

NATO, BUILDING GLOBAL INSECURITY

Authors: Gabriela Serra (coord.), Pere Ortega, Eduardo Melero Alonso, Tica Font, Nora Miralles Crespo, Teresa de Fortuny, Xavier Bohigas, Alejandro Pozo Marín, Javier García Raboso, José Luis Gordillo, Ainhoa Ruiz Benedicto, Reiner Braun



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report on the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) presents an updated snapshot of the military alliance, taking into account the global context of simultaneous crises and the heightened tensions caused by the invasion of Ukraine.

NATO's modus operandi are embodied in its Strategic Concepts, and from the two most recently approved we can draw some conclusions that help us understand the Alliance's goals. On the one hand, it seeks to promote a broad conception of defence, which allows it to greatly expand its scope of action to deal with "new threats", many of them non-military; there is also an attempt to relax its adherence to the United Nations Charter, in what has been described as the "legal deregulation of warfare"; NATO is also extending its geographical scope of action beyond what is established by the North Atlantic Treaty, as happened in the case of Afghanistan. Lastly, the democratic deficit with which this strategy is decided is noteworthy, bypassing the most basic rules of parliamentarism. In June 2022, a new Strategic Concept will be approved in Madrid, which is expected to emphasise reinforcement, deterrence and defence, which is equivalent to increasing all military capabilities, whether nuclear, conventional or cybernetic. It will also include an explicit reference to the relationship with China, which it considers to be a "systemic challenge". Furthermore, it will state that it will not only respond to armed attacks, but that NATO could intervene militarily in the event of any threat to its security. Deterrence, based on an appropriate combination of nuclear and conventional capabilities, is and will be a central element of NATO's strategy.

NATO was born in opposition to Moscow and, following Russia's invasion of Ukraine, which undoubtedly deserves total condemnation - among many reasons for the violation of state sovereignty protected by international law and the United Nations - the Alliance reinforces its legitimacy against it. However, this does not absolve NATO of responsibility for the contempt it has shown towards Russia, following its commitment not to expand eastwards after the fall of the Berlin Wall and the demand that Ukraine does not join the Atlantic Alliance. For Russia, the possibility that Ukraine joins NATO was perceived as a serious threat to its security. The Alliance's leaders, however, have hardly invoked violations of international law to criticise Russia, perhaps because they have also excelled in this area themselves. They have thus chosen to push for a proxy war in Ukraine in order to resolve, by force, what they perceived as the first round of a new Cold War between NATO and Russia/China. In other words, the Alliance is going backwards and back to square one in its history, leaving no doubt as to its role: NATO is the best solution to the problems caused by NATO itself.

In this sense, the military Alliance, since its very foundation 73 years ago, has fought wars on an almost permanent basis. NATO's involvement in wars such as those in Yugoslavia, Libya and Afghanistan shows how far it is from the purposes set out in the North Atlantic Treaty of 1949. Its politico-military interventions

that take place so far from the territories of its member states, with the aim of promoting regime change, are an objective that goes directly against to the principle of the self-determination of peoples, and are incontrovertible empirical proof of the Alliance's transformation into an aggressive and imperialist organisation.

NATO membership also implies subordination to US interests and guidelines. This applies not only to defence, but also to foreign policy and relations with the rest of the world. It is a colossal mistake to identify US interests with those of Europe. Membership of an organisation that is ultimately nothing more than a military bloc implies a militarised vision of the world that, in the face of conflict, prioritises militarised responses over other possibilities. It also implies the need for a continuous process of rearmament. In addition, it turns member states into military targets for potential adversaries of the United States.

On the other hand, it is important to note how energy security has stood out among the motivations of NATO and its members in the various missions in which they have participated. Its contribution to the climate crisis is as significant as its lack of transparency and accountability. NATO's announced emission reduction plans are markedly greenwashing and its approach to climate change is eminently securitarian, avoiding any approach related to climate justice. The very existence of the Alliance contributes, in fact, to sustaining the colonial model of exploitation of the planet and dispossession of the majorities, which are the basis of the climate and environmental crisis.

The Alliance also acts as a key element in the diversion and return of migrants outside European borders and is far from being an instrument generating stability and security in complex contexts. The cases of Libya, Iraq and Afghanistan serve as an example.

The war in Ukraine highlights the need to re-establish a European peace movement aimed at recovering a common and shared security among all the peoples and nations of Europe. In this logic of an international architecture of peace and security, it is also necessary to limit, overcome and dissolve all military alliances and replace them with inclusive institutions of security and peace.

It is also essential to incorporate the feminist discourse, linked to collectivity, to a community-centered approach, to the land, to the centrality of life and care. This is especially true when we are faced with the choice between continuing to sustain extractivist and environmentally destructive dynamics through armed violence, or simply degrow, destroy the systems of domination and survive.

This publication therefore advocates "No to war, no to NATO" as an amendment to the whole, to a militarism predatory of human lives and resources, of habitats, of economies. Peace is not just a trite slogan, but a policy of relations that must be deployed at all levels, from interpersonal to inter-state, now more than ever.



If you appreciate our research and want to help us keep our rigour and independence, you can become a member or make a donation by scanning the QR code or on this link:
<http://centredelas.org/fes-te-soci-a/?lang=en>



Read the full report at:

<http://centredelas.org/publicacions/otanconstruyendoinseguridad/?lang=en>

Graphic Design: EstevadEstevadó

With the support of:



In collaboration with:

