

PERCEPTIONS
JOURNAL OF INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

June - August 1999

Volume IV - Number 2

PARTNERSHIP FOR PEACE

YÜKSEL İNAN & İSLAM YUSUF

Dr Yüksel İnan is Professor of International Law in the Department of International Relations at Bilkent University, Ankara.

İslam Yusuf is Research Assistant in the Department of International Relations at Bilkent University.

INTRODUCTION

NATO emerged victorious from the Cold War situation of opposing blocs. But, NATO was unable to survive in the same old way. New conditions require a fundamentally new architecture, not only for European but also for global security.

NATO's Brussels Summit in January 1994 opened a new stage in the Alliance's history when the participants reconsidered its military-political role and the place of the organisation in the changing world. At this Summit, Alliance leaders announced: "We have decided to launch an immediate and practical programme that will transform the relationship between NATO and participating states. This new programme goes beyond dialogue and co-operation to forge a real partnership: a Partnership for Peace (PfP)".¹

Conceived at Travemuende in October 1993, born at the January 1994 Summit in Brussels, and introduced to the potential partners by expert teams a month later, PfP met with considerable initial scepticism. Following the openings of the Partnership Co-ordination Cell (PCC), one of the main bodies of PfP, in Mons, Belgium, and the Partner Liaison Offices in Brussels during that spring, the doubts quickly gave way to optimism. And, with the completion of the initial PfP exercise, Co-operative Bridge 94, near Poznan, Poland, in September 1994, optimism gave way to praise. Within the short span of one year, PfP went from a concept to the implementation of concrete results.

By extending the hand of friendship to the new democracies of Central and Eastern Europe and beyond, PfP strives to draw the states of the former Warsaw Pact into the international fold. As a bonus, it also allows NATO to reach out to those nations of the Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) (formerly the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, CSCE) that were previously neutral. The response to NATO's invitation has been impressive. A year after its inception, PfP had 25 partners (now 24 because of the accession of the Czech Republic, Poland and Hungary to NATO in March 1999)². It has conducted many peacekeeping exercises and is in the midst of implementing a robust programme of activities for coming years.³

PfP was created in the framework of the North Atlantic Co-operation Council (NACC), established in 1991, as an additional initiative. It allows the partners to determine the scope and pace of their relationship with NATO on a bilateral basis. The NACC continued to focus more upon multilateral consultations and co-operation and remained a vital part of the overall co-operative equation.

The PfP programme is, and will remain, an equal opportunity for all, while allowing each partner to

develop progressively closer relations with the Alliance on the basis of its own interest and actual performance.

The PfP is more than a programme of activities. It also aims at developing closer political ties. In launching PfP, NATO's leaders thus gave a commitment to consult with any active participant if a partner perceives a direct threat to its territorial integrity, political independence or security. This offers a channel for consultations with the Alliance on possible future crises and on ways in which they might be defused.

Active participation in PfP will play an important role in the envisaged evolutionary process of NATO expansion and has already played a significant role in enlarging NATO through the accession of the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland. As the Brussels Summit Declaration stated, "We expect and would welcome NATO expansion that would reach to democratic states to our East, as part of an evolutionary process, taking into account political and security developments in the whole of Europe." PfP, as the Secretary General, Manfred Wörner, remarked, can and will lead to NATO membership for some countries though this need not be a goal for all those who participate.

STEP BY STEP TOWARDS THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE PfP

Since the revolutions of 1989-1990, NATO has become of increasing importance to the post-communist states of Central and Eastern Europe. The Alliance is seen as a key basis of security in the 'new Europe'. The post-communist policies of the Central and East European countries have sought a 'return to Europe'—the 'return' symbolising acceptance of Western values, institutions and political practices. In practical terms these countries have sought integration with the West European economy by membership of the EU and security by membership of NATO.

