

Editors' Statement:

**Current Developments and
Recommendations**

1 Focus: Military operations under close scrutiny

“Army in action”

The united Germany has undergone a fundamental change with regard to its security and defence policy. Whereas the old Federal Republic demonstrated restraint in military matters, disassociating itself from Germany’s past, today’s Germany is one of the UN’s largest suppliers of troops. The number of military missions has risen steeply since 1994. The *Bundeswehr* has officially been restructured to become an “army in action”.

Bundeswehr - quo vadis?

In its 2006 White Paper, the Federal Government did something which the Red-Green coalition had not manage to do in seven years: It explained the principles, objectives and means of its security policy – a long overdue undertaking in view of the many questions requiring clarification. In his speech marking the 50th anniversary of the *Bundeswehr*, Federal President Horst Köhler asked: “The *Bundeswehr* is being transformed from a defensive army – but into what? An army in action? An intervention army?”

STATEMENT

Last year, we criticized the discrepancy between what our armed forces are now allowed to do and what we actually know about this. Unfortunately, this criticism still applies. The White Paper does not close the gap between constantly changing operations with varying mandates and the clear precepts of a democracy. What is actually meant by an “army in action” and what this should or should not be allowed to do often remains unclear. At least the White Paper calls for a more thorough public discussion on the new role of the *Bundeswehr*. We are taking up this demand in our focus. It is intolerable that *Bundeswehr* soldiers should risk their lives in countries all over the world without knowing exactly why. All too often, politicians seem to be deploying them according to the old motto of: “*On s’engage et puis on voit*”.

Too many question marks

Critical discussion of the new Bundeswehr essential

We are therefore taking a close look at the *Bundeswehr*’s missions to date – in the Balkans, Afghanistan, Congo, Lebanon among others. It is

Armed forces to
deal with conflicts?

essential to evaluate these missions. The Federal Republic under Federal Chancellor Schröder rejected the Iraq war outright – with good reason. Nevertheless, the increasing number of *Bundeswehr* operations is evidence of this country's growing faith in the role of the armed forces as a practical and capable instrument for dealing with conflicts. Developments in Afghanistan teach us otherwise. Security is certainly a top priority when rebuilding a state, but military operations do not win hearts and minds.

We do not disapprove of military means *eo ipso*. But if they are to succeed they must be part of an overall concept for political and civilian stability. Federal Chancellor Merkel was right to emphasize at the NATO summit in Riga that she wanted to make it clear to the alliance partners that the most important task in Afghanistan is to strengthen civilian rebuilding. But did this produce results?

Operations *ad hoc*
and decided reactively

The *Bundeswehr's* operations to date suffer from the fact that they are decided and justified *ad hoc* and reactively. External factors, for example the

STATEMENT

relationship with the United States as the main power in the alliance, solidarity within NATO or the so-called CNN effect, are often decisive. Decisions on military intervention are based on a web of domestic and foreign policy factors, which means that the reasons and justifications for interventions rarely tally.

If the aim of *Bundeswehr* operations is to settle violent conflicts in the societies affected, the yardstick for success must be the sustainable transformation of local violent conflicts and, in particular, the establishment of rules and institutions for peaceful conflict processing. These are the criteria for continuously assessing the implementation of Germany's military and civilian measures – and correcting them as appropriate.

Yardstick for operations

Tasks and effects of international military operations

It is becoming increasingly difficult to determine the actual number of active military missions or operations involving military participation. Since

Over 50 resolutions in the *Bundestag*

1994, the German *Bundestag* has passed more than 50 resolutions approving or extending foreign missions involving the *Bundeswehr*. These have ranged from delegations of individual soldiers through to the sending of larger contingents to crisis and war regions. The scale, duration and task profile of these missions vary hugely. One must distinguish between different case groups in order to draw a balance of their results and successes.

Observation, surveillance,
security

Most missions are *observation, surveillance and security* missions. Their main function is to underpin agreements to reduce conflicts by demonstrating international military presence. In most cases, these operations have the approval of the conflicting parties. For example, armed forces protected the temporary UN transitional administrations in Cambodia in 1991 and in East Timor from 1999 onwards. In Autumn 1998, NATO troops supported a civilian OSCE verification mission in Kosovo, which supervised Yugoslavia's self-commitment to reduce its military and police presence. And NATO collected the weapons of Albanian rebels in Macedonia in Summer 2001. Following such

Aim achieved

STATEMENT

missions, one can evaluate whether the objectives stated in the mandates have been achieved. This was the case with the examples stated above. However, it is difficult to judge whether this success was actually due to the presence of foreign soldiers. The same applies to the orderly conduct of the presidential elections in Congo last year, which the EU supervised with its controversial mission. Furthermore, the missions are not always appropriate for the actual problems in hand. For example, the Federal Navy patrolling the Lebanese coast could only prevent supplies of weapons from reaching the *Hisbollah* if these supplies were actually transported by sea. There was no question of this, however, even before the mission. The operation thus created the impression that its aim was to demonstrate military presence without risking danger, rather than to actually sort out the conflict.

