

# OCCASIONAL PAPERS

---

14

---

## THE FUTURE OF THE EURO-MEDITERRANEAN SECURITY DIALOGUE

*Elizabeth Abela, Roberto Aliboni, Antonio Badini,  
Duygu Bazoglu-Sezer, Biad Abdelwahab, Alberto Bin*

*Edited by Martin Ortega*

INSTITUTE FOR SECURITY STUDIES - WESTERN EUROPEAN UNION  
INSTITUT D'ETUDES DE SECURITE - UNION DE L'EUROPE OCCIDENTALE

43 AVENUE DU PRESIDENT WILSON, 75775 PARIS CEDEX 16

**March 2000**

# OCCASIONAL PAPERS

---

14

---

**THE FUTURE OF THE EURO-MEDITERRANEAN  
SECURITY DIALOGUE /  
L'AVENIR DU DIALOGUE EURO-MEDITERRANEEN  
EN MATIERE DE SECURITE**

*Edited by / Sous la direction de  
Martin Ortega\**

**THE INSTITUTE FOR SECURITY STUDIES  
WESTERN EUROPEAN UNION**

43 AVE DU PRESIDENT WILSON, 75775 PARIS CEDEX 16

March 2000

---

*Occasional Papers* are essays that the Institute considers should be made available, as a contribution to the debate on topical European security issues. They will normally be based on work carried out by researchers granted awards by the Institute; they represent the views of the authors, and do not necessarily reflect those of the Institute or of the WEU in general. Publications of *Occasional Papers* will be announced in the Institute's *Newsletter*, and they will be available on request, in the language used by the author. They can also be accessed via the WEU website:  
[www.weu.int/institute/](http://www.weu.int/institute/)

**THE FUTURE OF THE EURO-MEDITERRANEAN  
SECURITY DIALOGUE /  
L'AVENIR DU DIALOGUE EURO-MEDITERRANEEN  
EN MATIERE DE SECURITE**

*Edited by / Sous la direction de  
Martin Ortega\**

---

\*Martin Ortega is a research fellow at the WEU Institute for Security Studies, where he is responsible for Mediterranean issues and contributes to the work of WEU's Mediterranean Group. He was a Senior associate member of St Antony's College, Oxford, 1988-89, lectured in public international law and international relations at the Autonomous University, Madrid, 1990-92, and held a similar position at the University of Salamanca from 1992 to 1997. Publications include papers on security and cooperation in the Mediterranean, war crimes, and the decision-making process in the EU, and books: *La legítima defensa del territorio del estado* and *Hacia un gobierno mundial*.



## CONTENTS / TABLE DES MATIERES

<b>Preface (English)</b>	v
<b>Préface (français)</b>	vi
<b>Programme of the seminar / Programme du séminaire</b>	vii
<b>List of participants / Liste des participants</b>	ix
<b>I. Introduction: towards an enhanced Euro-Mediterranean security dialogue</b> <i>Martin Ortega</i>	1
<b>II. OSCE's Mediterranean activities</b> <i>Elisabeth Abela</i>	7
<b>III. NATO's Mediterranean dialogue</b> <i>Alberto Bin</i>	13
<b>IV. Le dialogue méditerranéen de l'UEO</b> <i>Arnaud Jacomet</i>	16
<b>V. Quelques commentaires sur l'état actuel du processus de Barcelone</b> <i>Alexander Zafiriou</i>	20
<b>VI. Réflexions sur le développement de la Charte euro-méditerranéenne de paix</b> <i>Ambassadeur Jean-Pierre Courtois</i>	22
<b>VII. The development of the Euro-Mediterranean Charter for Peace and Stability</b> <i>Ambassador Fathy El Shazly</i>	26
<b>VIII. EUROMARFOR and security cooperation in the Mediterranean</b> <i>Admiral Francisco Rapallo</i>	29
<b>IX. A realistic approach to security cooperation in the Mediterranean</b> <i>Mark Heller</i>	33
<b>X. How Egypt "thinks Mediterranean"? Joint military exercises and regional security cooperation</b> <i>Mohamed Kadry Said</i>	36
<b>XI. Relations between the EMP and NATO's Mediterranean dialogue – future prospects</b> <i>Ambassador Antonio Badini</i>	40

<b>XII. Respective roles of the EU and NATO in the Mediterranean</b> <i>Ian Lesser</i>	42
<b>XIII. Developing coordination between the EMP and NATO's Mediterranean Dialogue</b> <i>Thanos Dokos</i>	44
<b>XIV. Four scenarios for the relationships between the EMP and NATO's Mediterranean dialogue</b> <i>Carlo Masala</i>	48
<b>XV. Le Maghreb entre l'Union européenne et les Etats-Unis</b> <i>Nicole Grimaud</i>	51
<b>XVI. Le dialogue de l'OTAN sur la Méditerranée et l'institutionnalisation de la Charte</b> <i>Jean-François Daguzan</i>	53
<b>XVII. Better coordination of security dialogues in the Mediterranean</b> <i>Stephen C. Calleya</i>	61
<b>XVIII. La coopération euro-méditerranéenne en matière de sécurité : un point de vue syrien</b> <i>Haytham Satayhi</i>	63
<b>XIX. The Euro-Mediterranean Charter and security in the Mediterranean</b> <i>Ambassador Pedro López-Aguirrebengoa</i>	65
<b>XX. Repenser la sécurité en Méditerranée</b> <i>Álvaro de Vasconcelos</i>	69
<b>XXI. Le projet de Charte euro-méditerranéenne pour la Paix et la Stabilité : un point de vue tunisien</b> <i>Ambassadeur Rachid Driss</i>	72
<b>XXII. Main Conclusions</b> <i>Martin Ortega</i>	74
<b>XXIII. Principales conclusions</b> <i>Martin Ortega</i>	77

## **PREFACE**

The WEU Institute for Security Studies organised a seminar on ‘The future of the Euro-Mediterranean security dialogue’, on 13-14 January 2000 in Paris. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the possibilities of enhancing the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership’s political and security chapter, including the establishment of a military dialogue within the Barcelona Process. The seminar also tried to assess the contribution that WEU’s Mediterranean dialogue might provide, in the wake of the acquisition of WEU functions by the EU, and the synergies that will have to be found between the EMP’s new security dimension, and NATO’s Mediterranean dialogue.

Participation in the seminar was very varied. Senior officials from the Barcelona process, international civil servants from the EU, NATO, OSCE, and WEU, high-ranking military officers, all of them acting in a personal capacity, and academics, from the EuroMeSCo network and elsewhere, were invited to discuss the proposed subjects openly and frankly. Following the usual practice, the Institute tried to strike a balance between officials and academics, and to obtain a wide geographical representation. In the end, participants came from nine WEU or NATO member nations, and from five Mediterranean countries.

The programme of the seminar, which follows this preface, gives an idea of the subjects addressed and the contents of the debates; a list of participants is also included. This paper contains the written contributions to the seminar, in their original language and in the order that were presented, as well as some concluding remarks in English and French by the editor. It must be underlined that all contributions represent the authors’ personal points of view, and not necessarily those of any state or organisation.

The editor would like to express his sincerest gratitude to all the participants in the seminar, the authors (who keep the copyright), and the Director and staff of the Institute for their support. Special thanks are due to Denise Affonço-Herrmann, who worked conscientiously both in the preparation of the seminar and of this publication.

M. O.



euro-méditerranéen en matière de sécurité ”, les 13 et 14 janvier 2000 à Paris. L’objectif de la réunion était d’examiner les possibilités de renforcer le chapitre politique et sécuritaire du Partenariat euro-méditerranéen, notamment l’instauration d’un dialogue militaire dans le cadre du processus de Barcelone. Le séminaire a également tenté d’évaluer la contribution que le dialogue méditerranéen de l’UEO peut apporter, suite à l’acquisition par l’UE des fonctions de l’UEO, et les synergies qui devront être trouvées entre la nouvelle dimension sécuritaire du PEM et le dialogue de l’OTAN sur la Méditerranée.

La participation au séminaire a été très variée. Des hauts responsables du processus de Barcelone, des fonctionnaires internationaux de l’UE, de l’OTAN, de l’OSCE et de l’UEO, des officiers militaires de haut rang, intervenant tous en leur nom propre, et des universitaires, notamment du réseau EuroMeSCo, ont été invités à examiner les sujets proposés de manière ouverte et en toute franchise. Comme d’habitude, l’Institut s’est efforcé de trouver un juste équilibre entre les responsables gouvernementaux et les universitaires, tout en respectant une représentation géographique aussi large que possible. Finalement, les participants étaient issus de neuf nations membres de l’UEO et de l’OTAN et de cinq pays méditerranéens.

Le programme du séminaire, qui suit cette préface, donne une idée des questions traitées et du contenu des débats ; la liste des participants est également incluse. Cette publication regroupe les contributions écrites au séminaire, dans leur langue d’origine et présentées selon l’ordre indiqué dans le programme, ainsi qu’une conclusion, en anglais et en français, de l’organisateur du séminaire. Il faut remarquer que les contributions représentent le point de vue personnel des auteurs, et non celui d’un Etat ou d’une organisation.

Martin Ortega souhaite exprimer ici sa gratitude à tous les participants, aux auteurs (qui conservent le copyright), et au Directeur, ainsi qu’au personnel de l’Institut pour leur appui. Il remercie, tout particulièrement, Denise Affonço-Herrmann pour le travail consciencieux qu’elle a fourni aussi bien lors de la préparation du séminaire que pour la publication de cet ouvrage.

M. O.

## **Programme of the seminar / Programme du séminaire**

*Thursday 13 January / Jeudi 13 janvier*

Afternoon / après-midi

SESSION I: Present status of security dialogues: EMP, OSCE, NATO, and WEU /

Etat actuel des dialogues en matière de sécurité : PEM, OSCE, OTAN & UEO

CHAIR / PRESIDENCE: Nicole GNESOTTO

Elisabeth ABELA

Alberto BIN

Arnaud JACOMET

Alexander ZAFIRIOU

SESSION II : The development of the Euro-Mediterranean Charter for peace and stability / Le

développement de la Charte euro-méditerranéenne pour la paix et la stabilité

CHAIR / PRESIDENCE: Ambassador Paulo COUTO BARBOZA

Ambassadeur Jean-Pierre COURTOIS

Ambassador Fathy El SHAZLY

Roberto ALIBONI

*Friday 14 January / Vendredi 14 janvier*

Morning / Matin

SESSION III: Specific Topics for a Security Partnership / Domaines spécifiques

CHAIR / PRESIDENCE: Ambassadeur Jean-Pierre COURTOIS

Admiral Francisco RAPALLO

Mark HELLER

Mohammed KADRY SAID

SESSION IV: Relationships between the EMP and NATO's Mediterranean dialogue: What Perspectives? / Les relations entre le PEM et le dialogue méditerranéen de l'OTAN : Quelles perspectives ?

CHAIR / PRESIDENCE: Ambassador Antonio BADINI

Ian LESSER

Thanos DOKOS

Carlo MASALA

Nicole GRIMAUD

*Friday 14 January / Vendredi 14 janvier*

Afternoon / après-midi

SESSION V: Questions raised by the different institutional memberships / Questions soulevées par les différentes compositions institutionnelles

CHAIR / PRESIDENCE: Guido LENZI

Jean-François DAGUZAN

Stephen CALLEYA

George JOFFE

Haytham SATAYHI

SESSION VI: Conclusion: Synergies between the dialogues / Conclusion : Synergies entre les dialogues

CHAIR / PRESIDENCE: Ambassador Pedro Lopez AGUIRREBENGOA

Álvaro de VASCONCELOS

Duygu BAZOGLU-SEZER

Ambassadeur Rachid DRISS

## List of participants / Liste des participants

Elizabeth ABELA, Adviser, Section for External Cooperation, Conflict Prevention Centre, OSCE, Vienna

Roberto ALIBONI, Director of Studies, Istituto Affari Internazionali (IAI), Rome

Antonio BADINI, Ambassador Coordinator of the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership, Director General for the Mediterranean and the Middle-East, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Rome

Duygu BAZOGLU-SEZER, Professor of International Relations, Bilkent University, Ankara

Abdelwahab BIAD, Professeur de Droit international, Professeur invité de l'Université de Rouen

Alberto BIN, Coordinator, NATO's Mediterranean dialogue, Political Affairs Division, NATO, Brussels

Stephen C. CALLEYA, Deputy Director, Lecturer in International Relations, Mediterranean Academy of Diplomatic Studies, University of Malta, Malta

May CHARTOUNI-DUBARRY, Chargée de Recherche, Département Maghreb/Moyen-Orient, Institut Français des Relations Internationales (IFRI), Paris

Jean-Pierre COURTOIS, Ambassadeur, Chargé de Mission auprès du Secrétaire Général pour le Processus euro-méditerranéen, ministère des Affaires étrangères, Paris

Paulo COUTO BARBOZA, Ambassador of the Portuguese Republic to Luxembourg, Portuguese Senior Official in the EMP, Lisbon

Jean-François DAGUZAN, Maître de Recherche, Fondation pour la Recherche Stratégique (FRS) et Fondation Méditerranéenne d'Etudes Stratégiques (FMES), Paris

Floris DE GOU, Conseiller politique, Assemblée de l'UEO, Paris

Thanos DOKOS, Director of Studies, Hellenic Foundation for European & Foreign Policy (ELIAMEP), Athens

Rachid DRISS, ex-Ambassadeur, Président, Association des Etudes internationales, Tunis

Fathy EL SHAZLY, Ambassador of Egypt to Turkey, Ankara

Nicole GNESOTTO, Directeur, Institut d'Etudes de Sécurité de l'UEO, Paris

Nicole GRIMAUD, Directeur de Recherche, Centre d'Etudes et de Recherches internationales (CERI), Fondation Nationale des Sciences politiques (FNSP), Paris

Mark HELLER, Principal Research Associate, The Jaffee Center for Strategic Studies, Tel Aviv University, Ramat Aviv

Arnaud JACOMET, Chef de la Section Affaires générales, Secrétariat Général de l'UEO, Bruxelles

George JOFFE, Geopolitics and International Boundaries Research Centre, School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS), University of London

Mohamed KADRY SAID, Military Advisor, Al-Ahram Center for Political and Strategic Studies, Cairo

Christian KUDLICH, Director, EU Council Secretariat, Brussels

Guido LENZI, DGAP, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Rome

Ian LESSER, Senior Analyst, RAND, Santa Monica, California

Julian LINDLEY-FRENCH, Research Fellow, WEU Institute for Security Studies, Paris

Peter H. LIOTTA, Professor of National Security Affairs, US Naval War College, Newport, Rhode-Island

Pedro LOPEZ-AGUIRREBENGOA, Ambassadeur en mission spéciale pour les Affaires méditerranéennes, ministère des Affaires étrangères, Madrid

Carlo MASALA, Senior Academic Researcher, Institute for Political Science and European

Affairs, University of Cologne

Antonio MISSIROLI, Research Fellow, WEU Institute for Security Studies, Paris

Gloria OGAYAR SUAREZ, Lebanese American University, Beirut Campus, Beirut

Martin ORTEGA, Research Fellow, WEU Institute for Security Studies, Paris

Francisco RAPALLO, Admiral, Commander EUROMARFOR, Cadiz

Maartje RUTTEN, Research Fellow, WEU Institute for Security Studies, Paris

Haytham SATAYHI, Head, Political Department, Center for Strategic Studies and Research,  
Damascus University

Burkard SCHMITT, Research Fellow, WEU Institute for Security Studies, Paris

Dimitrios TRIANTAPHYLLOU, Research Fellow, WEU Institute for Security Studies, Paris

Álvaro de VASCONCELOS, Director, Instituto de Estudos Estratégicos e Internacionais  
(IEEI), Lisbon, and Secretary-General of EuroMeSCo

Alexander ZAFIRIOU, Principal Administrator, European Union Council Secretariat, Brussels

## **I. Introduction: towards an enhanced Euro-Mediterranean security dialogue**

*Martin Ortega*<sup>1</sup>

This contribution seeks to identify five issues that were discussed during the seminar, and to present some concrete proposals towards the establishment of a new security and military dimension within the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership (EMP). The five topics are: (1) the rationale for EMP's new security dimension; (2) how to include security-related measures in the Euro-Mediterranean Charter for Peace and Stability; (3) specific topics for a Euro-Mediterranean security dialogue; (4) coordination with NATO's Mediterranean dialogue; and (5) the different national positions *vis-à-vis* a new EMP security dimension. This first contribution is based on a discussion paper submitted to the seminar.

### ***1.1 The rationale for the EMP's new security dimension***

Up to now, the security aspects of the EMP's political and security chapter have not been sufficiently developed, arguably for three main reasons. Firstly, since 1991 the EU has been a civilian power that is giving birth to a common foreign policy but is devoid of any real common security and defence policy. At the time of planning the Barcelona conference, and later, the EU could not offer its Mediterranean partners a substantive dialogue on security issues, including a military dialogue. Secondly, EMP has no military dimension because the Mediterranean partners' armed forces are rather reluctant to engage in multilateral military cooperation. Thirdly, and perhaps even more importantly, international disputes in the Mediterranean region hamper steady advance in a Euro-Mediterranean security dialogue. This applies particularly to the Middle East Peace Process, even though this and other disputes do not impede bilateral north-south and south-south military cooperation, nor the multilateral dialogues proposed by NATO and WEU.

In spite of these major difficulties, there are five reasons that justify attributing a new kind of security dimension to the EMP. The first reason is the Barcelona declaration's global approach to the Euro-Mediterranean relationship, whereby the partnership applies to a broad range of themes, not only economic but also political and security, as well as social, cultural and human questions. It does not make sense to leave the security dimension out of this all-encompassing approach. Secondly, the role of the military in the political systems of many Mediterranean partner countries makes it advisable to enhance the present political and security dialogue, and include a military dimension. An initial and limited military dialogue would not immediately transform the overall nature of the current political dialogue, but it would surely give a more realistic basis to the EMP.

Thirdly, on a more practical footing, the drafting of a Charter for Peace and Stability, announced in the conclusions of the Stuttgart Conference of April 1999, will provide a more advanced framework for pragmatic cooperation. If the Charter's final purpose is to establish a common area of peace, stability and prosperity through a reinforcement of political dialogue, security and military matters cannot be neglected.

Fourthly, at the Cologne European Council of June 1999 the EU decided to establish a common security and defence policy (CSDP) to supplement its CFSP, and more specifically to

---

<sup>1</sup> Research Fellow, WEU Institute for Security Studies, Paris. The views expressed here are personal, and do not represent the position of any organization.

acquire new capabilities for crisis prevention and crisis management. This process was continued at the Helsinki EU Council of 10 December 1999, and will probably be finalised at the end of 2000. The EU's new military scope makes it easier to confer a new military dimension on the various fields covered by CFSP, including the Barcelona Process. This is relevant to EU members, but CSDP may also be of interest to EU's Mediterranean partners for a number of reasons, which equally justifies gradually including some defence and military aspects in the EMP and in the Charter.

Finally, another obvious reason is the new, more positive political atmosphere surrounding some of the traditional disputes in the region. One can never take for granted political developments in the Mediterranean, but there are intense negotiations in various tracks of the Arab-Israeli conflict, a better understanding has developed in Greek-Turkish relationships, Libya is gradually returning to international society, and the situation in the Maghreb also seems propitious. Although there is no direct link between any particular dispute and the multilateral EMP process, a better political environment in the region will undoubtedly make for an enhanced political and security dialogue.

### ***1.2 How to include security-related measures in the Euro-Mediterranean Charter for Peace and Stability***

The stated objective of the Charter is to promote peace and stability in the region, or "to prevent tensions and crises and to maintain peace and stability by means of cooperative security", as the Stuttgart conclusions put it. The Guidelines for elaborating a Euro-Mediterranean Charter, agreed as an informal working document at Stuttgart, foresee an enhanced political dialogue whose purpose would be to prevent tensions and crises, and to maintain peace and stability by means of comprehensive and cooperative security. In the Guidelines, a generic scheme of objectives and means is drawn up, and the accent is clearly put on partnership-building, and on partnership-building measures (PBMs). The Stuttgart Guidelines define first the Charter's principles, scope, and objectives, and then the means and mechanisms to attain those objectives. Five categories of means and mechanisms are set forth: (a) enhanced political dialogue, (b) partnership-building measures (which may be understood as a list of concrete measures but also as the general inspiration of all the means and mechanisms), (c) measures to improve good-neighbourly relations and regional cooperation, (d) preventive diplomacy, crisis management and post-conflict rehabilitation,<sup>2</sup> and (e) joint action modalities.<sup>3</sup>

As far as military dialogue is concerned, in principle, there are two practical ways of incorporating it in the Charter's framework. Either military partnership-building measures are included in existing categories of means and mechanisms defined in the Guidelines (for instance, under the heading of preventive diplomacy and crisis-management, or else within the list of general PBMs), or a new specific category is set up. This category may be called "security partnership-building measures", or even "military partnership-building measures".

In any event, implementation of the Charter will undoubtedly depend on political circumstances. Within the framework of the Charter, the definition, planning and execution of concrete measures that are suitable for all the EMP partners will be a complex task. Informal contacts ought to pave the way to more specific negotiations. Concrete measures should be

---

<sup>2</sup> This last category 'to be developed on a strictly voluntary and consensual basis in the framework of the EMP without interference with other institutions and bilateral efforts'.

<sup>3</sup> This category 'to be developed at a later stage'.

feasible and have a manifest added value for Mediterranean partners. These measures should be conceived and approved of, at least in their general lines, by the Senior Officials of the Barcelona Process. Adequate financial and human resources should be allocated to coordinate those measures. The EU Council Secretariat might be in charge of the coordination of concrete PBMs (even in the field of military dialogue). Another possibility would be to establish a specific office, with some degree of independence, to coordinate these kinds of measures, although this possibility is dependent on the wider decision on whether and to what extent the EMP should be institutionalised.

### ***1.3 Specific topics for a security partnership***

Following the Charter's adoption, a number of specific measures might be envisaged and realised. There are many proposals on the table: in particular, the recent report by the EuroMeSCo Working Group on the Charter<sup>4</sup> contains an array of interesting ideas that could be adapted and carried out in the future, if the necessary political will exists. For the sake of this discussion, possible concrete measures will be organised on *three levels*: security PBMs, non-institutionalised cooperation, and institutionalised cooperation.

As for the *first level*, the Presidency conclusions of the Palermo meeting in June 1998 foresaw the development of partnership-building measures not only in the political and security chapter but also in the other two chapters. The Stuttgart conclusions confirmed the notion, later conceptualised from the academic point of view by Roberto Aliboni.<sup>5</sup> The Charter should now give birth to tangible *security PBMs*. Instead of putting forward more ambitious measures, like the establishment of Mediterranean CSBMs or other types of institutionalised cooperation in the security field, the first objective should be to promote dialogue and mutual knowledge among the politico-military authorities and among the respective armed forces. The EMP should therefore include a number of security (and military) partnership- and transparency-building measures which will allow a better understanding between authorities who belong to different political and military traditions. A good example is seminars and other kinds of academic activities and visits, which are currently carried out within NATO's and WEU's Mediterranean dialogues. Another instance is the interesting transparency-building experience of EUROMARFOR, described below by its present Commander.<sup>6</sup> Also, the various bilateral measures taken in the Egyptian-Israeli relationship, analysed by Mohammed Kadry Said,<sup>7</sup> are a source of inspiration for multilateral concrete initiatives.

The following are some ideas for developing *security PBMs* in the EMP:

- seminars and academic meetings;
- information seminars and sessions, specifically focused on security and defence issues, either in European or in Mediterranean capitals;

---

<sup>4</sup> See Roberto Aliboni, *Building blocks for the Euro-Med Charter on Peace and Stability*, EuroMeSCo Papers N. 7, January 2000.

<sup>5</sup> See Roberto Aliboni, *Ibidem*, section 2.1. See also Claire Spencer, 'Partnership-building in the Mediterranean', *The International Spectator*, October-December 1999.

<sup>6</sup> See contribution by Admiral Francisco Rapallo, 'EUROMARFOR and security cooperation in the Mediterranean', below.

<sup>7</sup> Dr. Mohammed Kadry Said, 'Confidence-Building Measures: A Practical Approach', contribution to the EuroMeSCo Working Group on the Charter, October 1999 (mimeo).



- a Euro-Mediterranean network of institutes of defence studies;
- visits, fellowships, and other personal exchanges;
- observation of military exercises;
- informal and working meetings of governmental experts (diplomats, other officials, and military officers) in military issues;
- exchange of basic information (documents, procedures, doctrines) on military assistance to the civil authorities, military role in civil emergencies, civil-military relationships, participation in peacekeeping operations, land de-mining, etc.<sup>8</sup>

A *second level* of concrete measures could be termed *non-institutionalized cooperation*. Once a better mutual knowledge amongst Euro-Mediterranean politico-military and military authorities has been achieved, new measures in the fields of confidence-building, security, and military cooperation could be planned and realised, without establishing new institutional structures. The EMP's Project for the creation of a Euro-Mediterranean System for Natural and Man-Made Disasters Prevention, Reduction, and Management<sup>9</sup> is a very interesting precedent, whose format could be reproduced in other areas. Other ideas that could be included in this category are:

- planning and holding of joint military exercises;<sup>10</sup>
- sporadic cooperation of Euro-Mediterranean armed forces for specific peacekeeping operations;<sup>11</sup>
- maritime cooperation between northern and southern Mediterranean states for tackling refugee and migrant issues at sea;<sup>12</sup>
- Euro-Mediterranean cooperation for land-demining.

A *third level* could be designated *institutionalised cooperation*, and in principle will only be attained at a later stage. If the Charter succeeds in launching a more profound political dialogue, other kinds of measures in the security field could be envisaged in the future, such as traditional CSBMs, institutionalised multilateral cooperation in security matters, establishment of Euro-Mediterranean multinational forces, etc. Other proposals elaborated within the EuroMeSCo working group on the Charter are: Euro-Mediterranean conflict prevention centre, a communication network among EMP partners, standing liaison with the Euroforces (or other multinational forces answerable to the EU, like Eurocorps, it might be added), etc.

---

<sup>8</sup> See also Fred Tanner, 'Joint Actions for Peace-Building in the Mediterranean', *The International Spectator*, October-December 1999.

<sup>9</sup> Visit [www.euromed.net/political-security/DISASTERMGMT/Disaster\\_en.htm](http://www.euromed.net/political-security/DISASTERMGMT/Disaster_en.htm). for basic information on this Project.

<sup>10</sup> See contribution by Mohammed Kadry Said, 'How Egypt "thinks Mediterranean"? Joint military exercises and regional security cooperation', below.

<sup>11</sup> Carlos Echeverria, *Cooperation in Peacekeeping among the Euro-Mediterranean Armed Forces*, Chaillot Paper N. 35, WEU Institute for Security Studies, Paris, 1999.

<sup>12</sup> Michael Pugh, 'Maritime Peace Support Operations in the Mediterranean', *Mediterranean Politics*, Winter 1997, pp. 1-19. The WEU-ISS will publish a *Chaillot Paper* by Michael Pugh on maritime cooperation in the western Mediterranean (forthcoming, April-May 2000).

#### ***1.4 Relationships between the EMP and NATO's Mediterranean dialogue: what prospects?***

EU's acquisition of WEU's functions and of a military capacity to carry out so-called 'Petersberg operations' will supplement any aspect of the EU's CFSP, including the EMP. WEU's Mediterranean Group has started to discuss how the *acquis* of WEU's Mediterranean dialogue could be used for the benefit of the Barcelona Process's security dimension in the future. Also, under the Italian Presidency of WEU a seminar on WEU's role in the Mediterranean and the EMP was organised in Genoa in December 1998. Nevertheless, a prospective EMP's military dimension is dependent on the establishment of EU's new security and defence policy which is to be defined following the Cologne and Helsinki EU summits. In doing so, the EU will surely act in accordance with NATO's new Strategic Concept of April 1999, since NATO is the main organisation for both defensive and crisis-management purposes in Europe.