NATO extended its first 'hand of friendship' to Central and East European countries at the London Summit of July 5-6, 1990.⁴ At NATO's Copenhagen Summit of 6-7 June 1991, NATO took a decision "To intensify ... [NATO's] programme of military contacts at various levels"⁵ with Central and East European states. NATO gave special attention to the new situation in Central and Eastern Europe at its meeting in Copenhagen. It was stated in the Declaration on Partnership with the countries of Central and Eastern Europe that the security of NATO countries was inseparably linked to the security of all other states in Europe. The consolidation and preservation of democratic societies throughout the continent and their freedom from any form of coercion or intimidation are therefore of direct and material concern of the Alliance.

The abortive Soviet coup of August 1991 led, for example, to the Central and East European states' call for "institutionalised co-operation" with NATO. Until then, NATO had treated all former Warsaw Pact countries alike. During the August 1991 coup attempt in the then-Soviet Union, the August 21 North Atlantic Council Ministerial Statement differentiated the Soviet Union from the other Warsaw Pact countries, when it suspended liaison "pending a clarification in the country."⁶

The Meeting of Alliance Heads of State and Government in Rome on 7-8 November 1991 marks a watershed, not only in the history of NATO but also of Europe. The Rome Summit was the latest in a series of high-level meetings that over the past two years had guided the Alliance's transformation and redefined its role and missions in new Europe.

In Rome, the Heads of State and Government were able to announce that commitments made 15 months before in the London Declaration had been kept. This was done notwithstanding the

diplomatic focus on the Gulf crisis in this period and the mounting political uncertainties in the Soviet Union both before and after the Moscow coup attempt the previous August. One of the principal achievements of the Rome Summit was to raise liaison to a new qualitative level in recognition of the democratic progress made by the Central and East European nations.

To institutionalise this co-operation between NATO and the Central and East European countries, which had begun even before the London Summit, the NACC was formed in 1991 and a commitment was made for NATO's Military Committee and NATO subordinate committees to meet with representatives from partner nations at regular intervals.⁷

Russian instability underlined, on the one hand, the Central and East European countries' sense of insecurity and, on the other, NATO's reluctance to overcome Moscow's opposition to the extension of membership eastwards. In October 1993, the US Secretary of Defence, Les Aspin, introduced the PfP proposal at a Meeting of NATO Defence Ministers in Travemuende, Germany. The plan and US inspiration were conceived as a means of placating the Central and East European countries seeking NATO membership and Russia, which was worried about being left out in the cold. The proposal offered greater military co-operation with NATO, but not membership, and was open to all states in the NACC and CSCE. The NATO Summit of Heads of State and Government in January 1994 adopted the PfP proposals. The Alliance had sought to 'square its circle' of dilemmas, moving beyond NACC and not isolating Russia.⁸

At the Brussels Summit of 10-11 January 1994, the Alliance Heads of State and Government broke partial silence on NATO's enlargement and issued the invitation to the NACC and OSCE countries able and willing to contribute to the programme, to join with NATO in the new co-operation framework: Partnership for Peace.

NATO looked to strengthen its ties to the East and saw PfP as a 'real partnership' between NATO and participants from the NACC and CSCE. The PfP was placed under the authority of the North Atlantic Council (NAC) and partners were invited to participate in political and military bodies at NATO headquarters with regard to Partnership activities. NATO did not extend its security guarantee or membership to partner states but agreed to "consult with any active participant in the PfP if that partner perceives a direct threat to its territorial integrity, political independence, or security."⁹ All Central and East European countries applied for the PfP programme and signed an agreement for intensive co-operation.¹⁰

The Partnership programme was a complex compromise between several contradictory interests:

- a. Eastern Europe's strong desire for rapid admission and NATO states' resolve to do nothing that may strain the cohesion of the Alliance or antagonise Russia,
- b. the NATO states' willingness to engage the East Europeans, including Russians, in a co-operative venture,
- c. the American wish to develop priority relations with Russia while boosting the reforms in Central and Eastern Europe and fortifying the US's leading role within the Alliance, and
- d. Russia's interest in slowing down the integration of Central and Eastern Europe in the West until she has recuperated as a global power and to prevent her self-isolation from European processes.

