

**DEFENCE AND
SECURITY**

124 DSC 05 E
Original: English



NATO Parliamentary Assembly

SUMMARY

of the meeting of the Defence and Security Committee
Grand Union Hall, Grand Hotel Union, Ljubljana, Slovenia

Saturday 28 May 2005

ATTENDANCE LIST

Chairman	Joel Hefley (United States)
Vice-Chairman and Acting Rapporteur of the Sub-Committee on Future Security and Defence Capabilities	Franco Angioni (Italy)
General Rapporteur	Julio Miranda Calha (Portugal)
Rapporteur of the Sub-Committee on Transatlantic Defence and Security Co-operation	John Shimkus (United States)
President of the NATO PA	Pierre Lellouche (France)
Secretary General of the NATO PA	Simon Lunn
Member Delegations	
Belgium	Jurgen Ceder
	Theo Kelchtermans
Canada	Jane Cordy
	Joseph A. Day
	Frank W. Mahovlich
Czech Republic	Petr Necas
	Antonin Seda
	Milos Titz
	Radim Turek
Estonia	Sven Mikser
France	Jean-Guy Branger
	Lionnel Luca
	Jérôme Rivière
	Philippe Vitel
Germany	Robert Hochbaum
	Karl A. Lamers
	Ruprecht Polenz
	Helmut Rauber
	Kurt J. Rossmanith
	Thomas Röwekamp
	Bernd Siebert
	Verena Wohlleben
Greece	Georgios Kalantzis
	Andreas Likourentzos
	Andreas Loverdos
Hungary	Mihály Balla
Italy	Giovanni Lorenzo Forcieri
	Furio Gubetti
	Luigi Marino
	Mario Palombo
Latvia	Dzintars Rasnacs
Lithuania	Rasa Juknevičienė
Luxembourg	Jean-Pierre Koepp
	Lydia Mutsch
	Fred Sunnen

Netherlands	Willem Hoekzema
Norway	Gunnar Halvorsen
	Per Ove Width
Poland	Jerzy Wenderlich
Portugal	Manuel Filipe Correia de Jesus
	António Alves Marques Júnior
	Jorge Neto
Romania	Eduard Raul Hellvig
	Ioan Mircea Pascu
	Attila Verestóy
Slovakia	Jozef Bucek
Slovenia	Anton Anderlic
	Franc Capuder
Spain	Manuel Atencia
	Jesus Cuadrado
	Maria Rosario Juaneda
	Jordi Marsal
	Alejandro Muñoz-Alonso
	Francisco Ricoma
	Roberto Soravilla
Turkey	Vahit Erdem
	Muharrem Karsli
	Mehmet Nessar
United Kingdom	Hugh Bayley
	Sir Menzies Campbell
	Lord Clark of Windermere
	Sir John Stanley
United States	Jim Bunning
	Norm Coleman
	Patrick Leahy
	Dennis Moore
	Mike Ross
	Jeff Sessions
	John Shimkus
	Gordon Smith

Associate delegations

Armenia	Aleksan Karapetyan
	Artur Petrosyan
Austria	Katharina Pfeffer
	Alfred Schöls
Croatia	Krešimir Cosić
	Velimir Plesa
Finland	Kauko Juhantalo
	Suvi-Anne Siimes
Moldova	Vitalia Pavlicenco
Russian Federation	Victor A. Ozerov
	Victor Zavarzin
Sweden	Urban Ahlin
	Allan Widman

Switzerland	Edi Engelberger Hans Hess Theo Maissen
The FYR of Macedonia*	Teuta Arifi Esad Rahic
Ukraine	Anatoliy Domanskyi Oleksander Kuzmuk Georgii Manchulenko Volodymyr Zaplatynskyi Oleg Zarubinskyi

Mediterranean Associate delegations

Algeria	Mostefa Chelloufi
Mauritania	Cherif Ahmed Ould Mohamed Moussa

European Parliament (EP)

Elmar Brok
Ana Maria R.M. Gomes
Armin Laschet
Geoffrey van Orden

Parliamentary Observers

Bosnia and Herzegovina	Momcilo Novakovic
Japan	Masataka Suzuki
Serbia and Montenegro	Asim Dizdarevic Zvonko Obradovic Milorad Todorovic

Interparliamentary Assembly

Assembly of the Western European Union	John Wilkinson
--	----------------

Parliamentary Guests

Jordan	Hussein Al-Qaisi Mohammed Arsalan Jehad Momani
--------	--

Speakers

Ronald Asmus, Executive Director, The German Marshall Fund
Karl Victor Erjavec, Minister of Defence, Slovenia
Albert Pierce, Director, Centre for the Study of Professional Military Ethics

Committee Secretary

Steven Mark

International Secretariat

Zachary Selden, director of the Committee
Valérie Geffroy, co-ordinator of the Committee
Claire Watkins, co-ordinator

* Turkey recognises the Republic of Macedonia by its constitutional name.

Alex Dowling, research assistant
Filippo Gamba, research assistant

1. Following the presentation of the General Report on *NATO's Out Of Area Operations* [056 DSC 05] by **Julio Miranda Calha** (PT), **John Shimkus** (US) underlined the importance of moving to a common funding mechanism for the NATO Response Force (NRF) instead of the 'cost lie where they fall' approach. **Ioan Mircea Pascu** (RO) agreed and said the problem extends to all NATO operations, not just the NRF. He also stressed the importance of Provincial Reconstruction Teams (PRTs) in Afghanistan as a bridge between civil and military activities. **Oleg Zarubinskyi** (UA) reminded the committee of Ukraine's support of the Alliance's efforts in Afghanistan, including the use of Ukraine's heavy lift aircraft. **Willem Hoekzema** (NL) asked for further elaboration on common funding and whether it would involve new contributions. The General Rapporteur responded that the next report would offer proposals on a new funding mechanisms for NATO operations.
2. National caveats were also discussed. **Sven Mikser** (EE) argued that the problem extended beyond NATO to the whole nature of national decision-making processes. **Vahit Erdem** (TR) raised the issue of equipment shortfalls in Afghanistan and suggested that the report cover this in more detail. The General Rapporteur agreed that this was a problem and noted that it was more a result of incomplete participation by some members of the Alliance than simply a lack of equipment.
3. **Sir Menzies Campbell** (UK) voiced his concern at the unwillingness of some members to participate in the Iraq training mission, as mentioned in paragraphs 68 and 69 of the report. Though he opposed the war, he believed that it was in the interests of all members to assist in stabilizing Iraq.
4. **Victor Zavarzin** (RU) underlined the strategic importance of Afghanistan to Russia and explained that Russia has provided support in numerous ways, including strategic air support to NATO and funding for the Afghan National Army (ANA). Russia is particularly concerned about the problem of drug trafficking and he offered Russian support for any new NATO initiatives. The General Rapporteur welcomed Russian support, particularly in helping to provide alternative livelihoods to opium production.
5. Returning to the issue of national caveats, **Giovanni Lorenzo Forcieri** (IT) stated that he believed that national caveats should be discussed and resolved at the level of the North Atlantic Council. The most damaging caveats are those that remain undisclosed until a crisis occurs, and he stated that full disclosure in advance could eliminate many problems. He also believed that the report gave too optimistic an interpretation of the situation in Afghanistan where warlords were still armed and powerful. The General Rapporteur noted that the facts cited in the report came from reliable sources including NATO representatives in Afghanistan.
6. **Ana Maria R.M. Gomes** (EP) pointed out that the EU was funding an election observation mission for the September 2005 parliamentary elections. She also believed that not enough had been done to disarm warlords and overcome the drug production problem.
7. **Krešimir Cosić** (HR) stressed the importance of border police in securing Afghanistan and preventing drug trafficking.
8. **Karl Victor Erjavec**, Minister of Defence of Slovenia, spoke about his country's efforts to build a military suitable for national defence and international operations. He emphasized Slovenia's commitment to improving its national capabilities and contributions to Alliance operations. Slovenia is increasing its contribution from 29 to 60 personnel in Afghanistan and supporting the NATO training mission in Iraq. The Western Balkans remains a priority for Slovenia. A continued international military presence is vital, especially to help resolve the precarious situation in Kosovo. Although outstanding issues of cooperation with the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia (ICTY) must be resolved across the region, Mr Erjavec

believes that closer integration of the region into Euro-Atlantic institutions is the most sure path to long-term stability.