The future EMP's political, security (and military) dialogue will have to be coordinated with NATO's Mediterranean dialogue, and the proper synergies between them will have to be established. So far, the basic objective of NATO's and WEU's Mediterranean initiatives has been to increase mutual knowledge and transparency between the respective organisations and their partners, and for that reason those initiatives share EMP's general approach, that of cooperative security, made explicit in the Stuttgart Guidelines. NATO's and WEU's multilateral dialogues have a political dimension and a practical dimension. The political component consists of periodic meetings with representatives from partner countries who express their points of view on security issues and to whom the latest evolutions of the respective organisations are explained. Visits, seminars, and observation of some military exercises are the types of measures that make up the practical dimension.

The following proposition was submitted to the seminar: NATO's Mediterranean dialogue and the future security and military dimension of the EMP are compatible and mutually reinforcing. On the one hand, the EU and NATO will have complementary roles in the European security architecture. It should be emphasized that the EU's military dimension will be confined to its common security and defence policy, that is to say, in the field of conflict prevention, conflict management, and Petersberg operations. For its part, according to its new Strategic Concept, NATO is the main organisation dealing with security and defence in Europe, for which reason it is only logical that the Alliance continues the dialogue with its Mediterranean partners about such broad issues. NATO's Mediterranean dialogue is an integral part of the Alliance's cooperative approach to international security, and is meaningful for both allies and partner countries. On the other hand, transparency, information, and partnership in security and defence matters are so badly needed in the Mediterranean that the EU's and NATO's efforts will continue to be necessary in the foreseeable future. Therefore, both EMP's future military dimension and NATO's Mediterranean dialogue are compatible and should be designed consequently. Concrete activities of both dialogues will contribute to a better mutual knowledge and a further *rapprochement* of EU and NATO, on the one side, and their Mediterranean partners on the other.

It seems obvious, however, that the detailed coordination of both dialogues is dependent on the wider relationship between the EU and NATO that will be created as a result of the construction of a common European security and defence policy. Three alternatives could nevertheless be advanced. First, EMP's security dimension and NATO's Mediterranean dialogue may continue to be parallel endeavours. Second, a better coordination between these two dialogues might be explored. The third alternative would be to find areas of common activity; for instance, all NATO members could be associated with some activities of EMP's security dialogue, and the EU could also be associated with NATO's Mediterranean dialogue.

### *1.5 Questions raised by the different institutional memberships*

EMP's membership and that of the NATO, OSCE, and WEU Mediterranean initiatives differ somewhat, which makes their coordination more complicated. Perhaps it is useful to recall the different memberships:

- *EU's partners in the EMP:* Algeria, Cyprus, Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Lebanon, Malta, Morocco, Palestinian Authority, Syria, Tunisia, and Turkey;
- *WEU's Mediterranean partners:* Algeria, Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Mauritania, Morocco, and Tunisia;
- *NATO's Mediterranean partners:* Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Mauritania, Morocco, and Tunisia;
- *OSCE's Mediterranean partners for cooperation:* Algeria, Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Morocco, and Tunisia.

The different memberships of the EMP and of WEU's Mediterranean dialogue require particular attention, because these two dialogues tend to merge. Following the Helsinki summit, Turkey is a candidate for joining the EU in the long term, and is a member of NATO and Associate Member of WEU. Cyprus and Malta are also candidates for EU membership but do not partake in multilateral security dialogues. On the other hand, Syria and Lebanon are two EMP partners which do not take part in other multilateral military dialogues, and are not apparently ready to start a new experiment within the EMP framework until they have satisfactorily settled their differences with Israel. These two Mediterranean partners (and Libya when it becomes a partner in the Barcelona process) may have serious difficulties in engaging themselves in the new security and military dimension of EMP, at least at the outset. For its part, Mauritania is present in NATO's and WEU's Mediterranean dialogues, but is not a member of the EMP. The final status of the Palestinian Authority has to be established before it can participate in security dialogues.

There are several ways of overcoming the membership hurdle. One way of surmounting this difficulty will be to start the proposed dialogue by taking modest steps. The list of concrete security PBMs suggested above contains a number of activities whose realisation seems to be neither particularly troublesome nor politically controversial. Another way is to allow a system for opting-out from concrete activities during at least a transitional period. The partners in the Barcelona Process that have accepted the Charter and the new security dimension will not be obliged to attend all the activities in the security field for some time. Finally, another way would be to permit subregional projects within the EMP and the Charter.

## **II. OSCE's Mediterranean activities**

*Elizabeth Abela*<sup>1</sup>

This contribution explains the main mechanisms characterising the relationship between the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) and the Mediterranean Partners for Co-operation (MPCs), prior to focusing on potential future developments.

Major OSCE meetings such as Summits and Ministerial Council meetings have paved the way for a deepening of relations between the OSCE and the MPCs. In the Istanbul Summit Declaration of November 1999, the linkage between security in Europe and the Mediterranean was underscored once more. Heads of State or Government stated: “In light of our relationship with our Mediterranean Partners, Algeria, Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Morocco and Tunisia, we reaffirm that strengthening security and co-operation in the Mediterranean area is of major importance to the stability in the OSCE area. We therefore intend to enhance our dialogue and joint activities with them”.

The OSCE-MPC dialogue is long-standing and goes back to the beginning of the Helsinki process. The interdependence between security in Europe and in the Mediterranean region has been emphasized time and again in CSCE/OSCE documents, and in seminars and meetings, which have addressed the Mediterranean dimension. The relationship between the OSCE and the Mediterranean Partners, often referred to as the Mediterranean dimension of security, is largely based on major OSCE documents, such as the Helsinki Final Act 1975, the Helsinki Document 1992, the Budapest Document 1994, and most recently, the Charter on European Security, adopted in November 1999.

### ***II.1 From the beginning***

In the chapter on “Questions relating to security and co-operation in the Mediterranean” included in the Helsinki Final Act (1975)<sup>2</sup>, the participating States stated their conviction that: “security in Europe is to be considered in the broader context of world security and is closely linked with security in the Mediterranean as a whole, and that accordingly the process of improving security should not be confined to Europe but should extend to other parts of the world, and in particular to the Mediterranean area”.

Further, they noted the interest expressed by the non-participating Mediterranean States in the Conference since its inception, and duly took their contributions into account, and declared their intention to promote the development of good-neighbourly relations with the non-participating Mediterranean States. They sought to increase mutual confidence so as to promote security and stability in the Mediterranean area as a whole. The participating States also declared

---

<sup>1</sup> Adviser, Conflict Prevention Centre, OSCE Secretariat, Vienna. The views expressed in this paper are solely of the author and do not necessarily reflect those of the OSCE or its participating States.

<sup>2</sup> During the meetings of the second stage of the Conference (1975), contributions were received and statements heard from the following non-participating Mediterranean States on various items: the Democratic and Popular Republic of Algeria, the Arab Republic of Egypt, Israel, the Kingdom of Morocco, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia.

their intention to encourage with the non-participating Mediterranean States the development of mutually beneficial co-operation in the various fields of economic activity.<sup>3</sup>

## ***II.2 Framework for cooperation***

The chapter on the Mediterranean in the Helsinki Final Act was an expression of the political will of the participating States and the Non-Participating Mediterranean States (NPMS) as they were referred to in the past<sup>4</sup>, to co-operate in a number of fields. At present, the OSCE maintains relations with six Mediterranean Partners for Co-operation: Algeria, Egypt, Israel, Morocco, and Tunisia, and since May 1998, with Jordan.

In future, other states may desire to join as partners for co-operation. In such cases, the Chairman-in-Office circulates the written request of the state interested in becoming a partner for co-operation among all participating States of the OSCE, and carries out consultations on the subject. A decision on welcoming the new partner for co-operation is then adopted at the Permanent Council, by consensus, as with all decisions. This was the case when Jordan became an MPC upon the adoption of a decision in May 1998.

The main mechanisms for co-operation with the Mediterranean Partners are based on a number of OSCE documents and decisions. Among the most central was the decision adopted at the 25<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Committee of Senior Officials in March 1994 in Prague, stating that the MPCs will be invited to participate in Ministerial Council meetings, Review Conferences, regular meetings with the Troika and, on a case-by-case basis, to seminars and other ad hoc meetings in which they had a special interest. Mediterranean States were given access to all CSCE official documents and the right to submit views to the Chairman-in-Office. The MPCs attend the Summit meetings of the OSCE.

A significant further step in the OSCE-MPC relationship took place upon the adoption of a Budapest Summit decision on the Mediterranean in December 1994. This included the establishment of “an informal, open-ended contact group, at the level of experts within the framework of the Permanent Council”, the holding of annual Mediterranean Seminars<sup>5</sup>, and high-level consultations between the OSCE represented by the Troika and the Secretary General, and the MPCs. At the Budapest Summit, it was also stated that, in order to consider proposals that originate in the contact group, seminars and high-level consultations, the Chairman-in-Office will invite during the course of the year representatives of these MPCs, as appropriate, to any meetings of the Permanent Council solely devoted to “Mediterranean Issues”. The Chairman of

---

<sup>3</sup> In the follow-up meetings after Helsinki, the Mediterranean States were invited to make written and oral contributions. A number of meetings were also held on issues related to the Mediterranean between 1979 and 1993, largely on economic, environmental, scientific and cultural issues, in addition to practical ways of co-operation between the Mediterranean States and the CSCE.

<sup>4</sup> The nomenclature was changed to Mediterranean Partners for Co-operation by a 1995 Permanent Council decision.

<sup>5</sup> The Seminars are usually attended by high-level representatives from participating States, the Mediterranean Partners for Co-operation, international organizations, parliamentarians, academics and NGOs, thus leading to a cross-fertilization of ideas and recommendations. The following seminars have taken place:

- “The OSCE Experience in the Field of Confidence-Building”, September 1995, Cairo;
- “The OSCE as a Platform for Dialogue and the Fostering of Norms of Behaviour”, June 1996, Tel Aviv;
- “The Security Model for the Twenty-first Century: Implications for the Mediterranean Basin“, September 1997, Cairo;
- “The Human Dimension of Security, Promoting Democracy and the Rule of Law”, October 1998, Malta, and
- “Implementation of Human Dimension Commitments”, 6-7 December 1999 in Amman, Jordan.

The consolidated Summaries of all seminars are available from the OSCE web-site: [www.osce.org](http://www.osce.org).

the Forum for Security Co-operation, with the consensus of the participating States, may also invite representatives of these non-participating States to meetings devoted to “Mediterranean Issues”. The need to revive such meetings has been invoked on a number of occasions.

### ***II.3 Mediterranean Contact Group meetings and seminars***

The meetings of the Contact Group, which have convened since 1995, and Seminars have generated a number of proposals and ideas on enhancing the OSCE-MPC dialogue and on rendering it more operational. The deliberations of the Contact Group provide the opportunity for participating States and the six MPCs to maintain dialogue by gathering around the same table, to discuss and exchange ideas on a number of issues pertinent to both sides of the Mediterranean. During such meetings, a number of States, including the MPCs are frequently represented at ambassadorial level. To a large extent, in 1999, the Contact Group deliberations focused on briefings and discussions on the Charter for European Security.

It seems to be emerging, both among several participating States and the MPCs, that there is need for closer co-ordination and co-operation with the OSCE’s main deliberations and institutions. At the Review Conference last September 1999, prior to the Summit, several participating States called for the enhancement of the Contact Group meetings, by inserting on its agenda the follow-up of proposals made during OSCE Mediterranean Seminars, including taking advantage of the 1994 Budapest Summit decision on the Mediterranean. A number of these proposals found their way into the Charter.

A number of these recommendations pertain to confidence-building measures (CBMs) to be promoted in the OSCE-MPC relationship, such as the holding of thematic round tables, including the participation of NGOs and experts. Specific ideas have been offered on holding meetings in the human dimension that could be promoted by OSCE institutions, participating States and the Mediterranean Partners. Furthermore, proposals to set up a Conflict Prevention Centre for the region have been made on various occasions by some of the MPC representatives. Such proposals may, in future, find their way onto the agenda of the Contact Group for further discussion, thus perhaps leading to the elaboration of some of them.

Seminars also provide for a substantial part of the ongoing Mediterranean dialogue by focusing on specific issues. While generating impetus into the dialogue, the OSCE Mediterranean Seminars provide the opportunity to devote time to exchanging views and re-capitulating ideas and suggestions made, as well as contribute to further developments in the OSCE-MPCs relationship.

At the beginning of December 1999, the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, as the newest partner, in co-operation with the OSCE Secretariat, hosted the most recent OSCE Mediterranean Seminar. The Seminar, entitled Implementation of Human Dimension Commitments, in Amman, carried forward work started at last year’s Seminar held in Malta on the Human Dimension of Security, Promoting Democracy and the Rule of Law. The Seminar was attended by all six Mediterranean Partners - Algeria, Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Morocco and Tunisia – which made substantial contributions. Upon the request of the Chairman of the Contact Group, a list of recommendations made at the seminar was drawn up by the Secretariat for further consideration.

Following the wish expressed by representatives of the MPCs, in May 2000, the OSCE Secretariat will organize a workshop for experts from of all six Mediterranean Partners on OSCE tools, instruments and mechanisms, during which meetings and discussions with officials from the OSCE institutions will take place. Discussions will take place, inter alia, on the role of the

Conflict Prevention Centre of the OSCE Secretariat, the functions of the missions and field activities, the schedule of the Forum for Security Co-operation for the year 2000 and its work as the decision-making body governing the implementation of confidence- and security-building measures.

As part of the OSCE-MPC relationship, candidates from the Mediterranean Partners are welcome to apply for participation in the “Researchers in Residence Programme” designed to give researchers working on OSCE or OSCE-related topics the opportunity of carrying out research in the OSCE archives in Prague. OSCE internships (usually for graduate students and young diplomats) are also open for candidates from the MPCs.

#### ***II.4 Other meetings***

The Mediterranean Partners for Co-operation are invited to attend relevant meetings in all the three dimensions of the OSCE, i.e. the politico-military, the economic, and the human dimensions. They were invited to the Follow-up Conference on the Code of Conduct on Politico-Military Aspects of Security in September 1997 and June 1999, and to the Seminar on Defence Policies and Military Doctrines, in January 1998. In addition, in the past two years, they have been invited to the opening and closing sessions of the Annual Implementation Assessment Meetings, which convened to assess the implementation of the Vienna Document 1994, now superseded by the Vienna Document 1999, which, *inter alia*, includes a section on regional issues. It obliges States to show transparency and predictability in their military activities by setting out parameters for the Annual Exchange of Military Information, Information on Plans for Deployment of Major Weapon and Equipment Systems and Exchange of Information on Defence Planning, and information on military activities.

The MPCs attend the annual meetings of the Economic Forum held in Prague, which reviews the implementation of commitments undertaken in Economic Dimension. They participate in the Human Dimension Implementation Meetings and the Supplementary Human Dimension Meetings. Parliamentarians of the MPCs are also invited to a number of events organized by the Parliamentary Assembly of the OSCE, such as the Annual Sessions and other meetings.

#### ***II.5 OSCE activities in the field***

The OSCE has a broad mandate to fulfil in view of its co-operative and comprehensive approach to security, and the increasing number of missions and field activities that it has deployed over the last few years. To date, the OSCE has more than twenty missions and field activities in countries from South Eastern Europe, to the Caucasus and Central Asia. The missions and field activities carry out their functions in all phases of the conflict cycle: from early warning and conflict prevention, to crisis management and post-conflict rehabilitation. OSCE's institutions, apart from the Secretariat, include the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR), the High Commissioner on National Minorities (HCNM), and the Representative on Freedom of the Media (RFOM). All play an important role in the promotion of democratic institution building, rule of law and human rights. The input of the OSCE's institutions in the work of these missions is of major significance. To achieve its goals, the OSCE has been

developed to maintain a co-operative and transparent approach based on the indivisibility of security in its area.

A promising field of OSCE's Mediterranean dialogue pertains to its operational work. In June 1998, the Permanent Council adopted a decision providing for representatives of the MPCs, to make short-term visits to the OSCE Missions, and to include observers sent by partners in OSCE/ODIHR election monitoring or supervision operations. The OSCE Secretariat and ODIHR respectively drew up modalities for the participation of the MPCs. All but one of the MPCs participated in a workshop in Sarajevo in May 1999 organized by the OSCE Mission to Bosnia and Herzegovina. Some of the MPCs have also participated in election monitoring activities organized by ODIHR. Perhaps in future, the OSCE will draw on specific expertise that can be provided by the MPCs for some of its field missions. Proposals in this regard have already been made.

## ***II.6 Charter for European Security***

From the beginning of the discussions on a Security Model for the Twenty-first Century mandated by a 1994 Budapest Summit decision, the Mediterranean Partners expressed their interest in participating in those discussions. They had the opportunity to follow and comment on the Security Model in seminars and meetings of the Contact Group. In 1999, the Mediterranean partners were invited twice to participate in the relevant discussions of the Security Model Committee pertaining to the Mediterranean region. In the same year, some of the Partners submitted their proposals in writing, while others expressed their views orally in order to be considered for the relevant part of the Charter.

The section on "Our Partners for Co-operation" in the Charter for European Security recognizes the interdependence between the security of the OSCE area and that of the Partners for Co-operation, as well as the commitment to the relationship and dialogue with the Mediterranean Partners. This section states that those recommendations emerging from the Contact Group and the Mediterranean seminars are to be examined. Furthermore, the Charter for European Security makes reference to drawing on relations developed so far, and more specifically it states that "the potential of the Contact Group and the Mediterranean Seminars must be fully explored and exploited". In the Charter, Heads of State or Government, further declared that "we will encourage the MPCs to draw on our expertise in setting up structures and mechanisms in the Mediterranean for early warning, preventive diplomacy and conflict prevention".

## ***II.7 Concluding remarks***

As in all dialogues, the enhancement of the OSCE-MPC relationship will depend on both OSCE participating States and the MPCs. One of the proposals made in the 1999 Seminar in Amman speaks of the need to render the OSCE-MPC relationship more systematic rather than basing it on sporadic events. The elaboration of proposals made by both the Mediterranean partners and the participating States could lead to this end. Moreover, a stronger linkage between the Contact Group and the other OSCE bodies and institutions would further consolidate the dialogue.

With regard to the relations with other institutions, the OSCE is kept informed on issues pertaining to the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership, of which the main elements, it is interesting to



note, are based on the Helsinki Final Act. The Contact Group meetings are regularly informed on the work being carried out in the Barcelona Process, usually by a representative of the Presidency of EU, especially with regard to major Ministerial meetings. The importance of avoiding overlap between the OSCE and the EU is often underscored. The OSCE invites representatives of other European organizations to the Mediterranean Seminars, and has welcomed contributions to its discussions by representatives of other international organizations, including from the EU/Barcelona Process, WEU and NATO.

The MPCs generally react to the OSCE individually. They do not usually speak as a group though they have done so occasionally as for example prior to the 1994 Budapest Summit when all the Partners advocated closer relations with the OSCE. It remains to be seen when and at what speed the MPCs will respond, as a region, to the OSCE. One could argue that in view of the political process underway in the entire Middle East peace process, prospects of progress in OSCE-Mediterranean relations might have become more realistic.

Over the last twenty-five years, the OSCE, built on a community of shared values and commitments, has created a set of tools, instruments and mechanisms to increase its effectiveness in countering risks and challenges to security within its region. It plays a central role within the human dimension and conflict prevention, and it is precisely with regard to such issues that the OSCE may play a role in offering its comparative advantage and expertise for the establishment of similar structures and mechanisms as required for the Mediterranean region.

### **III. NATO's Mediterranean dialogue**

*Alberto Bin*<sup>1</sup>

#### ***III.1 Introduction***

Over time, the concept of security has increasingly been given a broader meaning than merely the absence of military aggression. Although the bottom line of security continues to be survival, it also includes a substantial range of concerns other than military ones. Indeed, today there seems to be a broad consensus on the need for a comprehensive vision of security. In fact, many of the security-related concerns that have come to the fore in the Mediterranean after the end of the Cold War are non-military issues that may interact with more traditional security risks.

In this regard, NATO's Strategic Concept, approved by the Alliance's Heads of State and Government at the Washington Summit in April 1999, reflects the Alliance's commitment to a broad approach to security, which recognizes the importance of political, economic, social, environmental and cultural factors in addition to the indispensable defence dimension.

This applies especially to the Mediterranean, a region which is currently facing a multitude of problems and challenges. They include socio-economic disparities, migration, conflicts and arms proliferation. The nature of the issues which characterize the Mediterranean security environment is by no means exclusive to the region. The specific geo-political and socio-cultural context, however, give the Mediterranean a particularly complex security identity.

The multidimensional character of the regional security environment accounts in large part for the growing interest in the Mediterranean on the part of individual nations, international organizations, and non-governmental bodies. Indeed, many intra- and inter- regional cooperative undertakings have seen the light of the day since the collapse of the Berlin Wall. They include the EU's Barcelona Process, the Middle East Peace Process, and the Mediterranean initiatives of the WEU, OSCE, and NATO. The long-term objective common to all the cooperation schemas is creating a climate for peaceful and mutually rewarding relations in the Mediterranean.

As the prevailing problems of the region are mainly of a socio-economic nature, it is only logical that in promoting cooperative relations across the Mediterranean the EU takes the lead. Yet it is equally clear that the EU alone could not cope with the breadth and diversity of that region. Moreover the EU alone does not represent the views of all nations that play a major role in the Mediterranean.

It is thus only logical that the evolution of the Mediterranean as a stable and prosperous region requires the involvement of other actors. NATO is one such actor. Its Mediterranean Dialogue, launched in 1994, is a component of the broad framework of regional cooperation and is meant to complement other international efforts, most notably the EU's Barcelona Process.

In this regard, it would be useful to start a reflection on how to achieve better coordination of existing cooperation initiatives - while respecting their specific characteristics - in such a way as to exploit to the full their complementary nature.

---

<sup>1</sup> Coordinator, NATO Mediterranean Dialogue, Political Affairs Division, NATO Headquarters, Brussels. The opinions expressed in this paper reflect only the author's views and not necessarily those of NATO or its member states.

### ***III.2 The central role of partnership, dialogue and cooperation in NATO's Strategic Concept***

The comprehensive approach to security embedded in NATO's new Strategic Concept forms the basis on which the Alliance will accomplish its fundamental security tasks and develop effective cooperation with other international organizations. The collective aim is to build a security architecture in which the Alliance's contribution to the security and stability of the Euro-Atlantic area and the contribution of these other international organizations are complementary and mutually reinforcing, both in deepening relations among the countries involved and in managing crises.

The Alliance's contribution to the emerging security architecture is centered around six fundamental tasks: the preservation of the transatlantic link; the maintenance of effective military capabilities sufficient for deterrence and defence and to fulfil the full range of its mission; the development of the European Security and Defence Identity within the Alliance; an overall capability to manage crises successfully; its continued openness to new members; and the continued pursuit of partnership, dialogue and cooperation with other nations

Indeed, the Strategic Concept has made partnership a fundamental security task. This central role of partnership is a reflection of an evolving reality: complex security environment requires cooperative approaches. NATO has acted in line with this logic since the end of the Cold War. The Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council, the Partnership for Peace programme, the Permanent Joint Council with Russia, the NATO-Ukraine Commission and the Mediterranean Dialogue are among the tools now available for use by Allied and partners countries.

### ***III.3 NATO's Mediterranean dialogue: the Alliance's contribution to regional security cooperation***

Since the end of the Second World War, and the emergence of the bloc-to-bloc confrontation thereafter, security in the Mediterranean region was too often perceived as an extension of the East-West stand-off that divided the European continent. This region was seen as a perimeter to the Atlantic Alliance, a fact reflected by the Mediterranean being portrayed as NATO's "Southern Flank".

In recent years, a fundamental transformation in the Mediterranean security environment has occurred. The end of the Cold War and progress – albeit slow and uneven – in the Middle East Peace Process have provided an auspicious environment for the promotion of new relations in the Mediterranean region. As a result, the Mediterranean has finally come to be regarded as a security region on its own merit, to be approached without intellectual, ideological or cultural barriers.

Today, NATO looks to the Mediterranean as a region with its own specific dynamics and challenges, and with a still largely untapped potential for dialogue and cooperation in security matters. The Alliance's Mediterranean Dialogue with six non-NATO Mediterranean countries -- Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Mauritania, Morocco and Tunisia -- is not a reaction to any particular event or threat but rather is part of NATO's overall cooperative approach to security. It stems from the realization that security in the whole of Europe is linked to the security and stability in the Mediterranean.

The objective of the Mediterranean Dialogue is primarily political: to increase understanding of NATO's policies and activities and get a better appreciation of the security interests and perceptions of the countries involved. Political consultations between NATO and its

Mediterranean partners are held on a regular basis. These are complemented by information sessions and briefings on NATO's current agenda.

In addition to its political goals, the Mediterranean Dialogue also seeks to foster practical cooperation. The primary vehicle for this is an annual work programme between NATO and the Mediterranean Dialogue countries. The Work Programme for 2000 includes activities in the field of information, civil emergency planning, crisis management, science, education, as well as military activities. Furthermore, some Dialogue partners participate in the NATO-led IFOR/SFOR in Bosnia-Herzegovina and KFOR in Kosovo.

At the Washington Summit in April 1999, the Alliance's Heads of State and Government decided to enhance both the political and practical dimensions of the Dialogue. Enhancements include increasing the frequency of political discussions between representatives from NATO and Mediterranean Dialogue countries, as well as offering additional opportunities for meetings, conferences and seminars. In this connection, it is worth noting that Egypt has kindly offered to host the next ad hoc Mediterranean Dialogue Seminar at Ambassadorial level. Previous seminars were held in Italy and Spain. The event will therefore be the first of this kind to be hosted and organized by a Mediterranean Dialogue country.

Allies also decided to strengthen the practical dimension of the Dialogue by including additional activities in areas where NATO can add value, and where Dialogue countries have expressed interest.

#### ***III.4 The way ahead***

The Washington Summit has further demonstrated that the Mediterranean Dialogue has the potential to evolve. There is room for expansion of both participation and content. In this regard, NATO's contribution should be to continue to strengthen the Mediterranean Dialogue by concentrating on fields where it has a clear comparative advantage. This will complement the initiatives of other organizations and contribute to constructive relations with NATO's Mediterranean neighbours.

Over the course of the past few years, NATO's Mediterranean Dialogue has demonstrated a solid basis for developing additional cooperation in a variety of fields. Today, more than ever, NATO looks forward to working together with Mediterranean Dialogue nations in order to build the trust and transparency required of a true partnership.

## IV. Le dialogue méditerranéen de l'UEO

*Arnaud Jacomet*<sup>1</sup>

Un sous-groupe d'experts sur la Méditerranée a été créé par une décision ministérielle en novembre 1986 et mis en place en juillet 1987 pour analyser les questions de sécurité méditerranéenne. Il s'est appuyé dans ses travaux sur les études de l'Institut de l'UEO et sur des contributions nationales. Ce groupe a défini une liste de principes susceptibles de contribuer à la solution des questions de sécurité en Méditerranée.