Involvement in Lebanon not dangerous

Longer term *consolidation and stabilization missions in post-war societies* represent a second case group. The building of state structures following the end of a war or civil war is only possible in a secure environment. The abbreviations

Stabilization of post-war societies

Aims not achieved with quasi protectorates

EUFOR, KFOR and ISAF stand for the examples of Bosnia (1995), Kosovo (1999) and Afghanistan (2001). On the whole, the two missions on the Balkans met the minimal expectations of preventing violent clashes. They are not to blame for the fact that no end to the conflicts is in sight even after 12 and 8 years respectively. This is due to lack of political consolidation. So far, the quasi-protectorates have been unable to realize the objectives of a self-supporting peace and a multi-ethnic nation-building process.

Wars of intervention

Wars of intervention represent the third and at the same time most problematic group of military operations. The Kosovo war in 1999 violated international law – however, much one may argue about its legitimacy against the background of the massacres and mass expulsions in Bosnia. The Iraq war in 2003 was a clear violation of the ban on war under the UN Charter. Nothing remains of the arguments which were used to justify this war. They were threadbare from the very beginning.

STATEMENT

A further possible reason for intervention is to put an end to *unrestrained violence* against defenceless groups of the population, in cases where the government is not willing or able to do so. This is the aim of the international *Responsibility to Protect*, which was approved by the UN summit in September 2005. Armed interventions to this end have not taken place to date, although there has been no shortage of reasons for intervention. The problem in Rwanda (1994) and in Srebrenica (1995) was not that the community of states lacked the capacity to intervene, but that it lacked the political will to do so. Protection must be forthcoming in cases where there are elements of genocide, mass killings or ethnic cleansing and where help for the victims can be mobilized.

Responsibility to protect

Military operations under scrutiny: The case of Afghanistan

As violence in Afghanistan increases, there is growing concern about developments in the country and about the *Bundeswehr's* mission. There was

Alliance solidarity decisive
motive

wide consensus when the *Bundestag* approved this mission in Autumn 2001. In the meantime, the justification for the mission has been partly forgotten, partly succeeded by new tasks. During the *Bundestag* debate of 8 November 2001, the then Federal Foreign Minister, Joschka Fischer, formulated the “central question” as follows: “Can we, in this situation, where the people and the government of the United States are under attack, leave our most important alliance partner alone, an alliance partner who is responding to this attack and who is making a stand against this attack on the basis of international law? Yes or no? This house must take this decision.”

Pacifying Afghanistan last on
the agenda

Just how much the *Bundeswehr*'s operations in Afghanistan were primarily a question of loyalty to the alliance was once again revealed during the Iraq war. Berlin tried to avoid participating in the war and sought to limit the quarrel with Washington over Iraq by demonstrating its commitment in Afghanistan. Secondly, the mission in Afghanistan was intended to serve the fight against terrorism. Arguments relating directly to Afghanistan as such

STATEMENT

took third and last place: for example support for the Afghan government, stabilization, humanitarian reasons, the call for democracy or women's rights.

Complex justifications for military operations are, of course, the rule and difficult to avoid. Different intervention objectives can be contradictory or even stand in each other's way. In the case of Afghanistan, it is becoming increasingly clear why the call for an overall concept is growing louder. It is also striking that the former "central question", support for the United States, no longer appears in the Federal Government's concept for Afghanistan of 12 September 2006. Instead, the focus lies entirely on preventing the destabilization of the country. The target conflict has not been solved. Germany's Afghanistan policy is still determined primarily by external factors, particularly by massive pressure from NATO to send additional forces and to deploy the *Bundeswehr* in direct combat action in the south of the country. Added to this is a reluctance for reasons of domestic policy to change a plan once it has been adopted and to admit mistakes.

Pressure from NATO

Military action weakens rebuilding

It would be wrong, however, to blame the Federal Government for the deteriorating situation in Afghanistan. German policy is just a small part of the overall international operation, which is dominated by the United States from the military, financial and political point of view. Imprudent practices on the part of the US forces are reducing the political involvement of the Afghan people in the rebuilding process and weakening the intended nation-building process. On the other hand, it is doubtful whether the preconditions for democratizing Afghanistan actually exist. A democratic state cannot be founded on the basis of the Taliban or the Northern Alliance, on the militias and the warlords or on traditional tribal structures. The country's middle class is extremely small and weak as a potential societal basis for democracy.

Poor preconditions for democratization

On the whole, Germany's Afghanistan policy is characterized by the following elements: a) the sending of military units for reasons of alliance policy and other secondary reasons, for example Germany's interest in a permanent seat in the UN

STATEMENT

Security Council; b) the need to shape military presence in such a way as to eliminate as far as possible the prospect of own losses, which is why Kabul and the North were chosen as areas for the German mission; c) the assumption of the main responsibility for building up a police force, whilst at the same time not providing sufficient personnel and financial resources; d) a reluctance to transfer the *Bundeswehr* from stabilization tasks to combat activities; e) engagement in the field of development policy, *inter alia* in the form of Provincial Reconstruction Teams (PRT). It is unfortunate that this web of activities makes it difficult to develop a consistent strategy for conflict processing in Afghanistan – buzzword an “overall concept”.

Contradictory Afghanistan policy

Contrary to short-lived reports of success, there are more setbacks to be reported from Afghanistan than progress. The main causes are political. The establishment of state power and administration structures is progressing slowly. This disappoints hopes for stability, security and economic development and encourages people to join the armed opposition. Increasingly the foreign troops,

More setbacks than progress

who should really be supporting the Afghan government and assisting state-building, have let themselves be drawn into combat situations. Their sometimes tough methods have set large sections of the population against them.

