Europe in NATO – Partner for War

By Reiner Braun

In November 2010 at the NATO summit in Lisbon the military alliance decided upon a new Strategic Concept. In this concept Europe for the first time in the history of NATO is recognized as an independent but integrated pillar within NATO. Under item 32 of the new Strategic Concept of NATO it reads: ‘...the European Union is a unique and essential partner for NATO [...] We welcome the entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty, which provides a framework for strengthening the EU’s capacities to address common security challenges.’ And then the military alliance admits openly that for this new Strategic Partnership the implementation of the Lisbon Treaty is essential. Historically this is a new development. Up to that point especially the USA and also Great Britain abstained from declaring Europe as a military partner. The political and economic weakness of the USA and a new ‘bundlen sharing’ forces the Obama administration to acknowledge the reality of an own imperial European factor which is pegged into NATO but also acts independently. Fundamental for the behaviour of the states is the EU Lisbon Treaty. This treaty stipulates the military terms and plans of the EU. The treaty is also a document for NATO politics since the NATO Summit in Lisbon 2010, even though not all EU members are in NATO (e.g. Austria, Finland, Ireland, Sweden).

This is still not in com- pision with the armament and war politics of the USA but full of dangerous and militant conflicts and aspects that promote military interventions which are unfortunately already a reality as seen in Macedonia, Kosovo and Somalia.

Europe as military power

The European Union is constituted as a military power which intervenes with armed forces under NATO leadership (or also without NATO support) all over the world even without a mandate of the UN Security Council and which establishes and expands the, for this purpose required, military capacities. Under Article 42, first Paragraph of the EU Lisbon Treaty it says that ‘the common security and defense policy shall provide the Union with an operational capacity drawing on civilian and military assets’ on which the Union can resort to in case of ‘missions outside the Union for peace-keeping, conflict prevention and strengthening international security in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter’. A geographic limitation is not included. It is a matter of ‘missions outside the Union’, that to say everywhere around the world.

Combat missions worldwide

Article 43, Paragraph 1 of the Lisbon Treaty is the legal core of militarization within the EU, it is the contractual fixation of authorization and disposition to combat-missions. It lists the ‘missions’ of the EU in which the Union may use civilian and military means.” The deployment of military in case of natural disasters could be part of these missions as well as securing resources and other economic and geopolitical interests of the Union, and the participation in aggressions and succeeding occupational regimes. All the enumerated aspects of Article 43 shall be permitted and if necessary required.

NATO Strategy and Europe after Lisbon

By Dave Welch

The European Union is regularly portrayed as a peaceful economic and political partnership between 27 member states. However, although the military strategies and forces of the EU states are supposedly independent of each other and of NATO, they are closely linked and are becoming more so. The EU member states are also members of NATO and 3 other NATO members are EU Applicants. The development of a Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP) for the EU has its roots in the European Security and Defence Identity previously developed within NATO. The CSDP aims to develop integrated European security structures and has led to EU engagement in a number of civilian and military missions in Europe, Africa and Asia. In addition, in 2009 the European Parliament voted in favour of a Synchronised Armed Forces Europe (SAFE) as a step towards further synchronization of European military forces. These developments have been seen as a challenge to the EU’s commitment to NATO but the 2010 Lisbon Summit underlined a determination to improve the NATO-EU strategic partnership. NATO’s new Strategic Concept, as adopted at Lisbon, commits the Alliance to working with the UN and the EU in military engagements to prevent crises, manage conflicts and stabilize post-conflict situations. The EU currently has a limited mandate over defence issues, with a role to explore the issue of European defence agreed to in the Amsterdam Treaty, as well as oversight of the Helsinki Headline Goal Force Catalogue (the ”European Rapid Reaction Force”) processes. However, some EU states may and do make multilateral agreements about defence issues outside of the EU structures. The entry into force of the Treaty of Lisbon triggered member states of the Western European Union (WEU) to scrap the organisation, which had largely become dormant, but they have kept the mutual defence clause of the Treaty of Brussels as a basis for a possible EU mutual defence arrangement.

Peace is the basis for a sustainable world
The Illusion of the so-called “Civil Power Europe”

By Tobias Pflüger

O f the countless foray suggestions for an efficacious “Civil Power Europe” in distinction from the “military power Europe” is not to say that it is a nonexistent issue. A matter of fact both phenomena strongly go hand in hand. One of the peculiarities of the global power system/world-system is the large norm shift of the global financial/local power towards China – respectively towards China’s market/socialist world-system. In this system, dynamics driven by the market/socialist association of states and businesses, the world is the white zone”. Since the beginning of modern age the world was created gradually. After the end of the Cold War the North Atlantic center’s ascendency on the world stage has moved forward. Not only the former real-socialist countries are open to this center (Eastern Europe almost became periphery of the West), but all regions worldwide (traditional “free market” areas) are confronted with a common enemy. The reality of fact that different market/statist regional complexes and the European Union are facing “civil power Europe” should quite plainly how the power of the rich diminishes the middleclass and the poor. And when dialogue becomes impossible, motions when a new of collective means are needed. What the matter concerns, the EU – including the US – should be a Civil Power Europe.

NATO Strategy and Europe after 2013

EUrope in the NATO Strategy

Partner for War

After the coming into force of the Treaty its implementation and development did not meet the expectations. This Treaty was then chosen by some of the member states as a legal obligation.

Implementation and initialization of the so-called “Civil Power Europe”

The Union is on a fatally wrong track. It is contractually laid down that the EU is “shall (...) promote peace and cooperation among its members. The Union is on a fatally wrong track. It is contractually laid down that the EU states “shall (...) promote peace and cooperation among its members. It is contractually laid down that the EU states “shall (...) promote peace and cooperation among its members. (...) promote (...) the Union budget for urgent missions (...) can therefore deploy military in case of natural disasters, (...) shall have the start-up fund”. The Illusion of the so-called “Civil Power Europe”
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Greece is being forced to make ruinous sacrifices to cope with a financial crisis. For the last months Greece has been enduring the pressure of the Eurozone – the EU and European Commission – about several measures that our country needed to take. Greece ended up with the Franco-Greek armament deal in the Euro. In the meantime Greece remains committed to engage armament commitments and to commit to new ones by the dominant Euro- pan-winners Anglo-Makedlandia-Nato and French-Italiai. As austerity measures are loaded against the Greek people, creating a crisis situation that leaves no good for Greece. From the solidarity unity understood, the Greek government means out our hand to purchase arms from Germany, from the last to France and Italy. The German armament industry will continue to be a major beneficiar of Greek spending if Greece avoids exit from the Eurozone. The military budget of Greece amounts to four billion Euros. German arms manufacturers delivered Greek arms manufactured by Submarine and Eurofighter to Greece. What are Greek needs these weapons for? It is to defend itself against Turkey? But it is, by the way, also receiv- ing German weapons. I cannot see that Germany could be in a conflict with the economic capacity of Greece when it is supposed to save its own economy. But that is what the European Union agreed in the Codex of Codax on arms trade. Portugal also came to the conclusion that proofs: peace is possible. The arms trade has the possibi- lity to damage that many even without war - because peace is not! (General Secretariat) Christine Hoffmann, General Secretary of Pax Oekumenica www.paxoekumenica.de

No to War – No to NATO

Reiner Braun (NARWA, Germany), Claire Chastelain (Collectif national unifié OTAN-Afghanistan – Palestine, Contrepoints (Stop the War, Greece), Luis De Brabander (Belgium), Andrea Denis (MoSoC – Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament), Joseph Servat (American Friends Service Committee, USA), Anna Glikson (The Belarus network, Campaign Against Nuclear Weapons, Belarus), Judith Leber (Peace Action, USA), Vo- lker Lima (PAFP, Peace Action, Germany), Peter Simon (Convoy – Coalition of Left, Germany), Anna McGuirk (Collective national unifié OTAN-Afghanistan, France), Agneta Norberg, Swedish Peace Foundation, Sweden, Stéphane Pigeot (We-sinsister, Million-Demonstrators, Germany), Catrin Peter- sen (Convoy Salvation, Denmark, Belgium), Eva Rassbach (Code Red, Germany), John Rees (Stop the War, UK), Ricardo Robles (Por- tales, Mexico) and the Campaign (for a Social Europe, Italy). Further information: www.no-to-nato.org