A Bonn, en juin 1992, les ministres ont approuvé la liste commentée de ces sept principes (dialogue, transparence, confiance, prévention des conflits, suffisance, règlement pacifique des conflits et non-prolifération des armes de destruction massive) et donné un mandat au groupe sur les « contacts entre l'UEO et les pays du Maghreb ». Le dialogue a effectivement commencé à l'automne 1992 par des contacts avec les ambassades à Londres de quatre pays d'Afrique du Nord : la Tunisie, l'Algérie, le Maroc et la Mauritanie.

Dans cette contribution, j'examinerai successivement les modalités de ce dialogue, son contenu, et je conclurai sur la question de son avenir.

### *IV.1 Les modalités du dialogue*

Ce dialogue est piloté par le Groupe Méditerranée sous l'autorité du Conseil permanent et en application des mandats qui lui sont donnés depuis juin 1992. Ce Groupe de travail est composé de représentants – civils et militaires – des 28 pays de l'UEO depuis la décision du 10 mars 1998 concernant les pays associés partenaires. L'Institut d'Etudes de Sécurité de l'UEO et l'état-major militaire sont représentés à chacune de ses réunions. Le Groupe Méditerranée fait rapport au Conseil permanent sur ses travaux au cours des six mois de chaque Présidence en exercice, et ses décisions sont prises à l'unanimité.

Les paragraphes « Méditerranée » figurant dans les Déclarations ministérielles de l'UEO depuis juin 92 reflètent le consensus sur les modalités et la substance du dialogue. Ils ont valeur de mandats pour la poursuite de ce dialogue. La Présidence en exercice a un rôle d'impulsion déterminant pour l'orientation du dialogue.

Relancé en 1994 (mandat de Kirchberg), le dialogue a été successivement élargi à l'Egypte (mai 1994), à Israël (mai 1995), puis à la Jordanie (mars 1998). Les réunions d'information avec les ambassadeurs à Bruxelles des pays du dialogue ont été complétées en 1994 et 1995 par trois rencontres avec des experts des capitales (diplomates et militaires). Toutes ont eu lieu sur un mode bilatéral (pays concerné – pays membres de l'UEO) au siège de l'Organisation.

Ces rencontres avec des experts n'ont pas eu de suites jusqu'à cette année. En effet, la formule s'est avérée inadéquate pour plusieurs raisons :

- trop lourde compte tenu de son caractère bilatéral (4, puis 6 réunions consécutives à organiser sur un même sujet) ;

---

<sup>1</sup> Chef Section Affaires générales, Secrétariat général de l'UEO, Bruxelles. Les points de vue exprimés sont tout à fait personnels et ne constituent pas forcément le point de vue de l'UEO.

- préparation insuffisante en bilatéral et persistance de divergences sur les objectifs et l'organisation des réunions avec experts au sein du Groupe Méditerranée ;
- sujets trop généraux ;
- priorité donnée à l'information sur les activités de l'UEO par rapport à l'examen approfondi de possibilités de coopération ;
- représentation inégale, voire insuffisante, d'un pays à l'autre, ainsi que d'une réunion à l'autre tant du côté des pays partenaires du dialogue que de celui des pays de l'UEO.

Depuis 1996, le dialogue s'est donc trouvé limité à sa fonction d'information (rencontres avec les ambassadeurs portant sur les résultats des réunions des ministres de l'UEO). Une première expérience de réunion d'information multilatérale tentée sur proposition du Conseil en juin 1996 ne fut pas concluante. La présidence italienne a réussi à convaincre les partenaires du dialogue des avantages du format multilatéral qui a été retenu pour l'information sur les réunions ministérielles de Rome, Brême et Luxembourg.

Outre la visite de représentants des ambassades à Bruxelles des pays du dialogue au Centre satellitaire de Torrejón le 11 décembre 1997, des séances d'information ont été organisées à leur intention par l'état-major militaire de l'UEO : les 20 mai et 9 décembre 1998. La réunion d'information multilatérale du 8 décembre 1999 a été l'occasion d'un point d'information sur la coopération avec l'Union européenne ; le développement du concept de coopération civilo-militaire (CIMIC) ; l'opération de déminage en Croatie (MADUEO) ; la préparation de l'exercice CMX-CRISEX 2000 ; la coopération avec l'OTAN et enfin, l'inventaire UEO des moyens et capacités disponibles pour des opérations menées par les Européens (audit). Pour l'exercice CMX-CRISEX 2000 comme ce fut le cas pour CRISEX 98, les partenaires du dialogue ont été invités à une réunion d'information de présentation de l'exercice ainsi qu'à une réunion d'évaluation postérieure à celui-ci.

L'avenir du dialogue a fait l'objet d'un débat au Conseil permanent du 26 mars 1996. Le Conseil a reconnu à cette occasion l'utilité d'une contribution de l'Organisation à la définition des aspects sécurité du processus de Barcelone. Depuis avril 1996, l'UEO est représentée aux réunions du Groupe Maghreb/Machrek de l'Union européenne. De fait, les travaux et activités du groupe Méditerranée de l'UEO ouvrent la voie à une éventuelle contribution de l'organisation au processus de Barcelone. Le dialogue méditerranéen de l'UEO porte sur tous les aspects sécurité mentionnés dans la Déclaration de Barcelone. Il est donc logique que l'UEO se soit déclarée disposée, par le biais de son Groupe Méditerranée, à apporter son acquis au processus de Barcelone. Mais cela suppose que l'Union européenne fasse une demande dans le contexte de l'élaboration d'une charte pour la paix et la stabilité ou dans celui d'avancées du Partenariat euro-méditerranéen (PEM). Jusqu'à présent aucune demande de l'Union n'a été adressée à l'UEO. Pourtant la réflexion s'est poursuivie au sein du Groupe Méditerranée à partir de contributions nationales et d'un document d'appui de l'Institut. Dans un document ouvert, le Groupe a défini plusieurs mesures concrètes existantes et nouvelles. A supposer qu'il puisse être finalisé sous l'actuelle présidence portugaise, ce document pourrait être utilement transmis à l'Union.

Quant aux dialogues développés à l'initiative de l'OTAN et de l'OSCE, ils sont considérés comme complémentaires de celui de l'UEO. Le Groupe Méditerranée a donc eu, en tant que de besoin, des échanges d'information sur les diverses initiatives méditerranéennes existantes.

L'approfondissement du dialogue a principalement dépendu de la reprise – sur un mode multilatéral – des réunions du Groupe Méditerranée avec des experts des capitales (ministères des affaires étrangères et de la défense). Le Groupe a souvent débattu de sujets susceptibles de se

prêter à une approche multilatérale de ce type de réunions, écartant une approche bilatérale impliquant certains partenaires du dialogue sur des sujets d'intérêt commun. Fin 1998, un accord a été trouvé sur le thème : « Prévention des conflits : concept et mécanismes ». La Présidence portugaise a décidé de concrétiser ce projet en février prochain à Lisbonne.

#### *IV.2 Contenu du dialogue*

Les travaux de réflexion sur la sécurité européenne ont souligné combien la région méditerranéenne méritait une attention particulière de la part de l'UEO en tant qu'organisation de sécurité et de défense : (a) le concept commun adopté à Madrid en novembre 95 et rendu public, comporte onze paragraphes sur la Méditerranée. Ce document présentait une analyse des risques potentiels dans la région à la veille de la Conférence de Barcelone ; (b) la réflexion sur les intérêts européens de sécurité à l'aube du XXIème siècle conduite à 28 en vue de la réunion ministérielle de Paris de mai 1997 contient une partie intitulée « Quels rapports entre l'UEO et les régions voisines ? » dont un paragraphe était consacré à l'utilité du dialogue méditerranéen susceptible d'être enrichi et approfondi.

Le dialogue dont l'UEO a pris l'initiative peut être considéré à la fois comme générateur de mesures de confiance et comme un instrument de transparence. Ses lignes de force sont :

(1) *L'information mutuelle* sur :

- les activités de l'UEO, son développement opérationnel, les résultats des Conseils ministériels ;
- les exercices et manoeuvres sous l'égide de l'UEO.

L'information sur les activités des unités multinationales comme EUROFOR/EUROMARFOR relève des pays participants mais cette division du travail est difficile à admettre pour les partenaires du dialogue qui s'attendent à être informés par l'UEO d'activités extérieures à l'Organisation.

(2) *La confrontation des expériences nationales des pays de l'UEO avec celles des pays du dialogue* susceptible de porter sur :

- les opérations de type Petersberg (entraînement, formes de coopération envisageables pour l'assistance humanitaire et le maintien de la paix) ;
- la gestion des crises (alerte précoce, surveillance des situations de crise) ;
- le déminage humanitaire terrestre ;
- la demande d'assistance de l'Égypte du 1er décembre 1997 a été examinée par les organes compétents de l'UEO. Dans sa réponse du 28 avril 1998, le Secrétaire général a précisé que le rôle de l'UEO était limité à la coordination d'offres nationales ;
- les doctrines militaires ;
- la non-prolifération des armes de destruction massive.

L'Égypte et, dans une moindre mesure, le Maroc, la Mauritanie et la Tunisie ont fait des propositions, certaines détaillées, pour une confrontation des expériences et des méthodes de prévention des conflits et de maintien de la paix avec comme but la mise sur pied de coopérations concrètes. Ces pays n'ont reçu de l'UEO ni les réponses ni les propositions de suivi que leurs autorités attendaient.

### *IV.3 L'avenir du dialogue*

Le progrès du dialogue de l'UEO a toujours essentiellement dépendu de la volonté politique des États membres. A mon avis, les réticences à le dynamiser depuis 1992 ont tenu à trois facteurs principaux :

- le souhait de certains pays de subordonner le dialogue au processus de Barcelone ;
- le souci d'autres pays d'éviter tout double emploi avec le dialogue de l'Alliance atlantique ;
- les initiatives des quatre pays de l'Eurofor et de l'Euromarfor en faveur de coopérations concrètes avec les pays méditerranéens non membres de l'UEO ;
- le décalage entre les intentions politiques exprimées et la réalité du dialogue n'est pas niable : la volonté de transparence dans le dialogue n'a pas suffi à lui donner une substance réelle.

L'avenir du dialogue méditerranéen de l'UEO dépend fondamentalement, depuis Cologne et Helsinki, du temps qui sera nécessaire à l'Union européenne pour reprendre les fonctions et activités exercées jusque là par l'UEO. En ce qui concerne les relations de l'UEO avec les pays tiers, il est clair que les pays intéressés, informés par l'Organisation elle-même des perspectives de la phase de transition, auront un intérêt prioritaire à développer leur dialogue avec l'Union. La substitution d'une organisation à une autre pour la gestion des crises sur la base du Traité d'Amsterdam aura pour conséquence naturelle de rendre caduc, à plus ou moins brève échéance, le dialogue méditerranéen dans le cadre de l'UEO. Du moins aura-t-il joué un rôle de précurseur utile et démontré que l'examen des questions de sécurité est possible sur une base multilatérale pour peu qu'il occupe une place somme toute modeste par rapport au dialogue fondamental sur les grands enjeux du développement de l'espace méditerranéen. Néanmoins, l'UE et certains partenaires méditerranéens pourront tirer profit de l'expérience de l'UEO pour renforcer le volet politique et sécuritaire du Partenariat euro-méditerranéen.



## V. Quelques commentaires sur l'état actuel du processus de Barcelone

*Alexander Zafiriou*<sup>1</sup>

Ce séminaire est un exercice méthodologique très important car, finalement, ce que l'on essaie de faire c'est articuler tous les dialogues méditerranéens et mieux les organiser les uns par rapport aux autres. Cet exercice est extrêmement utile puisqu'il répond à des interrogations que nous avons, tous, dans nos domaines respectifs de responsabilité. Evidemment, la tâche pour l'Union européenne est la plus lourde, car elle a l'ambition de mener cette activité avec nos partenaires méditerranéens dans une perspective globale, en tenant compte du plus grand nombre d'éléments qui fondent notre partenariat euro-méditerranéen.

Il faut toutefois parler de deux préalables à garder à l'esprit lorsque l'on parle du partenariat euro-méditerranéen. L'UE en tant qu'acteur mène un processus évolutif qui doit être constamment révisé, car l'UE est en pleine mutation elle-même. Il y a également l'effort d'ajustement économique entrepris par nos partenaires méditerranéens. La conjonction des deux évolutions domine la recherche incessante de partenariat et constitue une des ambitions du processus de Barcelone. Ces deux efforts imposent, sans aucun doute, des interrogations aux uns et aux autres sur la façon d'y parvenir. Le fait même d'essayer de concevoir une Charte qui englobe les principes de la déclaration de Barcelone et qui les développe est précisément une réponse à ce processus de recherche de partenariat.

Les discussions en cours essaient d'identifier les mesures ponctuelles de partenariat dans lesquelles on pourrait lier les partenaires dans des entreprises spécifiques. Le fait de chercher à apporter en commun, des réponses aux nouveaux besoins des sujets éminemment politiques, tels que le terrorisme, la drogue, l'immigration, les échanges humains, donne la mesure de cette approche globale. Par ailleurs, la recherche sur la nouvelle manière de gérer les crises s'inscrit également dans cette vision ; et l'on peut voir que, progressivement, s'établit une longue liste de sujets que les partenaires des deux rives essaient de résoudre ensemble.

C'est dans un sens, la spécificité du partenariat de Barcelone ; en m'occupant de cette question, je suis frappé par l'ambition de cette entreprise, justement par sa diversité culturelle, sa richesse mais aussi ses difficultés. Très souvent on se demande ce qu'il y a de commun entre tous ces pays, mais finalement on constate qu'on est confronté aux mêmes grandes questions, aux mêmes grands défis. L'Union répond, pour sa part, à ces préoccupations, les partenaires de leur côté aussi, et on discute toujours pour trouver ensemble la meilleure méthode. Une des leçons de Barcelone est qu'elle constitue un processus en pleine évolution, qui avance, en tâtonnant, sur les différents terrains de coopération.

Et là, je rejoins le thème de la Charte qui nous préoccupe dans ce séminaire. L'idée d'adopter un instrument évolutif répond justement à cette préoccupation des défis qui changent. En enchaînant sur les perspectives d'avenir, les conclusions du Conseil européen d'Helsinki en matière de défense et de sécurité constituent une évolution importante. De ces conclusions, on peut relever peut-être deux aspects significatifs : un aspect institutionnel, à savoir la création d'un Comité politique et de sécurité qui va essayer de rassembler les éléments politiques et de défense, et de discuter dans une optique de politique étrangère commune. Le deuxième aspect important sont les engagements pratiques et concrets, à savoir la création d'une force de réaction rapide, et la conjonction de ces efforts avec les autres organisations telles que l'OTAN et l'UEO. Ces deux

---

<sup>1</sup> Administrateur principal, Secrétariat du Conseil de l'UE, Bruxelles. Les points de vue exprimés sont tout à fait personnels, et ne représentent pas nécessairement les positions d'une organisation.

aspects peuvent intéresser les pays méditerranéens. Comment ces évolutions vont-elles s'articuler pour répondre à leurs besoins ? Il semble encore prématuré d'y apporter des réponses.

Un domaine fertile de coopération peut néanmoins être envisagé dans le cadre des engagements pratiques du deuxième aspect, à savoir les actions non militaires pour la gestion de crises prévues par les conclusions d'Helsinki, qui s'articulent largement autour des missions de Petersberg compte tenu de l'expérience acquise par les pays européens. A ce stade préliminaire, je pense qu'en considérant sous cet angle des actions non militaires issues des conclusions d'Helsinki, il y a un domaine de coopération à discuter et à déterminer.

En conclusion, ce séminaire (qui peut être considéré comme faisant partie du «seminar diplomacy») est extrêmement utile pour déterminer précisément les synergies entre les différents organisations et dialogues. Il est vrai que ces dialogues, depuis quelques années maintenant, ont évolué de façon un peu désordonnée. Mais, récemment, l'UE a osé prendre de nouvelles responsabilités dans un domaine considéré comme tabou depuis longtemps, celui de la sécurité et de la défense. Ainsi, on voit mieux ces synergies se profiler vers l'avenir, et je pense que l'OTAN et l'UE ont une complémentarité à établir dans le futur.

Finalement, il ne faut pas oublier que toutes ces activités doivent être menées en étroite consultation avec nos partenaires méditerranéens. C'est un leitmotiv qu'on entend souvent, mais qu'il faut appliquer vraiment pour éviter tout malentendu. Cela est très important, et reflète la volonté de l'UE d'être sur la même longueur d'ondes avec ses partenaires méditerranéens, et de ne pas être perçue comme voulant s'engager sur une route différente et à leurs dépens. Il est donc absolument essentiel d'associer les pays européens et ceux du processus de Barcelone dans cet exercice pour continuer, en commun, sur la voie de la recherche d'une sécurité globale en Méditerranée.

## **VI. Réflexions sur le développement de la charte euro-méditerranéenne de paix et de stabilité**

*Ambassadeur Jean-Pierre Courtois*<sup>1</sup>

Le thème qu'il m'a été demandé de traiter étant celui de la Charte euro-méditerranéenne de paix et de stabilité, il me paraît nécessaire de rappeler brièvement, au préalable, l'ensemble des décisions qui sont à l'origine du projet : alors que la Déclaration de Barcelone (novembre 1995) n'avait fait qu'évoquer la possibilité « à terme » d'adopter un « pacte de stabilité », lors de la Conférence de Barcelone II (Malte – avril 1997) un mandat avait été donné par les ministres des Affaires étrangères aux Hauts Fonctionnaires de préparer un texte en vue de son adoption « lorsque les circonstances politiques le permettront » (condition des progrès réalisés dans le processus de paix posée par les pays arabes). Plus récemment, ce mandat a été confirmé et renforcé à Barcelone III (Stuttgart – avril 1999) avec, cette fois, la fixation de l'échéance de Barcelone IV (novembre 2000) pour l'achèvement du projet et son adoption éventuelle, sur la base de « lignes directrices » annexées aux conclusions de cette même Conférence de Stuttgart.

Où en est-on aujourd'hui de cette préparation ? Deux réunions ad hoc des Hauts Fonctionnaires se sont tenues pendant le second semestre 1999, qui ont été consacrées à entamer un débat de fond sur la finalité et les objectifs de la Charte. Elles seront suivies de plusieurs autres, pendant la Présidence européenne du Portugal, jusqu'à la Conférence informelle des ministres des Affaires étrangères prévue à Lisbonne en mai 2000, au cours de laquelle leur sera soumis un rapport intérimaire faisant le bilan de l'ensemble des discussions et proposant des orientations.

Comme on le voit, la dynamique de préparation du projet est donc désormais lancée. Comme je l'ai rappelé, un facteur essentiel de son avancement sera constitué, il ne faut pas se le cacher, par l'évolution des négociations du processus de paix du Proche-Orient qui sont récemment entrées dans une phase décisive avec la reprise des discussions entre Israël et la Syrie. Néanmoins les 27 partenaires de Barcelone ont pris l'option, audacieuse mais nécessaire pour la crédibilité de leur processus, de ne pas attendre la conclusion de ces négociations pour aller de l'avant. Aussi peut-on estimer que, malgré toutes les difficultés et les incertitudes qui demeurent, un contexte favorable existe aujourd'hui pour franchir une étape décisive dans l'élaboration de la Charte et, il faut l'espérer, ensuite permettre son adoption.

Cela étant, mon propos ne saurait être, il va de soi, d'aborder tous les éléments de contenu du projet qui seront en discussion. Je me bornerai seulement, à ce stade, à avancer – en tenant compte des premiers résultats des débats que nous avons eus entre les 27 – quelques observations et suggestions sur ce que l'on peut appeler son approche conceptuelle.

Les « lignes directrices » de Stuttgart ont en fait orienté et structuré la future Charte – je puis le révéler sans trahir la confidentialité de ce document – autour de trois grandes questions : les principes et les engagements en matière de stabilité ; l'organisation et le renforcement du dialogue et de la coopération politiques destinés à assurer celle-ci ; enfin les mesures de sécurité propres à la consolider. L'idée générale sur laquelle l'ensemble des partenaires semblent être parvenus à un consensus est, de ce fait, assez largement celle d'une sorte d'accord-cadre évolutif.

---

<sup>1</sup> Coordonnateur du Processus euro-méditerranéen, ministère des Affaires étrangères, Paris.

Celui-ci reposerait en effet, au départ, essentiellement sur des engagements de stabilité de nature politique dont le respect serait assuré par le dialogue et la concertation entre les ministres des Affaires étrangères, lesquels serviraient de cadre à la prévention des tensions et des conflits ainsi qu'à leur règlement. Faute de pouvoir être adoptées dans l'immédiat par l'ensemble des 27 partenaires, les mesures de sécurité ou de diplomatie préventive proprement dites n'y figureraient, par réalisme, qu'en tant qu'objectifs réalisables à terme et à mettre en oeuvre progressivement. Bref, il devrait bien s'agir au premier chef d'une « charte de stabilité » et non, à ce stade, d'une « charte de sécurité » ; elle devrait être un document politique qui, comme la Déclaration de Barcelone, serait adopté – et non signé – par les partenaires et donc non juridiquement contraignant.

a) Ma première remarque sera donc, effectivement, pour souligner l'importance, à mes yeux tout à fait essentielle, de ce caractère « d'accord-cadre politique » que doit revêtir la charte si nous voulons qu'elle puisse être adoptée et, ensuite, réussisse. Ceci ne découle pas seulement du fait que les pays méditerranéens ne seraient pas en état de souscrire dès à présent à de véritables mesures de sécurité et qu'au demeurant, les négociations pour y parvenir nous prendraient du temps, ce qui rendrait par là-même très aléatoire la possibilité de l'adoption du projet à une échéance aussi proche que celle de Barcelone IV. C'est aussi, je crois, une nécessité profonde.

Pourquoi ? Parce qu'il est clair que, pour être acceptable et acceptée par nos partenaires du Sud, l'adoption de mesures de sécurité supposera un accord politique préalable qui crée entre les 27 un cadre global de confiance et de coopération suffisamment fort. Compte tenu du poids du passé dans nos relations avec ces pays et, par ailleurs, de l'importance des tensions et des conflits qui continuent de les opposer, cet accord politique et cette confiance ne pourront eux-mêmes s'établir, me semble-t-il, que si le projet souligne suffisamment les deux éléments essentiels que devraient être :

- d'une part, l'accord, désormais acquis entre l'ensemble des partenaires, pour une approche globale et partagée du problème de la stabilité dans la Méditerranée (incluant donc également ses facteurs internes, dont le développement) ;
- d'autre part, l'affirmation par ces mêmes partenaires de leur volonté d'établir, à l'avenir, des relations reposant sur l'équilibre et le respect mutuel de leurs souverainetés.

C'est, sans nul doute, ce défaut d'accord politique préalable en profondeur entre les 27 qui, autant que le gel du processus de paix, a été à l'origine de l'échec des propositions européennes de mesures de confiance pendant les deux premières années du processus de Barcelone. A l'inverse, le rapprochement qu'ont opéré les Quinze en 1998 – sous l'influence du Forum méditerranéen – en direction de leurs partenaires du Sud pour une conception plus large et spécifique de la stabilité dans la région a indéniablement joué un rôle décisif dans l'évolution de la position de ces derniers en faveur de l'idée d'une Charte.

Ceci montre que *nous ne parviendrons, à mon sens, à organiser un système de sécurité collective en Méditerranée avec la Charte qu'à l'aide d'un véritable projet politique commun et que, pour réussir, celui-ci devra être nécessairement évolutif et équilibré aussi bien dans sa démarche que dans les instruments qu'il mettra en oeuvre.*

b) Ma deuxième observation concerne le cadre de coopération politique des ministres des Affaires étrangères qui, à cause de la nature essentiellement politique de la Charte, devrait précisément constituer la pièce maîtresse du dispositif. Cette coopération existe déjà, on le sait, dans une large mesure puisque les ministres ont pris l'habitude, depuis la Conférence de

Barcelone, de se réunir chaque année et que ce dialogue politique à haut niveau a même été essentiel pour la préservation du partenariat face aux menaces qui ont pesé sur lui (à cause du gel du processus de paix).

Il est tout aussi évident, cependant, qu'il faut, pour obtenir la confiance que j'évoquais plus haut, donner à la coopération politique entre les 27 une dimension et une densité beaucoup plus fortes. Il conviendra, me semble-t-il, de voir « jusqu'où l'on peut aller trop loin » à cet égard, en tenant compte des positions de nos partenaires méditerranéens dans la mesure où, en raison des tensions ou des conflits existants, plusieurs d'entre eux se montrent actuellement réticents à l'égard d'une institutionnalisation trop poussée de ce cadre de la coopération entre les ministres. Probablement faudra-t-il envisager, dans ce domaine aussi, un dispositif évolutif dont la Conférence de Barcelone IV pourrait jeter les bases et qui pourrait être, ensuite, progressivement renforcé avec l'accroissement de la coopération et de la confiance entre les partenaires.

Il ne faut pas oublier non plus que, lors de leurs réunions annuelles qui seront désormais régulières – et non plus tenues au coup par coup, ainsi que cela a été le cas jusqu'à présent –, les ministres continueront naturellement, comme la Déclaration de Barcelone leur en a fait le devoir, à assurer le suivi de l'ensemble des volets du processus. Ils seront, de ce fait, parfaitement à même de veiller, par ce biais, au maintien et au renforcement de la stabilité dans toutes ses composantes (non seulement politiques, mais aussi économiques, culturelles, sociales et humaines), conformément à l'approche globale rappelée plus haut qui est désormais à la base de toute la démarche du partenariat.

C'est dire qu'à considérer les choses concrètement, le débat, très utile et nécessaire, que nous avons eu ces derniers mois sur la nature exclusivement politique ou non de la finalité de la Charte est, à mon sens, en partie artificiel. En fait, dès lors que nous sommes tous d'accord pour considérer que la Charte ne doit pas être « une répétition de la Déclaration de Barcelone », il est clair que la réalisation des objectifs de celle-ci (au sens large du terme) reposera évidemment aussi, pour une large part, sur les instruments essentiels que sont les 2ème et 3ème volets (dont la mise en oeuvre est assurée par le règlement MEDA et aussi, pour beaucoup, par les accords d'association). Il en résulte que, pour ce qui concerne sa partie proprement fonctionnelle, la Charte devrait être d'abord et surtout destinée à compléter ceux-ci par le renforcement et l'organisation du partenariat politique et de sécurité, qui est aussi bien restée jusqu'à présent très insuffisante. *C'est de cette manière qu'elle pourra – et devra – assurer et garantir la cohérence de l'ensemble, tout en étant, pour nous Européens, essentiellement un instrument privilégié – et particulièrement approprié – de la nouvelle PESC et de la priorité que nous avons entendu donner à sa dimension méditerranéenne après Barcelone.*

c) Dernière série de remarques qui illustre également la nécessité d'une réflexion pertinente et approfondie sur les grandes orientations de la Charte : l'approche à adopter concernant la partie relative aux mesures de sécurité et de partenariat.

Je crois, comme je l'ai déjà souligné, que le réalisme obligera à n'envisager, à ce stade, qu'un engagement des partenaires sur le principe de l'adoption de telles mesures, considérées en quelque sorte en tant qu'objectifs. Il conviendrait néanmoins, pour crédibiliser cette ambition, que les 27 s'engagent aussi à en négocier le contenu dès après l'adoption de la Charte. Une fois l'accord obtenu sur celui-ci, l'on pourrait imaginer qu'ensuite la mise en oeuvre des mesures puisse s'effectuer de manière flexible, aussi bien dans le temps que dans l'espace : soit qu'un ou plusieurs partenaires estiment nécessaire de disposer de délais supplémentaires pour leur application, soit que d'autres veuillent au contraire aller plus vite et plus loin, en concluant des arrangements spécifiques plus élaborés et plus contraignants, notamment dans un cadre subrégional.

