

West European Studies

Newsletter

December 2002

Headlines:

Interview with David Audretsch

WEST to become a dynamic network throughout the university, says the Director of the West European Studies

Expansion made NATO more European

Opinions from Roy Gardner, Charles Bonser and Martin Spechler

Meet WEST

Highlights on the new staff

Student of the month

WEST graduate returns to army

David Audretsch:

WEST to become a dynamic network throughout the university

Contemporary policy issues is the new focus of West European Studies, says its director

WEST: Dr. Audretsch, what new qualities do you think you bring as Director of WEST and what is your vision for WEST over the next 5 years?

DA: Our goal is to build on the rich tradition at IU based on exceptional strengths in the humanities and languages. We would like to continue and extend these traditional strengths to also include a focus on contemporary European policy issues. Much of the original motivation for the federal government to support



areas studies programs with a focus on Western Europe stemmed from concerns about the cold war. But with the demise of the Berlin Wall and the passing of the cold war, this original concern is now being re-oriented towards focusing on contemporary issues of policy confronting Europe and its relation to the U.S. This certainly involves a central role for the European Union as a decision-making entity.

WEST: You are a chaired professor in SPEA, Director of the Institute for Development Strategies, and the Director of WEST. How do you manage to divide your time?

DA: We try to stand on the shoulders of giants. IU is blessed with an abundance of knowledge, passion and expertise about Western Europe. Human and programmatic resources dedicated to the study of Western Europe extend beyond any single department, program, school or even campus. Being active and involved across different programs, schools and at different locations in the state provides a valuable platform for linking up and harnessing the diverse interests focusing on Western Europe. With globalization becoming one of the main priorities of SPEA, and Western Europe as one of the priority regions, much of what I've been involved with at SPEA focuses on Western Europe. For example, over the past few years we have organized and sponsored the "Seminar Series on Contemporary European Issues". Just a little over a month ago, we hosted a conference with the Hudson Institute here on campus on "The Future of Manufacturing in Indiana and Europe", which included a number of participants from Europe. We've organized conferences and projects on and in Western Europe, and we teach classes that actually take students to Europe. Thus, an integrated, wholistic approach finds common links across multiple activities with a common focus on Europe.

WEST: WEST just applied for a Title VI grant. What are your expectations?

DA: I am very proud of the teamwork exhibited by our WEST staff. Led by Karen Boschker, the Assistant Director, and Dan Knudson, the Associate Director, our WEST team identified the rich inventory of human and programmatic resources devoted to the study of Western Europe here at IU. Given that we're a very large, multi-school and multi-campus university, this task was anything but trivial. One of the rewards of this task was the opportunity to become better acquainted with colleagues and programs across the Bloomington campus and throughout the IU system. IU offers a diversity of interests in Europe spanning a broad spectrum of departments, programs, schools and campuses. A second aspect of the Title VI grant involved identifying and articulating new programs and activities where we'd like WEST and the university to become more involved. Again, completing this task required learning about the various interests of our colleagues at IU and identifying potential clusters of interest. We of course hope that our hard work preparing the Title VI application is rewarded with a grant from the Department of Education in Washington. But even going through the process of preparing the application yielded a host of rewards that are significant and valuable.

WEST: You became Director of WEST almost a year ago. How would you like to be remembered after you leave the post one day?

DA: We are blessed with the opportunity to transform WEST from an academic department with a handful of faculty to providing a focal point for a large and dynamic network of diverse colleagues throughout the university. We hope this will result in WEST participating and partnering in a broad spectrum of activities involving all dimensions of Western Europe. To succeed we need partners from the other area studies programs, such as REEI, humanities and social science

departments in the College, and programs in other schools, including education, music, law and business. And we need to have partners from the other campuses of the university. We think that increased globalization will lead IU faculty and programs to look increasingly for linkages with WEST as a mechanism for including regional content about Europe in their activities. I would anticipate that we are embarking on an era where interest in Western Europe is evolving from a relatively small group of highly competent and specialized experts to a much broader group of scholars who are discovering the importance of "place" in their research and teaching activities. We hope to be part of the evolution of WEST from largely the focus of a narrow group of area study experts to a much broader and dynamic participation throughout the university.