ICC – No to War No to NATO

No to War – No to NATO consists of:

- Annie McStravick (Collectif national unifié OTAN-Afghanistan, Belgium), Dr. Roger Cole, (NEAT) and is situated in the Northern Ireland.
- Kristine Karch, (Comitè Surveillance OTAN, Belgium), Mairead Maguire (Northern Ireland)
- Roger Cole, (NEAT) and is situated in the Northern Ireland.
- Annie McStravick (Collectif national unifié OTAN-Afghanistan, Belgium), Dr. Roger Cole, (NEAT) and is situated in the Northern Ireland.
- Mairead Maguire, Nobel Peace Prize Laureate 1976, Northern Ireland
- Lars Eriksson, (PAGAN, Portugal), Kevin Martin (Peace Action, USA)
- let (Comitè Surveillance OTAN, Belgium), Elsa Rassbach (Code Red, Germany)
- Richard Robles (Por- tales, Mexico) and the Campaign (for a Social Europe, Italy).
- Further information: www.no-to-nato.org

NATO’s Influence on Irish Neutrality

By Roger Cole

Irish values traditionally consist of Independence, Democracy and Neutrality. Ireland remained neutral in World War II and did not pass the NATO Test. However, since its accession to the European Union in 2004, Ireland experiences a loss of national sovereignty and an increase of its integration into the supranational EU. This participation in EU influenced and delivered lessons for the Irish government. The voice of the Irish people voting the referendums on Nice and Lisbon was disrespec- ted by the government, forcing the people to vote again until they gave the “right” answer.

We understand the Lisbon Treaty as an attempt to constitution- alise the militarisation of the EU. This militarisation was linked to a self-reference of the EU. The Treaty linked to the military capabilities oriented to the EU. This militarisation was linked to the institutional link. The Treaty linked to the European Defence Agency and a participation in NATO. The Lisbon Treaty linked to the military capabilities oriented to the EU and intensified the arms trade. The Treaty linked to the military capabilities oriented to the EU.

At its Lisbon Summit in 2008 NATO described the EU as a strategic partner. The current Irish government connected to support the NATO imperatives. The role of the Peace & Neutrality Alliance (PANA), since its foundation in 1994 and the role of Sinn Fein and the United Left Alliance has been to oppose this growth in nationalisation and militarisation. The role of the Peace & Neutrality Alliance (PANA) has linked to the opposition in Sinn Fein and the United Left Alliance in 1994 and the role of Sinn Fein and the United Left Alliance.

The Peace & Neutrality Alliance (PANA) is a group of organisations that opposes the militarisation of the European Union and campaigned for Irish neutrality. The Peace & Neutrality Alliance (PANA) is a group of organisations that opposes the militarisation of the European Union and campaigned for Irish neutrality. The Peace & Neutrality Alliance (PANA) has linked to the opposition in Sinn Fein and the United Left Alliance.

Safeguarding the Peace & Neutrality Alliance (PANA) has linked to the opposition in Sinn Fein and the United Left Alliance.
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Stop EU and NATO Interventionism!

By Arielle Denis

Since the end of the cold war, illustrating Churchill’s assertion that the most stupid attitude in politics is keeping the same policy whatever changes are occurring, NATO’s nuclear policy has not moved much.

The new push in favour of a world free of nuclear weapons is now shaking the old alliance showing growing divisions among the 28 members. Can the Chicago Summit deliver some fresh air?

The current nuclear discourse is full of contradictions – and now haunted by a terrifying pheno menon called emotional crisis. President Obama’s commitment is a worldwide free of nuclear weapons formulaulated in April 2009 now widely calli ng for, but then his admin istration allocated huge bud gets for its nuclear weapons program. Russia agreed to this goal but claims its need for nuclear weapons to compen sate deteriorating conventional arsenal of them.

If courage and lucidity never acquire nuclear weapons. Because as long as these nuclear weapons are in the world, NATO will remain a nuclear alliance. So let’s get rid of this menace. Does NATO seriously think to use them? It means that the US will risk “New York or Los Angeles.”

The withdrawal issue” shows that they are based, Germany first, to reduce reliance on nuclear weapons, to prevent their spread into dangerous hands, and ultimately to end them as a threat to the world. Can some foreign minister seriously think that the US is going to risk “New York or Los Angeles?”