State machinery more efficient and just

The fate of Afghanistan will be decided by whether the majority of the population and organized political groups consider the establishment of stable state structures to be advantageous. The state machinery must succeed in asserting its advantages over local power structures. Foreign troops can help in particular by gaining time for this process. Foreign military presence will lose its acceptance if it fails to establish state structures which show that the state's achievements in the social, economic and security fields are more efficient and just options than those offered by particularist players. A development under which foreign troops or organizations perform state tasks would be a sign of failure.

The *Bundestag* and the Federal Government are called upon to consider at regular intervals whether

STATEMENT

there is still a sound basis for the presence of the *Bundeswehr* in this context. Furthermore, they should oppose pressure from third parties to adapt the *Bundeswehr's* mission to become a combat mission. We consider indirect participation by German signals soldiers and reconnaissance aircraft in the active fight against rebels to be counter-productive because the growing number of Afghan victims is whittling away support for intervention and engagement in state-building.

Operational missions
counter-productive

Should no political progress be made in the course of the next few months and the societal basis for state-building in the disputed provinces not improve, there is no alternative but to withdraw the troops to the relatively safe areas and to concentrate on protecting these areas. Furthermore, an exit strategy must be drawn up for the event of a further deterioration in the situation.

Draw up an exit strategy

The fallacy of the overall competence of the armed forces

There is growing disapproval of the renewed sending of forces abroad. The *Bundeswehr* should not and cannot be a service enterprise which is always on call to deal with worldwide crises.

Rules and exceptions being reversed

The current Grand Coalition is not the first German government to use the armed forces as an instrument for representing its foreign policy interests. The White Paper confirms this. On the other hand, the White Paper ignores the question of what German soldiers can do and what they are prepared for. The fiction of the overall competence of the armed forces is threatening to get out of hand; rules and exceptions are being reversed. The army must remain the state's instrument for dealing with an emergency, not for everyday political use.

Ban on violence must remain the norm

International law and the German Basic Law – the latter not least against the background of Germany's past – stress the ban on violence as the central norm, from which deviations are only allowed under exceptional circumstances. We therefore demand

STATEMENT

clear criteria regarding the admissibility and objectives of future *Bundeswehr* missions. These can help to make the critical discussion on the appropriateness and need, the opportunities and risks, the effects and successes of *Bundeswehr* missions abroad more objective.

Operational criteria for military missions

The fact that military interventions alone have not had the intended stabilizing effect, not to mention have not led to state and nation-building, has served to increase scepticism and doubts. In most cases the *Bundeswehr* is being called upon to perform tasks for which it is hardly prepared and which would overtax any army: It must perform the duties of a robust federal police force, fight rebellions, disarm illegal combatants, escort aid convoys, arrest criminals, stop drug couriers, reconcile conflicting ethnic or religious groups, and build a new state machinery. Military presence can gain time, but this time must be used *for political purposes*. If not, UN missions tend to merely freeze conflicts, to simply

Bundeswehr overburdened

Military operations as a substitute for policies

administrate them, and thus finally prolong them. The soldiers are over-burdened with unfeasible expectations. Their presence creates the illusion of containing the conflict, it becomes a substitute for politics and causes politicians to be inactive or to jump from one unfinished intervention to the next.

In many cases, UN missions have contributed towards the signing of peace agreements, refugees returning home, support for transitional administrations and the holding of elections. But such successes also depend on factors which the intervention powers can only control to a limited extent – the degree of violence, social fragmentation and the interests of local stakeholders, local capacities, the level of international aid and the organizations holding supreme command. UN missions can promote the transition to peace providing local conditions so allow. But they do not have much effect as long as a violent conflict is being waged on a wide front or if the use of violence by local stakeholders even draws the missions into the conflict – as was the case in Kosovo, in Macedonia and in Sudan. Even employing military

STATEMENT

means, the possibilities for ending violence against the will of the conflict parties are very limited.

Military interventions must be in accordance with international law. According to Chapter VII of the UN Charter, the only legitimate grounds for intervention are an act of aggression and a breach of or a threat to the peace. Added to this, the contracting parties to the Genocide Convention of 1948 agreed that “genocide, whether committed in time of peace or in time of war, is a crime under international law which they undertake to prevent and to punish” (Art. 1). If the United Nations is unable to implement this undertaking except by military measures, an orderly and institutionalized process is required – for establishing and condemning the facts of the case and for enforcing compulsory jurisdiction.

International law, international military law and other international standards are to be strictly observed. War crimes, crimes against humanity and violations of the Geneva Conventions, particularly attacks on and violence against civilians, are to be

Legitimate reasons for employing force

Procedures needed for preventing genocide

Military operations bound by International Law

punished under penal and military law, irrespective of the position of the person or alliance partner. After all, these are crimes and not “collateral damage” in the fight against terrorists or rebels and even tend to encourage people to join terrorist or rebel groups.