Ceci permettrait la création d'un espace méditerranéen de sécurité collective sur une base progressive et volontaire, un peu à l'image du phénomène des tâches d'huile qui se recoupent peu à peu pour former un seul ensemble. Bien entendu, il faudrait, dans ce cas, veiller tout particulièrement à ce que le processus ainsi engagé ne compromette pas la globalité du partenariat ; elle doit, en l'occurrence, être d'autant plus prise en compte que, nous le savons, l'un des principes cardinaux de la sécurité en Méditerranée est son caractère indivisible et que nos partenaires du Sud lui sont, à juste titre, très attachés. Il paraît évident, néanmoins, qu'il faut absolument sortir de cette sorte de contradiction dans laquelle nous avons été jusqu'à présent enfermés, entre la nécessité impérative de préserver cette globalité et celle, tout aussi forte, de progresser, de commencer enfin à mettre en pratique les principes souscrits au titre du 1<sup>er</sup> volet de Barcelone. *C'est pourquoi il me semble que l'idée consistant à poser le principe d'un engagement collectif fort sur des objectifs de sécurité communs, mais avec une certaine flexibilité dans leur mise en œuvre, pourrait être une réponse appropriée.*

Sans doute n'aurions-nous guère pu l'envisager au début du processus. Mais l'on peut penser qu'aujourd'hui, après quatre années d'existence du partenariat euro-méditerranéen au cours desquelles nous avons réussi, malgré les difficultés, à consolider notre dialogue et à créer entre nous un minimum de confiance, cette démarche devrait pouvoir être acceptée par tous. Elle me paraît, en tout cas, une nécessité si nous ne voulons pas nous condamner à l'immobilisme et à renoncer à tout progrès, alors que « la Méditerranée de l'après-processus de paix » est devenue un espoir proche et va constituer un véritable défi pour l'ensemble des Etats qui ont adopté la Déclaration de Barcelone. Au demeurant, ce n'est pas un hasard si l'on constate que cette même approche progressive et flexible a déjà été suivie pour les autres domaines du partenariat, notamment dans le volet économique avec le projet de création de la zone libre-échange. Elle confirme que, pour la sécurité aussi – au même titre que pour les autres facteurs de la stabilité – la réussite de notre espace commun euro-méditerranéen sera affaire de temps, mais aussi de volonté.

Telles sont les réflexions – faites, est-il besoin de le souligner, à titre personnel – que m'inspirent le projet de Charte dans son état actuel et les débats qui l'accompagnent. Permettez-moi, pour conclure, d'y ajouter un dernier mot, à savoir que *cette Charte devrait incontestablement constituer la pièce essentielle qui manquait à l'édifice du partenariat entre les 27, par le rôle qu'elle devrait jouer pour son équilibre :*

- du côté européen d'abord, parce que, grâce à l'équilibre et à la complémentarité qu'elle introduira entre les 3 volets, elle permettra aux Quinze de n'être pas seulement le principal bailleur de fonds de la région (avec MEDA) mais aussi de contribuer, comme c'est leur devoir et leur intérêt, au maintien de la paix et de la stabilité de la région ;
- pour les pays méditerranéens ensuite, par le rééquilibrage que le projet devrait aussi opérer à leur profit, au sein du processus, en renforçant la dimension politique et multilatérale (régionale) de leurs relations avec l'Europe (qui sont restées jusqu'à présent trop exclusivement marquées par la coopération économique et financière).

Si elle réussit, la Charte devrait être, de ce fait, réellement une étape historique, en organisant pour la première fois, la stabilité en Méditerranée sur une base collective, solidaire, et durable.

## VII. The development of the Euro-Mediterranean Charter for Peace and Stability

*Ambassador Fathy El Shazly*<sup>1</sup>

Before addressing some of this seminar's central issues, depicted in the introduction, let me make some remarks of general nature which seem quite important to me.

1. For us in Egypt, the Charter is an extremely important document, as we have made the building of the Euro-Med partnership a priority area of our foreign policy. The Charter is the first regulatory document of its kind in which drafting we participate, with an eye to prescribing the conditions under which a future of peace and stability could be achieved for the Euro-Med space. Policy designs for our part of the world, Barcelona Declaration included, have mostly been the work of others, specially Europeans. The drafting process is supposed to be completed five years after the launching of Barcelona Process. Lessons taught during five years of interaction should be reflected in the document. Equal contributions from the North and South should be sought, with no imposition from either side.

2. Barcelona Declaration committed the partners to mutually respecting national specificities. The Charter should emphasize this commitment as long as a democratic state of law is in place. The European partners should realize that the survivability of any societal change is preconditioned with its coming voluntarily from within.

3. Until a credible Common Security and Defence Policy of the EU is agreed upon, European partners should show readiness to actively participate, in their national capacity, in the setting up of a Euro-Med security architecture. In the same vein confidence should be created in the South as far cooperative security tools in the North are concerned. Furthermore, the partners should not be left in the dark regarding the evolving relationship between the European Union and NATO. In this context I would like to suggest that Mediterranean partners be invited to witness WEU/NATO joint exercises such as the one to be conducted in February 2000 on crisis management. In due course, agreement should be reached to enable the Euro-Med Partnership to use for its own purposes assets currently pertaining to WEU.

4. Security is indivisible. The Charter should clearly cater for security extensions beyond the territories of the parties, including in the Arab World and the Balkans.

5. As establishing confidence between the partners is one of the main objectives the implementation of the Charter should bring about, the principle of collective participation should be maintained and inclusion rather than exclusion should become the golden rule. By virtue of this rule the recently created EU/Israel forum should be reconsidered and greater transparency should be introduced in the so called Western Mediterranean process. This process is known to have been dealing with subjects usually dealt with in the Euro-Med Partnership, therefore it would be mutually beneficial to have reports about its activities submitted to Barcelona process. Furthermore it should become an open club accessible to other partners.

The prospect of establishing a security dimension in the Euro-Med Partnership deserves some comments. First of all, it should be underlined that the partners have unanimously demonstrated their approval of Stuttgart Guidelines. Fine-tunings and minor alterations will be a matter of course.

---

<sup>1</sup> Ambassador of Egypt to Turkey.

As for partnership-building measures, military or none military, they should be in my view contained in a separate annex that would undergo periodical review. As most of the exercise will be about confidence-building, apart from specific measures, mechanisms of enhanced dialogue conducive to fostering confidence will also appear in the Charter. Examples of those could be a mechanism for preventive diplomacy and crisis management and an agency for cooperation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, the promotion of nuclear safety and the prohibition of nuclear weapons. Formerly, it was widely believed among Arabs that no process entitled peace and stability could be embarked upon between partners while some of them were legally in a state of war. Arabs also believed that military confidence and security building measures under those conditions would practically amount to bestowing blessing and tolerance on the foreign occupation of Arab territories. Therefore, the following understanding was reached among Arabs:

- It would be very difficult to accept military measures as long as foreign occupation persisted.
- Necessary time should be allowed for the reflection on and drafting of the Charter, with the hope that by the time it will be ripe for implementation peace could have finally been achieved in the Middle East.

To me this understanding seems working.

But before leaving this particular point I have to add that I have repeatedly listened with astonishment to European researchers talking about the need to give a greater role for NATO in the Mediterranean to maintain the so called hard security leaving for Barcelona Process only questions of soft security. I recall no such distinction in the Barcelona Declaration. In the vocabulary of Barcelona process, security has always been comprehensive, encompassing both categories hard and soft. After all, as clearly demonstrated in former Yugoslavia, it has increasingly become difficult to draw dividing lines between soft and hard security. Hence military partnership-building measures will have to figure on the list of measures to be adopted.

On the other hand, our original reading of regional cooperation tolerates its being conducted between more than two countries. Never-the-less I believe that it could be counter productive to create within the Charter pre-assigned chambers of sub-regional nature.

Stuttgart Ministerial conference decided that the Charter should be ready for the approval of the Ministers by the time Barcelona IV is to be convened in the second semester of this year. I personally believe that this time frame could be met. I am hopeful that recent positive developments in the Middle East peace process as well as between Turkey and Greece and concerning the Cypriot problem will create an added momentum for the Charter process.

According to Stuttgart Guidelines, the Charter will be a politically binding document. Never-the-less this should not preclude us from taking initiatives that may lead to contractual commitments, within the Charter.

I have always been very sceptical as far as EU common strategy for the Mediterranean is concerned. I have regarded the Barcelona Declaration as a strategy paper in itself. I thought that new members to whom the Union was supposed to enlarge were required to accept the *acquis communautaire*, Barcelona process included. Therefore I wait to see what new the common strategy would bring us. At the same time I believe that the Charter will most probably have a consolidating effect on EU Common Foreign and Security Policy.

When I proposed that the Charter should be accompanied with a separate document on partnership-building measures, I was thinking that cementing confidence was an evolving process



that should be reviewed periodically within short intervals. I also think that the Charter will create several forums, each of them with its programme of action to be progressively implemented and periodically reviewed.

## **VIII. EUROMARFOR and security cooperation in the Mediterranean**

*Admiral Francisco Rapallo*<sup>1</sup>

I would like to thank the Institute for the invitation to attend this meeting and for giving me the opportunity to address you. At the same time, I would like to convey to you best wishes from my three colleagues, the Commanders in Chief of the Fleets of France, Italy and Portugal, member nations of the EUROMARFOR initiative. Let me begin with the main points about EUROMARFOR.

### ***VIII.1 Background***

The history of EUROMARFOR begins in the WEU Ministerial Council of June 1992 that took place in Petersberg. In that Council, the WEU member nations agreed in principle to identify forces to be made available to WEU, in order to contribute to the development of the European Security and Defence Identity (ESDI).

Following the Petersberg Declaration, four countries, France, Italy, Portugal and Spain agreed with the idea of a maritime Force based in two concepts:

- Firstly, to provide WEU members with a basic multinational naval structure; and
- Secondly, to participate, in agreement with the Petersberg Declaration, in the development of multinational initiatives for peace and security.

The idea of that concept was a reality in May 1995 at Lisbon with the signature of EUROMARFOR Constitutive Document. Three months later, in October 1995, the Commander in Chief of the Spanish Fleet was appointed as the first Commander of EUROMARFOR.

In my view, this is an appropriate moment to link the signature of EUROMARFOR Constitutive Document and the Barcelona Conference, that took place the same year, in 1995, because both events express a concern about the stability and security of the Mediterranean region. In that sense, it is possible to say that the EUROMARFOR concept is in line with the concept of the Barcelona Declaration. In this context, it is important to emphasise that EUROMARFOR is, by statute, open to other WEU members, which can be fully integrated without any difficulty, and has started a process of transparency-building with Mediterranean partners.

### ***VIII.2 Mission and tasks***

Based on the Petersberg Declaration, the missions that can be assigned to the Force are the following:

- humanitarian and evacuation operations,
- peace-keeping operations, and

---

<sup>1</sup> Commander-in-Chief of the Spanish Fleet, Commander of EUROMARFOR, Rota, Spain.

- crisis management, including peace-making operations.

Therefore, EUROMARFOR can be employed to accomplish a wide spectrum of tasks: from humanitarian, medical and logistic support or evacuation operations to those related with maritime policing and control or amphibious support and coastal operations.

### ***VIII.3 Employment***

The Force may be employed under the direction of the four countries, or in the framework of different organizations. Due to the fact that EUROMARFOR is a “Force answerable to the WEU”, it will be principally employed in a WEU-led operation, but at the same time the Force could also be employed in the framework of NATO, the UN, OSCE or other international organisations.

Although the Mediterranean Sea is the most important area of interest, there are not restrictions in this aspect, therefore the Force can operate outside the Mediterranean.

### ***VIII.4 Force structure***

Considering the wide range of missions, the composition and size of the Force cannot be pre-determined. That means the EUROMARFOR is not permanently activated, but ready to operate at short notice, and is constituted by units assigned by the four countries and maintained at an appropriate level of readiness. These units perform their national activities and after a decision to activate the force has been adopted, the Force will be assembled, case by case, to carry out a specific mission. The units are selected from the earmarked units that are more suitable for the specific operation. Nowadays, the units earmarked for a possible activation of the Force include: 1 aircraft-carrier, 7 frigates, 3 corvettes, 1 nuclear submarine, 4 minehunters, 2 logistic units, 4 amphibious units, and 2 air patrol maritime.

### ***VIII.5 Command levels***

EUROMARFOR is structured into three different levels of command: political, operational and tactical. The highest level of command is the “High-level Interministerial Committee” (CIMIN), composed by the Chief of Defence and the Director of the Political Affairs of each member country. This committee ensures political and military co-ordination between participating nations, establishes the conditions for the employment of the Force and provides directives to the Commander of the Force.

The second level of command is the Commander of the Force (COMEUROMARFOR) who is subordinated to the CIMIN. The COMEUROMARFOR is appointed on a rotational basis among the commands of the fleet of participating nations and is supported by his own national staff, added with a permanent Cell, composed by one officer of each participant navy, in order to provide the continuity of planning and liaison duties. The Constitutive Document assigns to the COMEUROMARFOR different tasks depending on whether or not the Force is activated. On the activation of the Force, either for training or for a real operation, the COMEUROMARFOR will joint the units that will make up the Force and will exercise operational control to accomplish the

mission. When the Force is not activated, the task of COMEUMARFOR is to prepare and be ready to activate the Force under the direction of the CIMIN.

The lowest level of command is the Tactical Commander Officer of EMF, called COMGRUEUMARFOR, with responsibility to conduct operations at sea. The staff of this command is a multinational one, based on his national staff afloat, augmented with officers from the other three countries.

### ***VIII.6 Activities***

From 1995 to this date the Force has been activated to participate in national and NATO exercises. Periodical “Tours” are also organized with the objective to project visibility and promote a better understanding of EUROMARFOR in other countries.

To date, the Force has been activated in the following occasions:

- Year 1996. Participation in exercise “EOLO”, followed by a port visit to Valletta (Malta).
- Year 1997. Participation in exercise “ILES D’OR”, followed by a port visit to Lisbon.
- Year 1998. Participation in exercises “GALLURA” and “EOLO”, followed by a port visit to Koper (Slovenia).
- Year 1999. Participation in exercise “SWORD FISH”, followed by port visits to Catania (Italy), Piraeus (Greece), Izmir (Turkey) and Taranto (Italy).

### ***VIII.7 EUROMARFOR and the Mediterranean dialogue***

Now, let me go back to year 1995 and remember the importance of the Barcelona conference. The Barcelona Declaration proclaimed the “general objective of turning the Mediterranean Sea into an area of dialogue, exchange and co-operation”. Although the policy and security chapter of the Barcelona process does not include a military dimension for the time being, the reality is that military co-operation may play an important role in support of this process. In this field it is clear that there is a wide range of possible co-operation interest and interaction, for example: search and rescue, humanitarian and disaster relief, evacuation, maritime policing, logistical and medical support, etc. In this area, the experience gained so far by the EUROMARFOR navies, may be very useful because it provides the adequate background to successfully accomplish the missions to be assigned to the Force.

On many different occasions the highest level of EUROMARFOR command, the CIMIN, has expressed the wish to develop actions for co-operation with the Mediterranean countries, specially those involved in the Mediterranean dialogue with the WEU. In that sense, EUROMARFOR made in 1997 some attempts to obtain diplomatic approval for port visits to Southern Mediterranean countries, but finally the visits were cancelled because the clearance was not obtained.

In order to continue a policy of transparency, last year my predecessor as COMEUMARFOR, the Commander in Chief of the Portuguese Fleet, made an invitation to visit EUROMARFOR HQ in Lisbon to representatives from countries belonging to the Mediterranean Dialogue. Despite participation being reduced to two countries, representatives from the embassies of Algeria (embassy counsellor) and Egypt (defence attaché), the overall assessment is a positive one as a first step. For my period of command the intention is to continue

working in this way of promoting a better knowledge of EUROMARFOR, so I intend to repeat the same invitations, in this case to visit the EUROMARFOR HQ in Rota (Cadiz).

### ***VIII.8 Concluding remarks***

I am sure, and this is the message I want to give you here today as Commander of the European Maritime Force, that EUROMARFOR can and should play a very interesting role in achieving the aim of the Barcelona process.

In my view there are some possible ways in which co-operation between EUROMARFOR and the Mediterranean Dialogue countries could evolve, for example:

- invitations to visit EUROMARFOR HQ
- participation in common exercises
- exchange of observers
- briefs and demonstration of working methods
- port visits to Mediterranean countries.

To this end, and as a complement to the invitation to visit our headquarter in Rota, a possible visit to a Southern port during next EUROMARFOR “Tour”, in April this year, is envisaged. In any case, EUROMARFOR is determined to continue its efforts for transparency-building.

Let me conclude with some final considerations:

- EUROMARFOR constitutes a credible Force very well suited to conduct missions outlined in the Petersberg Declaration.
- EUROMARFOR is also a visible contribution to the development of a European Strategic Defence Initiative.
- EUROMARFOR is a concept shared by four WEU Mediterranean nations, linked with the spirit of the “Barcelona process”, but open to other WEU nations.

I am sure all of us agree on the need of intensifying multinational initiatives for peace and security in the Mediterranean. With this in mind, and considering EUROMARFOR objectives, missions, tasks and easy activation, the Force is an ideal tool for an effective co-operation with nations of Mediterranean Dialogues in developing mutual understanding and confidence building in order to enhance co-operation in the Mediterranean region.

## **IX. A realistic approach to military cooperation in the Mediterranean**

*Mark Heller*<sup>1</sup>

In the totality of Mediterranean security and stability, the military or hard security dimension is a factor of secondary importance. Other issues, especially economic and social distress and domestic strife, are more directly relevant to the so-called “soft security” agenda that comes closest to defining a common security concern of the Euro-Mediterranean space. The components of that agenda – drug trafficking and other sorts of organized crime, terrorism, environmental threats, and constraints on personal rights and freedoms (including freedom of movement) – impinge more directly on the welfare and individual security of people around the Mediterranean rim. And to the extent that the military dimension is relevant, it is not a Mediterranean-wide concern, since its relevance varies greatly across the region. In some areas, it is practically insignificant. In others, it is a very prominent issue. But even in those areas, the Euro-Mediterranean dialogue is not the most appropriate vehicle for addressing the issue. Given the continuing political-military weight of the United States in world affairs, the most promising course is to extend the dialogue laterally and to transform it into a Euro-American-Mediterranean triologue.

### ***IX.1 Purpose of the dialogue***

Security dialogues can have two agendas. The first is institutional. Many existing institutions are searching for new approaches to the Mediterranean, and for purposes of this agenda, dialogue is an end in itself. It may not necessarily have a positive impact on real military-security dilemmas, but it enhances the visibility and prominence of the institutions involved.

The second agenda is functional. Its purpose is to reduce the insecurities of parties in a given region, and for purposes of this agenda, dialogue is a means to an end. With respect to the functional agenda, it is possible to pursue dialogue at two levels. One is a diffuse consultation that aims to introduce or reinforce general norms of international relations or codes of conduct in a particular region or, indeed, throughout the world. Norms produced by such security dialogues usually are at a very high level of generality; examples include commitments to resolve disputes by non-violent means or to refrain from interfering in the internal affairs of other countries. There are numerous undertakings of this sort – perhaps the most all embracing is the Charter of the United Nations – and there will doubtless be many more, particularly in the area of global arms control.

The other level is much more focused. It seeks to produce specific reassurances against specific insecurities and particularly, in the military dimension, against fear of military attack. This type of insecurity is ultimately a function of politics, that is, of the political relations between various countries, rather than about force structures or operational codes or balances (or imbalances) of power. That is why countries with considerable capabilities (and imbalances), such as the United States and Canada or France and Germany, do not need reassurances, confidence- and security-building measures (CSBMs) or third-party involvement, to deal with their insecurities *vis-à-vis* each other, while countries such as Greece and Turkey or Armenia and

---

<sup>1</sup> Jaffee Center for Strategic Studies, Tel-Aviv University, Tel-Aviv.

Azerbaijan do. Military-security dialogues cannot address the problem of hostile intentions. If China is truly determined at some point to use force to bring about unification with Taiwan, no dialogue or regional security structure can alleviate Taiwan's security concerns (or will be entertained); only self-help and/or outside support can address the problem. By contrast, when there is no specific intention to resort to military force, dialogues and active security structures can make a contribution by mitigating some of the insecurities in an inter-state environment charged with suspicion and mistrust, such as those arising from misperceptions and ambiguities.

But the relevance of dialogue at this level for the Euro-Mediterranean space, while appealing, is somewhat forced, because there is no region-wide insecurity of this sort. Measured by the frequency and intensity of military-security interactions (actual combat; preparation for combat; talking, thinking, planning and worrying about combat), the insecurities in the Mediterranean are not North-South or even South-South. Instead, they are Southeast-Southeast and, to a lesser extent, Southwest-Southwest. In a military sense, these localized insecurities do not directly threaten counties in other parts of the Euro-Mediterranean space, and even their indirect ramifications fall more properly under the "soft security" rubric. Consequently, the "indivisibility of Mediterranean security," while perhaps arguable if "security" is understood in the very broadest sense of the term, is more of any hypothesis than an empirical reality insofar as military affairs are concerned. And this means that concrete measures to address concrete military insecurities need logically to be applied, not on a region-wide basis, but rather in sub-regional settings involving specific adversaries. The operational questions that emerge from this are therefore: "What is to be done?" and "Who can best do it?"

### ***IX.2 What is to be done?***

Experience in other areas of the world suggests a long list of concrete CSBMs that can be discussed and implemented in order to promote parties' reassurance about the actions, if not the intentions, of potential adversaries. Most of these are aimed at introducing greater transparency in military capabilities and plans. Examples include the publication of defence budgets, orders-of-battle and curricula in military academies and other training courses. Some are intended to reduce anxieties connected with military exercises, such as prior notification of exercises, invitation of observers, or commitments to conduct exercises and weapons tests on non-threatening trajectories. Information connected with these actions can be deposited in a sub-regional "clearing house." Other measures, such as exchange visits and joint exercises, aim at familiarization and socialization of commanders and troops in the hope of "humanizing" the adversary. And some, such as "hotlines" and crisis management centres, are intended to permit direct, real-time communication in order to reduce ambiguities or clarify uncertain situations.

### ***IX.3 Who is to do it?***

Given this range of possibilities, the problem is not to conceptualize the concrete measures that should be produced by military-security dialogues, but rather to organize and institutionalize them. Theoretically, this can be done by direct bilateral or multilateral discussion among the parties in any particular sub-region. However, the tensions and suspicions that create the need for a military-security dialogue also normally constitute an obstacle to effective consultation. Consequently, there is almost always a need for some third-party involvement to propose,

coordinate, facilitate or “shepherd” the dialogue among the parties and to contribute its own experience and knowledge and to provide a second level of reassurance to back-up and enhance (through political-military guarantees, military and technical advice, logistical and other services) the reassurances implicit in specific CSBMs.

The fact that most of the examples of concrete measures mentioned here are drawn from the Helsinki process (and have been discussed in various ways at the Arms Control and Regional Security (ACRS) Working Group of the Middle East Peace Process) implies some significant European role. Furthermore, the weight of the EU relevant to this mission may well increase in the future as the European Defence Identity develops over time. Nevertheless, the specific character of the parties and issues in the Southeast and even Southwest areas of the Mediterranean also means that it is unrealistic, at the present time, to discuss concrete regional/sub-regional military (i.e., hard) security measures without some significant American input. This is not so much because of a comparative American advantage in technical expertise or facilities but rather because of the overarching shadow of American political-military weight in the world and the expectations that this raises among regional/sub-regional parties.

In sum, a Euro-Mediterranean dialogue is both necessary and sufficient to address the major components of the stability agenda in the Euro-Mediterranean space: social and economic problems and their “soft-security” ramifications. But on the specific issue of the military component of this agenda, the most promising way to extend the dialogue is to involve the United States, as well, and to transform the dialogue into a Euro-Mediterranean-American triologue.



## X. How Egypt “thinks Mediterranean”? Joint military exercises and regional security cooperation

*Mohamed Kadry Said*<sup>1</sup>

In spite of the fact that the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership (EMP) has almost no clear military dimension, it is easy to realize that the level of security cooperation and mutual dialogue between the EMP members is better than before even in military areas. There are more cooperative efforts against terrorism, more initiatives in crisis escalation control, and more regular joint military exercises between countries of the region.

In my brief presentation, focus will be directed to bilateral and multilateral joint military exercises as one of the hottest measures of military and security cooperation. Joint training is becoming more and more common between Euro-Mediterranean countries. Egypt regards such activity as an important instrument of its regional security policy. Recently, between 9 October to 3 November 1999, a large scale multinational joint exercise *Bright Star 99* have been staged in Egypt near Alexandria, with the participation of 11 nations, 7 of them from the Barcelona process. My aim is to stimulate discussion on such high-level military cooperation, although some of us might argue that such activities are not precisely conducted within the EMP sphere.

From a confidence-building perspective, joint military exercises strengthen ties between countries and personnel of the forces involved. They progressively help to unify language, terminology and concepts required to carry out joint operations during war and peace. The Egyptian wide scope programme for air, land, and sea joint exercises reflects Egypt’s interest in sharing experience and building confidence with other Mediterranean partners. It is clear that the programme expands in size and type of missions to serve the needs and interests of the participating countries as well. It also creates diverse relations with different security actors like NATO, WEU, the EU, and the US.

The multilateral *Bright Star* series in which Egypt plays a central role since 1981 is now considered the largest joint exercise outside NATO. Conducted every two years, it presently involves 11 countries: US, Egypt, France, UK, Germany, Italy, Greece, Netherlands, Kuwait, Jordan, and United Arab Emirates. While *Bright Star 97* included 58000 troops and seven participating countries, *Bright Star 99* included nearly 75000 sailors, soldiers, airmen, marines, and focused on air, land and sea operations as well as command and control interoperability. It has expanded into a major war game on a scale not seen since the 1990-1991 Gulf War. *Bright Star 99* saw also an amphibious landing on the Egyptian coast, air operations, surface-to-surface engagements, and data sharing. The US Secretary of Defense William Cohen, British Secretary of State for Defence Geoff Hoon, and Egyptian Defence Minister Field Marshal Mohamed Hussein Tantawy attended certain phases of the exercise.

Another important example is the *Cleopatra* series of joint naval exercises, which started in the Mediterranean in 1988 with the participation of Egypt and France. Italy has joined the exercise in 1996. It includes joint planning, war games, lectures, debates, and seminars. The principal naval missions exercised are terrorism fighting, rescue operations, fact-finding, ship inspection and monitoring. The *Cleopatra* series can be considered as a “Mini Euro-Med” military cooperation project that can be easily expanded to include other Euro-Med countries or to merge with other defence activities in the area. Other bilateral joint training projects are

---

<sup>1</sup> Al-Ahram Center for Political and Strategic Studies, Cairo.

conducted with France, United Kingdom (Hermes), Italy (Storm), Jordan (Ain Galoot), and Saudi Arabia (Morgan).

Israel participation with Arab countries in joint training is much related to the final phases of the Peace process. However, an important step forward has been achieved in July 1999 by launching cooperative joint environmental exercises with the participation of Egypt, Israel, Jordan, and the Palestinian Authority in the Red Sea. The exercise might complement the Israeli-Jordanian project "The Red Sea Marine Peace Park".

The official Egyptian assessment of joint training with other nationalities is mostly positive, and considered by the Egyptian defence planners as good opportunity to work with multinational forces that will be probably the pattern of military activity in future. The most important outcome for the participating troops is the opportunity to draw a realistic image about the "others", not only in military professional areas, but also on cultural and humanitarian aspects. In fact, a window is generally opened to exchange views on diverse issues, like man-technology interaction, war in the desert, and other security subjects.

