctrine and advocate a legal obligation for Nuclear Weapons States (NWS) to abstain from using nuclear weapons against Non-Nuclear Weapons States (NNWS) as has been done by China;

(d) We think the new Strategic Concept should mention explicit timelines and assign greater responsibility to committees such as the Special Consultative Group on Arms Control in order to reaffirm NATO's commitment.

II. Missile Defence

Greens oppose the anti-missile shield since it was put on the agenda by the George W. Bush Administration. We view it as an unprofitable investment, both from a political and a financial view. Broad opposition has first stalled and then transformed the project that is now foreseen to be put under NATO auspices. Politically, there is the danger that a missile defence system would allocate scarce resources to an arms build-up project. We strongly believe such political capital would be better invested in conflict prevention and finding political solutions to security threats coming from countries like Iran. Moreover, there is a real risk that a NATO missile defence system would only encourage Russia to develop new missile technology that could overcome the NATO shield. Therefore we oppose a separate NATO anti-missile shield.

Furthermore, the costs associated with a NATO missile defence shield are much too high. The system is not entirely reliable and offers no real substitute to nuclear deterrence. NATO officials are hiding the true expense of such a project when they state it would only cost 200 million over the next ten years. This figure merely accounts for the coordination of the system through command and control. Missiles and sensors are much more expensive and would have to be paid for by individual member states.

III. Conventional Disarmament

NATO members spend more than 70% of global expenditure on armaments. Yet, even such a huge amount of tax payers' money has not lead to well trained and well equipped forces that are easily deployable. National armed forces are still organized in an outdated way. Obliging all NATO and EU members to spend at least 2% of their GDP on defence will only lead to more misdirected investment without any improvement to security. We call on the five NATO Member States that meet or exceed the 2% GDP objective to seriously reconsider reducing military spending (Indrek Tarand has a different point of view).

In our view, defence ministers should use the new Strategic Concept to consolidate harmonization of national armed forces. We do not need 27 navies in Europe. The Netherlands and Belgium have already merged their navies into one and France and Britain recently announced the integration of parts of their armed forces due to financial constraints. However we do not want Member States' governments to revert to strictly intergovernmental approaches in the field of common security. The time has come to go a step further and implement a division of labour in the defence sector. Especially EU Member States should consult and coordinate cuts in defence budgets and use the Permanent Structured Cooperation laid down in the Lisbon Treaty as tool for more cooperation and synergies without spending more, even though NATO might not welcome that. Member states will then realize they can spend less on armaments and understand that conventional arms control and disarmament will not threaten their collective ability to act in times of crisis.

Because NATO is the world's leading military power when it comes to conventional weapons, leaders should be ready to engage in far reaching disarmament and arms control negotiations. We demand the re-establishment of the Special Consultative Group on Arms Control and urge NATO members to ratify the Adapted Conventional Forces in Europe Treaty (A/CFE) and to put explicit reference to these

aspects in the new Strategic Concept. It goes without saying that we also expect Russia to rejoin the treaty.

IV. New reasons for activation of Art. 5?

From a Green point of view, it is unacceptable to broaden the scope of Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty. Article 5 should only be activated in case of an armed attack against the territory and/or the population of a NATO member state. Besides collective defence, NATO should provide crisis management on the basis of the UN Charter.

The very idea of having NATO engage in broad cyber security we do not agree with. The very concept of cyber security is problematic because it is not clearly defined. In our view, this would only make sense in terms of protecting and defending NATO communication and electronic infrastructure. The protection and defence of member states' information infrastructures is an internal security issue which should be tackled by interior ministers (Indrek Tarand has a different point of view).

We're also strongly opposed to the idea of granting NATO a role in the field of energy infrastructure and access to strategic resources worldwide. The new Strategic concept should not turn NATO into a military branch of WTO, OPEC, or even private multinational companies like Shell or BP. If NATO engages in this field it will only exacerbate the unfair and unjust distribution and asymmetric access to strategic resources.

V. Civilian NATO?

NATO needs no civilian capabilities because it is a purely politico-military organisation. If NATO operates in countries or regions in need of international police, justice or public administration expertise, then civilian organisations like the UN, OSCE or EU should deliver such capabilities. In addition, if NATO engages in civilian capacity building this would put further strain on EU member state's ability to generate forces for civilian missions.

VI. Security Architecture

We need a new deal regarding the division of labour between NATO, UN, EU, OSCE and other regional organisations as ASEAN or the African Union (AU). At the moment, issues of hierarchy and division of labour still need to be clarified. The UN's role in legitimizing the use of force should be acknowledged and reaffirmed in NATO's new Strategic Concept. NATO should strengthen its links to the UN. Opening a liaison office at UN Headquarters is a good idea which should be reflected in the new concept. On the other hand, the division of labour especially between EU, OSCE and NATO needs to be clarified. NATO should put emphasis on further developing NATO-Russia relations based on the work of the NATO-Russia Council. At the same time we expect Russia to be constructive in that cooperation.

We agree NATO is better equipped than the EU in dealing with high intensity military conflicts. However, the EU is one of the most ambitious providers of civilian

expertise, conflict prevention, and peace-building. The EU has invested much time, energy and financial resources regarding these concepts and capacities for Security Sector Reform (SSR).

Greens support the idea of significantly strengthening the OSCE and urge OSCE and EU Member States to formulate an Action Plan that would outline a road map towards a charter for a security community in the OSCE area. Greens remind NATO that also non-aligned and neutral countries inside and outside the EU have an important role to play in conflict prevention, civilian crisis management and peace-building.