

**Role of Baltic States in “War on Terror” and
Occupation of Afghanistan, 2001-2012**

*Dissertation submitted to Jawaharlal Nehru University in partial
fulfilment of the requirements for the award of the degree of*

MASTER OF PHILOSOPHY

ANOOP KUMAR



Centre for Russian and Central Asian Studies

School of International Studies

JAWAHARLAL NEHRU UNIVERSITY

New Delhi-110067

2013



JAWAHARLAL NEHRU UNIVERSITY

School of International Studies

New Delhi - 110067

Tel. : 2670 4365

Fax : (+91)-11-2674 1586

Centre for Russian and Central Asian Studies

19-07-2013

DECLARATION

I declare that the dissertation entitled **ROLE OF BALTIC STATES IN "WAR ON TERROR" AND OCCUPATION OF AFGHANISTAN, 2001-2012** submitted by me for the award of the degree of **MASTER OF PHILOSOPHY** of Jawaharlal Nehru University is my own work. The dissertation has not been submitted for any other degree of this University or any other university.

Anoop Kumar

Centre for Russian and Central Asian Studies,
School International Studies,
JAWAHARLAL NEHRU UNIVERSITY

CERTIFICATE

We recommend that this dissertation be placed before the examiners for evaluation.

Prof. Arun Mohanty
Chairperson,
CRCAS, SIS, JNU

Dr. K. B. Usha
Supervisor

**DEDICATED TO
MY MOTHER AND FATHER
FOR THEIR INCESSANT STRUGGLE
TOWARDS MY EDUCATION**

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my supervisor K.B. Usha for her inspiration, guidance and support in the Research and for her valuable suggestions in all walks of life. I am highly thankful to all professors in the centre for their encouragement and providing a helpful environment for the novice like me to successfully complete the difficult task of Research. I am also very thankful to the office staff to make my work very smooth which provided me time to invest in the Research.

I would like to thank all my classmates for their vibrant presence and who stood with me in all difficult times. I am especially thankful to Arun, Govardhan and Abdulla for their encouragement and highly useful discussions. I would like to thank my JNU friends Virendra, Harish, Daya, Shameem Siddiqui and Chandrasen for their support and critical appreciation.

I am highly indebted to my friend Devapriya Sanyal for her support, encouragement and help.

I have no words to express my feelings about the struggle of my parents in the direction of my education. I owe thanks to my brother Jitendra and my sister Deepika.

None of the above holds any responsibility for the errors and omissions that may have crept into the study; I am solely responsible for any such lapse.

New Delhi

Anoop Kumar

CONTENTS

	Pages
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	vii
List of Abbreviations	xi
Definitions of Key Terms	xiii
Chapter 1: Understanding “Global War on Terror”	1
Chapter 2: The Security Policy Priorities and Strategic Partnerships of the Baltic States with the US and the European Union	21
Chapter 3: Participation of the Baltic States in the War and Occupation of Afghanistan	43
Chapter 4: Policy of Baltic States in Post War Afghanistan	65
Chapter 5: Conclusion	81
References:	87

List of Abbreviations

ANSF	Afghanistan National Security Force
ANP	Afghan National Police
APRP	Afghanistan Peace and Reconciliation Programme
ARTF	Afghanistan Reconstruction Trust Fund
BBC	British Broadcasting Corporation
BALTBAT	Baltic Battalion
BALTNET	Baltic Air Surveillance Network
BALTRON	Baltic Naval Squadron
BARSEC	Baltic Sea Region Energy Cooperation
CCDCOE	Cooperative Cyber Defence Centre of Excellence
CIA	Central Intelligence Agency
CIS	Commonwealth of Independent States
CNTF	Counter Narcotics Trust Fund
EOD	Explosive Ordnance Disposal
EU	European Union
FDI	Foreign Direct Investment
FSC	Former Socialist Countries
GICNT	Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism
IMF	International Monetary Fund
ISAF	International Security Assistance Force
LNAF	Latvian National Armed Force
MFA	Ministry of Foreign Affairs

NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organisation
NDN	Northern Distribution Network
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
NTSU	Nordic Transition Support Unit
OEF-HOA	Operation Enduring Freedom – Hornsof Africa
OEF-TS	Operation Enduring Freedom – TransSahara
OMLT	Operational Mentor Liaison Team
OSCE	Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe
PFP	Programme for Peace
PRT	Provincial Reconstruction Team
RCE	Regional Command East
RCN	Regional Command North
TRACECA	Transport Corridor Europe Caucasus Asia
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNHRC	United Nations Human Rights Council
UNFPA	United Nations Population Fund
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner of Refugees
UNSC	United Nations Security Council
US/USA	United States of America
USSR	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
WTO	World Trade Organisation
WEU	Western European Union
WMD	Weapons of Mass Destruction

DEFINITIONS OF KEY TERMS

Al Qaeda: It is a global militant Islamist organisation established by Osama Bin Laden in 1999. It consists of network of militants supported by nations like Pakistan, Saudi Arabia and others whose objective is 'Global Jihad' and follows Sharia law. The US accused Al Qaeda responsible for the September 11 attack.

Axis of Evil: This term was coined by George W. Bush to indicate the common enemies of the United States and those governments which are supportive of terrorism according to the US. He accused and added those nations in the "axis of evil" who are trying to get nuclear weapons to help of terrorism. Countries like Iraq, Iran and North Korea were accused initially and later other enemy nations have been added into the list.

Bretton Woods Institutions: World Bank and the International Monetary Fund are the two organisations which are known as Bretton Woods institutions. Their establishment took place in 1944 in Bretton Woods, New Hampshire with the objective of rebuilding and managing the economy and to promote cooperation of the post war period after the World War II.

Clash of Civilizations: As a theory this phrase has been developed by Samuel P. Huntington and according to this theory in post cold war world order cultural and religious identities will be the most important source of all conflicts.

Cold War: The cold war was between the two superpowers, the United States of America (USA) and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) for hegemony. It was the war of ideas which resulted in economic and political tussle and arms race.

Common Security: The concept of common security emerged from the Common Security and Defence Policy of the European Union also known as European Security and Defence Policy, where the elements of military security and others are to be treated as common among the nation-states involved.

End of History: It was proclaimed by Francis Fukuyama after the cold war in his book that the socio cultural evolution of human kind is no more possible. According to him further evolution out of contestation between the ideologies and whatever remains after the cold war is the final true destination of human kind.

Geopolitical: Political and Economic prominence of any nation-state because of its Geography. It has both physical and human aspect and includes the location, size, population, resources and other things.

Global War on Terror:It is a military campaign initiated by the US in response to the September 11, 2001 terrorist attack. It is claimed by America and its allies that this is a war against global terrorism which is spreading across the world through terrorist organisations like Al Qaeda.

Grand Chessboard:It is the work of Zbigniew Brzezinski which focused on the Geo strategy in central Asia and exercise of power on the Eurasia. It was the formulation of American strategy towards Eurasia.

Hegemony:It is associated with the dominance or indirect rule, where the hegemon uses different forms of power to dictate and for furtherance of its interest.

Imperialism:Dominance of one state by the other state, where the ruling state exploits the people and resources of the ruled state for its benefit and to gain profit. It is different from hegemony in the sense that it is more direct while hegemony is indirect.

Laissez Faire:It is a French word which means 'let do'. It is the form of economy where production and distribution is decided on the basis of market and demand. The role of state or government is also very limited.

Market Economy:Market system is based on the principle of laissez faire in which state has minimum role in the economy and the production and distribution is based on demand and supply and the prices are being decided according to the conditions of the market.

Near Abroad:This term is associated with those countries which emerged after the dissolution of the Soviet Union and it is popularized by Andrey Kozyrev, a Russian foreign minister to show the right of Russia to influence its region.

Operation Active Endeavour:NATO launched a naval operation called "Operation Active Endeavour" which was mainly concerned to remove the militant activities from the Mediterranean Sea.

Operation Anaconda:The US, NATO and non-NATO forces started "Operation Anaconda" to destroy any possible traces of Taliban and Al Qaeda.

Overseas Contingency Operation:President of the United States George W. Bush declared "Global War on Terror" which is officially known as

“Overseas Contingency Operation”, an international military campaign with an objective to curb Al Qaeda and terrorism from the face of the earth.

Operation Enduring Freedom: In response to the September 11 attacks, America initiated many operations in different countries under the banner of “war on terror,” for instance; in Afghanistan they have started “Operation Enduring freedom” with an objective to curb Al Qaeda and its affiliates from Afghanistan.

Victory of Liberalism:It was the philosophy of free market and free trade. America was the follower of this philosophy which emerged victorious after the cold war and therefore it was called as victory of liberalism.

WMD:Weapons of mass destruction are the weapons which can cause great harm to the people, infrastructure and resources.It includes mainly biological and nuclear weapons.

Chapter 1

Understanding “Global War on Terror”

“Global War on Terror” is a military campaign launched by United States of America and its allies in 2001 to combat international terrorism. The terrorist attacks on Pentagon building in Arlington, Virginia near the seat of US government in Washington D.C. and World Trade Centre twin towers in New York city on 11 September 2001 by Al Qaeda raised intense fear and speculation among American political elites regarding the possible further attacks on innocent citizens in homeland and abroad. The target of attack was the symbol of US military, political and economic power. After the 9/11 attacks the then US President George W. Bush declared a policy of pre-emptive strikes for targeting terrorists and “rogue nations” that harbour terrorists. After the 9/11 events the US government changed foreign policy and launched a global campaign against terrorism. The US invaded and occupied Afghanistan on 7 October 2001 and overthrew Taliban that supported Al Qaeda and its leader Osama Bin Laden. European Union supported US global campaign against terrorism. As EU members, Baltic states also participated in the military and humanitarian interventions in Afghanistan as part of anti-terrorism policy of EU. This chapter tries to understand the geo-political context and causes of the “war on terror”. It also discusses the context of and participation of Baltic states in war on terror. This chapter will inquire into the causes the “war on terror” to find whether it is really so, or “terror of war” just to enhance the hegemony of the leader States involved, because since the days of the cold war and even before, the tussle, conflict and war has been initiated and fought by the powerful States to establish their hegemony.

During the cold war different means have been employed, different paths adopted to establish their hegemony by the two most powerful States of the world, which caused economic instability and arms race, where one State for the balance of power or because of the security dilemma was using different methods to become

militarily powerful. Military power was the most important weapon for the sustainability of any State till the end of the cold war. This chapter is going through the journey of international world order from one of unilateral immediately after the cold war to a current multilateral one. America's way was one of challenging opposition and to maintain hegemony for its political and economic interests in the form of "war on terror".

Post-cold war era is being characterised by the emergence of not only a new world order, but the emergence of new security threats also, because the conflict based on an idea was no more a characteristic of the world order. Global political economy, market and regional integration like European Union united the world where causes and effects are not only intra national but also international. The scenario developed after the post-cold war effected the enhancement of terrorism, because it became easy for terrorist organisations to establish networks to further their idea into the society (Enders and Sandler 1999).

Now under new kind of power structure the US emerged as the only superpower; its politics and hegemony in international relations gave rise to a very new kind of opposition in the form of terrorism. It all started with policies of the West and its incessant acts to hegemonize the world and to maintain its status of superpower with economic imperialism. America's policies especially in the Middle East to capture energy resources gave rise of Islamic opposition (Hudson 1996).

Middle East was highly important for the US because of its energy resources, it is also geopolitically important as it connects Europe and Asia. Russia also entered in the region and both the superpowers during cold war tried to control the region. The Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan (Gibbs 1987) and it has been defeated in Afghanistan and during the conflict Mujahedeen has been supported by the US. After the defeat of the Soviet Union in Afghanistan, the dissenters also opposed the hegemony of the US. Soviet Union with its communist philosophy had

opposition to religion and therefore the suppression of religious identities of the Islamic people of the Middle East turned them rigid with their identities.