In addition, certain humanitarian and disaster relief missions are performed like, for instance, in *Bright Star 97* Egypt and UK exercised a rescue operation for a large scale earthquake disaster in the city of Alexandria with losses assumed to reach ten thousand inhabitants. Experience gained has been utilized most recently during the earthquake tragedy in Turkey, where Egypt and other Mediterranean countries provided help and solidarity.

For a better understanding of the dynamics of Joint Military Training and its impact on regional security cooperation, the following remarks are important:

1. The more favourable the political atmosphere in the Euro-Med region, the more progress is observed in the joint training programs, mainly with respect to the number of countries participating, the size of troops, and the nature of missions conducted. The attached table demonstrates how *Bright Star* exercise has developed over time.

2. Continuity and regularity of a specific series of joint exercises generally lead to the creation of some kind of institutions for planning, assessing, and administrating the work. Agreements and/or military protocols are being developed.

3. Relations among the parties participating in the exercise are still mostly based on "balance of interests" not "common interests". Countries individual interests are generally given the priority in the operational, technological, or psychological fields. However, the number of missions planned to serve common regional interests increases over time.

4. The political message of the joint exercise, and the perceptions of other countries not participating, are important aspects of such cooperation. Threatening others is generally seen as negative message. The Israeli-Turkish naval exercise in 1998 (with Jordan as observer) was first seen by most of the Arab countries as threatening. However, no serious responses were recorded when the same exercise was repeated in 1999, only one year after the first one. Another example in this respect may be taken from *Bright Star 99*: The Egyptian spokesman was emphasizing repeatedly that the exercise was not against any country, and that "no obvious references to the Gulf War should be drawn, and any mirroring of actual events with Gulf War is purely coincidental". He also added: "A lot of times, you will find the military are able to build relationship ahead of other forms of government; we can develop such relations easier". The American message was different. William Cohen perhaps referring to Iraq said: "One country that is not represented here today should pay very close attention to what Bright Star represents", and back to the cooperative tone he said: "Joint training builds friendship and tradition of

cooperation between countries”. Cohen also said that “he saw during the joint naval landing an Italian ship carrying a British boat to transport Egyptian soldiers”.

5. The public opinion response and the media covering are also important factors. “Seminar diplomacy”, visits, and other forms of “soft” military dialogue do not generally attract the media or teach the public. At the start of joint military cooperation between Egypt and Western countries, newspaper coverage was always brief and found only in the inner pages. Now the situation is different. For instance, *Bright Star 99* was covered on front pages of all first line newspapers and magazines. The coverage emphasized the regional character of the event, and mixed military news with human and personal information about commanders, officers, and soldiers (e.g. stories about women’s role in the army, military service conditions, historical background of the participating battalions and regiments, etc).

6. Joint exercises are always associated with information problems. Some people see them as legalized spying. A classical question by almost all correspondents to me was: “*Don’t you think that the main goal of other countries participating in the exercise is to collect information about our army and our country?*” Generally speaking, sharing military information is still a problem in security cooperation.

7. Use of military forces for humanitarian tasks on regional level is one of the important by-products of multinational joint exercises. The presence of soldiers and officers in military uniform among civilians of other country during crises improves political environment and promotes regional identity.

8. From the EMP perspective a number of important questions might be raised:

- What should be the proper role of the Euro-Mediterranean dialogue in planning for such activity?
- What is the EU’s possible contribution within the framework of its Mediterranean policy?
- How can joint exercises serve the EMP’s “soft” security issues like drug trafficking, terrorism, and environmental disasters in the Mediterranean?
- Is it more appropriate for the EMP to limit its role to training centres and mission conceptualization, and to leave field planning and implementation for other institutions?

As a final last remark, which is very important although it might seem not much related to the subject, I would like to say that in spite of the spirit of partnership that surrounded *Bright Star 99*, it has awakened unfortunately the sad memories of Land-Mines Tragedy in the Western Desert of Egypt. The British, German, and Italian troops came again few kilometres from “Al-Alamein” area where more than 18 million pieces of ordnance and land-mines were buried in the sand during the Second World War. The soldiers of the three countries might have been even instructed before the exercise to avoid the dangerous areas.

The Land-Mines Tragedy in Egypt is a good example of how historical mistakes should be corrected before they endanger future cooperation hopes. Many Egyptian observers raised the subject during the exercise. They believe that Britain, Germany and Italy should assume responsibility for the removal and clean-up operations of these dangerous objects. It may be also seen as an ambitious humanitarian EMP cooperation project for the future.

**TABLE.- Bright Star Multilateral Joint Military Exercise -  
Historical Development**

<b>N</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Countries</b>	<b>Troops</b>
<b>1</b>	Summer 80	US-Egypt	Ground Forces
<b>2</b>	Summer 81	US-Egypt	Ground Forces
<b>3</b>	Summer 82	US-Egypt	Ground Forces
<b>4</b>	Summer 83	US-Egypt	Ground Forces
<b>5</b>	Summer 85	US-Egypt	Ground+Air Forces
<b>6</b>	Summer 87	US-Egypt	Ground+Air+Naval +Special Forces
<b>7</b>	Autumn 93	US-Egypt	Ground+Air+Naval +Special Forces
<b>8</b>	Autumn 95	US-Egypt-Britain- France-UAE	Ground+Air+Naval +Special Forces
<b>9</b>	Autumn 97	US-Egypt-Britain- France-UAE-Italy-Kuwait	Ground+Air+Naval +Special Forces
<b>10</b>	Autumn 99	US-Egypt-Britain- France-UAE-Italy-Kuwait- Germany-Greece- Netherlands-Jordan	Ground+Air+Naval +Special Forces

## **XI. Relations between the EMP and NATO's Mediterranean dialogue – future prospects**

*Ambassador Antonio Badini*<sup>1</sup>

I shall try to elaborate on the relations that may arise as a result of the evolutionary process that the EU and NATO are undergoing. Actually, so far relations between the two Organisations involving the respective Mediterranean Dialogues have been insignificant and there is no sign indicating any discernible improvement, at least in the short term.

I understand that we are participating in this seminar in our personal capacity, which means that while mutually taking advantage of our different experiences, the views we are going to express will not commit our own Organisations and Authorities. This will allow us to speak openly and frankly, making our debate more lively and interactive.

It seems that the focus placed on synergies between the various “Med-Dialogues” in the introduction to this seminar is tailor-made and instrumental to correctly perceive the value added that the complementarity relations should bring about in terms of the recipient Countries’ enhanced stability. However, in order for complementarity to be fully exploited, an *ad hoc* structured coordination mechanism is required which, in the case of the EU and NATO, is not in place. Arguably, the adapting process, now under way both within the Union and NATO, will bring out in the open the need to identify ways and means for the two Organisations to mutually reinforce their action in the Mediterranean basin. At that time, NATO’s role as a provider of assets and expertise to the EU with a view to helping her in carrying out her primary responsibility as regards security arrangements in the area might be clearer.

If we compare the overall objectives set out by the EU and by NATO we might detect a different focus as to the projection in the Mediterranean that could derive from the evolutionary process embraced by the two Organisations. The EU actually plans to reinforce her influence in the area on the basis of a two-pronged strategy. On the one hand, she aims - mainly through the adoption of a Common Strategy - to ensure greater coherence and synergy among the various instruments that she can avail herself of, including the ones that can be made available by the Member States. In doing so, she prepares herself to fulfil more effectively the task of counteracting sources of instability in the area.

On the other hand, thanks to the prospect of signing a Charter on Peace and Stability with Mediterranean Partners before long, she will lay the foundations for addressing together with the riparian States tensions and crises emerging in the region.

As the “New Strategic Concept” takes substance, NATO might instead find it much more preferable and productive to channel efforts and resources towards strengthening its ability to act as the more reliable regional organisation for protecting peace (Chapter VIII of the UN Charter), also by the use of force (Chapter VII), in the changing international security environment (law enforcement, peace-making, humanitarian-driven interventions, etc).

In other words, while NATO might become the last resort for protecting peace and preserving international order and justice, the Union could play the role of major provider of stability in the Mediterranean within a holistic approach with a view to preventing tension or ensuring that crises do not turn into conflicts. At the same time, she could launch a large-scale cooperative security strategy (for instance, political security initiatives could prove to be quite

---

<sup>1</sup> Coordinator of the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Rome.

effective in countering the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction), thus filling the institutional security vacuum which still characterises many riparian States in the area.

For practical purposes, could we assume that the evolutionary changes currently under way in the two Organisations will contribute to create a kind of watershed in their future roles for a safer and more prosperous Mediterranean basin?

The answer to this question is understandingly quite contentious. Nonetheless, a number of factual considerations may render the issue less premature than it might appear to be at first. As of today, complementarity relations between the two Organisations has not produced tangible results. Moreover, there is no reliable evidence justifying a significant change in the foreseeable future. Comparative advantages inherent to the two Organisations' institutional duties have been exploited only to a minimum, even where the conditions for inter-action seemed very propitious (for instance NATO's Civil Emergency Department should have contributed its expertise in the implementation of the initiative on prevention and management of natural and man-made disasters adopted within the political and security chapter of the Barcelona Declaration).

The fact is that complementarity can hardly work unless a reliable coordination mechanism is established. Are the necessary prerequisites at hand to make this coordination possible and effective in the near future? As food for thought I would like to submit the following considerations:

- Recent substantial progress in the European unification process is revealing the sustained political will of Member States to reinforce security and military dimensions. Thanks to the Amsterdam Treaty one should note that the Union will progressively acquire WEU's assets and expertise, which will prove to be very useful in carrying out the EMP, specially if - as is expected - the Charter will encourage the inclusion of the Petersberg-type tasks within the future CSBMs. Furthermore, the ESDI is bound to gradually take substance as the recent Helsinki European Council clearly indicates (WEU and NATO are conducting an important consultation on their respective capabilities).
- Although the weakening or loosening of the strategic link between the EU and NATO, which involves shared basic values and interests, may appear to be unthinkable, it may actually be on the political horizon once NATO's assets and capabilities are used for European-led operations. No matter how hard it may seem to envisage the nature and the scope of such operations today, there is no doubt that sooner than later the Union will be mandated to take on primary responsibility in the Mediterranean mainly due to her integrated and holistic approach to stability (with mutually reinforcing actions in the political, economic, social and cultural sectors).
- Action in the shorter term is, however, envisageable and desirable. Actually, provisional contacts should even be initiated between the EU's rotating presidency, assisted by the Council's Secretariat-General, and the International Secretariat of NATO, to pioneer well-selected joint initiatives involving the two Organisations in the sectors in which NATO can better contribute its recognised capability and expertise (civil emergency planning, scientific and technical activity, training for peace-keeping operations).

## **XII. Respective roles of the EU and NATO in the Mediterranean**

*Ian Lesser*<sup>1</sup>

I would like to make three points. But to start with, let me underscore that these remarks represent just one American perspective. You may certainly find more – and different – American points of view. It must also be said that the subject I am going to analyze is rather marginal in the American debate about Europe and about the Middle East. Perhaps it may become more important in the future, but let us keep in mind that for the moment it is not at the center of the debate.

My first point is that the EU engagement in the Mediterranean is going to be the key for long-term stability in the region. This is actually a widely shared view in the US. Just as an experiment, you may ask the question whether the Southern Mediterranean countries would survive without the EU's engagement; I think the answer is no. If you ask whether they would survive without other organisations, such as NATO, OSCE, or WEU being interested in the Mediterranean, the absence of these institutions might not be a good thing, but they would survive without these relationships. The economic and social nature of the challenges in the Southern Mediterranean is critical to this judgement. There is also the structural role that the EU has in the political economy of the south, which also has a security dimension. It is true that the security challenges in the Mediterranean are not generally North-South but rather South-South, but it may be added further that most of them are really internal. The role of the EU in the evolution of societies in the South is therefore critical, including the security dimension broadly defined. The EU's role in the Middle-East peace process is very controversial in the US, but if the peace process moves further ahead, the EU's presence in this important aspect of the Mediterranean equation will be even greater.

On the other hand, the EU is developing a CFSP, and a limited military dimension which can give Europe a greater security role in the Mediterranean. However, the more serious the EU gets about this, the more the EU will have the same problems NATO has in trying to explain its security engagement in areas in which the South is interested, and concerned.

The second point I would like to make concerns NATO's role in the Mediterranean. I would disagree slightly with those who maintain that the US engagement in the region is entirely synonymous with NATO's interests and presence. It is true that the US is a central actor in NATO. It is also true that the US is a key part of NATO's Mediterranean dialogue. But one cannot say that the US has been the most interested party in NATO's Mediterranean dialogue. In fact, it is only during the last year or so that the US has become a little bit more interested in the Mediterranean than before, when the dialogue was launched.

We have to accept that NATO is not as well equipped as the EU is to tackle some of the well-known challenges that are facing Mediterranean countries. But NATO is increasing its involvement in the Mediterranean. If we look into the future, NATO will be doing new things after the Washington Summit: more practical cooperation, a more realistic agenda for discussion, going beyond simply explaining what NATO is up to. Perhaps some kind of greater flexibility or variable geometry will be put in place for those countries who would like to have closer cooperation. So NATO's role is evolving, and for the better.

---

<sup>1</sup> Senior International Policy Analyst, RAND, Santa Monica, California.

Finally, the point about new members in NATO's Mediterranean dialogue should also be raised. Algeria is a candidate that is ready to be included. Possibly, if the peace process moves forward, other countries like Syria might be added, and even Libya. I think that in the end, NATO's dialogue is going to move closer to a PfP-like framework. This is not to say that exactly the same PFP-type pattern will be applied in the Mediterranean, but it will be a broader frame, that will allow us to conduct exercises, training or other activities (including some current, bilateral activities) in the "spirit" of the Mediterranean initiative.

At first glance, this evolution might indicate that a rather simple division of labour may be developed. The EU would carry out the social, economic and political engagement, and NATO would do defence. But, obviously it is not as simple as that. There are some other aspects that we have to consider.

First, whatever the comparative advantages, it will not be possible to differentiate the respective roles in such a clear-cut manner. And second, larger externalities will influence the balance between EU and NATO roles in the region. On the one hand, there will be influences from whatever wider dialogue is established between NATO and the EU on soft and hard security issues – and questions like the seriousness of European engagement in defense initiatives, whether NATO is going to be a more global actor, etc. On the other hand, the outcome of the Middle-East peace process could have a determining effect on all of the various Mediterranean initiatives.

If the process move forward, Southern attitudes could be transformed and new demands for monitoring and confidence-building measures will appear. The role of a renewed ACRS (multilateral arms control and regional security negotiations) process may also be important, because it will have to fit among the different multilateral dialogues that are already present. And in spite of the great economic and political role of the EU, it cannot be the sole facilitator or guarantor in the security realm. Mediterranean countries will have choices to make in different spheres between an EU frame and a NATO or US-related frame for relations – as is the case now for Algeria – and for certain issues they may not choose the EU. Or they will desire a more diverse, transatlantic connection. In the end, we should be less concerned about architecture, and more concerned about maintaining a convergence of objectives among the different dialogues, and among key actors in Mediterranean affairs.



### **XIII. Developing coordination between the EMP and NATO's Mediterranean dialogue**

*Thanos Dokos*<sup>1</sup>

Although Russia may be resurfacing, not as a threat, but as a security concern, and the Balkans are still unstable, NATO's and Europe's attention will increasingly be shifting towards the Mediterranean. Almost all of the risks referred to in the Alliance's New Strategic Concept are present in a more or less acute form in the Mediterranean.

There is a very lively debate under way concerning Europe's new defence identity. Whatever the final outcome of this debate, and one should not expect any concrete results in the near future, we cannot afford to "Europeanize" Mediterranean security efforts. The US has what it perceives as vital interests in the Mediterranean, and so does the EU<sup>2</sup>. Therefore, both the EU and the US must remain involved and work together to protect their interests and project stability. The critical question is "what are the modalities of cooperation and the division of labour".

Nor we can afford to "northernize", if I may use this term, Mediterranean security. We need the active participation of countries in the southern rim of the Mediterranean Sea if we wish for our efforts to succeed in the long term. Otherwise the whole exercise is futile.

#### ***XIII.1 Regional cooperation: problems and prospects***

The end of the Cold War has lifted many of the constraints on regional cooperation in the Mediterranean. There are several initiatives under way, including the Mediterranean Dialogues of NATO<sup>3</sup> and the Western European Union, the OSCE Initiative and the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership. The number of initiatives raises the issue of cooperation between organisations (interlocking or "interblocking" organisations). Antagonism and overlap between those organisations may be unavoidable, but should be kept to a minimum. The fact, however, that there is no hierarchical order among the initiatives makes coordination even more difficult.

The relative lack of success in efforts for regional co-operation in the Mediterranean can be attributed to a number of factors, including the following:

1. The existence of the Arab-Israeli conflict (and to a much lesser extent other conflicts such as the Greek-Turkish one) which frustrated efforts to explore cooperative arrangements in CSBM and arms control fields;
2. Some of the rivalries and conflicts in the region are overlapping with out-of-region antagonisms and conflicts, complicating even more the efforts for conflict resolution and co-operation;
3. There is a relative lack of south-south relations;

---

<sup>1</sup> Director of Studies, Hellenic Foundation for European and Foreign Policy (ELIAMEP), Athens.

<sup>2</sup> Including protection of energy supplies, prevention of mass migration and the spread of religious extremism, prevention of the proliferation of WMD, support for friendly regimes, etc.

<sup>3</sup> On NATO's Mediterranean Initiative see for instance: Nicola de Santis, 'The Future of NATO's Mediterranean Initiative', *NATO Review*, no.1, Spring 1998; Larrabee, Green, Lesser & Zanini, *NATO's Mediterranean Initiative. Policy Issues and Dilemmas*, Santa Monica, RAND, 1998; Alberto Bin, 'Strengthening Cooperation in the Mediterranean: The Contribution of the Atlantic Alliance', presentation at the 1999 International Halki Seminars, organised by the Hellenic Foundation for European & Foreign Policy (ELIAMEP)

4. There are misperceptions between the northern and the southern Mediterranean countries (as demonstrated, for instance, by the reactions to EUROFOR & EUROMARFOR).

Several preconditions must be met for a successful EU or NATO effort to build confidence and ensure stability in the Euro-Mediterranean region. I will mention four conditions, but there are many more.

- First, the Mediterranean region possesses its own specific dynamics and security challenges. The European model of cooperative security, with all its conditionalities, can be proposed to, but not imposed upon the Mediterranean region. Although some elements of NATO's PfP initiative, which was quite successful in Central and Eastern Europe, may be applicable to the Mediterranean, the relative heterogeneity of the region would require specifically tailored solutions.
- Second, no progress can be achieved without the active participation and contribution of NATO's Mediterranean partners.
- Third, we are lacking a uniform and commonly accepted definition of security on the two sides of the Mediterranean. The absence of a common political vocabulary and approach to security hinders the progress of a security dialogue with the Mediterranean countries and often contributes to misperceptions and misunderstandings on both sides.
- Finally, if we set the lower common denominator as our objective, then we risk ending up with very insignificant activities. If on the other hand we set very high expectations, subsequent failure could endanger the whole initiative. Finding the right balance is a very delicate and difficult process.

### *XIII.2 Proposals*

We must ascertain the capabilities of each country and organisation in order to achieve the most efficient division of labour between the EU and NATO.<sup>4</sup> The best means of preventing many future crises in the Mediterranean is to address their root causes before the situation reaches the crisis stage. Because most of the problems are of a socio-economic nature, the European Union is the best actor to deal with these problems and ensure that they do not escalate into major crises requiring military action. The EU approach is quite efficient because it is comprehensive, while NATO, by nature, cannot deal with socio-economic problems.

But NATO also has a role to play. Although the EU may be more acceptable to some countries, especially when the problem is of a socio-economic nature, NATO is perceived as more credible when it comes to hard security issues. Therefore, the role of each organisation has to be determined on a case-by-case basis.

Complementarity is the key word and each organisation should concentrate its efforts on fields where it has a clear comparative advantage and something constructive to offer as a contribution to the solution of the problems in the Mediterranean region. In other words, we should look for the "added value".

---

<sup>4</sup> Although I don't have any blueprint for a division of labour to offer, I do see one problem. In peacetime, both the (W)EU and NATO could cooperate with the Mediterranean partners on the same "area": Petersberg-type missions. This means that they offer the same "product" and, therefore, are competitors.

Concerning the EMP, Euro-Mediterranean partners' major objective should be the creation of favourable conditions for future negotiations on arms control and disarmament and the development of a culture of dialogue and cooperation in the politico-military sector.<sup>5</sup> The main emphasis should be on the continuation of the search for a Charter for stability, where a cautious approach is necessary. The first phase could consist of:

- “Low cost” confidence-building and transparency measures whose application would be voluntary;
- The notification of future military activities (discussion of a code of conduct for military activities);
- An exchange of information among military staff.

Potential activities in the context of the EU might include discussion –through the reactivation of multilateral meetings-- of national perceptions on a number of issues including de-mining operations, crisis management (such as observation, and eventual participation to CRISEX), non-proliferation and military doctrines, military contacts and visits, joint exercises, maritime CSBMs and, at a later stage, creation of Regional Security Centres/Conflict Prevention Centres.<sup>6</sup> Furthermore, since the EU does not have schools like NATO's in Oberammergau (SHAPE) and Rome (NADEFCOL), the WEU Institute for Security Studies should continue and even intensify its successful seminar activities with increased participation of Mediterranean partners (with emphasis on information seminars).

It is also argued that cooperation with the armed forces of Mediterranean partners for non-traditional military purposes should now be promoted. Potential areas of cooperation would include natural disasters relief, preventing illicit trafficking of all kinds, intelligence cooperation against terrorism, police cooperation against transnational crime<sup>7</sup>, civil reconstruction and eventually crisis management and peace support operations.

Concerning NATO, I shall list five points addressing political issues. First, the Alliance needs an outreach programme for the countries along the Mediterranean. While these countries are unlikely to become NATO members, their security will increasingly impinge on broader Alliance interests.<sup>8</sup> Second, NATO suffers from a serious image problem in the Mediterranean Initiative countries. Part, at least, of the general public views NATO as a Cold War institution in search of a new enemy. Third, if NATO's Mediterranean Initiative is to succeed, NATO will have to devote greater financial resources to it.

The next two points concern both EU and NATO. Both organisations should address the dilemma of deepening their activities with partners, or expanding the scope of the initiative geographically (otherwise, it is argued, it might inadvertently draw a new dividing line). However, it can be argued that because there are very few if any candidates that currently meet the criteria, expanding the dialogue's membership without the necessary preconditions might

---

<sup>5</sup> Fred Tanner, 'The Euro-Mediterranean Security Partnership: Prospects for Conventional Arms Limitations and Confidence-Building', EuroMeSCo Working Group on Confidence-Building, Conflict Prevention and Arms Control, Rome, July 1997, p. 20.

<sup>6</sup> Martin Lipkowski, 'Security in the Mediterranean Region', Working Paper, Political Committee, Assembly of the WEU, October 1996, p. 28 & 31-32.

<sup>7</sup> See for instance the study by Alessandro Politi on *European Security: The New Transnational Risks*, Chaillot Papers 29, October 1997, Paris, WEU-ISS.

<sup>8</sup> Asmus, R., Larrabee, S., Lesser, I., 'Mediterranean Security: New Challenges, New Tasks', *NATO Review*, No. 3, May 1996, p. 31.

create serious problems and inhibit further progress. And the same is true of the WEU's Mediterranean Dialogue. Therefore, the emphasis should be on deepening the Dialogue, while, at the same time, keeping the door open for new partners.

Finally, the spread of Islamic movements in the Arab and the Muslim world is an undeniable fact. Islam as a political force in the Muslim world will play an important role in shaping relations between Europe and the southern Mediterranean countries. Therefore, the West should seek to understand the political culture of Islam and cease to demonise this religion.

Finally, two suggestions about NATO's military planning. First, the alliance must continue to prepare itself for potential military setbacks while ensuring that its actions do not appear hostile. This dilemma will likely increase as NATO's planning for non-Article 5 operations matures.

Second, NATO should be prepared to deal with the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, without, however, exaggerating this threat. NATO should avoid the impression that it is searching for a new *raison d'être*; some might conclude that the alliance was trying to replace the old Soviet menace with a new combination of Islamic fundamentalism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. This could unnecessarily antagonise and isolate the Islamic or the Arab world and become a self-fulfilling prophecy.

### ***XIII.3 Conclusion***

We appear to be approaching a rather critical point concerning the future development and direction of EU's Mediterranean policy. Even after the initial period of implementation of the Barcelona Process, there is no clear answer to the question of whether and to what extent Europe should give greater priority to the Mediterranean.

Recent developments in various parts of the Mediterranean give us reason for optimism. Examples include the peace talks between Israel and Syria, the improvement of relations between Greece and Turkey, the relative stabilization of the domestic situation in Algeria, the smooth succession process in Jordan.

But there are many more problems, conflicts and crises to deal with. Fluidity, instability and continued evolution are the predominant characteristics of the Mediterranean security environment. Although I do not share the view that there may be today some sort of military threat from the South to the North of the Mediterranean, increasing stability in this region should be a high priority for Europe and the US. And this requires long-term planning, better coordination and cooperation, and substantially increased funding.

## **XIV. Four scenarios for the relationships between the EMP and NATO's Mediterranean dialogue**

*Carlo Masala*<sup>1</sup>

EU's and NATO's initiatives towards the Mediterranean are above all characterized by a lack of co-ordination between them. In the not-so-distant future, this could lead to a competition between the EU and NATO in the Mediterranean area. Frictions, which are already obvious, could increase and further reduce the efficiency of transatlantic and European Mediterranean politics. Therefore, one of the priorities of both organisations should be to ensure task distribution and/or sufficient coordination. In order to illustrate how this coordination is necessary, four possible future scenarios will be described.

### ***XIV.1 Division of labour***<sup>2</sup>

A division of labour could be achieved by dividing responsibilities between the EU/WEU and NATO. In this case the EU would deal merely with the economic, social and cultural challenges of the Mediterranean, while NATO would take up the challenges in the field of security and military cooperation. The W/EU would play an important role in NATO's CJTF. In this scenario, cooperation between NATO and the EU would be limited to the exchange of views between NATO's Secretary General and high EU officials. Cooperation and synergy would be achieved only in low-level functional areas. In principle, such a division of labour already exists, but it is not based on formal limitations or restrictions, but rather on structural deficits, above all on the side of the EU. As long as the Europeans have no real common foreign and security policy, and especially common defence policy, they should restrict their political activities in the Mediterranean to the creation of a free trade area by 2010. Hence the Barcelona-Process should be reduced to its economical, and socio-political elements, while NATO would give more substance to its Mediterranean Initiative.

But such a scenario would be sub-optimal in practice, and would also encounter strong opposition from some European countries notably France. It seems obvious that this scenario would provoke France's reluctance because it will strengthen the US' position in the Mediterranean.

### ***XIV.2 A Mediterranean Contact Group (MCG)***

A division of labour scenario would not lead to better synergies between the EMP and NATO's Mediterranean dialogue. Stronger consultation mechanisms and cooperation are required to produce synergy effects. In order to create those mechanisms, a first option would be to upgrade the Transatlantic Agenda between the United States and the European Union agreed upon in 1995. Under the framework envisaged there, Washington and the members of the EU may define concrete interests and exchanges. However, should this option prove inappropriate, as in the past,

---

<sup>1</sup> University of Cologne.

<sup>2</sup> See Andreas Jacobs & Carlo Masala, 'Germany's Mediterranean Challenge', in *Contemporary Security Policy*, 20 (1999) 2, pp. 113-114.

it would be necessary to look for new forms of coordination. Another possible solution would be an informal Mediterranean Contact Group, which would essentially aim to co-ordinate the activities of NATO, WEU, and the EU in the Mediterranean region. This contact group should be located outside the institutional frameworks of NATO and the EU, and it would offer a suitable forum to moderate the diverging interests between the Western countries regarding the Mediterranean and harmonize their policies. The MCG would coordinate the various multilateral activities in the Mediterranean Region, and promote exchange of information. Active members of such a hypothetical contact group would be the United States, Germany, France, Great Britain, Italy, Spain, and Turkey, among others. NATO's Secretary General and the High Representative of the CSFP would execute the MCG's decisions, which would have been consulted with Mediterranean partners.

#### ***XIV.3 Making the Barcelona process more flexible<sup>3</sup>***

Making more flexible the Barcelona process, as the Euro-Mediterranean Charter is apparently trying to do, is the third possible scenario and in this case a better coordination and cooperation between the EMP and NATO's Mediterranean Dialogue would also be possible. In this scenario, instead of relying on the unrealistic assumption that progress in the EMP (and more specifically in baskets 1 and 3) could only be achieved if all partners agree, more sub-regional and flexible cooperation should be introduced. If some partner countries are able and willing to achieve more cooperation in basket one and basket three they should be able to go ahead, even if some other members are not willing to participate in such forms of enhanced co-operation. Through flexibility it would become possible to include a military dimension in basket one under the auspices of WEU, or the new Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP). This flexibility would also keep apart the EMP, to some extent, from external factors, like the Middle East peace process. It may also allow the United States to participate as an associate member of the EMP in some of its activities and maybe reduce the American reservations towards the EMP.

But flexibility should not be misguided and end up in a break up of the multilateral approach of the EMP. To ensure that the multilateral global approach which is characteristic and the innovative element of the EMP remains at its core, flexibility should be used in two ways. The first one has just been outlined above: flexibility through the introduction of regional, sub-regional and transregional cooperation schemes. The second way would be to introduce an opting-out mechanism when it comes to participation in concrete actions. Flexibility may thus open up new forms of coordination between the EMP and NATO's Mediterranean Dialogue.

#### ***XIV.4 The future of transatlantic relations as sine qua non for the relationship between the EMP and NATO's Mediterranean Dialogue***

The probability of the three previous scenarios as well as the future of both Mediterranean initiatives are highly dependent on the future of overall transatlantic security relations.<sup>4</sup> If Europe

---

<sup>3</sup> See, Carlo Masala, *Die Euro-Mediterrane Partnerschaft. Geschichte-Struktur-Prozeß*, ZEI Research Papers Nr. 98, Bonn 2000

<sup>4</sup> For a more complex and detailed discussion of possible future directions of the transatlantic security co-operation see, Carlo Masala, 'Semper idem?' in, Andreas Jacobs & Carlo Masala (eds), *Hannibal ante portas? EU und NATO im Mittelmeerraum*, Baden-Baden 2000 (forthcoming).

should be, one day, able to act autonomously and independently from the United States, patterns and mechanisms of transatlantic co-operation will change dramatically. Again, two possible outcomes may be pointed out.

The worst case scenario would lead to a break-up of the existing structure. ESDI, which in such a scenario would be under command and control of the European Council, could “accelerate an American retreat from Europe”<sup>5</sup> that would render NATO somewhat superfluous. Then NATO’s Mediterranean Dialogue would consequently disappear. The EU would thus be able to offer its EMP Partners a real military dimension within the framework of the Barcelona process and beyond. The US would continue nonetheless to exert its influence in the Mediterranean, especially on the eastern shore. Unilateral action would increase and conflict between the US and the EU over Mediterranean issues might occur. The Mediterranean region, especially the eastern Mediterranean would become an area of competition and maybe conflict between the former allies. In such a scenario, if at all, only a division of labour, in the geographical sense, could be achieved.

Far from this undesirable scenario, constructive relationships between the EU and NATO should be established. The development of a common security and defence policy by the EU should not imply a decoupling within NATO. A balanced partnership in transatlantic relations also represents better coordination and cooperation between the EMP and NATO’s Mediterranean Dialogue.

---

<sup>5</sup> An U.S. official quoted in *IHT*, 16.12.1999.

## XV. Le Maghreb entre l'Union européenne et les Etats-Unis

Nicole Grimaud<sup>1</sup>

Tous les Etats du Maghreb sont disponibles ou ne tarderont pas à l'être pour coopérer tant avec les Etats-Unis qu'avec l'Union européenne. C'est une évidence pour le Maroc et la Tunisie occidentaux depuis leur indépendance. L'Algérie se sent orpheline depuis 1989 et aspire à s'inscrire dans la mouvance américaine pour ne pas rester en tête-à-tête avec l'Europe. Elle retrouverait ainsi une possibilité de jeu. La Libye se dit prête officiellement à s'engager dans le processus de Barcelone, mais chacun connaît les multiples tentatives de Kadhafi pour se réconcilier avec les Etats-Unis et son hostilité relève pour beaucoup du dépit.

Cela dit, quel est l'état des lieux, et que proposent les Etats-Unis et l'Union européenne ?  
*Sur le plan économique* : face à des Européens très actifs et bien installés sur le terrain, les Etats-Unis pensent à donner un contenu à l'initiative Eizenstadt qui remonte à 18 mois (juin 1998). Les Européens sont présents tout simplement parce que la géographie et l'histoire nourrissent des relations de proximité anciennes, parce que les courants commerciaux portent les investissements, et parce que le partenariat global proposé à Barcelone couronne naturellement cet état des choses d'autant plus qu'il est agrémenté de quelques crédits. Certes, le pétrole constitue un cas particulier. Il jouit d'une sorte d'exterritorialité en Algérie et les sociétés américaines ont pour elles leur expérience quasi universelle qui guide leur intuition en matière de recherche, et leur aptitude à mobiliser d'énormes crédits. Quant à la Libye, les pétroliers américains y ont joué le rôle de pionniers et leurs intérêts ont été conservés ; leur retour est souhaité très ouvertement, et on se rappelle que les Européens, Allemagne et Italie en tête, se sont opposés à la seule sanction susceptible de nuire gravement à la Libye : l'embargo pétrolier.

*Sur le plan politique* : ce survol donne l'occasion de raffiner l'affirmation de départ – tout le monde prêt à coopérer avec tout le monde. En fait, l'Amérique suscite, à des degrés divers selon les pays, un sentiment ambivalent. Attraction due à son statut de première puissance mondiale, mais réticences pour sa politique au Moyen-Orient : envers l'Irak, sa forte partialité envers les thèses israéliennes, et sa générosité envers l'Etat hébreu, notamment en matériel militaire sophistiqué. Le sentiment pro-palestinien des masses arabes étant instrumentalisé par les islamistes, les gouvernements ne peuvent franchir aisément une limite sans prendre de précautions ou de risques en politique intérieure.

En Tunisie, la forte tonalité pro-arabe de l'opinion, la jeunesse en particulier, a été respectée lors de la guerre du Golfe, la Tunisie étant restée en dehors de la coalition occidentale, mais elle n'empêche pas qu'une base terrestre dans le Sud soit fort discrètement accordée aux Etats-Unis.

En Algérie, où la culture anti-israélienne a été inculquée avec insistance depuis 1962, l'officialisation de contacts avec Israël a suscité au sein du FLN un comité contre la reprise des relations avec Israël.

En revanche, le soutien des Européens à l'Autorité palestinienne est porté à leur crédit. Par le biais de l'interminable conflit israélo-arabe, l'UE regagne une marge, un délai qui devrait lui permettre d'améliorer son offre sur le plan militaire.

---

<sup>1</sup> Directeur de Recherche, Centre d'Etudes et de Recherches internationales (CERI), Fondation Nationale des Sciences politiques (FNSP), Paris.



*Sur le plan militaire* : à mon avis, les Maghrébins n'ont aucun motif de refuser, et ne peuvent qu'être flattés d'être conviés aux dialogues méditerranéens que leur proposent, chacun de leur côté, l'UEO et l'OTAN. L'adhésion de l'Algérie au dialogue OTAN paraît proche. L'Europe cherchant en priorité à pacifier la région, la Charte jouera d'autant plus son rôle d'instrument de référence qu'elle aura été élaborée par tous.

Mais, depuis 1997, le mouvement se dessine tant à l'OTAN qu'à l'UEO d'ajouter au contenu du dialogue des activités militaires. Dans cette nouvelle phase, l'UE devrait, dans le cadre de l'affirmation de ses capacités de défense, repenser la coopération militaire qu'elle peut offrir à ses partenaires du sud. De même que pour les aides économiques bilatérales, il faudra bien se décider à fondre les actions bilatérales dans une grande initiative européenne. On pourrait procéder dans un premier temps à un inventaire de la coopération bilatérale militaire accordée aux maghrébins ; on aurait ainsi le noyau dur déjà existant d'une aide militaire à l'estampille européenne qu'il ne resterait qu'à rationaliser et compléter.

Au-delà, sur quel registre se situeront les rapports Europe/Etats-Unis ? Coopération de confrontation, complément ou concurrence ? Pour l'instant, c'est l'ambiguïté. Si la voie de la complémentarité avec l'Amérique triomphe, peut-être pourrait-on étudier le précédent tunisien pour en retirer des enseignements. Voilà 25 ans, depuis le printemps 1976, que le double parrainage accordé par les Etats-Unis et la France à la Tunisie confrontée à ses voisins a assez bien fonctionné. En outre, au moment où les Etats du Maghreb doivent répondre à la fois aux exigences de la modernisation et aux attentes de leur nombreuse jeunesse, un système régional de garanties qui assure la stabilité pourrait limiter les dépenses improductives.

## XVI. Le dialogue de l'OTAN sur la Méditerranée et l'institutionnalisation de la Charte euro-méditerranéenne

Jean-François Daguzan<sup>1</sup>

Désormais la Méditerranée, toujours en quête de stabilité et de sécurité, semble devenir un des nouveaux champs clos de la rivalité entre l'Europe et les Etats-Unis et les propositions ou initiatives des organisations régionales en matière de stabilité ou de sécurité méditerranéenne prolifèrent et se télescopent. Il s'agit donc d'en peser ici leur nature et leur portée.

### XVI.1 Cap au Sud : L'OTAN, la Méditerranée et le Golfe

Un nouveau langage est en train de s'organiser à Washington et à l'OTAN. Certains font prévaloir le caractère « indivisible » de la sécurité, et celui-ci implique donc un engagement accru de l'Alliance en Méditerranée (Benjamino Andreatta, ministre italien de la Défense, novembre 1997)<sup>2</sup>. A la même époque, les dernières déclarations de l'Amiral américain Joseph Lopez, commandant en chef du Flanc Sud de l'OTAN, peu avant la conférence de Madrid, furent assez illustratives de l'orientation vers le Sud que les Etats-Unis souhaitent donner à leur engagement dans la zone euro-méditerranéenne. L'Amiral constate ainsi que « la ligne de front de l'engagement des Etats-Unis pour la sécurité européenne se déplace vers la Méditerranée et au-delà ». Cette évolution dans l'engagement se justifie, au yeux de l'Amiral Lopez, par la permanence et la conjonction de facteurs belligères mal définis : « La prochaine guerre pourrait résulter de n'importe quelle combinaison de facteurs d'explosion : difficultés économiques, pénuries d'eau, fanatisme religieux, immigration, et j'en passe »<sup>3</sup>. On est, dans ce discours, au niveau du virtuel. Il permet de tout justifier, notamment le fait de contrôler militairement, *ad vitam aeternam*, l'espace euro-méditerranéen. Plus récemment, Hans Binnendijk, directeur de l'INSS du *National Defense University* à Washington, militait pour une stratégie « sudiste » et « réactive » de l'OTAN qui dépasserait la notion de champ d'application géographique dépassée et restrictive, pour évoluer vers une notion « d'intérêt commun ». Celle-ci a pour grand mérite d'inclure les intérêts pétroliers (« préserver l'accès au Golfe ») qui cohabitent avec le « contrôle de l'immigration d'Afrique du Nord », le « génocide dans les Balkans » et les Etats terroristes proliférants<sup>4</sup>.

Le point de vue de Binnendijk est, à cet égard, révélateur quand il dit d'une part que « l'OTAN doit se concentrer dans le sud car c'est là que l'insécurité réside » ; et, d'autre part, que « le manque de consultation au sein de l'OTAN à l'occasion de la récente crise irakienne est inacceptable si l'OTAN veut survivre au 21ème siècle ». Le fait que ces stratégies de l'insécurité floue s'accompagnent d'une dimension mercantile (notamment en matière d'antibalistique) ne doit pas être, non plus, occulté.

---

<sup>1</sup> Maître de recherche à la FRS, Directeur des recherches à la FMES, Paris.

<sup>2</sup> *TTU* du 20 novembre 1997, p. 2.

<sup>3</sup> Propos tirés d'un article de *l'International Herald Tribune* du 20 mai 1997, cités par Gilbert Achard, « Surenchère au sujet du flanc sud de l'OTAN », *Le débat stratégique*, n. 33, juillet 1997, p. 2

<sup>4</sup> Intervention lors du colloque *Mediterranean Security in the Twenty-First Century*, organisé à Rome (3-5 décembre 1998) par l'INSS de la National Defense University et le Centre militaire d'études stratégiques italien (CeMiSS).

## ***XVI.2 Le lancement du dialogue méditerranéen***

En 1994, à l'occasion de la réunion du Conseil de l'Atlantique Nord, et à la demande de l'Espagne et de l'Italie, l'OTAN a proposé à un certain nombre de pays du sud méditerranéen d'ouvrir des discussions en matière de sécurité. Les premiers pays sollicités individuellement, en février 1995, furent : l'Égypte, Israël, le Maroc, la Mauritanie, et la Tunisie. Ils furent rejoints un peu plus tard par la Jordanie.

Les dégâts diplomatiques provoqués par les premières déclarations catastrophistes sur la « menace du Sud »<sup>5</sup> conduisirent l'OTAN, sous la pression de l'Espagne à faire la proposition d'un *partenariat pour la paix en Méditerranée* (inspiré initialement du modèle de celui qui existe pour l'Europe centrale et orientale)<sup>6</sup>. Ce projet (devenu, désormais, *Dialogue méditerranéen*), contrairement à la philosophie de la conférence de Barcelone, distingue des États fréquentables et des États proscrits parmi les pays méditerranéens ; les bons furent sollicités pour faire l'objet d'une coopération privilégiée sur les questions de défense et de sécurité, les autres, les *Backlash States*, payant le prix de leur conduite régressive (Libye, Syrie) ou, d'autres, leur situation particulière (Algérie)<sup>7</sup>. Aujourd'hui, les objectifs de l'OTAN en Méditerranée peuvent être définis comme suit :

- la poursuite du dialogue avec les pays méditerranéens « acceptables » ;
- la gestion des crises à l'exemple de l'affaire bosniaque ;
- un rôle de stabilité interallié en Méditerranée (médiation informelle sur les questions de la Mer Egée ou de Chypre) ;
- une contribution accrue en matière de non prolifération.

## ***XVI.3 Les mesures concrètes lancées dans le cadre du dialogue***

La déclaration du Conseil atlantique de Madrid en juillet 1997, qui a sanctionné le repli de la France, consacre, en son point 13, la création d'un nouveau comité : le Groupe de Coopération méditerranéen qui aura pour responsabilité de poursuivre le dialogue avec les autres États méditerranéens sélectionnés :

- Le programme scientifique de l'OTAN a été ouvert aux pays du dialogue.
- La décision ministérielle de Sintra (Portugal) en mai 1997 a permis d'offrir le statut d'observateur des manœuvres terrestres et maritimes OTAN aux pays du dialogue qui en feraient la demande. Elle a également ouvert l'accès à des séminaires et workshops. Des visites de délégations militaires de l'OTAN ont été autorisées ainsi que la réciprocité (invitations aux quartiers généraux et échange d'officiers d'état-major). Enfin, le programme inclut des visites dans les ports des pays du dialogue d'unités de la STANAVFORMED.

---

<sup>5</sup> Abdelouhab Maalmi, « L'OTAN et le Sud, les malentendus d'un dialogue », *L'Annuaire de la Méditerranée 1996*, Germ/Publisud, Rabat/Paris, pp. 52-55.

<sup>6</sup> Voir Général Domenico Corcione, ministère italien de la Défense, *Security in the Mediterranean Region : a Partnership Strategy*, Informal meeting of Nato Defence Ministers, Williamsburg, 5-6 octobre 1995, non publié.

<sup>7</sup> Le concept de *Backlash State* a été développé dans un important article d'Anthony Lake et Gregory Gause III, « Confronting Backlash States: A debate », *Foreign Affairs*, mars/avril 1994.

- Un « concept » a été spécifiquement élaboré par les autorités militaires de l'Alliance à la destination des Méditerranéens :

- des cours à l'école OTAN de Oberammergau sur le rôle de l'action militaire dans le cadre de la protection de l'environnement, sur la coopération civilo-militaire, sur le maintien de la paix, sur les forces multinationales, le contrôle des armes conventionnelles et la coopération européenne en matière de sécurité ;
- des cours et conférences de formation au collège de défense de l'OTAN à Rome (le premier cycle « General Flag Officer Course » s'est tenu en avril 1998) ;
- enfin, d'autres activités sont conduites sous la responsabilité des deux principaux commandement (ACE et ACLANT). Elles incluent le suivi des exercices, des actions dans le cadre du Partenariat pour la paix tel que les sauvetages en mer, le soutien médical, et les manoeuvres de soutien à des actions humanitaires.

Le dialogue méditerranéen est-il donc le cheval de Troie de l'action multilatérale américaine dans cette zone du monde ? La réponse doit être nuancée. En effet, si l'on peut admettre que l'OTAN peut jouer un rôle pédagogique dans la formation et l'information des cadres militaires méditerranéens du sud et de l'est, on demeure perplexe quant aux capacités réelles de cette Organisation d'organiser la sécurité de l'espace méditerranéen et, encore moins, dans le Golfe. Un des arguments proposés par les experts est que l'OTAN est l'organisation la mieux adaptée pour parler et traiter des questions de sécurité en Méditerranée. Or l'OTAN, en dépit ou à cause de sa puissance militaire, est sans doute l'instrument de coopération politique le moins apte à contribuer à établir un système de sécurité satisfaisant en Méditerranée. Instrument simple (bien qu'au fonctionnement complexe) initialement dédié à la réponse à une menace simple et prévisible, il apparaît peu adapté à la gestion de situations complexes, mouvantes et hétérogènes qui sont le lot des situations méditerranéennes. La difficulté de mise en oeuvre de ses moyens s'illustre dans le cadre de l'affaire ex-yougoslave qui, bien que dans sa dimension slave, ressortit d'une problématique européenne, peut également, par sa complexité, être identifiée comme une situation, un archétype méditerranéen. Les Alliés ne s'y sont pas trompés en rejetant, lors du sommet de Washington, l'idée d'une compétence *erga-omnes* de l'organisation atlantique et en évitant bien toute implication dans le Golfe comme l'auraient souhaité certains Américains.

Néanmoins, la « pression » de l'OTAN sur l'espace méditerranéen devrait continuer à se renforcer, mais l'amalgame évident Etats-Unis/OTAN dans les pays arabes, le sentiment général anti-américain et la question du soutien inconditionnel à Israël devraient en limiter les effets stratégiques à des relations de bon voisinage.

Cependant, face à cette offensive conceptuelle, les Européens arrivent en ordre dispersé alors que, de leur côté, les riverains du sud peinent à s'organiser. Dans ces conditions, il devient urgent de faire un intense effort conceptuel pour redonner un nouvel élan à un espace de stabilité euro-méditerranéen qui soit réellement pris en charge par les parties prenantes locales.

#### ***XVI.4 La Charte euro-méditerranéenne pour la paix et la stabilité : seule option d'avenir pour les Européens et les autres riverains en Méditerranée ?***

L'UEO ne joue, pour l'instant, qu'un rôle limité dans la sécurité en Méditerranée. Au plan politique, le dialogue qui avait été entamé avec les pays du Maghreb, puis avec sept pays méditerranéens, a été mis en sommeil. Seul l'outil militaire, européen mais restreint, des

Euroforce et Euromarforce serait susceptible de représenter un embryon de présence politique sur le bassin. Cependant, l'existence de ces forces, mal expliquée à nos partenaires du sud, est vue de l'autre côté de la Méditerranée (de Tripoli à Rabat) comme une menace virtuelle, produisant ainsi l'effet inverse escompté. Ceci ramène à une question de bon sens : l'outil militaire n'a de réalité que s'il est soutenu par une dimension politique. En l'absence d'une telle dimension, son existence est vaine, voire nuisible. C'est dans la fusion avec l'Union européenne que les actions méditerranéennes de l'UEO pourront retrouver tout leur sens.

L'Union européenne est, à l'heure actuelle, la seule institution capable d'avoir un sens en Méditerranée. C'est donc au développement des instruments politiques issus de la Déclaration de Barcelone qu'il convient de s'attaquer. L'idée d'une Charte méditerranéenne chargée de prendre en compte la dimension « paix et sécurité » dans l'évolution future du processus de Barcelone est inscrite dans le premier volet du texte de la Déclaration. L'élaboration de la Charte, prévue pour le second semestre 2000, sous présidence française de l'Union, semble particulièrement prometteuse<sup>8</sup> et ce, même si le processus de Barcelone a connu des hauts et des bas. La Charte euro-méditerranéenne peut être le véritable socle d'une organisation institutionnelle de la Méditerranée qui imposerait l'Union européenne comme l'acteur majeur de la sécurité dans cette zone.

### ***XVI.5 Une démarche d'abord politique***

Installer une organisation institutionnelle dans une des zones du monde longtemps des plus instables nécessite une démarche prudente. L'approche doit donc être en premier lieu politique, comme le préconisaient les « *lignes directrices* » retenues à la conférence de Stuttgart. Il ne peut s'agir que d'un mouvement consensuel, non contraignant à l'origine et basé sur l'adhésion volontaire de ses membres. En l'état, seul le respect des grands principes de la Charte des Nations unies et la Déclaration de Barcelone doivent être posés comme a priori au moment de l'adhésion. Les trois volets de la Déclaration doivent constituer la base de référence, de principe et symbolique de la Charte<sup>9</sup>.

Cependant, l'acte constitutif, la Charte, doit être posé de façon solennelle. A cet égard, cette institutionnalisation ne peut passer que par une réunion des chefs d'Etat et de gouvernement partenaires du Processus de Barcelone. L'entrée préalable de la Libye dans le processus apparaît un élément décisif pour la réussite future de la Charte.

L'indivisibilité de l'ensemble euro-méditerranéen et notamment de la Méditerranée, elle-même, doit être réaffirmée. La force potentielle du Processus de Barcelone réside dans le lien entre Union européenne et Méditerranée et l'affirmation que la sécurité et la stabilité de l'un des protagonistes est corrélative à celle de l'autre. Cette notion de destin partagé doit se retrouver nommément dans le Préambule de la Charte.

La future Charte doit viser, d'abord et avant tout, l'organisation d'un cadre de coopération politique et de réduction des tensions interétatiques. Le volet 2, même si la sécurité économique est un enjeu essentiel difficilement séparable du premier, concerne d'abord la gestion de

---

<sup>8</sup> Voir notre article « Un pacte de stabilité pour la Méditerranée : un regard français », *Méditerranée : le pacte à construire*, FMES-CREST-UNISCI, Paris, Publisud, 1997, pp. 193-209.

<sup>9</sup> On pourra étudier le détail des idées évoquées dans cette deuxième partie dans notre étude sur « La Charte euro-méditerranéenne pour la paix et la stabilité : éléments juridiques et politiques », contribution au Groupe Euromesco sur la Charte, octobre 1999, et on tirera profit de la synthèse de Roberto Aliboni, « Building Blocks for the Euro-Med Charter on Peace and Stability », *Euromesco Papers*, n. 7, janvier 2000.

l'assistance économique de l'Union et ne peut faire l'objet d'une gestion collective dans le cadre de la Charte. Il y a donc un double niveau dans Barcelone qui doit être reflété dans la Charte : un volet coopération politique et de sécurité qui doit en constituer le cœur et un volet coopération/assistance qui en est exclu. Les questions assez hétérogènes incluses dans le volet 3, « domaines social, culturel et humain », même s'ils doivent figurer nommément dans la Charte ne devront être abordés que progressivement. En revanche, certains éléments du volet 3, cités également au volet 1, pourraient être des éléments rapidement opérationnels de la Charte : notamment ceux concernant le terrorisme, la drogue ou la criminalité transnationale.

#### ***XVI.6 Les avantages d'un acte institutionnel : fixer et durer***

Si la conférence de Barcelone et son programme de travail semblaient la voie la plus favorable pour développer un processus à l'origine fort peu évident de cohabitation des extrêmes, celui-ci ne peut avoir d'impact durable que dans un minimum d'institutionnalisation :

- *un organe décisionnel* : la conférence des ministres des Affaires étrangères (modèle coopération politique de l'OTAN) décidant à l'unanimité. Le cas échéant, à l'occasion d'actes solennels, la conférence des chefs d'Etat et de gouvernement pourra lui être substituée.
- *un organe administratif* : un Secrétariat général léger dirigé par un Secrétaire général. Initialement, il ne semble pas souhaitable que le Secrétaire général ait la dimension d'un Secrétaire général de l'OTAN ou du nouveau Secrétaire général/Monsieur PESC créé par le traité d'Amsterdam ; il doit se rapprocher plus de la dimension essentiellement administrative et technique de l'ancien Secrétaire général du Conseil des ministres de l'Union européenne (avant Amsterdam) ou par exemple du Chef du Secrétariat du programme Euréka.
- *un dialogue parlementaire euro-méditerranéen* : prémices d'une Chambre consultative euro-méditerranéenne. Le succès du dialogue entre les représentants des pays des deux rives, à travers les conférences interparlementaires successives, montre, s'il en était besoin, la nécessité d'une meilleure association de la représentation populaire aux décisions de l'exécutif. Il serait alors possible d'envisager une chambre consultative rattachée à la Charte, dont les membres seraient issus des représentations parlementaires nationales (comme l'Assemblée de l'UEO ou de l'Atlantique Nord, par exemple) et qui pourrait travailler sur des sujets d'intérêts communs et donner des avis ou produire des rapports sur la demande du Conseil de la Charte.

#### ***XVI.7 Les instruments de la Charte***

Pour jouer pleinement son rôle de stabilisation de l'espace euro-méditerranéen, la Charte doit disposer d'un certain nombre d'instruments opérationnels : Commissions, groupes de travail ou comités. Ils doivent être, à notre sens, orientés sur les missions principales dévolues à la Charte : prévention des conflits et réduction des tensions.

##### *Un mécanisme de prévention des crises et des conflits*

Le principal contenu de la Charte, en plus de constituer un forum officiel de dialogue et de concertation, serait axé sur la recherche de mesures de confiance et la diplomatie préventive et serait un cadre à la prévention des tensions et des conflits ainsi qu'à leur règlement. On rechercherait alors la mise en place, en premier lieu, d'un code de conduite et de règlement pacifique des différends ; ces mesures s'inscrivant au fur et à mesure de leur faisabilité

politique<sup>10</sup>. Les experts travaillant sur la sécurité en Méditerranée ont abordé à plusieurs reprises la question de la prévention des conflits. Ainsi, Roberto Aliboni n'hésite-t-il pas à qualifier le processus de Barcelone de « Macro-mesure systémique et structurelle de prévention des conflits ». Un certain nombre d'éléments peuvent être isolés de ces travaux qui, à la fois, montrent le caractère spécifique de l'approche prévention des crises et conflits en Méditerranée et la difficulté de la mettre en œuvre.