In the same document, they concentrate the removal of the B-61 nuclear bombs based in European countries. These bombs and their delivery programmes are a risk of the Cold War and are undeniably considered as obsolete. But most of the countries where they are based, Germany first, are calling for their withdrawal.
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Disband NATO – Stop the Killing and start talking!

Today faced with increasing economic and political crisis Europe is at a crossroads. In spite of the recession, the European military industrial complex continues to spend billions of people’s tax money on weapons of mass destruction. NATO continues to fight aggressive wars in Libya and Afghanistan, and has become a force of illegal intervention and occupation in order to secure resources. Citizens concerned that there are nuclear bombs in six European countries under the command of the US/NATO are calling for an end to NATO and militarism. A disarmed and demilitarized Europe and the money from such arms and weapons spent on providing real sustainable human security, would give economic and political justice and equity for all. We can all work to bring about change for real human security. Stopping the arms trade, ending the “War on Terror” (which is often a war on women and children) and setting up fair and equal trading with the developing world in order to promote peace not war, will secure our future.

Collective Imperialism

US systematic intervention is based on 3 principles: Brutal replacement of UN with NATO as the means of managing the international order, alignment of Europe with Washington’s strategic objectives and adoption of military methods reinforcing American hegemony.

Win the Fight for Life

The world is confronted with irresistible dilemmas. Ecological problems, the exhaustion of non-renewable resources, extreme poverty and armed conflicts give pressure to the political debate of the world development for the future. We have to seek a coherent, ethical and moral answer to this development. The globalization and the concomitant competition in production are not satisfying the needs of the majority. Confronted with economic crisis there are less governmental investments in human needs while governments are spending the people’s money on weapons and irrational productions. The outcry of the people has to echo through the halls of the political and economic centres of power. Sustainable development has to be a fair and democratic, a gradual and dynamic process that considers the needs of the people and not the needs of political forces, military alliances and economic institutions.

Why is there NATO?

After World War II, US plans for global hegemony assigned each world-region its “function”. NATO was established to defend the most important region, Europe, from threats of the East. Europe has gone along with US demands, even while strongly disagreeing with Washington’s positions. 20 years after the collapse of the Soviet Union, USA has missile defense systems in Eastern Europe and NATO troops are fighting in Afghanistan, which has great geopolitical importance due to its location in the heartland of the energy-rich regions. Former NATO-head de Hoop Scheffer confirms that “NATO troops have to guard pipelines that transport oil and gas that is directed for the West” to protect sea routes and other “crucial infrastructure” of the energy system. So the rational conclusion why exists NATO is not to defend Europe against imminent danger (like the USSR, or Iran today) but to ensure that Europe is subject to US interests. To put it short, NATO is an international intervention force under US command.

Peace – Now!

We are at a critical juncture in history, we are facing various tipping points and many hard choices lay before our leaders, with serious consequences if they make the wrong decisions. The strategy of defending the manufacture and stockpiling of nuclear weapons, as an effective deterrent to others, is now recognized as a flawed argument. If they were once justified, as a means of American-Soviet deterrence, they are no longer. Nuclear weapons were considered essential to maintaining international security during the cold war, but that is no longer the case.

NATO’s Immaturity

NATO is an exercise in intellectual, emotional and political immaturity. Instead of searching for solutions to the many conflicts in which the West is involved – by bridging the legitimate goals of the parties involved – NATO is always about winning, through sanctions, deterrence or military victory; at enormous costs in lives and values; not about finding solutions that could bring the world forward. NATO members have some good points, but so do others. High time for NATO to grow up instead of living in the past.

A Culture of Peace

Seriously concerned by the strong on-going militarization of the world with continued growth in military spending (more than 1.7 trillion $ per year) whilst 10 – 20 % would be enough to meet the basic needs of people as agreed in the Millennium Development Goals, it is necessary “to speak truth to power”. No country should be allowed to feel pride any more in being military strong. The world cannot afford to continue with the misuse of human and natural resources. In the future the strong countries are those who manage to create security by non-military means and use their resources to build human security and a true culture of peace. NATO is obsolete.
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