THE STRUCTURE OF PfP

The goals of PfP are clear. As set forth in the programme's Framework Document, 11 participating states will strive to do the following:

- a. Facilitate transparency in national defence planning and budgeting,
- b. Ensure democratic control of defence forces,
- c. Develop co-operative military relations with NATO for the purposes of joint planning, training and exercises in order to strengthen their ability to undertake peacekeeping, search and rescue, and humanitarian operations as well as others as may subsequently be agreed,
- d. Maintain the capability and readiness to contribute to operations under the authority of the United Nations or the OSCE,
- e. Develop, over the long-term, forces better able to operate with those of the Alliance.

A country wishing to join the PfP programme is first invited to sign a framework document that describes the basic principles on which PfP is founded. By virtue of their signature, countries undertake a political commitment to the preservation of democratic societies and maintenance of the principles of international law; to fulfil in good faith the obligations of the Charter of the United Nations and the principles of the Universal Declaration on Human Rights; to refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state; to respect existing borders; and to settle disputes by peaceful means. They also reaffirm their commitment to the Helsinki Final Act and all subsequent CSCE/OSCE documents and to the fulfilment of the commitments and obligations they have undertaken in the field of disarmament and arms control.

After signing the framework document, each partner submits its presentation document to NATO. This document indicates the aims for that country's co-operation with NATO, the specific areas of co-operation the partner wishes to pursue jointly with NATO, and the military and other assets the partner intends to make available for Partnership purposes.

Based on the statements made in the presentation document, and on additional proposals made by NATO and the partner, an Individual Partnership Programme (IPP) is developed and agreed jointly covering a three-year period. The IPP contains statements of:

- a. the political aims of the partner in PfP,
- b. the military and other assets made available by the partner for PfP purposes,
- c. the broad objectives of co-operation between the partner and the Alliance in various areas of co-operation,
- d. the specific co-operation activities to be implemented for each one of the co-operation areas included in the IPP.

The selection of specific activities is made by each partner separately on the basis of its individual requirements and priorities, from a list of such activities contained in the Partnership Work

Programme (PWP).¹²

The PWP contains a broad description of the various possible areas of co-operation and a list of available activities for each one of the areas of co-operation. The PWP, which covers a three-year period and is reviewed every year, is prepared with the full involvement of the partners.

To facilitate co-operation activities, NATO and the partner countries endorsed a Planning and Review Process (PARP) within PfP based on a biennial planning cycle, beginning in January 1995, designed to advance interoperability and increase transparency among Allies and partners. At their meeting in December 1994, NATO defence ministers attached particular importance to this process as a means of serving two of the central purposes of PfP: closer co-operation and transparency in national defence planning and budgeting. They confirmed that PfP provides an effective mechanism to develop the essential military capabilities required to operate effectively with NATO and to encourage interoperability between NATO and partners that is of value to partner countries whether they aspire to NATO membership or not. Participation of PfP countries in PARP is voluntary.

One of the main focuses of PfP is the development of greater co-operation in the field of peacekeeping. NATO and partner countries are increasingly likely to find themselves side by side in responding to, and implementing, UN and CSCE mandates.¹³ The need for more coherent preparation for peacekeeping missions has grown more urgent as a result of the increased risks and greater demands for military forces for operations such as those in former Yugoslavia.

Field exercises, to promote closer peacekeeping co-operation and interoperability, are a major aspect of PfP.¹⁴ Partners are not only fully involved in the planning, they also host an exercise on their territory.

Three PfP military exercises took place in 1994 and focused on basic peacekeeping skills. They were held in Poland, Norwegian waters and the Netherlands. Eight exercises were organised in 1995, four in partner nations and four in NATO states, with greater national participation and a broader scope of activities including search and rescue missions and humanitarian aid. In 1996, 14 exercises, which were further enlarged in size and complexity, were held. Twenty-four exercises were organised in 1997. In addition to these NATO-PfP exercises, there have been numerous workshops and training activities plus bilateral 'in-the-spirit-of' partnership exercises between a partner state and a NATO member. The NATO school in Oberammergau, the Marshall Centre in Garmisch, the North Atlantic Assembly and the Atlantic Treaty Association also ran special educational courses, conferences and seminars based on partnership issues and themes.