Les experts ne rejettent pas la démarche et les instruments classiques de prévention des conflits. Ils mettent cependant en avant les caractères :

- de progressivité dans l'évolution des phases : une culture de la prévention est à mettre en œuvre dans une zone du monde qui en est largement dépourvue ;
- de subsidiarité de la démarche de Barcelone par rapport aux processus existants (selon le principe établi dans la déclaration de Barcelone) ; mais cette question mérite d'être discutée tant la paralysie de certains processus est grande ;
- de retour d'expérience : les experts égyptiens font valoir avec raison que l'expérience des accords bilatéraux de prévention des incidents, notamment (Égypte/Israël ou Israël/Syrie, etc.) doit être à prendre en compte (téléphone rouge, annonce préalable de mouvements de troupes ou de manoeuvres, zones d'exclusion, etc.).

Cadre politique général de dialogue et de coopération, la Charte doit donc revêtir également des aspects opérationnels en matière de prévention des conflits. A cet égard, on pourrait s'inspirer de la convention de Stockholm du 15 décembre 1992 établie dans le cadre alors de la CSCE. Cette convention, qui respecte le caractère intergouvernemental de la CSCE/OSCE, permet à des Etats membres de rechercher une procédure de conciliation souple. Ce mode de règlement qui avait pu être trouvé trop intergouvernemental par certains observateurs au moment de sa création, semble a priori tout à fait adapté à la spécificité euro-méditerranéenne.

La création d'un *mécanisme politique d'urgence* similaire à celui créé par la réunion du Conseil des ministres de la CSCE des 19 et 20 juin 1991 à Berlin pourrait être également envisagée. La mise en place d'un tel mécanisme au niveau méditerranéen, conçu pour apporter une réponse rapide et utile à une crise brutale, pourrait aussi aider à réduire les risques de guerre ou d'actions offensives unilatérales (représailles) causées par une interprétation erronée de tels ou tels faits. La réunion des Hauts fonctionnaires chargés du suivi du processus de Barcelone pourrait jouer le rôle de *Senior Council*.

Enfin, à partir des différents modèles existants (et notamment celui de l'OSCE) un *centre d'information régional pour la stabilité en Méditerranée*, suivant en cela la recommandation de la conférence interparlementaire de Malte (point 18), pourrait être créé dans un premier temps. Ce centre pourrait ensuite évoluer, en profitant de l'expérience des ACRS, vers un *Centre régional de gestion des crises*. L'accent devrait être mis tout particulièrement sur le travail spécifique concernant l'après-« alerte avancée » (*Post Early Warning*), autrement dit sur la recherche de la réduction des crises dans ses premières heures<sup>11</sup>.

### *Un code de bonne conduite et l'établissement de mesures de confiance*

L'établissement d'un code de bonne conduite doit être également au cœur de la Charte. La base de ce code est toute entière contenu dans le volet 1 qui précise les engagements auxquels

---

<sup>10</sup> Ambassadeur Jean-Pierre Courtois, « Eléments sur le projet de Charte de paix et de stabilité », intervention au séminaire de Wilton Park, Le dialogue euro-méditerranéen (19-22 octobre 1998).

<sup>11</sup> Jean-François Daguzan, « Les implications d'un pacte de stabilité dans le désarmement en Méditerranée », dans Antonio Marquina (dir.) *Les élites et le processus de changement dans la Méditerranée*, FMES/CREST/UNISCI, Madrid, 1997, pp. 281-303.

souscrivent les parties signataires. Cet aspect comme le constate Fred Tanner est le plus souvent négligé par les analystes<sup>12</sup>. Cet ensemble de contraintes librement acceptées qui vont de règles de comportement interne (pluralisme, respect des minorités, etc.) à des règles de bon voisinage (en commençant par la non-agression pour aller jusqu'à la suffisance militaire) rappelle beaucoup le code de bonne conduite de l'OSCE du Document de Budapest de 1994, même s'il est moins détaillé que ce dernier. La question est de savoir s'il est possible d'aller plus loin.

Enfin, les colloques ou séminaires tenus sur les questions de défense en Méditerranée, ces dernières années, ont aussi clairement fait apparaître qu'un des problèmes majeurs posés aux riverains des deux rives était celui des fausses perceptions (identification de menaces non fondées, craintes instinctives, mauvaise interprétation d'actions militaires, méconnaissance de phénomènes culturels, etc.). Le travail sur les perceptions apparaît alors comme un enjeu majeur de réduction des risques dans cette zone<sup>13</sup>. De la même façon, l'établissement d'un *lexique commun de termes de référence* en matière de sécurité pourrait être un premier pas utile pour une appréhension commune des situations d'urgences et des moyens d'y faire face.

#### *Disposer de capacités d'action sub-régionales*

La Charte doit mettre en place la possibilité éventuelle de développer, sans circonvenir au principe d'indivisibilité, d'actions de « coopérations renforcées » (ou « actions communes dans les domaines où les Etats membres ont des intérêts importants en commun » pour reprendre les dispositions prévues à l'article J-1. al. 3, J-3 et aussi J-4 al. 5 du volet PESC du traité de Maastricht<sup>14</sup>) limitées à certains Etats ou groupes d'Etats et pouvant prendre soit une dimension géographique sous-régionale (Méditerranée occidentale) soit une dimension thématique (eau, par exemple). Cette formule a pour intérêt de laisser se développer des coopérations n'intéressant pas tous les partenaires en même temps (ce qui sera souvent le cas). Il faudra ainsi envisager des modalités d'abstention constructive dans les mécanismes de prise de décision. Les Etats partenaires non intéressés s'abstenant de gêner l'adoption de mesures auxquelles ils ne sont pas parties prenantes. Bien sûr, la possibilité de réintégrer le train de telle ou telle coopération devra rester ouverte.

#### *Créer une commission juridique de consultation*

Un dialogue sur « l'espace commun de légalité », mériterait également d'être entrepris<sup>15</sup>. Il peut toucher la réflexion sur les questions aussi diverses que l'environnement, la coopération policière, les questions de droit comparé, mais aussi, ultérieurement, le droit international et les questions juridiques liés aux différends et conflits de la zone (processus de paix, Sahara occidental, Gibraltar et Ceuta et Melilla, contentieux chypriote, Mer Égée, etc.) que les pays signataires de la Déclaration de Barcelone n'ont pas souhaité voir, dans un premier temps, pris en compte. Cette coopération juridique ne devrait, en aucun cas prendre la forme ou être interprétée comme un quelconque tribunal international mais, plutôt, comme un forum de débat et

---

<sup>12</sup> Voir Fred Tanner, « An Emerging Security Agenda for the Mediterranean », *Mediterranean Politics*, n. 3, Vol. 1, hiver 1995, p. 279-294.

<sup>13</sup> Jean-François Daguzan, « Un pacte de stabilité en Méditerranée : un point de vue français », *Méditerranée : le pacte à construire*, Collection Strademed n. 3, Publisud/FMES/ CREST/UNISCI, Paris, 1997, pp. 193-209.

<sup>14</sup> Procédure plus simple que celle du Traité d'Amsterdam et mieux adaptée à la spécificité euro-méditerranéenne qu'il faudra peut être encore simplifier.

<sup>15</sup> Voir ambassadeur Marc Bonnefous, « Vers un nouveau concept de sécurité », *La Méditerranée occidentale, un espace à partager*, FMES, Toulon, 1991, pp. 114-115; et Jean-François Daguzan, « Coopération régionale et sécurité collective en Méditerranée », *Revue d'économie régionale et urbaine*, n. 4 1992, pp. 574-575.



d'échanges qui permettrait de faire avancer des dossiers difficiles dans la sérénité et d'ouvrir des espaces de négociations euro-méditerranéens.

### ***XVI.8 Conclusion***

Le mécanisme politique d'établissement d'une Charte euro-méditerranéenne de paix et de stabilité doit être un processus forcément modeste mais ambitieux sur le long terme. Les problèmes sociologiques voire structurels qui marquent la spécificité du bassin méditerranéen sont tels que toute tentative qui viserait à brûler les étapes pourrait produire des effets désastreux et briser irrémédiablement cette dynamique.

Il faut en fait attendre des effets pédagogiques de l'institutionnalisation. La création d'un ensemble structuré (la Charte), le dialogue qu'il établira, les règles qu'il fixera et la publicité qui en sera faite seront autant d'éléments qui contribueront progressivement à favoriser l'évolution politique des Etats membres. Le Maghreb et le Proche-Orient sont rentrés dans l'ère des mutations et les transitions sont en marche. Même si certains facteurs peuvent faire craindre un vingt et unième siècle de crises, d'autres, pourvu que l'Union européenne accompagne politiquement et économiquement ce processus, permettent d'imaginer une ère de véritable stabilité. C'est tout le rôle qui revient à la Charte euro-méditerranéenne que de construire les bases pour y parvenir.

Face à cela, la stratégie américaine en Méditerranée est d'abord une affaire d'opportunisme. Ceux qui voient chez les Américains de diaboliques stratèges se trompent. Ils savent simplement utiliser les vides que l'Europe désunie leur laisse avec complaisance, en Méditerranée comme ailleurs. D'une certaine manière la stratégie des Etats-Unis en Méditerranée dont l'OTAN n'est qu'un des éléments, pourrait se résumer à deux points : d'une part, empêcher l'Union européenne de devenir une puissance à part entière en gênant son action, entre autres, sur l'espace méditerranéen ; d'autre part, doser l'effort de perturbation de telle sorte que celle-ci puisse continuer à jouer un rôle économique indispensable (y compris pour les Américains eux-mêmes) dans la zone et que les Etats européens continuent d'assurer un rôle militaire subalterne (qui devra être néanmoins réévalué au plan financier) dans la gestion d'une sécurité globale d'une zone allant du Caucase à la Méditerranée du sud en passant essentiellement par le Golfe et par l'Asie centrale, et dont les Etats-Unis seront les acteurs dominants. En d'autres termes, prenant acte de l'incapacité des Européens à organiser l'espace méditerranéen, les Etats-Unis profiteront du mouvement de coopération désormais lancé, mais à leur profit principal. A charge pour les Européens d'imposer leur propre stratégie !

## **XVII. Better coordination of security dialogues in the Mediterranean**

*Stephen C. Calleya*<sup>1</sup>

When one examines the different Mediterranean policy track records of the various European security organisations, it becomes clear that all would be more effective if they dedicated more of their efforts to dealing with issues that are of primary concern to their Mediterranean partners. Mediterranean countries too often perceive that the European security picture is moving along regardless of their views. This is certainly not the approach that is required if a credible Euro-Mediterranean confidence building framework is to be nurtured.

If European security institutions would like to upgrade their policies towards the Mediterranean they must add some substance to the concept of complementarity. It is true that overlap is better than a security vacuum, but there is no denying that synergy is better than overlap. While continuing to offer flexible approaches towards the Mediterranean which concentrate on different areas of specialisation, European security organisations would all maximise their output if they introduced a more transparent system of sharing information with one another.

If European security arrangements want to remain relevant in the Mediterranean they must adapt to and reflect the changing regional dynamics of the Mediterranean. Information regarding security initiatives across the Mediterranean area should be amplified and upgraded and the objectives of each initiative be clearly spelt out.

The same can be said when it comes to the criteria for participating in different European security initiatives towards the Mediterranean. It should be clear what the criteria for joining a security initiative are and a process perhaps similar for those candidates wishing to join the European Union can be adopted to remove the ambiguity that often surrounds accession guidelines. To date security initiatives lack a coherent *acquis* and have not developed a screening and negotiating like procedure similar to that adopted by the EU when it comes to admitting new members. When it comes to participating in Euro-Mediterranean security arrangements endless ambiguity will only contribute further to the misperceptions that already dominate security relations between the northern and southern shores of the Mediterranean. This will continue to undermine efforts that seek to nurture confidence in this region of the world.

A Euro-Mediterranean security framework should also seek to accommodate the states of Libya, Syria, Lebanon, and the Gulf states. The integration of such states into the main fabric of Euro-Mediterranean relations will significantly determine the pattern of relations that will dominate this region during the first quarter of the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

### ***XVII.1 The way forward***

Ideally, one should investigate the feasibility of setting up a Euro-Mediterranean Security Agency (EMSA) that would be mandated to co-ordinate the activities of the different European co-operative security networks operating in the area. EMSA could also aim to initiate an incremental security network.

---

<sup>1</sup> Deputy Director, Mediterranean Academy of Diplomatic Studies, University of Malta.

For instance, a Euro-Mediterranean Maritime Coastguard (EMMC) could initially carry out stop and search exercises in two principal areas: maritime safety and maritime pollution. At a later stage it could also include monitoring other aspects of security that include narcotics trafficking and the transport of illegal migrants.

In order to ensure that this security exercise can become operational in the shortest period possible, the EMMC should consist of sectoral types of soft security cooperation. Any two or more EMP members can start co-operating in specific sectors, such as that pertaining to maritime safety without having to wait until all partners are ready. This will enable the EMMC to evolve along sub-regional lines before it becomes feasible to establish a fully-fledged Euro-Mediterranean Coastguard at a later date. Areas where co-operation can be strengthened include conducting simulation exercises of oil spills, ensuring that international standards are observed during the cleaning of oil tankers, and monitoring the activities of non-Mediterranean fishing boats that are operating in the Mediterranean with a particular emphasis on over-fishing.

Since the end of the Cold War security organisation in Europe have succeeded in adopting more of an inter-locking than an inter-blocking type of framework when it comes to policy actions in central and eastern Europe. This is not the case in the Mediterranean where European security organisations continue to adopt unilateral policy initiatives that quite often end up duplicating other Euro-Mediterranean multilateral initiatives.

It certainly therefore seems timely for European security arrangements such as NATO, the EU and the OSCE to adopt a common structure to coordinate their respective Mediterranean dialogues. Such a coherent approach would immediately make European security initiatives in the region more effective and relevant in the eyes of the Mediterranean countries. The setting up of the Euro-Mediterranean Security Agency (EMSA) would allow European security institutions to find a common denominator of all the initiatives and concrete ways to coordinate their activities.

## **XVIII. La coopération euro-méditerranéenne en matière de sécurité : un point de vue syrien**

*Haytham Satayhi*<sup>1</sup>

Je remercie chaleureusement l'Institut de m'avoir offert l'occasion de participer à ce séminaire. Permettez-moi d'évoquer ici la position syrienne vis-à-vis du dialogue euro-méditerranéen sur la sécurité.

Dans son document de discussion [introduction de cette publication], M. Ortega a fait allusion à l'attitude syro-libanaise concernant le dialogue euro-méditerranéen en matière de sécurité. Il a perçu que la Syrie et le Liban ne sont pas prêts à participer aux négociations multilatérales avant qu'il n'y ait une solution satisfaisante de conflit au Proche-Orient, ce qui est tout à fait vrai. Et cette attitude syrienne, mal comprise peut-être en partie, est déformée par les autres. Mais c'est une attitude ferme et claire à la fois. Pourquoi ? Parce que la Syrie pense qu'on ne peut pas participer à une discussion ouverte sur la sécurité tant qu'une partie de son territoire est toujours occupée par un partenaire présumé.

La question essentielle pour elle est la récupération de son territoire comme introduction nécessaire à tout dialogue, sans quoi la tension et l'instabilité continueront à régner dans la région. Le raisonnement syrien sur cette question n'est pas lié au dialogue euro-méditerranéen seulement, mais il représente une question de principe conduisant la politique syrienne à refuser de même tout dialogue. C'est ce même raisonnement qui a conduit la Syrie, je me permets de vous le rappeler, à ne pas accepter de participer aux négociations multilatérales de paix au Proche-Orient, qui auraient dû continuer parallèlement aux négociations bilatérales après la Conférence de Madrid.

La position syrienne est, à mon avis, très claire. Tant qu'il n'y a pas de solution juste du conflit au Proche-Orient, elle ne discutera d'aucune question relevant de la sécurité. Mais réaffirmer cette position ne répondrait qu'à une partie de la question ; pour que la réponse soit complète, il faut que le dialogue sécuritaire, et surtout militaire soit lié au contexte politique et culturel très compliqué du Moyen-Orient. On ne peut donc pas l'inclure dans une ordonnance toute faite. En ce qui me concerne, à ce jour, je ne comprends pas pourquoi il doit y avoir une coopération militaire. Dans quel but ? Pour quel objectif ? Quel est l'ennemi présumé ? Quel est le mécanisme de cette coopération ? Franchement, je l'ignore, et peut-être que beaucoup de Syriens et d'Arabes ne comprennent pas non plus. Une coopération sécuritaire ne serait comprise que si elle se présentait après la résolution de conflits et de disputes.

Ceci me conduit à revenir sur l'idée de la souveraineté. Les pays rejoignant mon avis sont, en général, très sensibles à la notion de souveraineté. Cette notion est perçue de façon différente en Occident. Dans le Tiers-Monde, et surtout dans le Monde arabe, la souveraineté n'a pas toujours le même sens, car les pays arabes restent attachés à l'indépendance qu'ils ont obtenue, et donc à la notion de souveraineté. Bien sûr dans le processus de la mondialisation on parle surtout au niveau politique, et on affirme que la souveraineté ne peut pas être intégrale, mais je crois, personnellement, que la souveraineté est toujours une notion intégrale ; cette conviction reflète l'opinion publique que je connais un peu et qui se sent visée par cette situation.

On reste très soucieux puisque, comme le dit le proverbe arabe, « il faut éviter que les grandes puissances qui étaient sorties par la porte ne puissent revenir par la fenêtre », sous des

---

<sup>1</sup> Département politique, Centre d'Etudes stratégiques et de recherche, Université de Damas.

formes diverses : respect des droits de l'homme, surveillance du terrorisme, ou encore de la démocratie.

## **XIX. The Euro-Mediterranean Charter and security in the Mediterranean**

*Ambassador Pedro López-Aguirrebengoa*<sup>1</sup>

The Mediterranean region remains faced with important political, economic, ecological, social and cultural challenges that have to be taken up as common challenges for Europe and its partners in the region. Its characteristics of geographic unity but political diversity and complexity call for the development of a shared vision and a coordinated and sensitive response to address the problems and create an area of common interests. Given the outstanding strategic importance of the Mediterranean, we should look at it *sensu lato*, i.e., taking into account its interacting periphery.

The strategic goal is to help ensure that the Mediterranean region becomes a focus of peace, security, stability and prosperity for the benefit of all its inhabitants and its neighbouring areas, by efforts aiming at the establishment and development of good-neighbourly relations, prosperity and the elimination of poverty, as well as the protection and promotion of human rights, consolidation of democracy, good governance, the rule of law, cultural and religious tolerance, and the consolidation of civil society.

The European Union is elaborating a ‘common strategy’ for the Mediterranean, which will surely reinforce its Mediterranean policy and commitment. Personally, I hope it will be approved by the Lisbon Council. This ‘common strategy’ is to be based on the two specific priorities established by the Vienna Council Conclusions (11-12 December 1998) and confirmed at the Cologne European Council (3-4 June 1999): the Barcelona Euro-Mediterranean Partnership (EMP), and the Middle East Peace Process (MEPP). Both are differentiated but closely linked processes, and their link’s rationale was already established in the Barcelona Declaration: the EMP does not intend to replace the other activities and initiatives undertaken in the interests of peace, stability and development of the region, but it will contribute to their success.

With regard to this principle, three main ideas can be pointed out. Firstly, the Barcelona process was actually conceived as a *post pacem* process, at a moment when the end of the MEPP seemed to be within short reach. Secondly, the Barcelona process wanted to contribute, by creating a positive synergy, to the reduction and resolution of the tensions and conflicts in the region, but did not intend to substitute itself to the existing peace processes. Thirdly, it was assumed that the globality of the EMP scheme was of such an importance to all parties that it would be placed somehow above the more specific existing initiatives.

The Barcelona process is global, self-building, with an incremental approach, and interactive in its three Chapters. But the overall Euro-Mediterranean process depends - if the partnership is to develop the principles and objectives of the Barcelona Declaration - on its ability to help to create the appropriate conditions for the solution of existing regional conflicts that limit further regional and subregional cooperation; its ability to prevent future tensions, crisis and new conflicts from erupting, and to manage them, if needed be; and its role in post-conflict rehabilitation and peace building.

The Second Euro-Mediterranean Ministerial Conference in Malta (1997) was for this reason an opportunity for reflection. An awareness began to develop on both sides of the Mediterranean of the dangers inherent in converting the Barcelona process into a permanent hostage of the MEPP. Without ignoring the inevitable connection, EMP’s comprehensiveness and scope should place it at a different level, in order to enable the shared principles and goals formulated in the Barcelona

---

<sup>1</sup> Coordinator of the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Madrid.

Declaration and the Working Programme to be implemented. The *ad hoc* Ministerial Conference of Palermo, held in June 1998 to evaluate the course of the process, showed a clear joint political will to maintain EMP's progress and to further its subsequent development. Perceived common long-term interests gave the process a basis of renewed strength.

The Third Euro-Mediterranean Ministerial in Stuttgart (April 1999) confirmed this shared willingness and gave new impetus to the process. The recent relaunching of the MEPP since the arrival to power of Ehoud Barak's coalition government in Israel, in spite of recurrent difficulties, should be an opportunity not to be lost.

Following the Stuttgart Conference, the effort is placed now by the EU, together with its Mediterranean partners, in the Euro-Mediterranean Charter for Peace and Stability, based on the 'Guidelines' endorsed by Ministers in Stuttgart. The aim is to have the Charter's text adopted by the Fourth Euro-Mediterranean Conference of Foreign Ministers, due to be held in the second semester of 2000 under the French presidency of the EU, so that the Charter may enter into force as soon as political circumstances allow. The Charter is conceived as a politically, not legally binding document that will serve as an instrument for the implementation of the principles of the Barcelona Declaration where issues of peace and stability are concerned. Based on the concept of comprehensive security, the Charter will focus on the relevant political and security issues and will address, without prejudice to the existing decision-making procedures, economic, social, cultural and human aspects where they affect and determine peace and stability. Its main objective is to contribute to the establishment and strengthening of an area of peace and stability in the Mediterranean region, through a comprehensive, cooperative and balanced approach, based on the principle of the indivisibility of security and with the aim of creating a common security space.

The Charter should constitute a factor of stability, and should aim at improving the conditions for the settlement of current conflicts, without replacing existing mechanisms pursuing similar objectives. This goes hand in hand with the possibility of developing conflict prevention mechanisms in the frame of Charter, in order to tackle the root causes of conflicts and therefore contribute to preventing and deterring them, as well as developing crisis management, conflict solution and post-conflict rehabilitation. The Charter, to be evolutionary and flexible, as we intend, should leave open the possible future development of new common institutions to address peace and stability issues in the Mediterranean, provided that those institutions are focused, accountable and relevant. At the same time, the Charter should be a framework ready to interact with other efforts in the area, as well as to establish synergies, in the future and with the agreement of all participants, with other international organisations and regional and subregional processes

Given the existing situation and political constraints, at this stage we are looking for a "Charter for stability" and not yet for a "Charter for security" in the Mediterranean. The latter will only be possible in the future, when the EMP has reached the appropriate maturity, and provided all the participants in the Barcelona process agree that this new phase should be realised.

The progress achieved so far in developing partnership-building measures (PBMs), in spite of the difficulties which prevail, is encouraging and should be sustained and developed, identifying and exploring new areas of cooperation. There is an agreement to reinforce the political dialogue in areas such as the fight against terrorism, organized crime and illicit drug trafficking with a view to identifying appropriate measures for joint action. The continuation of the dialogue on fight against terrorism has received new impetus with the *ad hoc* meeting held in Brussels on 23 November 1999. The work being done in this subject by the Mediterranean Forum is also important.

At the time of the Barcelona Declaration, the EU could not offer its Mediterranean partners a substantive dialogue on security issues, since the EU was devoid of any real common security and defence policy, and because the Mediterranean partners were reluctant to engage in "hard security"

cooperation both in the North-South and South-South venues, given the existing conflicts and tensions in the area. This situation has significantly changed. The Cologne European Council decided to establish a common security and defence policy (CSDP) to supplement its CFSP, and more specifically to acquire new capabilities for crisis prevention and crisis management. This process was continued at the Helsinki EU Council of 10 December 1999, and will probably be finalized at the end of 2000. This makes it easier, from the internal EU perspective, to confer a new security dimension on the various fields covered by CFSP, including the Barcelona Process, although the exact content of this dimension cannot yet be foreseen.

On the other hand, the political character of the Charter should not exclude contractual commitments to be made under it, as required. While the rule of consensus should be maintained and applied for key elements of the EMP, the individual clauses regarding PBMs, good neighbourly relations, sub-regional cooperation and preventive diplomacy could be developed in an evolutionary way and progressively strengthened, with a flexibility in the implementation of individual clauses by agreement. Transparency and increased confidence are cornerstones of the process. In the future, at the appropriate moment and as part of conflict prevention, it may also be of interest to EU's Mediterranean partners to include defence and military aspects in the EMP, as envisaged by the Barcelona Declaration.

All this implies to increase and improve coordination, coherence and complementarity and to ensure synergies between the different existing regional and subregional dialogues, and also between activities undertaken by the EU and its Member States. Particularly, because other dialogues such as WEU's and NATO's Mediterranean dialogues, OSCE's Mediterranean activities, and the Forum for Dialogue and Cooperation in the Mediterranean (the Mediterranean Forum) go in the same direction. Interest in security and cooperation in the Mediterranean has developed considerably in the past few years, giving rise to different Western/European initiatives. All of them strive to find the means of making a specific contribution to the stability of the neighbouring regions. The different Mediterranean dialogues opened by NATO, the OSCE, the WEU and other institutions such as the Council of Europe itself, offer parallel and supporting courses, each one consonant with its own identity and specific perspective, capable of complementing the others and of contributing its own experience.

Deriving from its responsibility as one of the main actors in ensuring international stability, the EU is called upon to play a crucial active role in the Mediterranean. This must be done in close contact not only the mentioned initiatives and organizations but also with other countries of the region, with the UN, and with other competent international or regional organisations that have a presence in the Mediterranean, notably the Arab League and the Arab Maghreb Union. Close coordination with the United States, and cooperation with Russia, are likewise essential. Other peripheral important actors should be taken into account, like the Organisation of African Unity (OAU), or the Council for Cooperation in the Gulf. Finally, in the economic field, somewhat related to the specific framework of the Middle-East Peace Process, there is the Economic Conference for the Middle East and North Africa (MENA).

Nevertheless, the synergies between those various dialogues and activities should be sought, taking into account the sensitivities of the countries on the southern shore. Sometimes, they are suspicious of what could turn out to be an attempt by Europe and the Western world to project its own schemes in this area, and they would rather like such initiatives to lead to true egalitarian dialogues, aimed at building together a system of stability and security in the region. The overall perspective from which the countries of the southern shore view the region's stability and security must be appreciated and understood. For many of them, as shown in their positions within the framework of the different Mediterranean dialogues now under way, socio-economic, cultural and



environmental factors, for example, constitute harsh realities that must be addressed. These factors also put at stake their internal security and sub-regional relations, and constitute “risks” which are as great, if not greater, in the immediate term than the traditional risks. They insistently ask not only that Europe bear this duly in mind in such dialogues and in general cooperation with them, but also that it do so within its own European security scheme.