Expansion made NATO more European

WEST professors comment on the alliance summit in Prague

The NATO summit in Prague last November brought seven former Eastern bloc nations into the alliance. By inviting Bulgaria, Romania, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Slovakia and Slovenia to join the alliance, NATO has begun the biggest expansion in its history.

WEST asked its faculty members to comment on the eastward enlargement of NATO. Prof. Roy Gardner, Prof. Charles Bonser and Prof. Martin Spechler discuss the role of NATO after the end of Cold War and what the expansion means for the countries from Central and Eastern Europe and NATO itself.

Roy Gardner

Chancellor's Professor of West European Studies and Chancellor's Professor of Economics

The role of NATO after the end of the Cold War and especially now in the era of eastward expansions is European-wide security. The members are in fact partners for peace in Europe, a peace secured by the combined military assets of the partners. Furthermore, it is not just the members that are involved---the new members are being drawn from the ranks of countries formerly in NATO's official Partners for Peace program, which program will continue to offer up new members as time passes.

It is important also to point out a development parallel with the expansions, the NATO-Russia Council. This formation brings Russia to the table with NATO members on a regular basis—and involves Russia in an integral way with NATO deliberations and initiatives, and with the new construction for Europe-wide security.

Look at the expanded NATO and the NATO-Russia Council, and you're looking at Gorbachev's "European home, from the Urals to the Atlantic"---although not exactly as the first President of the USSR imagined it.

The expansion means that the countries from Central and Eastern Europe are on the "road to Europe," to borrow the phrase from Leszek Balcerowicz, former Minister of Finance for Poland. The same holds true for EU accession, which broadly overlaps the NATO expansion. The short century of great insecurity in Europe, 1914-1989, is over. And the greatest insecurity in that insecure century was experienced by Central and Eastern Europe. It is an open question, whether the countries of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS)--the former Soviet republics minus the 3 Baltic republics--are now or will someday be on the road to Europe too.

A bigger NATO, and especially the NATO-Russia Council, is a different NATO. The alliance is much less driven by needs of US security: indeed, the distinction between the North American and European members is by all accounts larger today than at any time in the history of the alliance. We can expect to see a further differentiation between pan-alliance action and strictly European theater action. The latter being increasingly the prerogative of the European members (all or part) acting as an independent subsidiary on European matters. This redistribution of effort would be welcome by the North American members in missions such as in Bosnia, Kosovo, and Cyprus--where NATO is either involved or has important security interests.

As far as capability is concerned, for now and the foreseeable future, there is only one superpower in the alliance--the US.

Charles Bonser

Dean Emeritus, School of Public and Environmental Affairs:

I was around NATO for a number of years, particularly since early 1990s. NATO is obviously very much under evolution and changes. I think NATO is a very successful organization, probably the most successful alliance that ever existed. With the end of the Soviet empire and the end of military threat, NATO was like an organization without mission. I was there during 1990-91 and I could sense it walking around the house of NATO and talking to people - they really were not sure what they were now, what their purpose was and what they were going to be in the future.

An important step NATO took in forming new mission was the partnership initiatives with the former Eastern block nations, including Russia. That was a positive step toward the new purpose-- to help stabilize that part of the world. In addition, the requirements for these countries to join NATO had led to changes in their own systems that were positive for them as well for world peace and stability in that part of Europe.

Expansion was another really important step. By adding first Hungary, Czech Republic and Poland, NATO made a statement that it going to be here for long term. It had also positive effects on the joining countries: they feel more secure and identify themselves more with the West than with the East. The most recent expansion by adding 7 more countries last month--Slovenia, Bulgaria, Romania, Slovakia, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania-- is a positive step for the same reasons as for the three Central European countries. It also seems Russia has been able to come to terms with this. Now the Russian government is more relaxed about NATO and working in a cooperative way. I think in the September 11th situation we enforced that. So NATO has come a lot farther that I thought it would have in 1990-91 when it was just dissolving as an organization.

An article in the last *Foreign Affairs* issue talks about the necessity for continuing evaluation process within NATO. For example, if right now a country joins NATO under certain conditions, there is no real mechanism for evaluating the contribution they agreed to make. If they are not upgrading in a way that they agreed to upgrade, there is no mechanism within NATO politically to say: if you don't change this, we will bounce you out of coalition.

NATO needs to restructure itself in order to prepare to deal with the threats of the future. For example, what kind of forces do we really need to combat al Qaeda? The other issue is that the European Union is developing its own military capability of 50 000 - 60 000 troops. How the relationship between NATO and EU going to develop? Besides political issues like that, there are also military-technical kinds of issues that have to be sorted out. So a lot of work needs to be done until NATO meets its potentials and it seems they can do that.

Martin Spechler* , *Professor of Economics, IUPUI:*

At its Prague summit on November 21-22, 2002, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, currently composed of 19 nations, invited seven countries from Central and Eastern Europe to enter into negotiations to join the alliance. They are Bulgaria and Romania in the Balkans, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania on the Baltic Sea, as well as Slovakia and Slovenia. These seven join former Soviet-bloc states of Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Poland, which were admitted in 1999. The new states are not particularly powerful, but they reinforce a pro-American activism against worldwide terrorism, as against a more reserved and skeptical stance adopted by the German Chancellor Gerhard Schroeder and French President Jacques Chirac in the recent discussions about armed intervention in Iraq. France and Germany prefer to exercise "soft power," including diplomacy, financial rescue, and official development aid, as well as peacekeeping forces. For example, Germany has agreed to take joint command (with the Netherlands, and following Turkey) of the international security force in Kabul, Afghanistan.

The leaders of the current members also approved a new rapid-reaction force to deal with such crises as the ones NATO has been involved in recently in Kosovo and Macedonia. They also promised "effective action" in Iraq to reinforce Security Council resolutions. But do they have the means to help? The Europeans have some two million soldiers, but modern equipment is scarce. West European members of NATO spend only about 2.1% of their GDP on defense--Germany less than that--as compared with over 3% for the USA. To utilize existing means more efficiently, Secretary General Lord George Robertson is urging more specialization. For example, Germany would contribute strategic lift capability and Spain mid-air refueling.

As before in Bosnia, alternative European Union action in Kosovo has been delayed by disagreements among the Europeans. Perhaps remembering the Europeans' reluctance to commit in Yugoslavia, the USA did not at first invite NATO to invoke Article 5 and take part in the Afghanistan operation. (Eventually 14 NATO members did agree, providing AWACS and naval patrols to "Operation Enduring Freedom.") This time the issue in contention with regard to Kosovo is the so-called Berlin-plus option, which would guarantee EU access to NATO planning and logistics. France and Britain also disagree about an independent European Security and Defense

Policy. A plan to deploy a rapid-reaction force of the EU itself, with a promised 60,000 troops, still lies in the future.

Since its inception in 1949 NATO has gone through many crises and disagreements. Such disagreements might hinder defense of NATO's new eastern frontiers because all 19 members must agree before its forces can be mobilized. Until the West European members of NATO feel the hot breath of terrorists at their necks, the Bush Administration may decide to act unilaterally with ad hoc assistance of countries concerned. NATO would be weakened, but probably would not fade away, much less die, owing to the assurance it gives the new members against possible Russian revanchism and other conventional threats.

** Professor Spechler has participated several times as a member of the NATO Economics Colloquium and follows Eurasian economic and security affairs actively*

Student of the month



WEST graduate returns to army

Vincent H. Torres is a Major in the United States Army who will graduate from Indiana University this December with a Master of Arts degree in West European Studies. Major Torres is a military intelligence officer with a secondary specialty as a European Foreign Area Officer specializing in the Netherlands.

Vince was a military Advisor at the Bureau of European Affairs and Security State Department. He advised senior officials including the Assistant Secretary on political and military issues related to NATO and European Allies and assisted in the formulation and coordination of U.S. policy and strategy. Major Torres has served in Bosnia and Panama as well as numerous stateside tours.

Vince holds a Bachelor of Science degree in Accounting (1991) from Rochester Institute of Technology in New York. After graduation he will become an instructor with the Indiana University Army R.O.T.C. program for one semester before continuing to his next assignment in June 2003. Vince is married and has two children Katia (2) and Luka (2 months).