

**The Editors' Statement:  
Current Developments and Recommendations**

## *1. Focus: An unprecedented new arms build-up*

Twenty years ago, the world witnessed an epochal breakthrough in international security policy. Even before the end of the East-West conflict, the two sides achieved a goal which had previously often been dismissed as Utopian: the introduction of concrete disarmament measures. Both sides agreed to reduce their arsenals of nuclear weapons, which they had piled up during the era of confrontation between the two systems. The greatest danger facing the survival of mankind, nuclear weapons capable of a terrific overkill, lost a lot of its horror.

In the meantime, this trend has been reversed. The turn of the millennium marked the beginning of an unprecedented build-up of arms. Worldwide, armed forces and weapons are consuming more funds than during the period of the East-West conflict. This new arms drive could prove more dangerous than the Cold War. It ties up immense resources, fuels mutual distrust and exposes illusions of being able to solve conflicts by military means. Moreover, it is not constrained by effective arms controls or a vigilant public. And instead of just two protagonists, there are now several. The rapid rise of China and India is leading to an unusual power constellation. There is a risk of the proliferation of nuclear weapons and these weapons could get into the hands of unpredictable players.

**Unprecedented  
arms build-up**

Inflation-adjusted military expenditure increased by around 30 percent between 2001 and 2006 and passed the one billion US dollar mark for the first time in 2003. The United States is responsible for almost half of this expenditure and this does not include the cost of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. Even not counting US military expenditure, global military budgets rose by 15 percent in real terms between 2001 and 2006 – but only by four percent in Western Europe. This difference is striking. But instead of asserting their position, Europeans tend to be embarrassed by their restraint.

**Exception:  
Western  
Europe**

Military expenditure is highest in the United States, Great Britain, France, China and Japan. The highest rates of growth of 25 to 30 percent are to be found in Central and Southern Asia, in North Africa and in the Middle East. The

countries with the biggest arms drive are India, Indonesia, Pakistan and Russia - and Chile and Colombia in South America. The largest increases in arms imports are to be seen in India and Pakistan and in the Middle East.

*Senseless arms drive?*

This new arms drive is easier to describe than to explain. The “unipolar moment“ when the United States considered itself a “world power without a rival” is a thing of the past. It would appear that the transition to a new international power constellation is being accompanied by a general increase in nation-state security considerations and power ambitions. Countries tend to use real or imaginary opponents to justify their policies of strength. At the same time, their military build-up is intended to enhance their status, not only from their own point of view but also from that of others. This new arms drive is made possible by high economic growth in certain key areas together with the easier availability of military technologies.

**Policy of strength**

US domestic and foreign policies have been characterized by a climate of alarmism since the attacks of 11 September 2001. The security mania fuelled by the Bush administration is effectively providing a license for an intensive build-up of weapons, the dismantling of international arms control agreements and the massive expansion of the security state at home. Buoyed by its enormous increase in power since the collapse of the Soviet Union and by neo-conservative ideologies of superiority, Washington has shifted away from its previous foreign and security policy which secured its supremacy through international organizations, alliances and arms control agreements and which also took the interests of its partners into account. The Bush administration has renounced this partial multilateralism.

**The shattered ruins of arms control**

Instead, Washington is now basing its policies on military superiority and on the might of the strongest. The effect is fatal: International arms controls are in ruins and the wars “against terrorism”, particularly in Iraq, have seriously damaged both international law and the reputation of the United Nations.

There is perhaps another even more serious motive for the arms drive: Emerging powers are denouncing the United States' unilateral military overinsurance and double standards with regard to weapons of mass destruction, but at the same time copying this behavior. Although weaker from the military point of view, other states, particularly Russia, are using their military potential to support their demands for a multipolar world without US predominance. This imitation of a policy of strength is threatening to lead to the return of military power as a global policy instrument. Washington's blatant policy of military supremacy is a significant cause of instability and the arms drive. However, the consequences of multipolarism are no less serious.

**Military  
overinsurance**

*The return to war and policies of force have failed*

The renaissance of classical power and military policies is anachronistic because today's globalized and interdependent world means that states are more reliant on one another than ever before. Climate change or the proliferation of nuclear weapons cannot be halted by military means: war cannot force the democratization of authoritarian systems. The arms drive does not reduce tangible threats, on the contrary. Obsessions with military superiority or even omnipotence have turned into political powerlessness. Afghanistan, Iraq and the Middle East conflict demonstrate that military supremacy is contraproductive and is no substitute for sound policies. The strategy of unilateral dominance has failed: it has produced the classical security dilemma. Anyone who strives for military superiority encourages fears and military countermeasures. These, in turn, increase insecurity and the sense of being threatened.