Middle East have tribal based societies where their identity is directly associated with their religion, which is very important to them (Hudson 2001). Attack on the identities of the Muslim world became of the capitalist agenda of the West, behind which there was politics of energy in which the Western objective of the dilution of the identities of the Muslim world would fit in. West wanted to influence the perspective of the followers of Islam, so that they could easily come under their cultural imperialism.

Economic imperialism and cultural imperialism go hand in hand and the use of both was the dire need of the US to get the benefit of the resources there. They refused to accept the so called modernity of the West and opposed the Western culture and therefore they became radical opponents of the West and the US which gave rise to the terrorism. The attack of September 11 on the WTO is nothing but an opposition to the economic imperialism of the west. The agenda of the US could not succeed the way it wanted and consequently gave rise to the opposition from those countries where identities of the people were being suppressed (Deshpande 2003). It led to the formation of those organisations who were not only vehemently opposing the West but also radically active, and ultimately plunged into terrorism.

In a post-coldwar era, emergence of few economically powerful States posed serious threat, not only to the world's most powerful State, i.e., the US; but this trend started to give primacy to the economic power over military power. Post-cold war era was characterised by the rise of China as strong export based economy (Gill and Lardy 2000), and emergence of Europe as an integrated economic system that also gave primacy to the economic power, which led the emergence of new power centres. The world system which was unipolar after the cold war was emerging and becoming multipolar; new regional alliances were

formed and with the advent of nuclear power few more States were laden with the same destroying capacity as well. The Grand Strategy in the foreign policy of the US was a move to think beyond its military power to combat rising power centres more effectively, and therefore as the history of the US foreign policy shows, its claims about “war on terror” are sceptical.

The cold war was the contestation to establish hegemony of one superpower for the furtherance of their interest, because victorious superpower would establish its political and economic system and market across the world. After the cold war, contestation between the different ideologies in the international arena was no more a dominant characteristic of the international system as it emerged after the Second World War. The admirers of classical democracy and capitalist market economy cherished the disintegration of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War; and the US’s apparent economic renaissance during the late 1990s consolidated its pre-eminent position and appeared to lock-in its dominance for the foreseeable future (Beeson 2004).

An era, a dream of a world system based on socialist principles perished. It was a time of the victorious western capitalist bloc, of classical liberal democracy with *laissez faire* as its political and economic principle or market economy as the economic system which became the final true destination for all the developed countries. After the cold war, the world system was characterized by the US as the only superpower; and America had every reason to increase its influence and hegemony, and precisely the desire of dominance is likely to remain a permanent feature of US geopolitical ambitions (Tellis 2008-2009). And it never missed the chance from the year, 1991 when it endeavoured to control world affairs obviously for the sole purpose of its politico-economic interests and needs.

Almost all the nations have adopted and followed American economic and political system as the self-evident truth. Immediately after the disintegration of the Soviet Union and the end of cold war, the triumphalist west proclaimed this

event as the “end of history” (Fukuyama 1992) and the “victory of liberalism” (Fukuyama 1992). The west designed “Grand Chessboard” (Zbigniew 1998), “clash of civilization” (Huntington 1996), “doctrine of “pre-emption”, and “war on terrorism” (Bush 2001) theses of geopolitics as cornerstone of the “New World Order” it started creating. Cold war was a tug of war between two superpowers but now it was a time for unilateralism and the US waged a new kind of war called “war on terror” to vindicate its role in the “new world order” and to challenge regional power centres and institutions which came into existence in the last two decades after the cold war, because whether the United States can maintain its standing as the sole great power depends largely on the possibility or otherwise of new great powers (Layne 1993).

The post-cold war era was different in such a way as it originated new system of economic powers like China, Europe and Russia; especially China’s rising importance in Asian affairs represents a major change in regional power dynamics in the early 21st century (Sutter 2005). Europe was also emerging economically and the focus of the power was no more military or political but rather economic in post-cold war era. As far as world order is concerned it was changing rapidly into multilateral where China and Europe emerged as big power centres. America had military and political power through which it was not possible to challenge the new emerging power centres. In that context America’s strategy of maintaining hegemony was no easy task. There was opposition also against the imperial policies of the US especially in the Islamic world. America took the advantage of the situation and formulated a strategy of new war called “war on terror” in the context of September 11 attack in 2001.

After the 9/11 attack there was a dramatic change in the foreign policy of the US. The first year of the George W Bush administration ironically continued the basic contours of the Clinton administration’s foreign policy. The attacks of September 11 dramatically changed that and the Bush administration embarked on a new foreign policy in the aftermath of attacks (Caldwell 2011). America’s strategy to

rule through maintaining hegemony is now their future policy, and to be hegemon a state must have the capability to enforce the rules of the system, the will to do so, and a commitment to a system that is perceived as mutually beneficial for the major states (Griffiths 2004). That capability rests upon three attributes: a large, growing economy, dominance in leading technological or economic sectors, and political power backed up by military power. All these led America to use new ways and methods to intervene in other nations. After the end of the Cold War, American policymakers sought to create a new grand strategy for the United States, but they failed in this endeavour. As a self-proclaimed 'policeman' to maintain hegemony which America had successfully built up after the cold war, the US got the reason to believe so because its demise [cold war] is commonly associated with the collapse of the Soviet empire in Eastern Europe in late 1989 or with the disintegration of the Soviet Union and of Communism in 1991 (Mueller 2004).

It all started with George W. Bush proclamation about combating terrorism in his speech before Congress, after nine days of the attack: "Our grief has turned to anger and anger to resolution. Whether we bring our enemies to justice or bring justice to our enemies, justice will be done" (Bush 2001). American President Bush said that "every nation, in every region, now has a decision to make. Either you are with us, or you are with the terrorists"(Bush 2001). This actually brought many changes in the foreign policy of the United States, but it did not bring any change in the grand strategy of the United States which existed there since 1945 (Boyle 2008). Therefore the tactics of hegemony to challenge the multilateral world order, arising out of China's, Russia's and European Union's rise, was a part of the grand strategy played by the US after cold war, and so it raises suspicion about the claims of waging a war in the name of fighting terrorism.

In the last decade, the "war on terror" has been overpowering states like Afghanistan and Iraq, occupying their territory, institutions and resources and justifying it to the extent of labelling America as the liberator. Actually America

conferred upon itself, the duty to act on behalf of the mankind, taking advantage of being a sole superpower. Such an act should have been in conformity with the United Nations, which is the responsibility of the Security Council and only in a condition when international peace and security is threatened (Koechler 2002).

With the emergence of America as a unilateral power and while Japanese economy declined and China emerged as an economic power (Friedman 2013), the Soviet Union's abandonment of confrontation in favour of "common security" paved the way for a series of unilateral gestures that broke the logjam of East-West conflict (Tannewald and Wohlforth 2005). And in the continuity of maintaining that unilateralism and hegemony, the "war on terror" is unprecedented in history; and where there is no contender, an unequal one in which the nation against which war has been declared is not even willing to participate in the combat. There is no opponent but a victim and a victim without any choice, who has to participate to receive the blows and to accept America's imperialism. The incident of 9/11/2001 terrorist attacks in America changed the world politics and the focus of international politics greatly. Washington is calling this change a "paradigm shift" (Kuniharu 2003) and giving more legitimacy to the US behaviour and actions. US declared "War on Terror", as the free countries in west and the US are facing threat to security from rogue weak states.

Astonishingly, initially the attack by the US on the so called terrorist states was unilateral, and later on the extent and compulsion by the powerful nations made the United Nations pass a few resolutions against spread of terrorism which certainly settled the framework for the future war. It took a global turn when resolution 1373 has been passed by Security Council in 2001, which condemned the September 11 attack and obligated UN member state to deny financing, support and safe harbour for terrorist (Resolution 1373, 2001). As a consequence by the year 2013 more than 166 countries stopped financing terrorist related assets; and also more than 300 terrorists, terrorist groups, and terrorist related

entities have been designated under an Executive Order freezing their assets (U.S. Department of State 2013).

“Now, nine years into the Afghan war, many Americans and U.S. allies have grown weary of conflict, unsure about U.S. objectives, and uncertain about U.S. prospects for success” (Armitage and Berger 2010). America declared the war not against any specific nation but against terrorism in general and so presented a choice before the nation-states that they are either with America’s “war on terror” or with “terrorism”. “This is world’s fight, this is civilization’s fight; the attack may have taken on American soil but the whole world had to be mobilized because it was an attack on freedom and civilization in the whole world” (Koshy 2003).

It is nakedly visible that with America’s “war on terror”, occupation, imperialism and neo colonialism has begun which has but enveloped into an idea presented as a ‘just war’ against terrorism. But a close scrutiny of America’s interest in those regions where war is still being raged will reveal the ugly truth behind the “war on terror”. The claims of the peace and democracy by the US are completely flawed, because the government created by the support of the US was constituted of those people who were responsible for the devastation of Afghanistan and Karzai’s government. And they are the main obstacle behind the establishment of peace and democracy (Rawi 2009).

America’s military campaign against terrorism in the form of “war on terror” led it to intervene in the land of Iraq directly and Palestine indirectly. The UN was forced to impose sanction on Iraq in 1991 and in the name of WMD; public opinion has been built up to label Iraq as a terrorist nation which is planning to develop WMD to harm America and the west. Palestine met the same fate because after the launch of “war on terror” Israel supported by America attacked Palestine.

In order to understand the reality behind the Taliban and terrorism, which challenged America by attacking on their embassies in Tanzania and Kenya in 1998 and attacked America on its soil on September 11, one needs to understand the genesis and evolution of those organizations which are in the prime debate proposed by America. America named Afghanistan for shielding Osama Bin Laden and Taliban. Afghanistan got united in 1747 and from thereafter had been facing constant attacks from Britain in their 'great game' to control Central Asia. The Soviet Union with the help of coup and direct military intervention in 1979, and then after soviet backed Govt. led by president Najibullah, started to fight Mujahidin troops which was supported by Pakistan, Saudi Arabia and America. When Afghanistan was under the soviet intervention, it was also undergoing humanitarian crisis (Dupree 1983). But when Moscow left the country in 1989, after the Mujahidin captured Kabul but could not retain it because of internal conflict, emergence of Taliban took place in 1994 which captured Kabul from the warring Mujahidins.

America initially supported recruitment of radical Muslims from across the world. Osama Bin Laden is also a recruit who had close connections with the Saudi royal family. His father was a construction magnate. Osama Bin Laden settled down in Peshawar to fulfil the cause of Afghanistan. Thousands of radical Muslims had taken training under the Mujahidin. In 1998 the Taliban had attacked American embassies in Kenya and Tanzania and as a consequence the UN had imposed sanction on the Taliban. America initially had recognized and indirectly accepted the Taliban regime but later on criticized the regime and their leaders and imposed many sanctions.

September 11, 2001 was the day when the World Trading Centre was attacked in New York. Since then America had decided to eliminate the problems of global terrorism, which includes major changes in the foreign policy of America to accomplish the task and which became the dream project of the then American President, George W. Bush. Terrorism is not new to the world, many countries

having the problem of terrorism for a long time like India was never considered seriously by the US. Even people of American identity had been attacked before September 11, 2001. But attack with so much intensity and on the land of America happened for the first time. The “war on terror” that was triggered by the events of September 11 had no gestation period as such. The state of war was declared by President George W. Bush and others without hesitation (Kathe et al. 2006). Nine days after the incident, i.e. on September 20, 2001 before the joint session of the Congress, President of United States declared “Global War on Terror” which is officially known as “Overseas Contingency Operation”, an international military campaign with an objective to curb Al Qaeda and terrorism from the face of the earth. But in a long journey of more than one decade, the war has taken many twists and turns and is still continuing with changing objectives and ways. American president George Bush identified Al Qaeda as the perpetrators of the attacks in New York and Washington on September 11 and accused Afghanistan harbouring Al Qaeda leaders, particularly Osama Bin Laden (Koshy 2003).

Al Qaeda is a global militant Islamist organisation established by Osama Bin Laden in 1999. It consists of network of militants supported by nations like Pakistan, Saudi Arabia and others whose objective is ‘Global Jihad’ and follows Sharia law. Al Qaeda has been labelled as terrorist organisation by UN, the US and United Kingdom in relation to 1998 attacks on US embassies in Tanzania and Kenya and September 11, 2001 attack on America. As a consequence America has launched “war on terror” against Al Qaeda and Osama Bin Laden who is the main commander of the organisation, and accused Afghanistan to shield Al Qaeda and Taliban regime which is an Islamist movement that had captured one eighty percent of Afghanistan. Al Qaeda after the September 11 attack, due to pressures from the security community, changed itself out of necessity, in the ensuing years, into a diffuse global network and philosophical movement composed of dispersed nodes with varying degrees of independence (Rollins 2011).

Though America labelled Al Qaeda as a terrorist organisation and started war against it, the history of the genesis of Al Qaeda shows the reality of American role in the establishment and development of the organisation. America wanted to challenge and fight Soviet aggression in Afghanistan and to fight soviet troops and Afghan Marxist troops; in the course, they developed a force of radical Muslims supported by Pakistan and Saudi Arabia. In 1996, the group named World Islamic Front for Jihad against Jews and Crusaders (WIFJAJC) was formed, which later developed into Al-Qaeda, led by Osama Bin Laden. It started establishing a large base of operations in Afghanistan, where the Islamist extremist regime of the Taliban had captured power in the same year.

America's foreign policy approach of fashioning America as the saviour of the world and organizer of the new world which began two decades back is still being continued, even more intensely. America started its global strategy to achieve and fulfil its interest had no elements in its strategy which could justify America's claim of being the saviour of the world. America justified attack on Afghanistan claiming it as the defender of Taliban, but America had immense geopolitical interest in the region which was one of the most important reasons along with other reasons such as exploitation of resources, political and economic. With the emergence of Asia as an important power centre America wanted to show its presence in the region. There is certainly a reason involving the self-interest of the US which causes attack on Afghanistan given its location in the Asian from which US is struggling since 2001 (Rubinovitz 2009).

After the attack in 2002 Bush presented National Security Strategy in which he focused on the proactive measures which were rather part of the US strategy before the September 11 attack (Doyle 2007). Definition of "terrorism" is changing according to the circumstances and according to the will and interest of the states. If terrorism is about instigating terror for some political ends, if it is about inflicting injuries on innocent people, if it is destroying infrastructure and

economy of nation, then certainly America's claim of enveloping "war on terror" with just cause is seriously doubtful.

Terrorism has been defined by different people differently and certainly America is also doing the same thing, because in the definition occupation is justified. They are manipulating the definition of the terrorism according to the wishes and objectives of the United States. America's definition of terrorism which is constantly getting changed is doubtful because terrorism is not a new phenomenon. Terrorism is old as recorded human history, and is, therefore, not a new phenomenon to much of the world. The terrorist attacks on the United States on September 11, 2001, however, were devastatingly unique for Americans (Caldwell 2011).

This war was constructed around the concept of religious extremism, which is tending to "terrorism" as proclaimed by the west. "Clash of civilization" is the name which characterizes the "war on terror." But close observation can show that religion is actually not in the midst of the genesis of the terrorism; it can work like unifying factor but is certainly not the main cause. Recent years have seen a hardening of identities based around ethnic, faith or other communities in response to the supposed 'flattening' of local differences by a process of globalization based on a heavily European and American market capitalist system (Burke 2012).

With the change in the policy of the US towards the Muslim countries, the opposition of the Muslim people was getting stronger. Initially the US has no unified policy for the entire Muslim world, but a change is seen and the US is now perceiving the whole Muslim world as one and relating it only to the Middle East, a focal point of the Muslims. When Osama Bin Laden challenged America by saying that he hates America because it supports Israel, the US started making an alliance with Israel. Initially America had no major role in the Israel-Palestine conflict but later on they started playing major role by favouring Israel. The US

also came in contact with organisations like Hamas. Now the world is completely changed because of the worldwide presence of media, which is certainly uniting the whole Muslim world. The American cultural hegemony, their opposition to the Islamization of the Muslim countries, and sanctions against Iraq were the main reasons behind the opposition to America (Khan 2002).

Initially or during the cold war, America was in fact supporting Islamic movements in some countries. "During the Cold War, for instance, in some countries the USA had been a supporter of some Islamic movements as an instrument in the fight against the Soviet Union or the pro-Soviet governments in the Muslim countries"(Yazdani 2008). Middle East was very important for America, not only for its rich energy and oil reserves but also for its geopolitical location. The fact that America could increase its influence via Middle East, Iran and Turkey to stop Soviet Union was also important. The same objective was working behind the support to Mujahedeen against the Soviet occupation in Afghanistan. America was in dire need of the support of the Muslim countries to contest Soviet Union; in the post-cold war era they have changed their policy priorities towards the Muslim countries. The US was also facing another kind of challenge by the Mujahedeen, because they were becoming stronger; their confidence was high because they had fought and won the war against the Soviet Union. Mujahedeen was considering America as another superpower and they were of the idea that easily they could fight with America. Entry of American forces in Saudi Arabia against Iraq was one of the reasons behind the Muslim anger.

The "war on terror" was not only confined to the border of Afghanistan, where direct military action has taken place and the perpetrators had no intention to keep it confined only to a single nation. In fact their desire was leading and compelling them to increase its sphere which is one of the essential characteristics of imperialism. Before the attack of September 11, American embassies in Nairobi, Kenya and Dar es Salaam in Tanzania and even American

people had been targeted by terrorists outside America. Terrorists had never attacked on the soil of America but this time it was evident that the attack was against American policies and its hegemonic role in international affairs.

In response, America initiated many operations in different countries under the banner of “war on terror”. For instance, in Afghanistan they have started “Operation Enduring freedom” along with other three more military operations with an objective to eliminate Al Qaeda and its affiliates from Afghanistan. The US, NATO and non-NATO forces also started “Operation Anaconda” to destroy any possible traces of Taliban and Al Qaeda. NATO launched another naval operation called “Operation Active Endeavour” which was mainly concerned to remove the militant activities from the Mediterranean Sea. “Operation Enduring Freedom” stretched its hands to reach towards Africa and there it is called as “Operation Enduring Freedom – Horns of Africa” (OEF-HOA). In the Sahara region of Africa the American action was named as “Operation Enduring Freedom – TransSahara” (OEF-TS) to check militant activity. USA also initiated military action in Iraq which was labelled as a terrorist nation since 1990 by the time Iraq invaded Kuwait. Fall of the Taliban was very important and a major gain for the United States because it reduced Al Qaeda’s chance of security access to the large training camps and worldwide network and consequently it lost the ability to conduct intercontinental operations (Evera 2006).

America called this terrorist alliance as an “axis of evil” which was highly sceptical and had no political integrity, because it was an alliance of enemy countries of Italy, Japan and Germany during the Second World War against America. This “axis of evil alliance” proposed by America had no historical connection. America started the action based on pre-emptive strike where the possible threats should be challenged and attacked even before they are formed and in the light of this theory they are attacking those states which according to the US are possible threats for the US. The definition of possible enemies is also

changing with the time passing and under which the US is intervening in any country they wish. Bush declared:

We've come to this moment through patience and resolve and focused action. And that is our strategy of moving forward. The war on terror is a different kind of war, waged capture by capture, cell by cell, and victory by victory. Our security is assured by our perseverance and by our sure belief in the success of liberty. And the United States of America will not relent until this war is won (Bush 2003).

America's projected definition of the "war on terror" contains not even a single element of realism, and yet it plunged into the war to apparently save the world from the scourge of terrorism which is so devastating according to America. What Bush means to say is that this is what America realized on 9/11 following which it waged a full-fledged war. But in reality, the "war on terror" is a method of America's global strategy. We now come to the question of what is meant by global strategy. It means increasing its hegemony all over the world; it also means that whosoever will come in the way will be crushed and that is exactly what is happening since 9/11. This is from where the agenda begins but this war cannot be called as war on terror because fundamentally this is not a war against something which is posing as a big problem in front of the world or America. And America is not in any way interested in solving the very serious problems of this world. War on terror has nothing to do with the fight against the global problems of terrorism but it is the biggest act of terror in the world and which has no comparison in the world. It has all the elements of terrorism itself and America's occupation leaves behind nothing but a trail of devastating effects and which is not only the killing of innocents and destroying material but also destroying the sovereignty and independence of humanity.

Various American institutions and intellectuals give the fundamental definitions of terrorism. The terrorism has been defined by many thinkers differently like "the illegitimate use of force to achieve a political objective when innocent people are targeted" (Laqueur 1987). The United States Department of Defence defines, "terrorism as the calculated use of Unlawful violence or threat of violence to

inculcate fear; intended to coerce or to intimidate governments or societies in religious or ideological". Within this definition there are three elements: violence, fear and intimidation. According to the FBI, "Terrorism is the unlawful use of force or violence against persons or property to intimidate or coerce a government, the civilian population, or any segment thereof, in furtherance of social and political objectives."

The U.S. Department of State defines "terrorism" to be premeditated politically motivated violence perpetrated against non-combatants by subnational groups or clandestine agents usually intended to influence an audience. America's political class believes that fear, violence, and intimidation for political and social gains are the basic elements of terrorism. Now the question is how the fear factor perpetrated by America is different, how the violence is different and whether there is any kind of intimidation faced by America or it has any political objective.

American influence in West Asia, Iraq war and Israel-Palestine conflict were the most important causes behind the September 11 attack. Humanitarian crises and sanctions provided the fertile land for the development of terrorism. In the name of justice and terrorism the war on terror is taking life of millions in the devastating nations and filling the belly of imperialist and capitalist nations in this world of globalization. This new world order is going to tend the whole system in their favour so that the world will be ruled by few and will have no resistance.

"Let us reorder this world around us"(Koshy 2001). These words by Tony Blair in his address to the labour party conference on October 2, 2001 indicates the clear intention behind the initiation of the war, rest of the claims by him like to uphold human dignity and social justice were mere blatant lies. This world of globalization where economic interest is pursued through military intervention is their politico-economic interests served by the use of NATO forces in reordering

the world. Whether it was Iraq, Afghanistan or any other nation it was clear that anybody who is going to oppose the American policies and interests is going to be a part of enemy alliance, which would be considered a major threat to international security. Serbia war and NATO intervention in Kosovo and Yugoslavia in the name of humanitarian crisis is nothing but the western dream of an undivided Europe because of the geostrategic need of integration of southeast Europe including Balkans and Serbia. Oil factor is one of the most important reasons for war and which is going on in specific areas like West Asia and Central Asia and the Gulf War was another example of oil war because oil is one of the important resources especially when technology and development is wholly based upon oil and natural resources.

President Barack Obama has announced in his State of the Union speech that 34,000 US troops will leave Afghanistan by early 2014 (BBC 2013) but their intention is highly sceptical. It might be possible that troops will leave the country as nothing is left to be ruined now, but there are other ways by which the US can show its presence there. These wars existed on multiple levels. At the local level, they were a mass of private battles, fratricidal skirmishes, communal clashes, often sparked by specific incidents of injustice, some pitting village against village, neighbourhood against neighbourhood, tribe against tribe. At the next level, the wars were often about the participation of the particular group in politics at a provincial or national level. Frequently they involved conflicts about the definition of a certain ethnic or religious group's position in a state. Only at the final level, the biggest in scale, could some of these conflicts be integrated into an overarching cosmic conflict pitting the west and its allies against radical Islam.

The US has proclaimed that the NATO will quit and the responsibility will be transferred to the ISAF and ANSF and also set 2015-2024 as the transformation decade (Mikser 2012). It seems their claim that ISAF forces will leave Afghanistan is sceptical because it is not a complete withdrawal; some portion of forces will still be present there; NATO's role will change but is not completely as it will stand by its commitment that there should be no resurgence of terrorism in

Afghanistan. Therefore NATO will be there to check and provide training because it is not easy for the ANSF to check the resurgence of the militants. “NATO declared an intention to provide sustained practical support to Afghan security institutions to improve their capacity to counter threats and contribute to regional security” (Mikser 2012). Therefore, the role of the NATO forces is changing but not their participation. “The United States and other donors continue to implement various infrastructure projects—particularly those for water, power, and roads” (Katzman 2013).

United States is not alone in the war, as alliances are a vital part of the war on terrorism (Byman 2006). It is only spearheading those politico-economic interests, envisaged by the capitalist nations. The US got unprecedented support in the history of alliances of war and the most ardent and strong supporter both militarily and ideologically was United Kingdom. The Prime Minister of Britain emphasized on some specific objectives of the “war on terror” which is representing and spearheading the politico-economic interests of capitalism and capitalist nations, so all those nations who had their interest being fulfilled by the American “war on terror” started to support it. The unipolar world order that has existed since the collapse of the Soviet bloc has now been transformed, in the course of the events of 1989 and post-September 11, 2001, into an order that divides the world along the lines of loyalty or allegiance with the United States as the imperial hegemon (Koechler 2002).

To increase the alliance and hegemony, America needed to add new enemies which America did by changing the very definition of “terrorism”. And the definition came to include any nation which is opposing “war on terror”. America initially proclaimed that Afghanistan is supporting Taliban and terrorists and their leader Osama Bin Laden. America also named two other nations supporting terrorism as Iraq and North Korea. But later on America included those nations who are developing weapons of mass destruction (WMD) in the ambit of terrorism supporting regimes, but this strategy of increasing the sphere of

enemies went further and included any nation which is against America or the west.

The war on terror has clearly redefined the world into two blocs one with terrorism and other against terrorism. Where the crusader is defining the enemy, because enemy is not clear and not certain, anyone can be made enemy. Presently theatres of operation are Iraq and Afghanistan; Somalia has been attacked; under the same rhetoric threats has been issued against Iran and North Korea (Staines 2007).

European Union is supportive of the war on terror observing its implication on the intra Europe integration and seeing the common history, culture, interest. It has derived massive public support in favour of American action in Afghanistan (Golino 2002). Recognizing terrorism as a serious threat to the world in general and European Union in particular decided for the collective action with the objective to prevent, protect, pursue and respond to terrorism. The European Union focuses on four ways to combat terrorism in its counter terrorism strategy. It begins with the building of national capabilities and sharing best practices and knowledge to achieve that objective. EU counter terrorism strategy also considers cooperation among the European countries as one of the important component to combat terrorism. Developing common capability is another important way for the EU to fight terrorism but the most important is to have international partnership which stretches to be a member of the NATO and Western Security Structure.

In all those nation states that are supporting NATO and “war on terror” the role and cause of Baltic States to support the war is very strange, because their own history knows the horrors of the Soviet occupation. Since 1940 except for a brief period of time by Nazi Germany, the Baltic States were occupied by the Soviet Union and they imposed communist party rule and the rule was characterised by the exploitation which was constantly opposed by the nationalist movements

(Shetty et al. 2012). The Russian Empire occupied and controlled most part of the Baltic States in the 18th century when the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth was partitioned in three stages by the Russian Empire. Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania became independent states after the World War I.

After the demise of the Soviet Union the Baltic states in its efforts to establish its identity separate from Soviet Union are trying not only to be a part of European union geographically but also economically and politically to be a part of the west(Ham 1995).The history of the Baltic States is not much different from what is happening in Afghanistan nowadays. Despite the fact that, the Baltic States are modernizing their military to support America's military intervention, they are also deploying their troops with the NATO mission.

The Baltic States are also increasing their budget for defence with the view to support occupation in the name of war on terror. The Baltic States prefer America's presence in the region to counter the Russians who are trying to increase their influence in the area. It is a primary security interest of the Baltic States that NATO and the EU should remain effective and capable of promoting international peace. It is a declared vital national interest of all three Baltic States to take an active part in the further development of the organizations (Winnerstig et al.[ed.] 2012).The Baltic States are supporting NATO establishment for their security concerns, because the US and NATO could provide them security both militarily and in other areas as well.But that depends upon the role played by the Baltics states in the NATO missions in those countries which are named as provider of security and space to the terrorist organisations and supporting globalisation of terrorism.

Chapter 2

Security Policy Priorities and Strategic Partnerships of the Baltic States with the US and the European Union

Baltic States have been under occupation under different regimes, and almost half century under the Soviet Union. Their history unfolds the horror of occupation, and a voice of dissent against the humanitarian crisis they were going through. Their independence in 1990 gave rise to the voice of nationalism in other regions who were the victims of the same fate and that enhanced the process of Soviet Union's disintegration to some extent. In the last decades they underwent massive changes in their economy, governance and foreign policies to establish their new identity distinct from their past. They resorted to democracy and market system and recognized their identity as European. They made changes, incorporated European laws to become part of the European Union, Geopolitically they hold a very important position and that's why known as gateway of the East and the West.

The Baltic States were fighting not with their domestic problems but also with their security crisis which was arising because of Russia, presence of their troops on their borders. Despite their cooperation among each other, their effort to make regional alliance with the Nordic countries, they were neither sufficient nor sure about their security. They moved to the Trans-Atlantic Security Structure and later on, became member of NATO and an important ally of the US. The Baltic States are fulfilling the dream of the New Europe envisioned by the US, for the furtherance of the US interest and hegemony. The Baltic States are supporting American occupation on the soil of Afghanistan in the name of "war on terror" and against their own struggle for independence with Russia, against their peaceful social movements for freedom just two decades back they are helping America to recreate their history of occupation again in some other country.

The Baltic States (Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia) are situated on the south eastern coast of the Baltic Sea. They were situated on the borderland of the old Europe; when the Baltic States were not a part of the Europe. After the formation of the New Europe, which is mainly associated with the post-communist Europe and known for its unconditional support to the “war on terror” while the old Europe never reacted so promptly, in context of such a big development in the world politics (Smith 2004).

The Baltic States became a part of the Europe and from then onwards, the Baltic States because of their historical and security reasons presenting their geographical location as Bridge between the East and the West. They also tried constantly, not only to get recognition as a geographical unit of the Europe, but also at the policy level as an integrated part of the Europe. The Baltic States desired to become a close ally of the West, for which they undertook massive measures regarding their security and economic transformation (Ham 1995).