9. **Albert Pierce**, Director of the Centre for the Study of Professional Military Ethics at the US Naval Academy, presented his ideas on *Training and Educating Military Forces for the Ethical Challenges of the Struggle against Terrorism*. He outlined a twin challenge, based on strategic and ethical dimensions. The strategic challenge, he explained, is built on 5 themes: military, intelligence, legal aspects, finance, and diplomacy. The ethical dimension arises from the fact that the terrorist attacks on September 11 were assaults on who we are, not on a policy or facility. Yet, in confronting such an enemy we cannot lose sight of the values and rules that underpin our society. To ensure that this does not occur, ethics must be a central element in professional military education and consistently reinforced. This means fostering an ethical instinct in troops that will allow them to react correctly in demanding situations. New educational programs are being developed in the United States to deal with this issue, but we should consider how we can develop common training programs across the Alliance to ensure ethical interoperability.

10. In response, Mrs Gomes stressed the need for political responsibility in the realm of military ethics, such as the cases of prisoner abuse in Iraq. **Jérôme Rivière** (FR) believed that national legislators must define the limits of infringements on civil liberties in the war on terror. **Mario Palombo** (IT) warned that we should not impede the military from doing their job and the first responsibility of an officer was the well-being of his men. **John Wilkinson** (WEU) warned of the impact of budget constraints in Europe on broad and effective military education. He also pointed out that the use of reserve forces can raise problems because they are often less prepared for stressful situations. **Franco Angioni** (IT) believed that ethics were instinctive to soldiers if fostered in the national culture. **Georgii Manchulenko** (UA) raised the issue of society's responsibility for reintegrating soldiers into society after the experience of war. **Victor A. Ozerov** (RU) asked about the problems of using combat forces for peacekeeping operations and asked if police forces would be better suited to such operations. Albert Pierce explained that US Marine training now focuses decision-making in complex environments where a unit may be performing combat, peacekeeping and humanitarian roles in rapid succession or at the same time. He concluded that rules should always apply in combat and that it was critical that leaders never give the impression that the rules do not apply in some circumstances.

11. The meeting continued with the presentation of the draft Report of the Sub-Committee on the Future Security and Defence Capabilities, on *NATO's Ongoing Role in Balkan Security* [057 DSCFC 05 E] by **John Smith** (UK), Rapporteur. In Mr Smith's absence, the report was presented by Mr Angioni. The floor was then opened to questions and comments.

12. **Sir John Stanley** (UK) expressed his appreciation for the clear reference in the report to Serbia and Montenegro's need to comply with the demands of the ICTY. He added that cooperation with the tribunal must be a condition for NATO and EU membership and that all the countries in the region should meet the tribunal's demands. Sir John Stanley concluded by stressing the strategic relevance of the Balkans for NATO and for the EU. Mr Angioni, in responding to Sir John Stanley's comments, agreed on the need for further cooperation with the ICTY and added that Serbia must be an active participant in the negotiations on the final status of Kosovo.

13. **Andreas Loverdos** (GR) warned the committee of the dangers of unilateral solutions in Kosovo. **Esad Rahic** (the FYR of Macedonia) noted the achievements of his country in reforming its security, judicial and political system, and its work to promote growth and stability in the region. Mr Zarubinskyi expressed his positive assessment of NATO's role in the Balkans and reminded the Committee of Ukraine's participation in peace-keeping initiatives in the region. He also invited the Rapporteur to mention Ukraine's cooperative role in the Balkans in the report. **Zvonko Obradovic** (CS) mentioned recent polls showing growing popular support for the Government's efforts to

comply with ICTY's demands. He also invited the Rapporteur to include in the report a reference to the difficulties faced by the Serb minority in Kosovo. Mr Obradovic underlined the need to reach a final solution through negotiations and compromises on both sides. Mr Angioni assured the committee that the final report would include recent developments in the region and that comments would be forwarded to the Rapporteur.