Evaluations

Continuous analysis and evaluations of military and civilian operations are required in order to prevent missions from being extended automatically. The feasibility of the peace policy objectives must not only be examined prior to military intervention, but also in the course of the mission. We therefore consider accompanying analysis to be necessary to verify whether a military mission is nearing its objectives and whether it is approaching its end (exit strategy). Following the end of the military operations, missions must be systematically analysed as to what they have achieved. This must be the task of independent organizations, commissioned within the framework of public calls. Only in this way can concepts and strategies be realistically adapted to changed conditions, and

Put an end to failed operations in good time

STATEMENT

operations which are threatened with failure be terminated in good time.

Military operations are extremely expensive compared with the cost of fighting poverty and providing security services at local level. The costs and benefits must therefore be evaluated and assessed in comparison with alternatives. It would be better for public safety and state institution-building in Afghanistan, Bosnia-Herzegovina and Kosovo to train local security forces and provide them with adequate technical and financial support. The Federal Republic, the EU and the United Nations could do a lot more to help build national security capacities in conflict regions and thus contribute more effectively to peace than through many a military mission.

Train own security forces

To sum up, we consider it essential that future military operations should at least apply the following six criteria:

1. *Legitimacy*: Missions must conform to the UN Charter and the German Basic Law;

Minimum criteria for
military operations

2. *Differentiation between peace policy and functional reasons*: Objectives relating to power, influence or alliance policy should not be decisive;
3. *Priority of civilian alternatives*: Have all non-military alternatives been exhausted or do they definitely have no chance of success?
4. *Overall political concept*, including clarifying the conditions for success in the target country;
5. *Evaluation*: No foreign mission without an accompanying evaluation and subsequent analysis of its costs and benefits;
6. *Exit strategy*: When and how is an operation to be terminated?

2. *A new nuclear weapons age is dawning*

NATO accounts for more than 70 percent of the world's military expenditure

In its 2006 White Paper on security, the Federal Government laments the “excessive accumulation of armaments” and fears negative consequences for the

STATEMENT

stability of critical regions in the world and indirectly also for Germany. This concern is justified. China's announcement that it intends to increase its defence budget by almost 18 percent this year caused the international community to sit up and take notice. The announcement met with heavy criticism in the United States in particular, where it is seen as a threat to the United States' own predominance. At the same time, America's military budget has increased by an average of 14 percent per annum since President Bush assumed office. Worldwide expenditure on armed forces and armaments has passed the trillion dollar mark. Almost half of this expenditure, 48 percent, can be attributed to the United States, and more than 70 percent to the western alliance as a whole. If one interprets the term "West" politically, that is to say to include Japan, South Korea, Australia and New Zealand, this share rises to over 77 percent. The world's other 166 states share the remaining quarter. This trend towards a return to the arms race of the past and even to an increase in its dynamism – without adequate justification – is far more

New arms race
threatens stability

Too little awareness of
the dangers

dangerous than the public in the West tends to realize.

Appeal against the nuclear arms race

Dramatic appeal

In January 2007, four esteemed veterans of the American political scene – Henry Kissinger, George Shultz, William Perry and Sam Nunn – made a dramatic appeal to their nation: America was on the threshold of a new nuclear age, more dangerous and more expensive than the Cold War. They recommended decisive efforts towards arms control as the only way to counter this harmful development. All five official nuclear weapons powers are disregarding their commitment to disarm, are modernizing their arsenals of warheads and carriers, and are thus undermining the global non-proliferation regime (*Non-Proliferation Treaty*). Partly as a result, the leaders of exposed non-nuclear weapon states are finding themselves confronted with the question of whether they should acquire their own nuclear weapons as a reliable protection against military threats - protection which the

Nuclear powers undermine Non-Proliferation Treaty

STATEMENT

nuclear powers claim for themselves as a matter of course. The war in Iraq has fuelled such ambitions. The nuclear aspirations of Iran and North Korea, the two remaining members of the “axis of evil”, are unsettling the world. But Japan, South Korea, Brazil, Saudi Arabia, Egypt and the United Arab Emirates are also voicing similar thoughts about acquiring their own nuclear weapons. A nuclear arms race, particularly in the already unstable region of the Middle East, would be a nightmare.

Threat of nuclear arms race in the Middle East

China’s anti-satellite test in January 2007 and Russia’s intense opposition to the United States’ plans for an anti-missile shield are once again making arms conflicts plausible, even between nuclear powers. The willingness of Warsaw and Prague to station up to ten American interceptor missiles and the corresponding large radar system is not a risk to Russia’s security in itself . The proposed system only promises protection against a limited number of approaching missiles from countries with relatively unsophisticated carriers – namely Iran. Nevertheless, it is part of a more extensive project. Comparable systems already exist

Missile defence shield in East Europe

in Alaska and California, others are being planned. Together they are intended to shield the entire territory of the United States. In 2002, Washington took the precautionary measure of quitting the 1972 ABM (*Anti-Ballistic Missiles Treaty*), which barred nation-wide missiles defence. What if technological developments produce the capability to defend against a large-scale attack using long-range weapons?

Peace dictated by the stronger

The hermetic missile shield – Ronald Reagan’s vision several years ago – does not make its owner’s offensive weaponry superfluous. But it does alter its strategic function. The fact that weapons can be used without risk makes their actual use superfluous. The superior option is to use weapons as a means of exerting diplomatic pressure: The state which upsets the balance of deterrent and holds the military threat monopoly would be able to dictate its political will. A peace based on reciprocity would give way to a peace dictated by the stronger power.