**Military  
omnipotence  
tantamount to  
political  
powerlessness**

*Use the scope for new multilateralism*

The Bush administration has squandered a lot of prestige and political influence. There is increasing awareness, even in NATO, that unlimited solidarity with Washington's neo-conservative strategies of force does not increase security but, on the contrary, boosts insecurity and weakens Europe's own position. Great

Britain has learnt this bitter lesson in Iraq. It is now important to take advantage of the current momentum. Whoever succeeds Bush in the White House will need new ideas and attractive policies to convince his or her partners. This improves the prospects for reviving multilateralism and arms controls. The Europeans should seize this opportunity and introduce their own initiatives.

**Europe's  
opportunities**

Regional cooperation is an alternative to a national arms drive. The European Union has created a model for dealing with its internal security problems and those of the EU candidate states through collective self-commitment and the institutionalization of decision-making processes. The African Union and the Shanghai Cooperation Council are at least making an attempt to learn from the lessons of the European process of integration. Regional cooperation is helping to reduce distrust and to develop common values and objectives through open discussions. It contributes to ending autistic debates on security and to producing common solutions to cross-border challenges. Transparency, in particular, has a literally disarming effect as a confidence-building measure in the field of arms exports and verification.

**Regional  
cooperation**

*Making use of Europe's "soft power" instead of antiquated power policies*

The European Union has not made sufficient use of its "soft power" in the past. After centuries of waging war against one another and conquering the world, European states have now been pursuing a policy of cooperation, integration and reconciliation since the end of World War II. Their willingness to give up their colonies, to become involved, to cooperate in international organizations and treaties and their experience with confidence-building measures, arms controls and disarmament gives them the power to shape policies. Admittedly, this presupposes that they discard antiquated power concepts and no longer hide their political experience under a bushel.

**The EU's  
power to  
shape policies**

As an organization of 27 states comprising former colonial and intervening powers, large and small states, NATO members and neutral states as well as states with a strong civil basis, the EU is not cut out for power politics. It is unable to compete for spheres of influence against large powers using military

means and should not try to adopt the United States as a role model and duplicate the latter's military power. The call by the Director of the European Defence Agency for 2008 to become "Europe's year of armaments" points in the wrong direction. The European Union must remember that its strength lies in the structural, long-term stabilization and modernization of endangered regions. This is a complex task, especially as the EU's range of instruments proves most effective in its immediate neighborhood. The EU has less influence in regions where it cannot offer the incentive of potential EU accession. Nevertheless, its expansion strategy also includes elements which could be applied to neighborhood policy, for example the linking of demands with attractive offers.

**Long-term  
stability**

*Bolder European initiatives in the field of arms control*

It is high time to challenge the renaissance of nation-state power politics and the build-up of arms. Multilateral cooperative security concepts are anything but obsolete in this age of globalization and increasing interdependence. On the contrary, steps must be taken to realize the security vision now that military unilateralism has failed. The EU can assume a pacemaker function. In the course of European integration, its members have recognized the clear advantages of overcoming national power politics in favor of common security.

The EU's approval of a plan of action for nuclear non-proliferation and the appointment of a Special Commissioner to the High Representative are steps in the right direction. We advocate testing the avant-garde model in the field of disarmament: a core group of European states could take the initiative without waiting for agreement from all the Member States.

**Avantgarde  
called for**

The prospect of complete nuclear disarmament must be revived. This is not an abstract Utopian vision as old and new hawks like to claim. On the contrary, the Treaty on the Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) established this goal in order to deal with what is still the greatest threat to humankind. For months now, respected members of the US security establishment – the Republicans George W. Shultz and Henry Kissinger and the Democrats William Perry and Sam Nunn

– have been campaigning to return the goal of a nuclear weapon-free world to the security agenda. James Baker, Colin Powell and others have joined the appeal. One can expect a country like the Federal Republic, which has renounced nuclear weapons for once and for all, to support this campaign and to promote it with all its might. Because the campaign - which has been taken up in Europe by Norway - originated in the “realist” center of the United States’ security elite, it could help to smooth the way for an ambitious and comprehensive policy of arms control and disarmament.

**A world without  
nuclear  
weapons**

*Calling a halt to the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction*

The treaty to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons is eroding fast. Although many contracting states still support it, they are disappointed because the nuclear powers are all wantonly violating their treaty obligations. It is to be feared that further members will follow North Korea’s example and leave the NPT. Europe is divided over this question. Whereas Great Britain and France are modernizing their nuclear weapons, Sweden, Germany and other states support the disarmament option. The Federal Government also supports the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban and putting a verifiable end to the production of weapons-suitable uranium and plutonium. It should do everything in its power to persuade the future American government to return to nuclear arms control.

**Nuclear  
arms  
control**

*NATO: No new confrontation with Russia*

At the NATO summit in Bucharest in April 2008, key European countries, including the Federal Republic of Germany, opposed the United States’ plans to offer Georgia and Ukraine an “action plan for membership“ to help smooth their way into the alliance. Nevertheless, they approved a framework resolution to accept both countries as members of the alliance - which means that NATO expansion has merely been deferred. Three quarters of the population of Ukraine are against NATO accession. Georgia, where a majority is in favor of accession, is involved in a serious conflict with its neighbor Russia over border and

**Reduce tension  
with Russia**

territorial issues connected with the secessionist provinces of Abkhazia and South Ossetia. Both states regard NATO membership as a means of strengthening their sovereignty vis-à-vis Russia, but this would also heighten the tension between NATO and Russia.