14. Mr Zavarzin reminded the committee of Russia's role in promoting stability in the region. He affirmed that it would be a mistake to consider Kosovo as an independent entity now, and that a stable and lasting solution for the region will require a considerable amount of effort. He also invited the Committee to re-evaluate the first review of the Kosovo standards by taking into consideration the poor economic performance of the area. **Teuta Arifi** (the FYR of Macedonia) added that the citizens of the region and the international community ought to play a bigger role in promoting a lasting settlement based on democracy and human rights. Mr Cosić emphasized Croatia's initiatives to enhance dialogue and cooperation in the region such as the Adriatic Charter, cooperation on energy and infrastructure investments, and the implementation of various EU projects.

15. The meeting continued with the presentation of **Ronald Asmus**, Executive Director of the German Marshall Fund, on *Reinventing NATO*.

16. Ronald Asmus began his presentation by saying that NATO is at a turning point similar to where it was in the early 1990s. NATO today is less relevant in Western capitals because the Alliance is not as central to today's strategic central issues as it once was. What is needed is a second reinvention of NATO similar to the previous reinvention of NATO following the collapse of the Soviet Union. At that time, NATO was able to successfully integrate former Warsaw Pact members and to project stability in the Balkans. But September 11 according to Dr Asmus changed the perspective by demonstrating that the threats come from outside Europe. The war in Afghanistan should have been a wake-up call urging NATO to reform. Unfortunately that did not happen and today we lack a comprehensive vision of the Alliance's role in the Middle East and the Black Sea and Central Asian regions.

17. He presented five priorities for NATO's second reinvention:

1. Complete the stabilization of the Western Balkans.
2. Further enlargement considering developments Georgia and Ukraine.
3. More active engagement in the Middle East.
4. Improve and deepen relations with Russia.
5. Build a constructive and clear relationship with the European Union.

18. **Pierre Lellouche** (FR) noted that we need an enhanced Transatlantic partnership and a strengthened Transatlantic strategic dialogue. Mr Lellouche emphasized the need on the European side to contribute more to the Alliance's capabilities. At the same time, he stated that we need clarity on the American side about NATO's role in US foreign policy. Mr Asmus, in responding to Mr Lellouche's comments, noted the growing appreciation and recognition in Washington that the problem today for US foreign policy is not that Europe is too strong but that it is too weak.

19. Mr Wilkinson reminded of the growing capability gap between the EU and the United States. **Norm Coleman** (US) affirmed that NATO is still relevant in Washington and that its importance will further increase since the United States has limited resources and will need allies to avoid overstretch. **Elmar Brok** (EP) indicated the US-EU summit in June as a good opportunity to enhance transatlantic dialogue and cooperation. He also emphasized the need for a partnership agreement between the United States and the EU. Ioan Mircea Pascu expressed his view that we must consider the EU and NATO as two complementary organizations.

20. Mr Asmus noted that NATO will remain the primary security organization but that the EU is instrumental in confronting current security challenges.

21. **Geoffrey Van Orden** (EP) urged the Committee to distinguish between European aspirations and EU aspirations embodied in the ESDP. EUs aspirations, according to Mr van Orden, represent only some members' desire to challenge US pre-eminence. **Jeff Sessions** (US) expressed his optimism on future transatlantic cooperation and the desire in the United States to maintain a lasting partnership with Europe. Mr Asmus concluded by saying that NATO is still Washington's primary instrument for strategic cooperation with Europe, and that it is in the US interest to have stronger European partner for collaborative efforts on homeland security and counter-terrorism.

22. The meeting concluded with consideration of the draft Report of the Sub-Committee on Transatlantic Defence and Security Cooperation, on *Progress on the Prague Capability Commitments* [058 DSCTC 05 E] by John Shimkus, Rapporteur.