STATEMENT

Scope for action on the part of the Federal Government

The Federal Republic has committed itself to nuclear abstinence under the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) and other agreements. More than other countries, it is thus entitled and interested in representing the security interests of the non-nuclear weapon states. The renunciation of the 150 or so tactical nuclear weapons still stationed in Germany would be a clear signal against rampant renuclearization.

Renunciation of “nuclear participation”

The Federal Government lacks the political clout to initiate the comprehensive timetable for disarmament which the four American politicians are demanding. This is the responsibility of the nuclear powers. Germany can only encourage, warn and urge. However, together with its neighbours and allies, it must make itself heard in those areas where its own security is at risk. The missile defence project is not a bilateral issue between the United States and those European allies which are willing to station the system on their territory, but is certainly a matter for NATO and more still for the EU.

Missile defence not a bilateral project

Ban on anti-satellite
weapons

The military use of space is also a topic which affects all Europeans. The anti-missile system has an inherent anti-satellite capacity and the Chinese ASAT test has demonstrated that more and more states are in a position to hit satellites. Not only the military, but also the civilian infrastructure of developed societies is becoming increasingly dependent on communications technologies in space. Only a complete ban on anti-satellite weapons can avert the risk of the destruction of civilian communications satellites in the event of a conflict. Negotiations on this issue are not even in sight. They should begin without delay.

3. Focus Middle East

Causes of regional and
international conflicts
interlinked

The Middle East continues to be a region with a dense concentration of high intensity conflicts. The situation in the region is characterized by the war in Lebanon in Summer 2006, armed conflicts between Palestinians and the Palestine conflict, which is still a long way from any settlement, occupation, civil

STATEMENT

war and terrorism in Iraq, the international conflict over Iran's nuclear programme, the escalation in Afghanistan and the horrific terror attacks in Morocco and Algeria. The path to peace is difficult because the causes of most of these conflicts are a mixture of regional and country-specific factors and numerous international players are involved in addition to state and non-state players.

Disaster in Iraq

Iraq represents the most graphic example of this correlation. The state machinery is weak and infiltrated by militias and ethnic-confessional groups. Violent conflicts between Sunni and Shiite Muslims and within both groups themselves, regional disparities and power struggles between political, ethnic and religious organizations all mark the heightening of the conflicts. The occupation forces, Arab *jihadist* infiltrators and the regional struggle for hegemony – particularly between Iran, Saudi Arabia and Turkey, but also between Syria and other countries– also add extra dimensions to

Situation in Iraq
complex

the conflicts. In the meantime, the situation in Iraq is so complex that even the Baker-Hamilton Commission predicts that an external solution has little chance of success in the next few years. The United States, as the most powerful player in Iraq, has thrown away the opportunity for a constructive solution. It may be able to obstruct or prevent developments in Iraq, but it can hardly shape them. Neither the withdrawal nor the reinforcement of US troops will put an end to the violence in Iraq. Although attempts at regional cooperation, e.g. the Iraq conferences involving all the neighbouring states, are in themselves wise, they no longer offer a way out of the debacle. Washington is having to pay the price for believing for too long that there was no need to hold direct talks with Syria and Iran.

Middle East conflict: Cornerstones for a solution are known, but no settlement in sight

Occupied territories and settlements the key

The crises in Palestine and Lebanon are linked through the regional dominance of Israel. The territories occupied after 1967 and the steady

STATEMENT

expansion of Israeli settlements remain the key problem in the Middle East conflict. In addition, the political conflicts between *Fatah* and *Hamas* following the latter's election victory have brought the Palestinian territories to the brink of civil war. The cornerstones for a solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict have long been known and continue to be recognized internationally: the foundation of an independent Palestinian state based on the principle of "land for peace". The end of the occupation and mutual recognition of both states and their security requirements would be a decisive step. But the Israeli side lacks the courage and political will; and on the Palestinian side, the leadership struggle is preventing a solution that requires discipline and dependability.

Palestinian state

The *roadmap* showing the way out of the violence has already been drafted. It is now mainly a question of exerting international pressure on the protagonists in the Middle East conflict to finally follow this path. Admittedly, there are strong opponents of a peace process on both sides. But both Israel and the Palestinian Authority are extremely

International pressure needed

Make use of dependency

dependent on international support, the former on the support of the United States and the EU states, and the latter also on support from Saudi Arabia and other Arab countries. These states have now promised Israel full diplomatic recognition, providing it withdraws from the occupied territories, and this dependency could represent an effective lever to exert the necessary pressure on both sides. Admittedly, international steps must first be taken to organize the necessary political will. This again presupposes that *both* sides must be called upon with equal emphasis to renounce violence. Furthermore, the external actors must stop playing *Fatah* and *Hamas* off against one another. This increases their inclination to violence and is an additional obstacle to peace with Israel.

Avoiding stirring up civil war

Chancellor Merkel has declared that that she wants to revive the *roadmap*. Although this plan is based on interim settlements, it lacks clear targets for a permanent solution to the dispute. The Middle East Quartet must negotiate concrete proposals for the final status with Israel and the Palestinian authorities – the line of the border, the question of Jerusalem,

STATEMENT

settlements and refugees. And it should no longer merely check whether the conflict parties are fulfilling their commitments, but should censure and sanction disruptive actions on both sides more vehemently. Finally, the European Union would be wise to strike the political wing of *Hamas* off its list of terrorist organizations. This would provide the necessary leeway for resuming talks, strengthening the pragmatists in *Hamas* and continuing support for the reform of the Palestinian Authority, which has been interrupted since the boycott.

