

Collective security in europe be promoted through nato essay samples

[Law](#), [Security](#)



Towards the end of cold, Europe was divided into East and West, with each affiliated to Soviet Union and United States respectively. With the collapse of the Warsaw Pact in 1991, there was great enthusiasm on the part of its former members to join the Western alliance lead by NATO. Moreover, as the European Union went ahead with absorbing new members from East and South, its geographic center moved toward Germany. In the process, adding to Germany's already increased political and economic weight on the continent (Mayhew 1998).

The expansion of became the new meaning for the European Union, and as well as for the NATO. This posed an historic opportunity for them to end division, and create foundation for long lasting " peace, stability, and prosperity on a pan-European basis". This is expected to change the global standing of Europe, and will require substantial geopolitical, economic and political adjustments within the union (Lund and Kanet 1999; Mayhew 1998).

The end of cold war between the United States and the Soviet Union started the beginning of the process of reconfiguration of security environment in Europe. With the dissolution of Warsaw Pact and breaking up of Soviet Union, the threat was almost gone. At the same time opinion started being raised regarding the need to dissolve the NATO. At the same time, Europe started facing other security challenges, particularly from former Soviet Union states. As a consequence, even after a decade, NATO remains critical to the overall security of North Atlantic and Europe. At the same time, European Union was in the process of formulating a Common European Security and Defense Policy. This creation of defense force was meant to complement

NATO, and also to engage in operation where the US is not a party.

Against the backdrop, this essay plans to analyze the enlargement of NATO and its implication on future security environment throughout the Europe.

We believe that enlargement of NATO will “ enhance European security, increase regional stability, and strengthen democracy within the newly admitted member states” (Ibryamova and Kanet).

At the same ignoring Russia apprehensions about NATO’s expansion, and excluding them from any security deliberations could lead renewed threats, similar to those during the Cold War. In spite of reassurances from the United States and the European Union, the eastward expansion of NATO continues to be of concern to the Russians. The classic reason for NATO’s existence had been to keep Americans involved in Europe, keeping Russians out and Germans in check. Even at the end of the Cold War, the calls for its dissolution didn’t succeed as it rapidly adapted itself to the changed geopolitical situation, and even expanded eastwards (Goldgeier 1999). For example, countries like Hungary, Poland and Czech Republic were not comfortable being on the sidelines as a buffer against Russia. They want to have a greater say in the affairs and in order to achieve that, wanted to have full membership of NATO.

The overall purpose of the new security arrangements thus created was to provide stability and security to the continent without creating any new fault lines. On the other hand, the Russians opposed the eastward expansion of NATO, from its outset. Russians felt that enlargement created new divisions, and betrays the spirit with which the Cold War ended. To alleviate Russian fears, NATO offered them Partnership for Peace and the Russia-NATO

Founding Act, which was signed in 1994 and 1997 respectively. The Partnership for Peace did initially attract Russian attention, but it seems it was more out of desire to retain some influence over Europe. But they gradually lost interest as nothing was able to contain the eastward expansion of NATO. In spite of various overtures on the part of NATO, the Russians remained negative about expansion of the former. Concurrently, thirteen eastern and central European countries were reminding their western counterparts about their commitment to admit them to full membership, including NATO (Hutchings 2001). The expansion of NATO as close as Baltics was quite unnerving to the Russians. At the same time, there was growing realization in its political elite that their response was limited by their economic and political clout. Further the events in Kosovo had negative impact on Russia, showing their marginalization.

These evolutions of NATO in Europe during the 90s are reflective of multiple factors that have shaped it. In spite of various hurdles, they have demonstrated, as in Kosovo, their ability to develop consensus over critical security issues. In the process NATO's approach has become incremental, and its approach to strengthen ties with Russia has remained a priority. Even as Western alliance goes on increasing Eastern and Central nations into its fold, their relations with Russia have remained a priority. To the extent that some analyst advocate formulate policies that give priority to Russian concerns. However, the terrorist attack of September 11th, 2001, on the United States, provided much need stimulus for the shift in US and Russian policy.

Against this backdrop, the European Union took steps towards localization or

Europeanization of its security arrangements. The treaty of 1993 that brought together the European Union, allowed for the creation of common defense policy thereby strengthening the presence of NATO in Europe. Especially after debacle in Bosnia, even the most ardent supporter of European security, came in favour of NATO umbrella over Europe.

Further, the initial US suspicion of Europe's Common Foreign and Security Policy gradually turned into support. As a step in that direction, in 1994 NATO decided to establish Combined Joint Task Forces for European members of NATO. They were created for operations beyond the NATO area, where US can choose not to participate. This step increased the relevance of NATO in European security matters. Next, in 1997 Madrid summit, NATO endorsed its enlargement and asserted its primary role over that of Europe to create its own defense mechanism.

In spite of all the talk about creating a common foreign and defense policy, the member of European Union failed to make any workable headway in this direction. This brought into focus the divergent views regarding foreign policy, and deficiencies in their military capabilities. This was more than highlighted during crisis in Kosovo and other post-Kosovo efforts. Some even argue that United States, by taking lead role in event like Kosovo, takes advantage of European passivity. Therefore, maintaining its relevance by creating disincentives for development of Europe's independent defense capabilities.