The common security area in a Europe without new borders invoked in the 1997 NATO-Russia Founding Act remains an empty shell. NATO is similarly distancing itself from previous declarations that it did not intend to establish a long-term military presence in the new member states: There will be American military bases in Romania and Bulgaria in the future and there are plans to install American interceptor missiles and the relevant radar-guidance system in Poland and the Czech Republic.

The US anti-missile system in East Europe affects Russia's security interests. As strategic relations between Washington and Moscow assume their former confrontational nature, Moscow will value its nuclear arsenal as a kind of military reinsurance all the more highly. Despite all American assurances to the contrary, the subsequent expansion of the system to become an efficient missile defense system could undermine Russia's second strike capability. It is unlikely that Moscow will submit to the role of a passive onlooker. Europe's security would suffer considerably from a new nuclear arms race, especially as this would be taking place in Europe itself.

NATO has various instruments at its disposal for supporting the transition of post-socialist military establishments. However, it should avoid causing new security dilemmas by affording Ukraine or Georgia full membership. Instead, it is important to upgrade the Joint Councils with Russia and Ukraine and give them more substance. This would enable Russia to voice its views. Furthermore, NATO can assume a more active role in dealing with humanitarian catastrophes by exchanging security-relevant information, in establishing effective border regimes and in reforming the security sector.

**No to a US  
missile shield**

**NATO:  
cooperation  
instead of  
expansion**

*In favor of a ban on cluster bombs*

Cluster bombs are considered to be particularly effective. They are dropped from planes or fired from artillery guns and disperse large quantities of small explosives over the combat area, many of which do not explode upon impact. Whole areas are thus effectively mined, endangering the civilian population even after the termination of fighting. Cluster bombs have been deployed in at least 23 states to date, including Kosovo, Lebanon, Iraq and Afghanistan.

Restrictions or a ban on cluster ammunition are currently being discussed in two forums. In 2007, Norway launched the “Oslo Process” which aims for a comprehensive ban. However, Russia, China, India, Israel and the United States oppose the process – the same states which have already refused to accept restrictions on the proliferation of small arms and light weapons. Nevertheless, more than 90 states are supporting the process.

At the same time, negotiations are also being conducted within the framework of the UN’s 1980 Convention on Conventional Weapons (CCW). A ruling on cluster ammunition should be added to the protocols on booby traps, fragmentation weapons, incendiary weapons, blinding laser weapons and other weaponry. In June 2007, Germany introduced a proposal which opened the door for new forms of cluster weapons instead of seeking an absolute ban.

The coexistence of two negotiating forums provides an opportunity for a competition for the best line of procedure. The Federal Government is taking part in both the Oslo Process and the CCW Review Conference. It is demanding rulings on limited deployment and is calling for differentiation between “dangerous” and “non-dangerous” cluster bombs, i.e. cluster bombs where the rate of duds is under one percent. We call upon the Federal Government to follow the examples of Norway, Austria, Hungary, Belgium and Ireland and to support a complete international ban on cluster bombs and to prohibit the production of and trade with this type of weapon in Germany. This would give further impetus to the Oslo Process and underline the credibility of Germany’s arms control policy.

**Absolute ban  
on cluster  
bombs**

## *Arms exports*

Arms exports encourage a dynamic regional build-up of weapons, as currently seen in the Near and Middle East. Highly sophisticated weapons are being supplied to countries which only comply halfheartedly with the rules of international relations. In order to deal with this situation, the EU introduced a Code of Conduct in 1998 which demands certain common standards for exports of weapons: for example compliance with international treaties and human rights, measures to combat terrorism and to prevent the re-export of weapons. At the same time, the Code of Conduct contains consultation mechanisms and an obligation to report on national transfers of weapons. Nevertheless, its impact has only been limited. In 2006, for example, it could not prevent Germany from approving deliveries of weapons worth 1.12 billion Euro to 53 states which, according to an independent appraisal, fail to satisfy the criteria of the Code.

For all too long, the issue of the proliferation of conventional weapons has been eclipsed by concerns about the proliferation of missiles and weapons of mass destruction. The EU Member States should act as a driving force for negotiations on a UN treaty on arms trading to at least curb the mostly illegal proliferation of small and light arms.

The EU Code of Conduct provides standards for arms exports controls. It is imperative that it be upgraded as a “common political position” of the EU. It would then lose the status of a recommendation and become binding for national legislation. It is important to persuade vacillating states to join the side of the supporters and to prevent differing interests from turning into insurmountable obstacles. This calls for a willingness to introduce more transparency in weapons trading, the strengthening of the UN Register of Conventional Arms and improvements in national reporting on imports and exports. Only thus will the restrictive arms exports policy of which Germany is so proud become verifiable.