Resume talks with
Hamas

Explosive stalemate in Lebanon

Unlike the situation in the Middle East, it is difficult to identify a possible solution to the long-standing domestic conflict in Lebanon. The basic problem is that state structures are weak and a large share of political power in the country is in the hands of political-confessional communities, warlords and other elite groups. There is little possibility to influence domestic power structures from the outside and to strengthen the state at the expense of

Weak state structures

the confessional communities. The stalemate between the Shiite-Christian and the Sunni-Christian blocks is crippling politics in Lebanon. This situation is aggravated by the fact that both camps are receiving international support, from Iran and Syria on the one hand and from France and the United States on the other.

Reduce the influence of the *Hisbollah*

A reduction in external involvement would create incentives for a political understanding in Lebanon which would provide a way out of the stalemate. The UN troops would be able to assist this course if they did not just protect Israel from *Hisbollah* attacks from Lebanese territory, but also protected Lebanon from military attacks from Israel and from Syrian influence. This could possibly reduce *Hisbollah's* influence on domestic policy, which is largely due to its ability to protect the country against Israel. On the other hand, there appears to be little chance of enforcing the disarmament of *Hisbollah* and at the moment this would risk triggering a new civil war in Lebanon.

STATEMENT

The nuclear conflict with Iran

Any attempt to decide the nuclear conflict with Iran unilaterally by military means would violate the international ban on violence, would make the majority of the Iranian population draw together around President Ahmadinejad and would completely destabilize the entire region; quite apart from the question of whether such action would actually destroy Iran's nuclear plants. Military threats have led Tehran to harden its position further. It has done so against the background of American-Persian history since 1953 and its encirclement by both US forces and the nuclear weapons of third parties in the region – US warships in the Persian Gulf and the nuclear powers of Israel and Pakistan as well as India, Russia and China in the immediate vicinity. The idea propagated by neo-conservatives in the United States that unpopular authoritarian regimes can be removed by force, thus initiating a process of democracy from outside, has already proved counter-productive in the case of Iraq.

War against Iran
would be fatal

Iran is insisting on its right to the peaceful use of nuclear energy as stated in the Non-Proliferation Treaty. Suspicions that Tehran is perhaps also pursuing military objectives and will quit the Non-Proliferation Treaty following the successful expansion of its uranium enrichment facilities are based on a number of Iranian treaty violations in the past. Hopes of being able to use political pressure, economic incentives, sanctions or military threats to persuade Iran to discontinue its enrichment activities have proved futile. The framework for negotiations should therefore be extended in several directions.

On the one hand, negotiations on security guarantees for Iran should be conducted with the government in Tehran. On the other hand, concrete steps should be proposed aimed at a nuclear weapons-free zone. Finally, consideration should also be given to the possibility of multilateralizing Iran's uranium processing activities. These proposals are based on the fact that President Ahmadinejad's position in Iran is not unchallenged and parts of the Iranian elite would like to prevent the country from becoming even more isolated. It is, of course, possible that a process of negotiation based on the steps mentioned

Right to peaceful use

Security guarantees

Multilateralization of enrichment activities

above could also fail, whether it be conducted officially or through backchannels. But insisting on current positions and increasing Iran's international isolation without taking the country's legitimate interests into account will reduce rather than enhance the chances of preventing its nuclear armament.

4. Shifts of power in the Atlantic-Pacific region

A number of countries in the Atlantic-Pacific region have growth rates which Europe can only dream about. The rapid economic rise of China and India, which together account for approximately 40 percent of the world's population, is causing a tectonic shift in the world order. In 2006, China was the biggest exporter of goods to the EU. With its unprecedented rate of modernization, it is considered the future power rival of the United States. Gradually Europe is becoming aware that the days of virtually unchallenged western hegemony are over.

Rise of China and India

Economic growth topped by the arms race

The impressive figures for the economic boom in the Asian-Pacific region are only topped by growth in the arms sector. According to official figures, China's defence budget for 2007 is just under 45 billion USD. Western experts estimate it, in fact, to be at least double this figure. With a military budget of a good 41 billion USD in 2006, Japan remained just below the maximum of one percent of its Gross Domestic Product stipulated in the Constitution, but intends to largely abolish the restrictions on arms and military forces introduced after the Second World War. India's defence budget was 23 billion USD in 2005. Here one must also consider the US-Indian military pact of June 2005 and the cooperation agreement concluded with the United States in July 2006, but not yet ratified by Congress, which seals India's status as a nuclear power. This could aggravate India's already troubled relations with Pakistan, also a nuclear power. The nuclear arms race is also exacerbated by North Korea's nuclear tests last year. These have prompted

Japan wants to lift arms restrictions

Nuclear agreement with India

STATEMENT

discussions in South Korea and Japan about the possibility of their own nuclear weaponry.