To conclude, it can be said that the challenge is, for the countries on both sides of the Mediterranean, how to deal with relationships in this region, and how to address a common destiny at a time of transition. The global perspective of the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership makes possible to conceive the future of the Mediterranean region with some degree of optimism. The Barcelona process should provide the necessary convergence to tackle the different political, social, economic and cultural aspects, create a zone of shared prosperity, temper the excesses of nationalism and their aftermaths and, in short, face up to the multiple sources of conflict that can endanger the whole region.

## **XX. Repenser la sécurité en Méditerranée**

*Álvaro de Vasconcelos*<sup>1</sup>

Je commencerai avec quatre préalables, avant d'aborder le sujet principal traité dans ce séminaire, à savoir le nouveau rôle de l'Union européenne par rapport à la sécurité en Méditerranée à la veille de l'adoption de la Charte.

Le premier préalable est la notion même de Méditerranée. La Méditerranée dont nous avons parlé ici est définie, dans une vision plutôt européenne, comme le point de rencontre entre l'Union européenne et les pays du Maghreb/Moyen-Orient. Mais il y a aussi une autre notion, si l'on considère la région depuis le Proche-Orient jusqu'au Golfe. La vision américaine de la Méditerranée est aussi plus ample.

La deuxième réflexion préalable, c'est que du point de vue de la sécurité qui a été l'objet de notre discussion, il me semble évident qu'il n'y a pas de menace directe ni du Nord contre le Sud, ni du Sud contre le Nord. Mais, dans cet espace dont nous avons parlé, les problèmes sont surtout de nature Sud-Sud, c'est-à-dire des problèmes du Maghreb et du Moyen-Orient, voire des problèmes de nature interne.

Troisième réflexion préalable : il est vrai que du point de vue de la sécurité analysée de façon objective, il n'y a pas de menaces. Or la perception subjective dans chaque pays peut être différente. La question qui se pose ici est la différence entre l'opinion publique et celle du gouvernement. Quand nous parlons de perception négative, nous parlons essentiellement de l'opinion publique, et lorsque nous parlons de dialogue – il y a un agenda commun – nous parlons essentiellement des gouvernements, de l'élite politique. L'erreur serait de confondre le point de vue de l'élite gouvernementale avec celui de l'opinion publique. Dans nos politiques, notamment dans les politiques européennes envers les pays de la Méditerranée, nous ne pouvons pas nous adresser seulement aux élites gouvernementales proches des points de vue des gouvernements européens sur un certain nombre de sujets, et ne pas prendre en considération les opinions publiques du sud de la Méditerranée, qui sont, du reste, également très importantes pour toute initiative en matière de défense. Dans ce domaine, le décalage des opinions est encore plus clair par rapport à l'OTAN, mais ce sera aussi le cas pour d'autres initiatives dans le domaine militaire.

Le quatrième préalable porte sur les différents agendas. Je ne suis pas sûr que nous ayons tous le même. Lorsque nous parlons de stabilité, cela ne signifie pas exactement la même chose pour tous les acteurs des différents dialogues. Que voulons-nous dire par dialogue politique ou dialogue sur la sécurité ? Parle-t-on de dialogue sur la démocratie ? Parle-t-on de sécurité interne ? La différence d'interprétation mérite beaucoup de réflexion pour éviter que ce soit la source de malentendus.

Durant ce séminaire, nous avons essayé de comprendre les divers dialogues méditerranéens, et nous avons surtout souligné les complémentarités et les synergies auxquelles ils peuvent donner lieu. Je pense qu'il faudrait parler aussi des différences et des asymétries. Différences entre le processus de Barcelone, qui est un processus à long terme ayant comme objectif la création d'une région. Il s'agit là d'un processus intégrant un volet économique, un volet humain et un volet politique et sécuritaire, mais dans lequel le but principal est de créer une zone de libre échange afin de promouvoir la stabilité à long terme. Alors que les autres initiatives

---

<sup>1</sup> Directeur, IEEI, Lisbonne, et Secrétaire général d'EuroMeSCo.

sont des initiatives politiques de nature tout à fait différente, dans le processus de Barcelone, il y a la conviction que, par la voie économique, il est possible de développer les pays du sud et en même temps de créer des Etats de droit où le respect des droits de l'homme et de la démocratie serait la règle. En outre, c'est en regardant les divers acteurs des différents dialogues que l'on voit les asymétries, parce que les acteurs fondamentaux sont l'UE, les Etats-Unis et les pays du sud et chacun voit les dialogues à sa manière. Nous parlons comme l'UE, les pays du sud parlent chacun de façon individuelle et non pas en groupe, et les Etats-Unis ont tous les attributs d'une puissance. Il y a là une série d'asymétries dans les relations entre les acteurs des différents dialogues.

Désormais, l'essentiel sera la planification du rôle de l'UE, après l'approbation de la Charte et l'instauration d'une politique européenne de sécurité et de défense, et c'est ce que l'on a commencé à faire. L'UE semble être un acteur qui peut acquérir tous les attributs d'une puissance capable d'avoir non seulement une politique économique mais aussi une politique étrangère et une politique de défense. Si cette évolution a lieu, l'asymétrie diminue dans la relation avec les Etats-Unis mais pas avec les pays du sud. Mais, en revanche, l'Union européenne doit trouver une répartition de travail avec l'OTAN. La réponse américaine à cette volonté de l'Europe d'avoir une présence plus forte dans le domaine politique et de la défense, et certainement aussi en Méditerranée, n'est pas établie. Il y a des Américains qui sont pour, et il y a aussi ceux qui sont contre. On a besoin d'une clarification de la position des Etats-Unis vis-à-vis de l'Europe de la défense.

D'ailleurs, dans n'importe quel dialogue méditerranéen, je pense que l'on pourrait finalement faire davantage si les pays du sud étaient mieux associés. S'il existait une Union du Maghreb arabe ou un début d'intégration régionale au Moyen-Orient, la voix des pays du sud serait plus forte. Si les pays du Maghreb et du Moyen-Orient avaient une structure sub-régionale, ces structures seraient une base pour le dialogue avec l'Europe, et une réponse fondamentale à la globalisation.

En fin de compte, qu'est-ce que Barcelone peut faire du point de vue de la sécurité ? On a fait ici tout un effort de réflexion, et j'en tire deux idées fondamentales. Peut-être que le dialogue et le partenariat militaires sont possibles, et peut-être que l'objectif le plus important de ce séminaire était d'ouvrir cette possibilité. D'ailleurs, il y a eu cette discussion sur la souveraineté, et aussi sur l'intervention. On est en train de parler des mesures de confiance, de transparence, etc., mais on est aussi en train de parler d'intervention. Je pense qu'il faut se demander ce que veulent dire les tâches de Petersberg à cet égard. Je pense que cela doit être clair pour nos amis du Sud : Petersberg, c'est tout sauf la défense territoriale. Quand nous parlons de missions de Petersberg, nous parlons d'interventions militaires. Je crois qu'une initiative importante serait d'essayer de définir les conditions d'intervention militaire avec nos amis méditerranéens. Est-ce que nous serions capables, entre les pays du Nord et du Sud, dans le cadre du processus de Barcelone, de développer les conditions d'intervention ? C'est l'une des questions fondamentales du débat aujourd'hui et ce n'est pas une question facile comme le montrent toutes les appréhensions de nos amis du Sud vis-à-vis de l'EUROMARFOR, de l'EUROFOR, du nouveau concept stratégique de l'OTAN ou de l'initiative européenne dans le domaine de la défense. Si nous n'arrivons pas à clarifier la notion d'intervention, cela conduira à une mauvaise compréhension et à des réactions négatives. Il faut en discuter, et continuer à travailler dans les lignes du discours de Kofi Anan sur le nouveau concept de souveraineté.

Pour conclure, je dirais que nous devons tout faire dans le cadre du processus de Barcelone, aussi bien sur le plan économique qu'en matière de sécurité, pour renforcer la coopération sous-régionale, parce que les mêmes problèmes existent aussi bien au Maghreb qu'au Moyen-Orient.

Suite aux négociations dans le processus de paix au Moyen-Orient, ce sera une opportunité extraordinaire pour la coopération sous-régionale car, si ce processus de paix avance, la coopération au Moyen-Orient pourra aller beaucoup plus vite qu'au Maghreb, grâce à l'existence des conditions requises pour une coopération sous-régionale au Proche-Orient.

## **XXI. Le projet de Charte euro-méditerranéenne pour la paix et la stabilité : un point de vue tunisien**

*Ambassadeur Rachid Driss<sup>1</sup>*

Le projet euro-méditerranéen de Barcelone est axé sur le libre-échange. Cette reformulation des relations entre les pays de l'Union européenne et ceux du sud de la Méditerranée, rendue nécessaire par les mutations intervenues à l'Est européen, constitue aux yeux des partenaires européens une nécessité sécuritaire, mais aussi une opportunité commerciale importante.

La déclaration de Barcelone sur le Partenariat euro-méditerranéen a défini un concept de sécurité globale fondé sur trois éléments :

- Politique et sécurité : définir un espace de paix et de stabilité ;
- Economique et financier : construire une zone de prospérité partagée visant à réduire les disparités des revenus entre les deux rives ;
- social, culturel et humain : développer les ressources humaines, favoriser la compréhension entre les cultures et les échanges entre les sociétés civiles.

La conférence de Barcelone a jeté les bases d'un processus évolutif et à long terme. Il n'en demeure pas moins important malgré les critiques qui lui ont été adressées.

D'autre part, l'idée d'une Charte euro-méditerranéenne chargée de prendre en compte la dimension « paix et sécurité » dans le processus de Barcelone est inscrite dans le premier volet du texte de la Déclaration, Partenariat politique et de sécurité, et a été entérinée par la troisième conférence euro-méditerranéenne (Stuttgart, 15-16 avril 1999).

Si l'on ne peut que se réjouir de la recherche d'une institutionnalisation et d'un rapide développement des aspects diplomatiques, voire militaires de la sécurité, on est en droit de se demander si le fait d'avoir limité le concept de Charte au premier volet de la Déclaration, n'est pas trop restrictif. En effet, sans dénier l'importance de la sécurité des nations, il conviendrait de faire évoluer ce concept vers une vision où l'accent est mis davantage sur la sécurité économique des gens, c'est-à-dire une sécurité assurée par le co-développement reposant sur une approche globale du développement et de la sécurité. Quatre ans après le lancement du processus euro-méditerranéen, l'Union européenne a incontestablement évolué et s'est rapprochée des préoccupations du sud. Dans ce contexte, cette approche devrait être explorée par le biais du dialogue. Il conviendrait de s'entendre sur les concepts, les perceptions et les définitions de la sécurité, ainsi que sur les moyens à mettre en oeuvre pour répondre aux défis qu'elle pose pour toute la région méditerranéenne.

A l'occasion de la réunion Euromesco organisée par l'A.E.I. (Tunis, 6, 7 et 8 septembre 1999), sur les nouvelles stratégies du développement, le professeur Chedly Ayari avait émis une série de propositions, dans une intervention fort remarquée, notamment un modèle de sécurité basé sur les vecteurs suivants :

- La mise en réseaux des actions de coopération entreprises en commun ;
- L'identification d'objectifs de développement communs ;
- La recherche de la cohérence dans les politiques de développement commun ;

---

<sup>1</sup> Président, Association des Etudes internationales, Tunis.

- Les choix judicieux des secteurs d'intervention ;
- La promotion d'une inter-culturalité et d'une citoyenneté euro-méditerranéenne.

D'autre part, l'Association des Etudes Internationales n'a pas seulement envisagé un partenariat dans le domaine politique ou sécuritaire, ou même économique, mais elle a également accordé une grande importance au volet social et culturel. C'est ainsi, que la déclaration finale émise à l'issue du séminaire organisé les 24, 25 et 26 novembre 1994 sur les relations Maghreb/Union européenne, en présence de l'ambassadeur de l'Union européenne à Tunis, propose un pacte de coopération et de sécurité entre le Maghreb et l'Union. Dans cette déclaration finale on lit sous la rubrique action culturelle :

« L'action culturelle vise un profond changement dans les mentalités, elle s'emploiera à éliminer les préjugés séculaires et à effacer les clichés qui sont incrustés dans les esprits donnant des images déformées, ici, de la société occidentale, et là, de l'Islam.

Ecoles, livres, journaux, stations de radio et de télévision, films et pièces de théâtre, tous ces moyens ne seront pas de trop, dans les pays des deux régions, pour imprimer dans l'esprit de chacun, une image plus sereine du voisin, de ses croyances, de ses coutumes et de ses aspirations ».

L'Union européenne institutionnalisée s'adresse à une région constituée d'une mosaïque de pays, qui n'ont de politique commune dans aucun domaine ; cependant, ils ont des perceptions et préoccupations communes, et sont dotés de cadres de coopération sous-régionale, l'UMA et la Ligue arabe, pouvant jouer un rôle dans l'approfondissement de ce dialogue méditerranéen.

Dans les pays de la rive Sud, la mondialisation suscite des espoirs et des craintes. Aussi, sont-ils attachés à une position globale de la sécurité qui reconnaît l'importance des facteurs politiques, économiques, sociaux et environnementaux en plus de l'indispensable dimension de défense. Et, pour reprendre cette expression de M. Hédi Baccouche, ancien Premier ministre tunisien, « l'Europe, dans sa marche à grands pas vers l'unité et l'agrandissement, nous entraîne, bon gré mal gré, dans son sillage et nous lance un grand défi »<sup>2</sup>.

Dans ce contexte, l'objectif des partenaires de la Déclaration de Barcelone est de créer un climat de confiance réciproque en Méditerranée et, pour cela, d'élaborer en commun une Charte euro-méditerranéenne de paix et de stabilité, malgré les difficultés rencontrées en chemin.

---

<sup>2</sup> Voir *Revue de l'A.E.I.* n. 71 (2/99), « Le Maghreb, difficultés et espérances ».

## XXII. Main conclusions

*Martin Ortega*

Just after the Barcelona Declaration of November 1995, some attempts to develop the political and security partnership by the Senior Officials of the Barcelona Process were frustrated by impeding political circumstances. The evolution of the EMP's first chapter was relatively poor in Valetta (April 1997) and Palermo (June 1998) ministerial meetings. The Stuttgart Euro-Mediterranean conference in April 1999, for its part, opened new expectations when it foresaw the adoption of a Charter for Peace and Stability, which is now being negotiated. A five-year old partnership between the EU member nations and twelve Mediterranean countries has resulted in this exercise being addressed with greater pragmatism, based on better knowledge among partners. Although the Charter will be an agreement that is political in nature, it will set the underpinnings for concrete cooperation measures in the political and security fields. The preparation of the Euro-Mediterranean Charter also coincides with the establishment of a military capability within the EU (a process launched by the Cologne EU summit of June 1999), which will allow the EU to offer its Mediterranean partners a dialogue on military matters as required.

The seminar organised by the WEU Institute for Security Studies introduced a debate on some topics that have lately come to the fore. The elaboration of a Euro-Mediterranean Charter for Peace and Stability clearly shows that there is great potential for security and military cooperation within the political and security partnership of the Barcelona Process. The questions of how the EU is extending its new Common Security and Defence Policy to this aspect of its CFSP, whether the EU is integrating the *acquis* of WEU's Mediterranean dialogue, and what kind of relationships will be established with NATO's Mediterranean dialogue can no longer be dismissed. The meeting offered an opportunity to start a prospective discussion on those issues among officials and academics from EU and NATO countries, and from Mediterranean partners.

This publication gives an accurate idea of the numerous and varied interventions during the seminar. It is quite difficult, however, to draw conclusions from this vivid set of contributions and the rich debates that ensued. The following points are just a personal elaboration on the main subjects addressed in the seminar.

(1) The EMP, NATO's Mediterranean dialogue, and OSCE's Mediterranean activities have their own merits and *should be continued*, since they provide an indispensable link between Mediterranean countries and institutional structures in Europe.

(2) The *most important initiative* in the Mediterranean, the EMP, is undergoing a significant evolution. An EU common strategy on the Mediterranean will offer a wider framework to the EMP, and the drafting of a Charter for Peace and Stability will develop the political and security partnership to an extent as yet unknown. At the same time, the EU is a changing actor to the extent that it is incorporating a security and military component following the Cologne and Helsinki European Councils. The EMP may receive the influence from this transformation if and when a security and military dimension is discussed with Mediterranean partners.

(3) At this stage, *the EU member states have to decide whether to propose to their Mediterranean partners the inclusion of security and military cooperation within the Charter*. On the one hand, this may be seen as premature by some EU members or by certain partners; but on the other hand, that cooperation is necessary to attain the EMP's global objectives, and it is consistent with the development of a Common Security and Defence Policy within the EU. A

majority of participants in the seminar considered that the text of the Charter should avoid any specific reference to security and military partnership-building measures from the outset: otherwise, some Mediterranean partners would not be prepared to adopt the Charter. On the other hand, some participants stressed the need to include military partnership-building measures from the beginning and to also involve armed forces in the EMP.

(4) In any case, *the Charter will be a dynamic political document whose open language would allow security and military measures as required.*

(5) Irrespective of whether or not security and military measures are expressly put forward in the Charter, *there is a wide catalogue of available specific measures for partnership and cooperation in a multilateral regional context.* The CSCE/OSCE experience as well as NATO's and WEU's Mediterranean dialogues are just a few models which offer a wide range of possible concrete measures in the security field. Once the political will is present, the EMP might entail such types of measures. However, two qualifications are necessary. Firstly, the EU will only be able to propose, coordinate, and carry out measures within its new security and defence competences as defined after the Cologne summit, in accordance with NATO's new Strategic Concept. This means that NATO's Mediterranean dialogue continues to have a value in itself. Secondly, those measures will be confined most probably to partnership- and transparency-building measures, and will not be traditional confidence-building measures (CSBMs). Specific security measures coordinated by the EMP, which can be envisaged for the whole Mediterranean region, are seminars, exchanges of basic information, visits, observation of military exercises, and similar measures. The EU could take advantage of WEU's expertise in this respect. More traditional CSBMs could be explored at a subregional level and in different frameworks, or even introduced in the EMP in the future, if the partners deem it appropriate.

(6) If any Mediterranean partners are reluctant to participate in the EMP security dimension, a number of solutions may be considered. The possibility of opting out from concrete measures for a transitional period, or the prospect of subregional cooperation, should be included in the Charter.

(7) Finally, *an enhanced EMP security dimension and NATO Mediterranean dialogue are compatible and mutually reinforcing.* The exact coordination of both dialogues will depend on the broader relationship that is established between the EU and NATO as a result of the construction of a common European security and defence policy. Three alternatives could nevertheless be envisaged. First, EMP's security dimension and NATO's Mediterranean dialogue may continue to be parallel endeavours with similar aims. Second, practical coordination of activities belonging to these two dialogues might be explored. The third alternative would be to find areas of common activity; for instance, all NATO members could be associated with some activities of EMP's security dialogue, and the EU could also be associated with NATO's Mediterranean dialogue.

In conclusion, following approbation of the Charter, sooner or later the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership will include in its first section measures concerning security and defence. This aspect of the Euro-Mediterranean dialogue will complete a partnership that endeavours to be comprehensive and will doubtless contribute to the realisation of the main objective of the Barcelona Declaration: 'turning the Mediterranean basin into an area of dialogue, exchange and cooperation guaranteeing peace, stability and prosperity'. Indeed, peace and stability will not be able to take root in the Mediterranean unless a deep-seated dialogue is established between the political and military authorities of all the countries involved in the region. One will now have to find the most appropriate practical measures for launching this security partnership and devote the necessary funds to their realisation. The 27 partners will have



to demonstrate that they have the necessary political will for this, but the historic task that the transformation of the Mediterranean represents requires a new initiative, responsibility for which lies above all with the European Union.

## XXIII. Principales conclusions

*Martin Ortega*

Juste après la Déclaration de Barcelone de novembre 1995, les efforts entrepris par les Hauts fonctionnaires du processus de Barcelone en vue de développer le partenariat politique et de sécurité ont été gênés par le contexte politique. L'évolution du premier chapitre du PEM a été relativement réduite lors des réunions ministérielles de La Valette (avril 1997) et de Palerme (juin 1998). La conférence euro-méditerranéenne de Stuttgart d'avril 1999 a, en revanche, permis de nouveaux espoirs en prévoyant l'adoption d'une Charte de paix et de stabilité, en cours de négociation. Un partenariat de cinq ans entre les membres de l'UE et douze pays méditerranéens conduit à faire preuve de plus de pragmatisme pour aborder cet exercice grâce à une meilleure connaissance entre les partenaires. Tout en étant un accord de nature politique, la Charte déterminera un cadre de coopération fondé sur des mesures concrètes aussi bien pour les questions politiques que pour la sécurité. La préparation de la Charte euro-méditerranéenne coïncide également avec la création d'une capacité militaire au sein de l'UE (processus lancé par le sommet de l'UE de Cologne de juin 1999), qui permettra à l'Union d'offrir à ses partenaires méditerranéens un dialogue sur les questions militaires en tant que de besoin.

Le séminaire organisé par l'Institut d'Etudes de Sécurité de l'UEO a introduit un débat sur quelques questions qui ont, dernièrement, suscité l'attention. L'élaboration d'une Charte euro-méditerranéenne pour la paix et la stabilité montre clairement qu'il existe un potentiel non négligeable de coopération en matière de sécurité et de défense au sein du partenariat politique et sécuritaire du processus euro-méditerranéen. Il importe donc de savoir comment l'UE étendra sa nouvelle Politique Commune de Sécurité et de Défense à cet aspect de la PESC, si elle intégrera l'acquis du dialogue méditerranéen de l'UEO, et quelles relations seront établies avec le dialogue de l'OTAN sur la Méditerranée. La réunion a été, pour les participants officiels et les universitaires issus des pays de l'UE et de l'OTAN ainsi que des partenaires méditerranéens, l'occasion d'entamer une discussion prospective sur ces questions.

La présente publication reproduit fidèlement les nombreuses et diverses interventions faites lors du séminaire. Cependant, il est difficile de tirer des conclusions de ce riche ensemble de contributions et des débats intenses qui ont suivi. Les points ci-après ne sont qu'une élaboration personnelle des principaux thèmes traités dans le séminaire.

(1) Le PEM, le dialogue de l'OTAN sur la Méditerranée et les activités méditerranéennes de l'OSCE présentent chacun leurs avantages et *devraient être poursuivis* dans la mesure où ils fournissent un lien indispensable entre les pays méditerranéens et les structures institutionnelles en Europe.

(2) *L'initiative la plus importante* en Méditerranée, le PEM, évolue considérablement. Une stratégie commune de l'UE lui offrira un cadre général, et l'élaboration d'une Charte pour la paix et la stabilité développera le partenariat politique et sécuritaire dans une mesure qui n'est pas encore connue. Simultanément, l'UE est un acteur qui évolue puisque, suite aux Conseils européens de Cologne et d'Helsinki, elle comprend un volet de sécurité et de défense. Le PEM peut être influencé par cette transformation dès lors qu'une dimension de ce type sera examinée avec les partenaires méditerranéens.

(3) A ce stade, *les Etats membres de l'UE doivent décider s'il convient de proposer aux partenaires méditerranéens l'inclusion de la coopération sécuritaire et militaire dans la Charte*. D'une part, cela peut sembler prématuré à certains membres ou partenaires de l'UE ; de l'autre,

cette coopération est nécessaire pour atteindre les objectifs du PEM, et elle est cohérente avec le développement d'une politique de sécurité et de défense dans l'UE. La plupart des participants au séminaire ont considéré que le texte de la Charte devrait éviter toute référence spécifique à des mesures concernant un partenariat sécuritaire et militaire dans un premier temps ; sinon, certains partenaires méditerranéens ne seront pas disposés à approuver ce document. D'autres ont, en revanche, souligné la nécessité d'y inclure d'emblée des mesures de nature militaire et d'impliquer les forces armées dans le PEM.

(4) Quoi qu'il en soit, *la Charte sera un document politique dynamique dont le langage ouvert permettra de mettre en œuvre les mesures sécuritaires et militaires en tant que de besoin.*

(5) Indépendamment de la question de savoir si les mesures de sécurité et de défense sont ou non expressément formulées dans la Charte, *il existe tout un éventail de mesures spécifiques de partenariat et de coopération possibles dans un contexte régional multilatéral.* Les acquis de la CSCE/OSCE ainsi que les dialogues méditerranéens de l'OTAN et de l'UEO ne sont que quelques exemples parmi d'autres permettant ce type de mesures concrètes dans le domaine de la sécurité. Dès lors que la volonté politique existe, le PEM peut mettre en œuvre de telles mesures, à deux conditions toutefois. Premièrement, l'UE ne pourra proposer, coordonner et appliquer que des mesures relevant de ses nouvelles compétences en matière de sécurité et de défense telles que définies après le sommet de Cologne, et compte tenu du nouveau concept stratégique de l'OTAN. Cela veut dire que le dialogue de l'OTAN sur la Méditerranée a toujours une valeur propre. Deuxièmement, il devrait probablement s'agir moins de mesures de confiance et de sécurité (MCS) que de mesures de partenariat et de transparence. Ces mesures spécifiques de partenariat sécuritaire coordonnées par le PEM, envisageables pour l'ensemble de la région méditerranéenne, porteront sur les séminaires, les échanges d'informations, les visites, l'observation des exercices militaires et mesures analogues. L'UE pourrait, à cet égard, tirer profit de l'expérience de l'UEO. D'autres MCS traditionnelles pourront être explorées à un niveau sous-régional et dans d'autres contextes, ou bien être introduites dans le PEM, si les partenaires le jugent approprié.

(6) Si certains partenaires méditerranéens hésitent à participer à la dimension sécuritaire du PEM, d'autres solutions peuvent être considérées. La possibilité d'être exemptés (*opting out*) pendant une période de transition ou la perspective d'une coopération sous-régionale devraient être incluses dans la Charte.

(7) Enfin, *un PEM renforcé en matière de sécurité et le dialogue de l'OTAN sur la Méditerranée sont compatibles et se renforcent mutuellement.* Leur coordination dépendra des relations générales qui seront établies entre l'UE et l'OTAN compte tenu de l'élaboration d'une politique européenne commune de sécurité et de défense. Il y a trois possibilités. Premièrement, on peut envisager une progression en parallèle de la dimension de sécurité du PEM et du dialogue de l'OTAN sur la Méditerranée avec des objectifs similaires. La deuxième possibilité serait d'explorer la coordination concrète des activités de ces deux dialogues. La troisième serait de trouver des domaines dans lesquels mener une activité commune ; par exemple, tous les membres de l'OTAN pourraient être associés à certaines initiatives du dialogue de sécurité du PEM, et l'UE pourrait, elle aussi, être associée au dialogue de l'OTAN sur la Méditerranée.

En conclusion, suite à l'approbation de la Charte, tôt ou tard le partenariat euro-méditerranéen inclura dans son premier volet des mesures dans les domaines de la sécurité et de la défense. Cet aspect du dialogue euro-méditerranéen complétera un partenariat qui se veut global et contribuera sans doute à la réalisation de l'objectif principal de la Déclaration de Barcelone, « faire du bassin méditerranéen une zone de dialogue, d'échanges et de coopération qui garantisse la paix, la stabilité et la prospérité ». En effet, la paix et la stabilité ne pourront s'installer en Méditerranée que si un dialogue profond s'établit entre les autorités politiques et

militaires de tous les pays impliqués dans la région. Maintenant il faut trouver les mesures concrètes plus appropriées pour lancer ce partenariat sécuritaire, et consacrer les moyens financiers nécessaires qui permettront leur réalisation. Les 27 partenaires devront faire preuve d'une volonté politique dans ce sens, mais la tâche historique que représente la transformation de la Méditerranée exige une nouvelle démarche dont la responsabilité incombe surtout à l'Union européenne.