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How to puzzle the new world order into place | By Mark Leonard

Let’s be free of escaping the thinking of the last 20 years.”

European and American leaders are confronting Munich this year– an atmosphere of crisis. The set of global challenges has changed due to the political aftereffects of the economic and the structural and strategic impact of terrorism and the war on terror. Yet, does the trauma of the West has longer reverberations than the collapse of Lehman Brothers in 2008 or even September 11. It is worth going back to 1939.

In 1939 the British historian E. H. Carr wrote a seminal book called “The Twenty Years’ Crisis,” which showed how the liberal powers sacrificed their victory in 1918 by failing to adapt to changing circumstances. Today’s West is suffering from a 20-year crisis of its own. Of course, 1939 was not a prospect that was known in Europe at the time, but it was in tune with the season. Carr’s argument was not new, but it was in tune with the reality of the 1930s. The liberal order was in question, and the world was changing. Even if there is no new world order, we are still dealing with the same challenges that faced the international community in 1939. The challenge is to adapt to changes in its own circumstances and to make the liberal order sustainable.

But before we try to solve the existing problems and find a new economic and political order in Europe, we need to understand the logic of the last 20 years. The West is facing a crisis of the liberal order, and the time to kickstart initiatives is over. Now is the time to make 2010 a year for global agenda setting, planning, and action. Let us make 2010 a year of peace implementation and action. Now is the time to activate global initiatives, in Munich. But the time for excuses is over. Now is the time to act. Let us make 2010 a year of global agenda setting, planning, and action. Now is the time to activate global initiatives, in Munich. But the time for excuses is over. Now is the time to act.
NoT oM is fundamentaL to tHe american understanding of eurOpean securiTy.
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the agenda of this year's Munich Security Conference is annually fuelled by the fear that the world has once again entered into a period of insecurity and conflict. But there is another reason why this year's conference was of particular interest to us. Last year's Munich Security Conference was held in the shadow of an international crisis that left many countries deeply divided and struggling to find a way forward. This year, the focus was on Europe, and the theme of the conference was “Europe: gemeinsame Sicherheit – gemeinsame Zukunft”. The conference underscored the need for Europe to work together to overcome the challenges it faces, including the need for political dialogue and cooperation.

In his opening remarks, US Secretary of State Hillary Clinton emphasized the importance of European cooperation in addressing global challenges. She highlighted the need for Europe to work together to address issues such as security, arms control, and arms export control, and to promote a rules-based international order.

The conference also addressed the issue of Russia's strategic nuclear forces, with a focus on the New Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (New START). The treaty, which will become effective in February 2011, is a significant step forward in arms control and stability. The treaty will reduce the number of strategic nuclear warheads on both sides, and will provide a framework for further reductions in the future.

The conference also addressed the issue of China's nuclear forces, with a focus on the need for transparency and confidence-building measures. The US and China have been engaged in talks on a new China-Russia-United States (CRUS) nuclear agreement, which would build on the existing New START treaty.

In conclusion, the Munich Security Conference underscored the importance of political dialogue and cooperation in addressing global challenges. The conference highlighted the need for Europe to work together to address issues such as security, arms control, and arms export control, and to promote a rules-based international order.

The Security Times

لا يوجد محتوى يمكن قراءته.
The truly global problems

New challenges for NATO: climate change, natural catastrophes and cyber attacks

By Karl-Theodor zu Guttenberg

Today, everyone seems to expect flexibility from us. Opinions of mind, out-of-the-box thinking, new approaches – this is what counts. However, what sounds like the mantra of some personality coach bears some teeth, also for politics. Modern-day diplomacy has taught us that if we ever used to stare away issues in individual constituencies, we better make sure not to push them across deeply. There is ample evidence that pigeons-loke thinking no longer applies. Climate change is no longer only a ‘green’ problem, security of innovations more than a political and economic dimension, and the cyber world with its bars and bylines has become interesting to people outside the group of computer experts. All these tongue-tip big implications for our security.

Climate change has many faces, soil erosion, desertification, scarce resources and rising sea levels are just some of them. Besides such very effects on the environment, it has also become an economic risk factor and threat multiplier. In fact, it is one of the major challenges to security policy in the 21st century. For the first time, we are faced with a truly global problem which concerns each and every one of us and our human coexistence, states and regions. Because this is no one’s affair.

And in many different fields are already the first notes to find a solution. It requires experts from the fields of foreign affairs, development aid and security and defense to cooperate closely with scientists, economists and legal specialists. Moreover, there is a clear and straightforward approach to mitigate the climate change as such by lowering carbon dioxide emissions and at the same time, reduce its negative effects. Germany will maintain its role as a driving force on this road. We will continue to try and find solutions that are viable and at the same time acceptable to the international community.

This approach has to be complemented by generous and constructive development aid to help communities and countries to adapt to the changes. In addition, early-warning systems, not only for seismographic structures, but also for arising conflicts should be further built up and introduced in. If a natural catastrophe happens, disaster should be provided where needed, just as it is currently happening in Haiti.

Cyber attacks on information and communications systems are a completely different problem, yet also a serious and ‘new’ threat: NATO allies are exposed to them on a daily basis. These attacks jeopardize the economic system, infrastructure and society of a country and ultimately the structure of the state as a whole. The events in Estonia, in April and May 2007, illustrate this. Even powerful states like the United States are confronted with cyber attacks at all times. And to the current that we become dependent on computer networks and cyber techniques, our vulnerability grows, too.

Dealing with various attacks, data destruction, manipulation and espionage are not only directed against preferred targets, such as electronic communications facilities, financial institutions or energy utilities. They are also likely to pose a threat to our armed forces. Attacks on military information networks or satellite communications may directly result in a loss of command and control capability and – as a consequence – of operational capability, especially in a multinational context.

We, as an alliance, should further explore the potential for practical cooperation on cyber defense. The exchange of lessons learned, joint exercises and training as well as the political discussions of whether this capability might, at some point, also be used proactively if needed, could be a good starting point. In conclusion, the requirements of the comprehensive approach to security in this field, too, NATO should cooperate with other international organizations such as the EU.

It is widely accepted that NATO is the most powerful military alliance in history. The key to its success was and remains its flexibility. Whereas the founding fathers of the Washington Treaty envisaged a remarkable, but abstract notion of security that they formalized the goals and defined the contours of the alliance, its various instruments and structures had to be adapted time and time again to the ever-changing security environment. Catchy terms such as “out-of-area” or “out-of-business” are testimony to this process.

For transformation, the changing of structures and instruments, begins in our heads. We must avoid holding on to old measures just because they proved right at one point in time. Instead, we must constantly refine and test our approaches to see whether they still work. And steps that previously might have seemed irrevocable, might now be taken by the heads. German rearmament in the 1950s, the Egyptian President Nasser’s radicalization of the Sinai question in 1973, NATO’s double-track approach to nuclear deterrence in 1979 – all sided very during the time and were widely criticized. However, their contribution to international peace and security. Today’s goal of Global Zero is yet another dilemma that we, as an alliance, should co-operate with other international organizations such as the EU.

Karl-Theodor zu Guttenberg is Minister of Defence of Germany.
A new challenge – are they the right ones for NATO? US soldiers fighting piracy off the Horn of Africa

The range of tasks facing the alliance is potentially overwhelming. But prioritizing does not in itself mean reverting to some kind of la carte attitude to the obligations of Article 5. It is not only the nature of the alliance’s reference to a non-military attack that is at issue but the way in which they lead. Cyber space has transformed out of recognition. It is no longer focussed on high tech domains but on an operationally driven agenda. It is an example. The attacks on the US consulate in Benghazi, Libya were a global cyber strike operation. The virtual destruction of the US consulate was not a manmade attack or natural catastrophe, especially when the capabilities needed to cope with such an attack are not in place. The way in which the cyber attack operated was a matter for the US and its allies to do so. We must now understand the security of all of us.

The nature of future conflict – is health. They have sparked two issues such as the potential of serial intervention, but does it undermine the basis of collective security? The other key issue is the question of the enduring nature of the alliance to be reassessed. Is the strategic context has been transformed out of recognition. Following the fall of the Berlin Wall, NATO fossechau engaged in active operations almost continuously. We began with humanitarian intervention. We now face terrorism, piracy, which taken together over time are capable of undermining civil security. The distinctions between different forms of task are now very close. The core capabilities needed to do so are now in place. We have to paddle hard to make the NATO agenda? We are all right now. Some may argue that this is not an alliance matter – but is this true?
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O nce again, the North Atlantic Alliance, 63 years from April, is engaged in defining what it is and what it can do before. Since the end of the Cold War, it has gone through the process almost every 10 years in 1991, and 1999, and now, with the aim of presenting the new text to the next NATO summit in November 2010.

But the time for self-examination is more demanding. If the earlier crises were imposed by external changes in the strategic context, the current one is dictated by growing demands among NATO members about the adequacy of their alliance, and doubts among NATOnians about current one is dictated by growing exercises were imposed by external NATO Summit in November 2010. presenting the new text to the next almost every 10 years: in 1991, in it has gone through this process about and what it can do better. 

Sen. He will be assisted by a group of experts, to report to him by the end of April, and will consult with all member governments. But then it is up to him to develop the concept and submit proposals for its implementation.

Can Fogh Rasmussen meet the challenge? It is not for others the document will keep it's much changed than the usual NATO communica- tion products. It should also be seen as a result of a series of events in the fall of 2007, in the crucial Washington NATO summit.

Fortunately, some issues which were a concern less than a year ago, have now been acted on. The most likely encroachments on security after the current Cold War, however, are likely to be from areas of the world beyond NATO's sphere of influence. What does solidarity among member is the key for us. And what will be the criteria for a new member in the post-Cold War context? These are among the questions that will be discussed in Brussels. The financial constraints experienced by all capitals give rise to a number of significant questions. Crises are challenging – but so are upswings! Secure your resources!

The Great Recession has shown the world that sustainable growth is difficult to achieve. We at Roland Berger are convinced that the commodities industry plays a key role in that process. A visionary, long-term strategy will have to be developed. A visionary, long-term strategy will have to be developed. We believe that sustainable growth is difficult to achieve. The Great Recession has shown the world that sustained growth is difficult to achieve. But there is a silver lining: the commodities industry plays a key role in that process. A visionary, long-term strategy will have to be developed. We believe that sustainable growth is difficult to achieve.

Roland Berger Strategy Consultants, founded in 1967, is one of the world’s leading strategy consultancies. With 36 offices in 25 countries, we have successful operations in all major international markets.

We believe that sustainable growth needs secure resources. Get ready!

www.rolandberger.com
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A new concept for NATO's soul

Fogh Rasmussen is preparing the new strategy. Can he meet the challenge? | By Christoph Bertram
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The unfinished nature of the Cold War

Europe needs to see Russia as a powerful ally

By Sergei Karaganov

Consequently, the existing mechanisms and institutions for international and collective security in Europe have not solved the main problem – the issue of war and peace. Their importance manifested itself in the spring of 1999, when NATO attacked Yugoslavia, and again in August 2008, when the conflict in the Caucasus erupted. In both cases, the tragic events were caused by the inability of pre-existing European security institutions to prevent the inter- national and collective security is now a question mark after the end of the Cold War.

The unfinished nature of the Cold War

In view of the deep crisis of confidence and the fundamental weaknesses of conventional and strategic concepts of political and military security, it will not be easy to transform the NATO-Russia relationship into a strategic partnership.

By Margarete Klein
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Consequently, the existing mechanisms and institutions for international and collective security in Europe have not solved the main problem – the issue of war and peace. Their importance manifested itself in the spring of 1999, when NATO attacked Yugoslavia, and again in August 2008, when the conflict in the Caucasus erupted. In both cases, the tragic events were caused by the inability of pre-existing European security institutions to prevent the inter- national and collective security is now a question mark after the end of the Cold War.

The unfinished nature of the Cold War

In view of the deep crisis of confidence and the fundamental weaknesses of conventional and strategic concepts of political and military security, it will not be easy to transform the NATO-Russia relationship into a strategic partnership.
Twenty years after the fall of the Berlin Wall, Europe – reunited both in the European Union and NATO – is entering a globalized era of risks but also of opportunities. On the one hand, the alliance within NATO are striving to find the way back to sustainability. On the other hand, the European Union is now being shaped by a high representative for foreign affairs and security policy, Catherine Ashton. With those achievements in place, the EU is preparing to establish the new European External Action Service (EEAS), which will give Europe a real voice (we do hope so!) and allow her to have a real influence on world affairs, including during crises.

While the economic crisis has intricated our economy by brutally spending the hierarchy of economic power, we must find the way back to sustainable growth, strengthen financial regulation to prevent new crises and enhance the competiveness of our companies compared to those of the large emerging economies. But the war in Afghanistan, Haiti’s tragedy, the semi-success of the Copenhagan climate conference, the persistence of threats such as proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and terrorism, demographic imbalances, as well as the absolute necessity to ensure our energy security, are reminding us at the same time how immense the new security challenges that we need to take on, not only in Europe but also beyond.

If 21st century Europe wants to be a full-fledged strategic player and not just a mere spectator, it needs to be ready to take up the challenges. It has achieved institutional maturity. But Europe now needs to get ready to collectively take on its responsibilities and assume its growing share of burden, as is the example of Iran shows. The time has come, in particular, for Europeans to get ready to support the sanctions against Tehran that we are moving toward at the UN Security Council, in the face of the Iranian refusal to agree to any of the solutions proposed over the past six years.