The basic working body in the field of PfP is the Political-Military Steering Committee on Partnership for Peace (PMSC), which may meet in various configurations either at Alliance level or as the Alliance with partners. The main responsibilities of the PMSC include:

- a. to advise the NAC with respect to PfP, being responsible for the overall co-ordination of the PWP,
- b. developing political-military guidelines for use by the NATO military authorities for the preparation of their PWP input on military exercises and activities,
- c. providing guidance for the preparation of the IPPs and for submitting them to the NAC for

approval,

d. developing and co-ordinating work in relation to the PARP.

The military aspects of co-operation in PfP are developed by the NATO military authorities on the basis of guidance proposed by the PMSC and agreed by the NAC. Since the Brussels Summit, the PMSC has been working on the details of PfP and preparing for its implementation.

Another basic working body of PfP is the Partnership Co-ordination Cell (PCC). The PCC is a key element of the PfP programme. Under the authority of the NAC, its role is to co-ordinate the efforts of partners to make their military structures interoperable with NATO in the areas of peacekeeping, humanitarian operations, and search and rescue operations and to co-ordinate joint initial planning of activities such as training and exercises. In order to co-ordinate this major effort, a central organisation was required. As a direct result of the Brussels Summit, the PCC was formally established in mid-1994. Under the Deputy Secretary General's command, it is located at Mons in Belgium. The inaugural opening of the PCC was conducted by NATO's Deputy Secretary General, Sergio Balanzino, in April 1994, in a building within the Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe (SHAPE) compound.

The PCC organisational structure incorporates four principal elements: the permanent staff, partner liaison teams, NATO liaison teams and a Supreme Allied Commander Atlantic SACLANT staff element.

Each NATO nation is represented in the PCC by a liaison officer, with the exception of Iceland, which provides the principal conduit of information flow between the NATO nations and the corporate body of the PCC. The NATO liaison teams are provided by the SHAPE National Military Representatives, and are fully informed of their nation's PfP activities, whether NATO-based or bilateral.¹⁵

THE ENHANCED PfP

The PfP initiative has been uniquely successful in influencing stability and security in Europe and fostering improvements in good neighbourly relations. It has become a permanent and dynamic feature of the European security architecture. In mid-1997, the Alliance decided to further enhance the role of the Partnership, building on its momentum and success. In Spring 1997 in Sintra, Portugal, Allied foreign and defence ministers launched a wide range of enhancement measures that have added a new quality to PfP and have substantively strengthened it in the political, security, military and institutional fields. The Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC) was founded replacing the NACC.¹⁶ The enhanced PfP programme will have a more operational role, stronger political consultations and increased opportunities for partners to participate in decision-making and the planning of PfP activities.

The overarching objectives of PfP enhancement are:

a. strengthening the political consultation element in PfP, taking into account the EAPC and related outreach activities,

b. developing a more operational role for PfP,

c. providing for the greater involvement of partners in PfP decision-making and planning.

To meet each one of these objectives, a series of enhancements have been agreed which aim not only to build on the existing programme but also to add a new quality to the Partnership.

EURO-ATLANTIC PARTNERSHIP COUNCIL

The EAPC forms the overarching framework for an expanded political dimension of partnership as well as practical co-operation under PfP. As stated in the EAPC Basic Document, agreed on 30 May 1997, the EAPC will take full account of and complement the respective activities of the OSCE and other relevant institutions such as the European Union, the Western European Union and the Council of Europe. Co-operation in the EAPC supports the creation of conditions for common approaches and joint action. The EAPC provides the framework to afford partner countries, to the maximum extent possible, increased decision-making opportunities for activities in which they participate.

The EAPC meets, as a general rule, at ambassadorial level in Brussels on a monthly basis. It also meets twice a year at both foreign minister and defence minister level. Additional meetings can be convened as required. It may also meet at the level of Heads of State or Government when appropriate.