In contrast to his predecessors, President Bill Clinton was more sympathetic towards European efforts towards developing more common defense policy, which diverged from that of NATO. However, this European effort was to

complement NATO's central in transatlantic defense cooperation. It has been Europe's objective from the outset to have an autonomous security capability, and also a NATO project. Its proponents have been of the view that a separable, but not separate force will give NATO a kind of flexibility it did not have. Also, it will diminish any French effort to create a Western European alliance that is potential competitor to NATO. Though there are some existing doubts about the whole effort. First, how far can the European effort go and what would be the nature of the relations with the Americans and NATO, and how the non-EU members of the NATO will be accommodated. Bush administration's reduced support for the European effort complicated its relations with them. This was at least till September 11, where Americans persisted on pushing regardless for the views of the Europeans, particular with regards to missile defense systems.

There has been an opinion in the United States that the European plan may be riskier than it appears. It may lead to wastage of European military assets, and may cause alienation of non-EU NATO members. And also, creation of a rival military structure may make it difficult for the United States and the European Union to reach synchronously to future crisis. So far the most serious allegation is that any such European arrangement will create a perception of Europeanization of the alliance. And that may eventually lead to decoupling of the alliance. From practical standpoint, it is hard to imagine a security scenario that does not involve the United States and the NATO. It is for this reason that the U S has been able to stress upon the Europeans that their combined defense set up shouldn't be seen as something distinct from NATO. Also they can use that for force for

peacekeeping purpose, but one way or the other they will need NATO support. By this approach, the Americans have been able to accommodate the European initiative and at the same time, keep the NATO intact and relevant.

The Europeans are still keen on going ahead with their defense plan, in spite of the fact that most major countries are downsizing their military infrastructure. The United States remains concerned in light of the shrinking budget of these European member, but still remains supportive of the idea, provided the supremacy of the NATO remains unchallenged.

Since the beginning of the new century, there has been a change in security challenges for NATO. These challenges have been in the periphery of NATO than its center. Also, the United States remains the dominant player in Europe. And at the same time the new challenges to US and to NATO are from areas beyond the traditional boundaries of the alliance, in Middle East and in Eurasia. Also it is feared that if Russia continues to assert itself more aggressively in areas other than Central Europe, such as the Balkans, eastern Mediterranean, etc, it can challenge the Western alliance. But, as the era after terrorist attacks on US has shown, the President of Russia has consistently shown cooperative approach in its relations towards the United States and the rest of the Western world. However, uncertainty remains about the durability of this approach, keeping in mind the domestic compulsions of Russia and willingness of the Americans to iron out the differences.

Against this background, Russians have consistently shown their support for working towards European security organization, such that their role is

granted. Also, their role in newly developing common European Security and Defense initiative looks attractive, particularly in light of reduced American influence in the region. In addition, the major US/European allies such as UK and Germany don't see pursuing an independent policy will lead to decoupling from NATO. That is because CESDP is not considered as a complement of NATO. The former is focused on humanitarian and peacekeeping operations, where United States has little interest.

After decades that say for Soviet bloc making an effort to join the Western alliances, such as NATO and European Union, the prospects of Eastern and Central European countries joining the pan-Europe security arrangements looks plausible. But the community remains undefined and unclear. For European security and primacy of NATO's role, leaders of Western nations will have to clarify the role of Russia.

According to Ambassador Dirk Brengelman, NATO's Assistant Secretary General for Political Affairs and Security Policy, speaking at the plenary session of the Conference on Military and Political Aspects of European Security in Moscow, there are currently three main issues: European security and stability are at the core of NATO's objectives, NATO is convinced that security is something that is interconnected and inter-dependent, and security of Europe would be better serviced if NATO and Russia found common ground.

Elaborating further on each of the points, he feels that NATO's contribution towards the security of Europe has been evident in the stability of Balkans. To further support his claim, he cites example of historic agreement between Belgrade and Pristina. Also, the NATO-led mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina

were meant to implement Dayton Peace Agreement

Stressing upon the second point, he refers to the role of Russia in promoting greater security for Europe. He claims that it is rooted in their core belief that both the nations can together build a lasting peace in Atlantic and European region. Together they envision a environment based on principles of democracy and cooperative society.

Thirdly and lastly, he believes that the security and stability of Europe will be strengthened if NATO and Russia found ways to resolve the outstanding issues. The most important of all issues would be: missile defense, reciprocal transparency and respect for all commitments between them.

In light of all the discussion above, especially in light of NATO's historic role in Europe and its established military strength, I would suggest that it is best placed to ensure safety and security of Europe in years to come.

References

Bowker, Mike and Cameron Ross. Russia after the Cold War. Harlow, England: Longman, 2000. Print.

Cross, Sharyl. " Not Whether But When: The US Decision to Enlarge NATO. By James M. Goldgeier. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 1999. 218p. \$42. 95 cloth, \$18. 95 paper.." American Political Science Review, 96. 01 (2002): 208--209. Print.

Hutchings, Robert. " Permanent Alliance? NATO's Prague Summit and Beyond." The Atlantic Council of the United States., (2001): Print.

Ibryamova, Nouray V and Roger E Kanet. " NATO, the European Union, and European security." The United States and Europe: Policy imperatives in a globalizing world, (2002): Print.

<https://assignbuster.com/collective-security-in-europe-be-promoted-through-nato-essay-samples/>

Mayhew, Alan. "Recreating Europe: The European Union's Policy towards Central and Eastern Europe." Cambridge University Press, xxi. (1999): 393. Print.

"NATO - "NATO's contribution to European Security" - Address by Ambassador Dirk Brengelmann, NATO Assistant Secretary General for Political Affairs and Security Policy, at the Conference on Military and Political Aspects of European Security, Moscow, 23-24 May." NATO, 2013. Web. 22 Nov 2013. .