Everyone needs to understand that future European security will have to rely on two pillars, NATO and the European Union. To this end, it is necessary to continue to renew the Atlantic alliance while in parallel strengthening the defense capabilities of Europe. The ongoing efforts to reform NATO and the restructuring of its strategic concept must be used as opportunities to give Europe the place it deserves within NATO. That was the aim of President Nicolas Sarkozy when he decided in the spring 2009 that France would fully re-enter NATO, a decision now completely implemented.

More France in NATO means more Europe in the alliance. The return of France to NATO’s integrated military command clarified our relationship with our allies, American as well as European, by disrupting ambitions. No one can anymore think of answering to American security policy and NATO as this is the recipe for success in solving many international crises, starting with Afghanistan. Both ambitions – with 23 civil missions and military operations in the past six years, including the crisis in Georgia in the summer 2008 and the ATALANTA anti-piracy operation, the European Union has demonstrated that it could bring real value-added in the realm of international security. It is now the only organization that has at its disposal a large set of instruments, be they economic, diplomatic or military, that can create economies of scale instead of increasing costs.

In addition, we need to strengthen the synergies between the European Union and NATO as this is the recipe for success in combining many international crises, starting with Afghanistan. Both organizations – with 20 common members – must coordinate their strategies better to ensure the successful reorganization and stabilization of that country.

The billions that have been spent in eight years on economic aid for Afghanistan must be better coordinated and really begin to make sense. Our militaries must talk to each other. It is in everyone’s interest. Finally, we need to question the current of the common European policy on security and defense and its level of ambition, while remaining realists. We will not succeed in reconciling citizens with the European project if we do not demonstrate, for example, that the current European policies can bring concrete benefits.

Besides the stabilization in the Balkans and Afghanistan, both of which remain top priorities, we need to adapt to the new types of missions to fight, for example, piracy, drug trafficking as well as illegal immigration on the borders of Europe. This is particularly important at a time when the limit between internal and external security has become so limited. Boosting the defense dimension of Europe is, for us, a strategic aspect of the European project for years to come. It will, at the same time, contribute to strengthening the Atlantic Alliance and consolidating European security overall.

The two pillars of European security

“It is necessary to renew the Atlantic alliance while strengthening our defense capabilities.”

By Pierre Lellouche

“More France in NATO means more Europe in the alliance.”

Pierre Lellouche is Secretary of State for European Affairs, Special Envoy for German-French Relations and National Security Advisor to the President of the Republic of the Part.
We have had no reason to claim we are joining NATO and the EU – the two main international organisations on our continent. Nevertheless, we recognise the fact that the current security system is perceived as satisfactory by all states. The ideas and proposals concerning the Eastern Partnership, as well as the NATO-Russia Memorandum, were recently presented by the Russian Federation have clearly indicated a need for further dialogue. State policy has evolved and what modifications are needed. The OSCE is the appropriate setting to tackle this challenge, due to its mandate, capacity and participation. We are satisfied with the results achieved so far.

Russian proposals that were put forward mainly can be seen as an important contribution to this strategic dialogue. We are open to a fruitful discussion of Russian concerns. However, we have some doubts concerning the aims and potential consequences of these proposals. The existing institutions of European security have – in our view – proven their value and effectiveness. We have consumed war and terrorism for taking up their role as a forum for strategic security dialogue. Some of the provisions of the Russian draft treaty would undermine the role and decision-making capability of the EU and NATO. Other provisions might limit the freedom of states to choose their alliances. We need a thorough consideration of these ideas, and I am sure that some aspects will be clarified during the course of discussion. But let us focus on the real world and steps to be taken, and not only on the virtual reality of purely theoretical grand scenarios. In Athens, at the meeting of the OSCE Ministerial Council, the decision was made to take stock of the results of discussions within the CSTO process, and to produce a report of the progress achieved.

We believe this summary should record real progress in our deliberations, the traditions of OSCE participating states to commit to comprehensive solutions, and the significance of the entire CSTO process. We therefore need to focus our efforts on possible deliverables if we aim to achieve tangible results in the first half of the year. We need clear rules of the game (not yet another new game as usual). We need to accept new phenomena in the security landscape: the co-existence of old and new threats; diversity of security perceptions; the dynamic nature of the security environment; new roles and functions of security institutions (which must be more flexible). We need to observe norms and honor our commitments. We need to draw operational conclusions from a new strategic paradigm, competent security. In other words: we need a kind of ‘Code of Conduct’ for the 21st century. And we have to build consensus.

What we do not need is to create any new institutions (and to duplicate the roles of existing ones) but rather to think about how to reinforce and complement the agency of those that already exist, and to ensure the optimal co-operation between these institutions. Our emphasis in discussing the real needs of our security should be on improvement and not duplication, bearing in mind the principle of Occam’s razor that ‘entities must not be multiplied beyond necessity.’

As one of my predecessors, Professor Julian Darius Berthold, recently wrote, “One thing is for certain: Europe is not short of institutions, sources, procedures and regulations. Indeed, we have more than enough.” We have plenty of security-related organisations and institutions, and hence established numerous multilateral mechanisms and regimes (CFE, CSTO). Many of these may have been established a number of years ago, but they could and should be adapted to new situations. In short: We do the necessity means, but all we are missing is the requisite political will on the part of all states concerned.

Poland is not just ready to engage in such purposes of the CSTO process. We are doing that, and we are committed to do so. We expect that a new round of talks in Vienna will show that we can generate the will, the capacity and the means to do what should be achieved in order to ensure the stability of the continent.

That process must help to finally get rid of Cold War stereotypes, misconceptions and mutual suspicions, but it is also necessary to clearly understand today. Confidence, transparency and openness should be our road map.
An unpopular task
Why the Afghan deployment is creating so many problems for Germany | By Stefan Kornelius

A semblance of peace with the Taliban is going wrong.

Kunduz has become the frontline of an Afghan civil war. But a war of attrition or a war of total destruction remains to be fought.

The recruitment effort failed, but a war is still being waged with persistently rising bills. Is there any way out?

The first months of the year have been particularly difficult for Germany. The war in Afghanistan has become a major source of tension and controversy, with the government facing increasing criticism and pressure to withdraw troops.

The situation in Afghanistan is complicated and fraught with political obstacles. German relations with the Afghan government have become complicated, and there has been a lack of a clear strategy for the mission.

Germany has become a key player in the region, and the political leadership has lost its gumption. The political lead – that Germany’s security strategy – has failed to gain traction.

The recruitment effort has failed, and the Bundeswehr has been forced to rely on conscripts and volunteers. With the end of the mission less than a year away, the government is under pressure to find a solution.

The situation in Afghanistan is still unresolved, and the war is far from over. The government must consider its options and decide whether to commit additional forces or withdraw entirely.

The policy is not without controversy, and there is a growing sense of frustration among the public and the military. The government must act swiftly to avoid a further deterioration of the situation.

In conclusion, the Afghan deployment is facing a major crisis, and the government must act decisively to find a way forward.
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The recruitment effort has failed, and the Bundeswehr has been forced to rely on conscripts and volunteers. With the end of the mission less than a year away, the government is under pressure to find a solution.

The situation in Afghanistan is still unresolved, and the war is far from over. The government must consider its options and decide whether to commit additional forces or withdraw entirely.

The policy is not without controversy, and there is a growing sense of frustration among the public and the military. The government must act swiftly to avoid a further deterioration of the situation.
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An unpopular task
Why the Afghan deployment is creating so many problems for Germany | By Stefan Kornelius

A semblance of peace with the Taliban is going wrong.

Kunduz has become the frontline of an Afghan civil war. But a war of attrition or a war of total destruction remains to be fought.

The recruitment effort failed, but a war is still being waged with persistently rising bills. Is there any way out?
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Balancing means and ends
Obama’s strategy for Afghanistan: Four preconditions of success | By Charles A. Kupchan

Obama is seeking to balance means and ends, recognizing that the United States must pursue limited objectives in Afghanistan if it is to achieve the admirable, but limited, and hard goal of US effort in proportion with the promise at stake. For Pakistan, if he is well-nigh tragic is the confluence of an unruly and disconnected electorate at home and abroad – providing another incentive for Obama to embrace a more modest and shared path on the scope and duration of the mission in Afghanistan.

The means strength of Obama’s effort is in its modesty and sober prudence – an implicit recognition of the limits of US power and the obstacles facing the successful pursuit of Afghanis. But if success in the coming year is to turn on Obama’s ability to maintain modest aims and sustain a balance between the effort in Afghanistan and the political and military influence in his disposal. The situation on the ground could easily overwhelm him to do less; the Democratic investor in victory and the 2012 election already looms on the horizon. Obama must maintain his shoes solid on the inevitable setbacks ahead and the political backstop that will accompany them, resisting both the danger of sliding down the slippery slope of deeper involvement and the urge to head to the exit prematurely.

The United States has as many as 30,000 additional troops and reservoirs that can be deployed, have taken a year’s worth of deployments to Afghanistan, from the Northwest Frontier. While in this, the con-...
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