China's modernization of its military sector is meeting with suspicion in the West. The Chinese Anti-Secession Law of March 2006 was accompanied by sabre rattling against Taiwan's striving for independence. In addition, China announced its intention to import modern Russian combat aircraft and to build a combat aircraft of its own, new landing vessels, nuclear submarines and aircraft carriers. Following years of arguing in favour of a ban on space weapons, which Washington ignored, China tested an anti-satellite weapon in January 2007 without prior warning. This is seen by many people as a military provocation. We believe that China's test should provoke prompt negotiations on a ban on space weapons.

China's military modernization

Anti-satellite weapon – call for a ban on space weapons

Not only dangers, but also opportunities

The increase in the significance of the Asian-Pacific region goes hand in hand with more or less open

Pre-programmed war?

conflicts between powers and large powers, the formation of alliances and the classical security dilemma. Nevertheless, we regard predictions that China's rise will lead to an unavoidable hegemonic conflict, or even to an unpreventable war, as panic-mongering. The picture of China as a nation which is ruthlessly converting its increasing power into military strength in order to overturn the existing power order is a misrepresentation. The new leadership in Beijing is making a visible effort to allay the fears of its neighbours by improving relations. Prime Minister Wen Jiabao even adopted a new tone in Japan, whose rigid attitude towards the past has always been a bone of contention in China, when he thanked Japan for its technological assistance towards China's modernization effort. Taiwan is unquestionably the crunch point in East Asia's security architecture. However, everything seems to indicate that, although Beijing is using martial rhetoric as a deterrent against secession efforts, it will actually accept the *status quo* as long as there is no acute danger of separation. After all, Taiwan is the largest investor on the Chinese mainland.

Chinese-Japanese relations improved

STATEMENT

A rapidly growing China is making active use of new forums and organizations to pursue multilateralism and engage in regional cooperation. International institution-building in the Asian-Pacific region is by no means as well developed as European integration and so far also lacks the arms control components needed to build confidence and tame the dynamism of the arms race. Nevertheless, international cooperation is growing more rapidly than people in Europe tend to notice. For example, the East Asian Summit was established in 2004 on the initiative of ASEAN. The summit has agreed concrete steps towards establishing a free-trade zone and principles for a regional security community. The Shanghai Cooperation Organisation, set up by China, Russia and the Central Asian republics, aims to jointly shape policies with regard to security interests and border issues, the fight against terrorism and energy supplies. And finally, the Six Power Talks are based on a Chinese initiative. Their goal, the settlement of the nuclear conflict with Pyongyang, could relax the situation in the divided Korea, contain proliferation and overcome *one* cause

International cooperation
growing

Nuclear conflict with
North Korea

of the regional arms race. In short: Long-standing fears of the “yellow peril” should not obscure the fact that China has recently also turned to *soft power*. Diplomacy, trade and international cooperation are the means with which it is trying to increase its influence, not primarily military strength.

China as cooperation
partner for global
governance

Europe will have to make a great effort to assert its position against the background of the rise of the Asian-Pacific region. But this development also holds out opportunities. New, important cooperation partners for multilateral concepts concerning a world order are emerging alongside the only remaining super power. It is important to take advantage of this opportunity. The EU should step up its efforts to involve China in the multilateral regulations of global governance. And it should steadfastly continue its strategy of dialogue for democracy and human rights. The only pressure which the EU can apply on China is to refuse to recognize its international legitimacy. The EU must also make it clear that its one-China policy cannot be used to justify violence against the democracy in Taiwan.

Democracy and
human rights

STATEMENT

Conflict potential of environmental destruction

The boom in Asia will intensify the worldwide competition for raw materials, energy and other resources which are in short supply. Sets of international regulations are therefore all the more important. The same applies for the downside of the boom: the immense ecological damage which it is causing in these countries, the global emissions of greenhouse gases, and the worldwide rise in temperature. It is imperative that China and India change the course of their environmental policy. But it is shameful to move “dirty” production processes from the United States and Europe to Asia in order to improve one’s own environmental standards and to then point the finger at Asia. Agreement between the rich industrial countries on large-scale reductions in emissions is a precondition for emerging countries also agreeing on gradual reductions. Africa, which is already at a disadvantage climate-wise, will suffer considerable damage as a result of climate change. Unless action to slow the rate of climate change is taken soon, there will be an increase in violent

Boom in Asia aggravating climate change

Africa as the loser

conflicts over the distribution of resources and a rise in emigration to rich countries dictated by environmental conditions.

5. Trouble spots in Africa

Of the many conflicts in Africa, the war in Sudan/Darfur and the situation in Congo have occupied German politics and the German public most. The Ethiopian military intervention at the end of 2006 also drew attention to the Horn of Africa.

The murdering in Darfur must be stopped

200,000 dead,
2.5 million refugees

The *Janjaweed* (mounted militias), which are supported by the Sudanese government, are still killing thousands of civilians in Darfur. But the situation is also being exacerbated by rebel groups which are receiving assistance from Chad. The toll so far is an estimated 200,000 dead and 2.5 million refugees. The African Union Mission in Sudan, (AMIS), with a peacekeeping force of just 7,000

STATEMENT

men and women, is overburdened by the task of protecting the population. Moreover, China's veto policy in the Security Council is preventing a more efficient intervention by the United Nations. China does not want to jeopardize its economic and strategic interests in the region. Despite cross-border battles and the horrific effects on the population, China considers the issue to be an inner-Sudanese matter and insists that Sudan's state sovereignty should be respected.