The work of the EAPC is supported regularly by the Political Committee and from time to time by the PMSC.

The EAPC replaces the NACC. The EAPC picked up from where the NACC ended and provides a framework within which both political consultations and practical activities under PfP can be taken forward. It combines the best elements of the NACC and PfP processes. Moreover, the EAPC provides for the inclusion of all partners—former NACC members and PfP participating countries automatically become members of the EAPC, if they so desire.

TURKISH PERSPECTIVE ON PfP

Turkey, as a NATO member since 1952, attaches particular importance to the Alliance as the linchpin of Euro-Atlantic security and stability. Although we have moved into an era where it is not hard security but soft security that is talked about, Turkey believes that there are still hard security issues in Europe.¹⁷

Turkey is certainly one of the countries that will not be neglected when it comes to Euro-Atlantic security. Turkey, as a NATO member, has actively participated in the deliberations aimed at establishing and enhancing Partnership for Peace and launching the EAPC, and has wholeheartedly supported practical regional co-operation within PfP.

Within this context, Turkey opened a PfP Commandership of Education Centre in Ankara in 1998 to organise courses in various fields ‘in the spirit of’ PfP, bringing together officers from PfP member countries.¹⁸ So far, Turkey has organised 16 courses at the Centre and a total of 313 participants from 28 countries attended them.

Turkey also has been active in establishing a rapid reaction force in the Balkans. Military officials from Balkan countries—Albania, Bulgaria, Macedonia, Romania and Turkey—agreed in principle in Ankara in March 1998 to establish a rapid deployment force, with the intention of preventing the

escalation of conflicts in the region.¹⁹

Turkey has encouraged the participation of the Caucasian and Central Asian states in the EAPC and PfP programmes. Turkey has supported the process of adaptation, which it believes is necessary to reinvigorate NATO and render it more flexible in responding to the new challenges of the post-Cold War era.

Within this context, Turkey has welcomed the successful conclusion of the agreement with the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland, which led to the signing of the joining protocols during the NATO Foreign Ministers Meeting on 16 December 1997.

Turkey can be a contributor to a much wider range of activities within NATO than was possible in the Cold War. As a European, Balkan, Mediterranean and Middle Eastern country, Turkey holds a unique geo-strategic position. Despite its troublesome location, Turkey is also an important security asset for maintaining stability, especially in the NATO periphery areas.²⁰

CONCLUSION

This paper has described the PfP programme, analysing its effects on Central and East European countries and on all European states. This conclusion summarises key elements and features of PfP. It ends by highlighting the fact that PfP has made remarkable progress in European security.

When the history of post-Cold War Europe is written, the January 1994 NATO Summit in Brussels will loom as a watershed event. Leaders of the NATO nations set a course for a more peaceful, free and united Europe by responding with imagination to the challenge posed by the demise of NATO's original *raison d'être*—the Soviet threat.

PfP has a very valuable role to play by promoting stability while NATO is engaged in the process of enlargement. In conjunction with the strategic partnership NATO wishes to achieve with Russia, it has remained a most useful tool in its own right, which has helped to avoid new dividing lines in Europe.

PfP offers a partnership of opportunity. The Alliance will do its best, to ensure that PfP reaches the potential it promises for enhancing the security and stability in Europe. Due to this, PfP has become a basis for a future comprehensive security architecture in Europe.

The Partnership programme has a wider, more political dimension to it, which is the promotion of, and commitment to democratic principles, thereby increasing stability and diminishing threats to peace.

The success and stability of Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic in activities in the framework of PfP made them the best candidates for NATO membership. As the NATO spokesman, Jamie Shea, stated, the PfP appears to be merely the first stage of the expansion process. Although there is no formal link between PfP and enlargement, the first new members to join the Alliance were those who, through their full participation in this programme, have demonstrated their ability to contribute to common defence and to carry out the necessary military reforms at home.

NATO, in its last summit of the century, held in Washington on 23-25 April 1999, commemorating the fiftieth anniversary of its foundation, took a number of key decisions. The Alliance member

countries approved a New Strategic Concept for NATO. They remarked that enlargement remains a priority for the Alliance. In the Summit, the PfP and EAPC became more operational. They also adopted a 'membership action plan'. It will help all the nine candidate countries, and others in the future, to prepare more actively to meet the requirements for NATO membership. They reaffirmed their commitment to consultation, partnership and practical co-operation through EAPC and PfP.

Since its inception in 1994, PfP co-operation has developed rapidly and has become a permanent feature of European security. There are currently 24 countries participating in PfP and this has transformed political-military relations across the continent and has become the instrument of choice when the Alliance and its partners consult and act together in the pursuit of peace and security.

The PfP initiative has come a long way in just five years. But the fact is that it still has a long way to go. The fledging and often fragile democracies of Central and Eastern Europe are in transition and possess differing degrees of stability. While democracies can spring to life in a relatively short time, it takes considerably longer for the institutions that make democracies work to evolve and mature. PfP focuses on the development of one of those institutions—the military—and, in doing so, nurtures the prospects for stability with progress towards democracy. In order to play the part of a full participant in PfP, the members were (and are) encouraged to become full democracies.

1 Partnership for Peace Invitation, Press Communiqué M-1(94)2, 10-11 January 1994.

2 Albania, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bulgaria, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kirghizstan, Latvia, Lithuania, Moldova, Romania, Russia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, Macedonia, Turkmenistan, Ukraine and Uzbekistan.

3 George A. Joulwan, 'NATO's Military Contribution to Partnership for Peace: the Progress and the Challenge', NATO Review, Vol. 43, No. 2, March 1995, p. 5.

4 'London Declaration on a Transformed NATO Alliance', Brussels, NATO Information Service, 5-6 July 1990, Articles 7 and 8.

5 Statement issued by the NAC Meeting in Ministerial Session, Copenhagen, 6-7 June 1991 in NATO Communiqués, Brussels, NATO Office of Information and Press, 1991, pp. 22-23.

6 NAC Statement, 21 August 1991, in NATO Communiqués 1991, pp. 24-25.

7 Klaus Naumann, 'From Co-operation to Interoperability', NATO Review, Vol. 44, No. 4, July 1996, pp. 17-20.

8 Mihalka, M., 'Squaring the Circle: NATO's Offer to the East', RFE/RL Research Report, Vol. 3, No. 12, pp. 1-9.

9 NAC, 10-11 January 1994.

10 John Borawski, 1995, 'Partnership for Peace', International Affairs, Vol. 71, No. 2, pp. 233-46.

11 Framework Document was issued by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the NAC in Brussels, on 10-11 January 1994, NATO Ministerial Communiqués,

Framework Document, Brussels, 10-11 January 1994, Annex M-1 (94) 2.

12 Gebhardt Von Moltke, 'Building a Partnership for Peace', NATO Review, Vol. 42, No. 3, June 1994, pp. 3-7.

13 Gebhardt Von Moltke, op. cit., pp. 3-7.

14 Richard Vincent, 'The Brussels Summit: A Military Perspective', NATO Review, Vol. 42, No. 1, February 1994, pp. 7-11.

15 Gunner Lange, 'The PCC: A New Player in the Development of Relations between NATO and Partner Nations', NATO Review, Vol. 43, No. 3, May 1995, pp. 30 -33.

16 NATO Basic Fact Sheet, No. 9.

17 Duygu Sezer, 'Turkey's Role in European Security' in Seminar on Turkey-EU Relations in the Post-Cold War Era, SAM Papers, No. 04/97 pp. 143-181.

18 Anadolu News Agency, 11 January 1999.

19 Turkish Daily News, 17 March 1998.

20 Gülnur Aybet, 'Turkey in its Geo-Strategic Environment', Royal United Services Institute & Brassey's Defence Yearbook, London, Brassey's, 1992, p. 93-5.