**Trade with  
weapons:  
strengthening  
the EU Code**

*Summary of recommendations*

1. The Amended Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe must be ratified and brought into force quickly. As a concession in order to save the CSE Treaty, NATO should unilaterally uphold the inspection regime, despite its suspension by Russia. The transparency created by a mutual exchange of information and regular on-the-spot inspections is worth the effort. **Ratify the ACSE Treaty**
2. The Federal Government and the EU should oppose the US missile shield in East Europe more vigorously. Weapons to defend against intercontinental missiles were rightly banned until 2002. Such weapons upset the balance of deterrent between the large nuclear powers and take their toll on European security. Cooperative diplomatic initiatives should be taken to meet the - for the moment - fictitious threat of missiles from third party states. **Abandon the missile shield**
3. One of the most serious threats is the existence of nuclear weapons and their proliferation to other states. The nuclear powers committed themselves to complete nuclear disarmament under the NPT. Nevertheless, there are still 27,000 nuclear weapons in circulation today, 95 percent of them in Russian and American arsenals. Nonproliferation will only succeed if the nuclear powers steadily reduce their stockpiles and discard the nuclear first strike option. The campaign for a nuclear weapon-free world deserves every support. **Disarm nuclear weapons**
4. We demand prompt negotiations to avert the acute risk of an arms race in and over space. The civilian infrastructures of all European states depend on space-based technologies. They would be helpless against an anti-satellite attack. Only a complete ban on weapons in space could significantly reduce this danger. **No arms race in space**
5. Europe and Germany, in particular, should pioneer an Arms Trade Treaty within the framework of the UN in order to at least curb the illegal proliferation of small and light weapons.
6. Cluster bombs are particularly insidious weapons. The Federal Republic should completely renounce the production of, trade with and the use of

cluster ammunition. We explicitly support a corresponding initiative by members of the Berlin coalition parties.

7. The EU Code of Conduct on Arms Exports must become a rule of conduct which is binding for all Member States. The Federal Government is proud of its restrictive arms export policy, but nevertheless permits extensive exports to countries which do not meet the Code's criteria.
8. Germany is dependent on the support of its allies and partners for all its initiatives in the field of disarmament and arms control – with one exception: Germany can decide alone on the withdrawal of nuclear weapons from its own territory. It should make use of these powers and send out a clear signal against re-nuclearization.

**Withdraw  
nuclear  
weapons from  
Germany**

## *2. Climate change and new risks of conflicts*

It is impossible to predict climate change and its different regional effects precisely. However, there is no denying that climate change is largely man-made and exacerbates resource shortages, particularly shortages of water. Continuous global warming is leading to increasingly frequent natural disasters and extreme weather conditions, such as heat, droughts or floods. Crop failure, hunger, poverty and environmental migration are the consequences. In addition, measures to combat climate change – for example the promotion of renewable energies – have occasionally had unintended consequences which serve to aggravate conflicts. For example, one of the causes of the current food shortages in Egypt, Bangladesh and Haiti is the fact that land which is suitable for growing food crops is being used to produce bio-mass for fuel production. As a result, the price of rice has risen so much in recent months that even the United Nations is unable to pay for food aid. The risk of violent conflicts grows as resources become scarcer and competition over these resources increases.

**Scarce  
resources lead  
to conflicts**

*Prevention instead of security countermeasures*

Shortages of resources due to climatic conditions have rarely led to wars between states in the recent past. However, several violent conflicts can be observed at sub-state level whose causes include such shortages. Current examples are the unrest in India and Bangladesh and the war in Darfur. In unstable autocratic systems in particular, the effects of global warming encourage the further collapse of what are often only rudimentary state structures, thus increasing the risk of violence. Environmental migration with its ensuing conflicts demonstrates the potential for supraregional escalation – and the urgent need for international action.

The causes of climate change do not have a security policy dimension, unlike many of its consequences. Countermeasures must address the roots of the problem. Industrialized nations, however, tend to derive the need for action primarily from security policy risks. Narrowing the discussion to security aspects is contraproductive. Climate change is still caused primarily by high emissions of greenhouse gases in industrialized countries, Such emissions have particularly negative consequences for weakly developed states. This only becomes a real danger to international security if action is taken too late or erroneously. In other words: The problem of global warming must be dealt with quickly and effectively in order to reduce the danger of conflicts in the future. An internationally coordinated preventive policy is urgently needed to tackle the roots of the problem. The most urgent task is to significantly reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in industrialized countries. Without affecting prosperity, this can be best achieved by increased energy efficiency. Measures must be introduced to improve the efficiency of regenerative sources of energy, i.e. solar and wind energy as well as the use of rest biomass. Here more decisive efforts are needed at national as well as international level so that new technologies can be developed and produced competitively.