AMIS overburdened

It is imperative to put an end to the insidious genocide in Darfur. UN revelations in April 2007 that the Sudanese army had transported weapons and heavy equipment to Darfur in military aircraft disguised as UN planes eliminated all doubts about the involvement of the central government in the murderous actions of the *Janjaweed*. Shortly afterwards Khartoum agreed to the UN's proposal to increase the AMIS force by approximately 3,000 soldiers. But even if the Sudanese government does keep its promise this time, effective help is only possible if the protection force is rapidly expanded – the decision to build up an overall strength of 20,000

Increase the protective forces

Ensure the protection
of the population

soldiers was already taken in November 2006 – and if Khartoum fulfils its obligations to ensure unhindered supplies of food and medicine to the refugee camps. As long as the aid measures in Dafur are only half-hearted, warnings that events such as those in Rwanda should never be allowed to repeat themselves are just empty talk.

More German engagement
in Africa

But protecting the population can only be a minimum goal. In addition, a concept must be developed for the future of the region and the refugees. Structural assistance to secure the people's basis for a livelihood can only take hold if there is a permanent end to violence. Federal President Horst Köhler is particularly committed to helping Africa; and the Federal Government has made Africa one of the focuses of its G8 Presidency. In this role, the Federal Government can work to increase the pressure on Sudan and Chad and intensify the international commitment to helping Dafur. It should try to convince China to revise its policy in the United Nations.

STATEMENT

Congo: Safeguarding the elections is not sufficient

Free elections took place in the Democratic Republic of Congo in 2006 for the first time since 1965. More than 17,000 UN and 2,000 EUFOR soldiers monitored the elections, which on the whole ran peacefully. The Federal Republic contributed 780 soldiers, whose mandate was limited to preventing armed conflicts in the country's capital of Kinshasa during the elections. In other words, their mission was very closely defined with regard to content, location and duration. Judged according to these criteria, the *Bundeswehr* mission was successful. It did not provide a contribution to the permanent stabilization and pacification of the country.

Election monitoring successful, Congo not pacified

The struggle for power between the election winner Kabila and his opponent Bemba is by no means over and the situation in the east of the country is still dangerous and violent. Kabila's government must be encouraged to conduct a resolute fight against corruption and to establish transparent political, judicial and economic structures, and its efforts must be supported. The illegal and uncontrolled

Stem the war economy,
punish profiteers

exploitation of valuable resources encourages corruption and favouritism, nourishes the continuation of local violent conflicts and robs the state of income which it urgently needs, for example to remunerate the underpaid and therefore unreliable security forces. But it is not sufficient to denounce Congo's war economy alone. As long as western companies continue to profit with impunity from illegal mining activities in Congo, the demands for good governance and ultimately for *Bundeswehr* missions to monitor the elections are merely symbolic.

Horn of Africa

Little notice given to
the Horn of Africa

Despite hundreds of thousands of refugees and thousands of dead, people in Germany are taking little notice of the conflicts in the *Horn of Afrika* and of the Federal Navy's mission in the region since 2001. Following the failure of the UN mission in Somalia, the country remained left largely to its own devices after 1995; the community of states failed to exert early, constructive influence and to support

STATEMENT

moderate forces. Ethiopia, supported by the United States, assumed responsibility for establishing an interim government, using massive pressure and military intervention. This government is dependent on Ethiopia and has little support from within the population. The weakness of the interim government is strengthening the opposition Union of Islamic Courts (UIC). Although this union also includes moderate groups which are willing to cooperate, it is depicted indiscriminately as being Islamic and associated with *al-Qaeda* and is included in the “fight against international terrorism”. Instead of encouraging a rapprochement between the political forces in Somalia, the policy pursued by the West, particularly the United States, is helping to polarize and escalate the violence and is impairing the conditions for constructive negotiations. The community of states must be all the more resolute in its efforts to mediate in Somalia and in the whole region. Without the formation of a representative and strong government and without the establishment of reliable administrative structures, there will neither be peace in Somalia nor a solution to the conflict with Ethiopia. The African AMISOM

Mediation in Somalia

Overall concept for peace necessary

peace force (*African Union Mission in Somalia*) will also be unable to establish peace without a comprehensive concept which is implemented quickly and successfully. Instead of suspecting the whole country of terrorism, it is important to support moderate religious forces, for example the *Hawiye* clan families, which are strongly represented in the UIC. Humanitarian aid must go hand in hand with a stop to arms supplies. The important international players are all united in the “Somalia Contact Group”. Germany could make a productive contribution within this group as a result of its good relations with the states in the Horn of Africa.

Criteria for an “army in action”

For all too long, the West has shown little interest in post-colonial Africa. The situation has begun to change since China, driven by its hunger for raw materials, became involved in the region. The forgotten continent not only has numerous failed states, but also many violent conflicts. Further requests to take part in United Nations and EU missions must therefore be expected. German politics must carefully consider whether, how and why it wants to send its “army in action” to Africa.

STATEMENT

It is very likely that the criteria outlined here will soon be put to the test.

Bruno Schoch
Andreas Heinemann-Grüder
Jochen Hippler
Markus Weingardt
Reinhard Mutz