**Is climate  
change a  
security  
problem?**

**New  
technologies**

*Contributors to and victims of climate change*

There are considerable differences between those states which are responsible for causing climate change and those which suffer as a result of it. The highly developed industrialized states are mainly responsible for climate change as they consume by far the most oil and natural gas and emit the bulk of dangerous CO<sub>2</sub>. These states contrast with states which are most seriously affected by the effects of climate change, but whose contribution to global warming is only slight. These are usually developing countries in the Third World, where shortages of resources, hunger, poverty and environmental migration are accompanied by poor economic development, fragile statehood and a weak civil society. This mixture produces an explosive potential for conflict. Agriculture will become impossible and migration the only solution if – as climate simulations predict – the rains in these countries fail more and more frequently.

**The West  
must accept  
responsibility**

As the main contributor to global warming, the West must accept responsibility and take action to remedy this situation. It can support the development of integrated water management (in order to cover daily needs and enable agriculture), but it can also help to develop civil society, stable democratic structures and institutions. Finally, a set of rules should be established for the fair distribution of emission rights throughout the world. Developing and emerging countries are adopting a strategy to “catch-up” with the living standards of industrialized nations. This will lead to equally high energy consumption in the future. Conflicts between current and future industrial nations are thus pre-programmed. Without worldwide equality it will only be possible to implement solutions through power politics. Preventing violence requires a just balance of interests between the contributors to and the victims of climate change. It also casts doubt on the viability of the growth paradigm propagated and exported by the West and the latter’s energy-intensive lifestyle.

**Equal  
treatment  
worldwide**

### *Arctic melting fast*

The dilemmas of climate protection policy are most obvious in the Arctic. The steady melting of the Polar ice is making it possible to exploit gas, oil and other natural resources and to conduct fishing operations, promising the neighboring states huge profits. These benefits of global warming tend to diminish interest in climate change and in moves to prevent the further melting of the Polar ice caps. Moreover, the prospect of being able to exploit previously unused resources inspires new longings and rivalries. There is already tension between the littoral states - the United States, Russia, Denmark, Norway and Canada - which could increase in the future. Old conflicts involving claims to sovereignty or maritime and territorial borders are once again coming to a head; for example with regard to the Northwest Passage, the North Pole and the Barents Sea. Previous cooperation models are reaching their limits. The existing treaties refer almost exclusively to environmental questions; their mechanisms for settling conflicts are no longer sufficient. So far the discussion has not escalated and conflicts have been settled by diplomatic and cooperative means. The talks must be intensified immediately – particularly on an amendment to the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea with regard to the Arctic – and they must be accompanied by the establishment of joint institutions to settle conflicts.

**New Arctic  
treaty  
needed**

### *Climate protection policy is also a form of conflict prevention*

The negative effects of climate change are not inevitable: they can be stopped. Time is pressing, but economic, social and technical options are by all means available. Climate protection policy also means conflict prevention. Conflicts can be avoided effectively through the international coordination of farsighted ecological and peace measures. Recommendations such as a certification system for biomass cultivation, the extensive regionalization of energy supplies or plans for integrated water management were tabled long ago, as were concrete measures for saving energy or increasing energy efficiency. The Federal Government is focusing its attention on the latter. We demand that efforts at

**Saving energy  
is not  
sufficient**

international level should be intensified. Germany should advocate the fair distribution of burdens with regard to climate change and use its influence in international institutions to ensure the quick preparation and implementation of corresponding processes between developed and under-developed states. It is also important to develop and implement the UN's "Climate Risk Management Program". The Federal Government is also called upon to use its influence within the United Nations to call for a "Council for Global Development and the Environment".

Images of hunger riots or of African refugees trying to reach the supposedly safe shores of Europe remind us that we must not just tackle the symptoms but the causes of such problems. To do this we must reconcile long-term security interests, development objectives, conflict prevention, the comprehensive protection of human rights as well as environmental and climate protection. The Federal Government can and should play an even more active role in these areas and should become a driving force in shaping a timely international climate protection policy.

**Broad-based  
approach to  
climate  
policy**

### *3. Deceptive stability of authoritarian systems*

Many countries with authoritarian regimes are dangerously unstable. The more the population and political, ethnic or religious minorities are excluded from power and the less they are able to voice their views publicly, the greater the probability that they will become radicalized. In many cases, authoritarianism conceals weak statehood, corruption and kleptocratic elites. There is a risk that the security forces will take over the state either directly or indirectly at the slightest sign of opposition. However, authoritarian systems do not only threaten the state's own population, but also regional stability. Crises in authoritarian states can have dramatic effects on neighboring states - due, for example, to streams of refugees, nationalist or religious radicalism and the spread of violence. In many cases, Western states refuse to acknowledge this source of instability and sanction authoritarianism as "an internal affair". All too often,

**Authoritarianism  
creates instability**

they are misled by deceptive promises of stability made by such governments. This is particularly true in cases where Western states attach absolute priority to free access to energy and other resources. By helping to legitimize such regimes, they become accomplices to authoritarianism and repression. This drives the opposition into the arms of violent fundamentalist and terrorist strategists.

How should the West deal with authoritarian states? Installing a democracy “through force of arms“ is out of the question, as the disaster in Iraq shows, as is a tacit partnership with despots. We propose a mixture of gentle and long-term measures to promote democracy which are not limited to the demand for free elections and the old formula from the era of détente of “change through rapprochement”. The West must also steadfastly support democracy and human rights in those states which are important economic or defense partners. At the same time, we criticize the ban on talks. Washington made a serious mistake when it broke off all relations with Iran in 1979. Even today, this makes it easier for the regime in Teheran to demonize the United States. It also makes it more difficult to seek a solution to the nuclear question and to ensure the cooperation which is absolutely essential for bringing stability to Iraq. Authoritarian regimes must be offered strong incentives for peaceful behavior and internal liberalization, e.g. regional integration, economic aid, debt relief or the conditional lifting of sanctions.

Financial and investment policies should be linked to the fight against corruption. A successful reform of the security sector can help to make it more difficult to misuse security forces for authoritarian purposes. Regional organizations, such as the African Union, should be encouraged to take more decisive action against autocratic regimes which demonstrate contempt for humanity. Germany and the EU should try to dissuade external powers from supplying murderous regimes with weapons, for example China in the cases of Zimbabwe and Sudan. Generally speaking, the EU states must coordinate their position towards authoritarian states at an early stage. Not only does this improve their chances of being heard, it also makes it easier to speak with one voice in the event of a crisis.

**Change through  
rapprochement**

**Incentives for  
liberalization**

**No weapons  
for autocrats**

#### 4. Current focuses

##### *Rebuilding aid instead of war in Afghanistan*

There are now over 60,000 foreign troops in Afghanistan. This compares with just 40,000 at the end of 2006 and a mere 4,500 members of the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) and a slightly larger number of US troops in 2002. Approximately 15 billion US dollars have been spent on rebuilding Afghanistan since 2002 – in addition to the cost of the war. Despite all this, the Afghanistan mission is on the verge of failure. It has failed to realize its original goals – overcoming violence, establishing a functioning state, smashing the Taliban and al-Qaida and combating terrorism – and the situation has deteriorated visibly. The state is a long way from being able to control its own territory. According to information from Michael McConnell, coordinator of the US intelligence agencies, the central government in Kabul only controls barely 30 percent of the country: regional tribal leaders (60 percent) and the Taliban (10 percent) share the rest. Last year, more than 8,000 people died in the fighting and the number of suicide attacks rose to over 150 – in a country where suicide attacks were unknown before 2001. All in all, there has been a 500 percent increase in the number of attacks by rebels since 2005. Approximately 40 convoys with food from the UN World Food Programme were looted in 2007; there were 130 attacks on humanitarian projects and their staff and 40 aid workers were killed and 89 kidnapped. However, there have also been success stories, for example the building of schools and roads. But neither the growing military presence nor the rebuilding efforts have been able to prevent the return of the Taliban and contain the increasing violence.

The *Bundeswehr* is being deployed in northern Afghanistan as part of the overall NATO and US mission. The success or failure of its operations, however, will not be decided in the North alone but will depend on developments in the country as a whole, first and foremost on strengthening the Afghan government. The *Bundeswehr's* role is gradually shifting from providing civil assistance to

**Afghanistan  
operation on  
the verge of  
failure**

**Strengthen  
the  
government  
in Kabul**

conducting military operations. The German government must reverse this situation. The Tornado squadron has been performing reconnaissance duties and supporting combat operations since Summer 2007. The secondment of signals staff and other support personnel to the South of Afghanistan, which was agreed for a limited period, has become permanent. The Quick Reaction Force, which is currently being set up, is also to undertake “proactive“ combat tasks with effect from this Summer. Furthermore, there is also mention of increasing troop strength by 500 to 1,500 soldiers when the mission’s mandate is extended this Autumn. All this is taking place because Washington and a few NATO partners are urging the *Bundeswehr* to play a greater role, not because it promises any success. The war in Afghanistan will not be decided by military but by political means – NATO believes that it must win, whereas the rebels are satisfied with not losing.

**No increase  
in military  
strength**

The Federal Government should argue against extending its combat role and concentrate instead on political and development activities to strengthen the Afghan government. The international community needs a united and responsible leadership which grants priority to assisting state-building, particularly the development of a functioning legal system, the implementation of the rule of law and the strengthening of state capabilities. Progress must be made in the field of security sector reform; and the enormous funds must be invested more effectively to build up local capacities instead of flying in foreign staff. The mission’s military components should be secondary to this key political objective. The NATO mission can only support the Afghan government, not replace it. There is nothing to support in those areas where the government is not present. The Federal Government should therefore set its sights on moving the *Bundeswehr* into the towns. President Karzai gave a clear warning at the end of April 2008 when he complained that the United States and Great Britain were ignoring his government on key issues. He claimed that they were conducting the “war on terrorism“ in the villages of Afghanistan and thus preventing a political agreement with the Taliban. He demanded respect for Afghanistan’s sovereignty and called for more help with rebuilding instead of taking over the role of the Afghan government.

**State-building**

**Respecting  
Afghanistan’s  
sovereignty**

The Federal Government could take the initiative for a new Petersberg Conference since the provisions of the Afghanistan Compact, which was signed in London, are partly unrealistic, partly outdated and partly without any sense of priorities. Afghanistan's porous borders not only offer retreat routes for illegal combatants but also encourage trafficking with drugs and weapons. Neighboring countries such as Iran, the Central Asian neighbors, India and Pakistan, China and, last but not least, Russia should therefore also be involved in efforts to stabilize the borders and in investments to support Afghanistan's infrastructure.

## **Stabilizing borders**

### *Combining pressure on Beijing with recognition of its reform policy*

Thirty years after the beginning of the reform era, China can boast a long list of successes. Despite various social and ecological discrepancies, never before has a state managed to free so many million people from the threat of hunger and misery in such a short period of time. The majority of the population shares the pride of the Chinese leadership in this achievement. The Tibetans are taking advantage of international attention on the Olympic Games to put forward their plight and their demands. Beijing is reacting with a heavy hand to the unrest in Tibet and to disruptions in the Olympic torch run and is reverting to its former line of propaganda, accusing the Dalai Lama of conspiracy and separatism. The leader of the Tibetans for his part is accusing China of "cultural genocide".

Almost 92 percent of China's population are Han-Chinese: Tibetans account for 0.42 percent of the total population. China's nationalities policy is more contradictory than the common picture of suppressed minorities would suggest. Members of minorities are exempted from the rigid one-child policy and also enjoy advantages with regard to access to higher education. Beijing is making an effort to modernize the under-developed regions in the West so that the gap between flourishing cities and remote areas does not become even wider. An age-old tradition, which was endorsed by Maoism, prevents formal equality for ethnic groups. It regards the Han-Chinese as the only cultivated group and the other groups as backward minorities which must be civilized. In fact, these groups do not even enjoy the autonomy to which they are entitled under the

## **Autonomy for minorities**

constitution and legislation. Tibetan Buddhism, for its part, finds it difficult to separate religion and politics. Nationally conscious Tibetans are refusing to accept turbo-capitalist modernization with its social and intellectual shortcomings which undermine their traditions. Their resistance is strengthening both the religion and ethno-national self-awareness, and this in turn is fuelling Beijing's fear of secessionism. The more the Chinese government reacts with repression, the more young Tibetans are inclined to protest forcefully – producing a spiral of violence.

Although the Communist Party is still in power in Beijing, today's China differs fundamentally from the Soviet Union or the totalitarian state under Mao. Demands for human rights and legal certainty in China deserve support, as do the demands of the Tibetans and other minorities for cultural autonomy and religious freedom. Persistent diplomatic pressure must be applied on the government in Beijing to conduct direct negotiations with the Dalai Lama. This pressure will be all the more effective if the West also shows China respect for its reform efforts and achievements.

The new Chinese leadership has demonstrated flexibility in the field of foreign policy in recent years. It has gone a long way in relaxing the tense relations with Japan and India. It has scaled back its threats in the conflict with Taiwan, a factor which contributed to the failure of the Taiwanese referendum on independence in March 2008. It is quite feasible that it will also end its policy of confrontation in Tibet and decide in favor of dialogue. However, the Chinese leadership can only act without losing face if there is an end to indiscriminate anti-Chinese campaigns. These serve to strengthen the nationalists and groups which are against further liberalization. Flourishing economic cooperation with a China that is firmly anchored in the globalized world forbids a return to confrontation between the systems.

**Dialogue  
instead of  
confrontation**

*The conflict in Palestine cannot be resolved by force*

Following a standstill lasting seven years, the Israeli and Palestinian governments made a new attempt to settle the long-term conflict in November

2007. At a meeting in Annapolis in the United States, Prime Minister Ehud Olmert and President Mahmud Abbas agreed to smooth the way for a Palestinian state within a year. There are still a large number of hurdles to be taken. Apart from the complex issues at stake, which include the territorial question, the status of Jerusalem and the return of Palestinian refugees, the form of the negotiations and the weakness of the leadership on both sides fuel doubts about an agreement on the final status. Like the failed Road Map of 2003, the Annapolis Process has no clear objectives or a mechanism for settling disputes. Moreover, it is questionable whether the parties would be able to introduce painful compromises in the face of internal opposition. Olmert is not in the position to halt the continued building of settlements, particularly in and around East Jerusalem, and Abbas is unable to guarantee that he can control Palestinian extremists which Israel demands as a precondition for the normalization of living conditions on the West Bank. The influence of the Palestinian President suffered as a result of the defeat of Fatah in the elections in January 2006 and has shrunk further since June 2007 following the split between the West Bank and the Gaza Strip.

**Obstacles to  
a Palestinian  
state**

Economic success is needed to strengthen the Palestinian President and the government of the West Bank, which he imposed without an elected mandate. This could give him the leeway required to meet Israel's demands. In the meantime, the collapse of the Palestinian economy has assumed dramatic dimensions. Hundreds of Israeli road blocks in the West Bank are preventing any form of normal economic activity.

**Economic  
success  
needed**

The financial boycott against Hamas and the Israeli blockade of the border have crippled industry, transport and public infrastructure in the Gaza Strip and have plunged large sections of the population into extreme poverty.

Despite all these problems, the United States and the EU are still pursuing their objective of bringing Hamas to its knees in the third year following its election victory. This policy is tantamount to the collective punishment of the Palestinian people for electing Hamas. It is also possible that Israel will try to seek a decision by force of arms. The Israeli government has rejected outright several offers mediated by Egypt. It has also turned a deaf ear to mediation attempts by former US President Jimmy Carter.

**Talk to  
Hamas**

Economic strangulation and military annihilation are recipes for political disaster. The hard-liners in Hamas who advocate the continuation of the armed struggle have strengthened their position and have ousted the pragmatists who sought to reconcile a two-state solution with Hamas's notion of itself. In view of this fiasco, the Federal Government should endorse the opinion of the European Parliament which has declared the policy of the political and humanitarian isolation of the Gaza Strip a failure. We recommend sounding out possibilities for a dialogue with Hamas in order to involve them in negotiations.

**No to the  
isolation of  
Gaza**

*Middle East: Cooperation and modernization instead of an arms build-up*

The danger of an Iranian atom bomb remains a key issue. Martial threats abound. The Iranian President Ahmadinejad has provocatively questioned Israel's right to exist and has expressed doubts about the murder of the Jews by the Nazis. In October 2007, US President Bush painted the picture of a "third World War" if Teheran did not halt its nuclear program. In the course of her election campaign, Hillary Clinton declared that America would, if necessary, be in the position to "totally obliterate Iran". The Bush administration warns ominously that it is not excluding any option and keeps open the possibility of bringing about a change of regime by force. But the US intelligence services of all people have deprived the "force" option of its legitimacy: In December 2007, they presented a report stating that Iran had halted its nuclear program in 2003.

The Europeans should urge the United States to adopt a different political course. Military threats have not prevented Teheran from building new centrifuges. Containment and ever tighter sanctions cannot prevent this nor can they lead to the overthrow of the regime. The aim of the sanctions cannot be to force the regime to capitulate, but to make it willing to negotiate in order to minimize the economic and political damage caused by isolation. Senior US diplomats who have conducted talks with Iranian academics and politicians in recent years have put forward a proposal for multi-lateral controls on Iran's uranium enrichment program. Officials in Teheran – right up to the President –

**Controlling  
uranium  
enrichment**

have announced their interest in such a solution. Of course, there is no guarantee that this plan will succeed - but no attempt should be left untried to break down the hardened positions and strengthen those forces in Iran which are willing to compromise.

Unfortunately the opposite is happening. Exhortations to hold out in Iraq and American supplies of military weapons to its allies are contributing to further confrontation in the region. The war in Iraq and the resulting political disaster have strengthened Iran's position as a regional power. This has prompted the United States to provide Iran's neighbors with massive supplies of weapons. Saudi Arabia remains the United States' closest ally, although the Saudi regime is one of the causes of regional instability. The democratization of the Near and Middle East propagated by George W. Bush and Condoleezza Rice as the long-term key to security is obsolete – if it was ever intended seriously. Now the authoritarian regime in Riyadh is to receive sophisticated weapons worth approximately 20 billion US dollars.

**Against an  
arms build-up  
in the Middle  
East**

What is more, Washington wants to forge a Sunni-Arabian coalition against Teheran. This serves to further fuel the enmity between Sunnis and Shiites in the entire region and these differences are then fought out in Iraq and Lebanon. Saudi Arabia has threatened to intervene in Iraq to protect the Arabian Sunnis. And Israel, which feels threatened by the arms build-up in the Arab states, has promptly replied by demanding the expansion of its military capacities and corresponding American military aid.

The discomfort which is visible in Berlin is not a sufficient reaction. What is needed are concrete initiatives for détente, confidence-building and cooperative arms controls. The Iraq adventure has weakened the hard-liners in Washington and London and it is quite possible that there will be support for an end to the confrontation in the United States in the future. The Europeans should urge the United States to at last negotiate directly with Iran on the question of uranium enrichment and to resume diplomatic relations. The two sides do have common interests: Although the United States and Iran are competing against each other for influence in Iraq, they both support the government in Baghdad.

**Common  
interests in  
Iraq**

Both emphasize the importance of Iraq's territorial integrity and of a strong central government. They also share a common interest in curbing the opium trade in Afghanistan and in depriving Sunni extremists as well as the Taliban and al-Qaida of power. "*Gouverner, c'est prévoir*" is a classical motto of wise politicians. Military confrontation is not wise – especially in a region on which the world economy depends for vital supplies of oil.

*Andreas Heinemann-Grüder*

*Jochen Hippler*

*Markus Weingardt*

*Reinhard Mutz*

*Bruno Schoch*