All the Baltic States share the same history of occupation and devastation, under different regimes, like Germany, Sweden and Russia and among them Russia for a longest period of time occupied the Baltic States. Gorbachev’s new policies led to the beginning of intense social and political movements for independence, which became more radical after the Brezhnev doctrine of limited sovereignty came into picture, this all not only led to the fall of Berlin Wall but also the independence of the Baltic States (Geron 1991). Despite their distinct culture and language difference; all the Baltic States are politically and internationally to a larger extent are considered as one but all the Baltic States share same history.

After the Baltic States gained independence they started the process of political and economic transition with two objectives, firstly these “former socialist countries (FSCs)” (Huittinen2001: 18) wanted to give up all the residue of the Soviet Union’s economic and political structure, which had devastated their countries and brought to them poverty and unemployment (Vardys 1966).

Instability in government and political parties, weak institutional framework and presence of Russian people in the territory of the Baltic States, were creating the situation of ethnic conflict and making the Baltic States politically weak and economically fractured and highly vulnerable especially in the hands of Russia.

After independence, the Geopolitical situation of the Baltic States was totally different. They were no more a part of the Soviet Union, but it was not the end of the Soviet Union's rule over these three countries, because Russia always tried to increase its influence in the Baltic States, their policies both at the domestic level and at the international level (Ciziunas 2008). The Baltic States had tremendous strategic importance and therefore the tussle between the East and the West for having their role and influence in these countries started with the independence of the Baltic States. Their independence was the victory of the West and their interests in the region, so the West welcomed this historical incident and recognized independence of the Baltic States, later at the policy level of the Baltic States it was evident in which Latvian president claimed that now they were facing and moving towards the West (Freiberger 2000).

When the Baltic States became free, they were encountering almost same kind of problems both domestically and internationally. They had a hostile, big and powerful nation as their neighbour, their weak economy and polity and therefore they resorted to new democracies, which they had to secure as an independent state, and they had to secure their sovereignty, their parliamentary, democratic system and their territorial integrity (Trapans, 1998). On the one side the Baltic States had European Union, as an emerging economic power and on the other side Russia from which they got independence.

They all went under transformation for establishing democracy, to change the economic system and to ensure the security. They resorted to the market economy as a solution for their economic problem (Mockunas 1993) because they were encircled by those nations which were following market economy and

those nations could only provide security to the Baltic States. The Baltic States realized that individually they could not save their sovereignty, nor they can successfully transform their politics and economy and therefore they adopted regional groupings among themselves as well as with the Nordic countries in a hope to ensure their security (Archer 1998).

Since the political and historical bondage and geographical proximity was much intense among the Baltic States so they became one, at least at the policy level. The Geographical location of the Baltic States between the Russia and the Europe, between the East and the West caused debate and tussle between the East and the West because the territory of the Baltic States was strategically important from the trade point of view. It is in the interest of the West particularly to the US and its concept of New Europe about which America was talking about for long but it was not turning into reality and whose emergence was also an opportunity and threat for the US (Mead 1989-1990) because it could have problematic, if the new Europe would not be in consonance with US needs and interest. The US has changed it into a big chance to maintain its hegemony, but with this development new dimension of geopolitics sprang up because Russian could not tolerate the West's intervention in its neighbour and that was Europe.

The enlargement of NATO and the incorporation of the Baltic States were also opposed by Russia (Gidadhubli 2004). The presence of the US and the NATO in a close proximity with Russia could be a serious concern for Russia especially when the Putin wanted to make Russia, as another power centre distinct from the US and the West. The Baltic States made it clear from the very beginning that they are not a part of the Slav tradition, they rather considered themselves belong to the Europe.

The direction of the transformation of the Baltic States was always towards the West, their economy, political tradition and international associations. They

showed their inclination towards the European Union and the West in search of new ways of reformation. They managed to enter in the EU (European Union) and NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organisation) in 2004 announced by NATO Secretary General Jaap de Hoop Scheffer(NATO 2004). The entry of the Baltic States into the European Union and the NATO, made it clear that they were a part of the America's New Europe. For instance Lithuanian National Security Strategy updated on 20 January 2005 establishes that "one of the primary interests of Lithuanian national security is the effectiveness of NATO and activeness in the safeguarding of international security and stability" (MFA Lithuania 2005).

As far as the security policies of the Baltic States are concerned, they are determined by their history, their geographical location and their neighbours consequentially the Baltic States decided to join the West and its Security Structure and they started supporting the EU and the US in a bid to gain security assurance and eventually they emerged as one of the strong supporters of the US morally as well as militarily in "war on terror". In an endeavour to overcome their historical and humanitarian crisis, injustice and devastation they started recreating their own history on the soil of Afghanistan. As a response from the US they have been appreciated and awarded the membership of Western Institutions and assurance of security.

The Geopolitical situation came into the picture after the independence which led the Baltic States to follow a new kind of security policies, which they had to pursue to secure their independence and sovereignty because their sovereignty was costly not only for the Baltic States but also for Russia, because they not only got independence from the Soviet Union as an outcome of their dissent and movements, but also played an important role in the dismantling of the Soviet Union (Muiznieks 1995). Gorbachev's policy of Glasnost, introduced in 1986, allowed critical debate to spread beyond dissident groups (Ham 1995) pushed the nationalistic debate which got further cause by the independence of the

Baltic States. Therefore the Baltic States also wanted to redefine their economic system and institutions which were completely following the Soviet Union model.

The Baltic States had to reframe their political and social framework and above all their economy, which was enveloped in the Soviet model which have to be transformed into market economy (Brixiova and Egert 2010), as an option available under their new security structure. Their military power was also not strong enough and was not in a situation to defend them from Russia their biggest and immediate threat. Russian troops were present in the Baltic States till 1994 and therefore to counter the military power of Russia they had to make new alliances, so the Trans-Atlantic Security Structure was only hope and NATO enlargement could have transformed the European Security (Blank 1998) which they were seeking for. The Baltic states were also were not ready to accept their Slavic identity, they wanted to be identified as a part of the Europe rather than a part of Russia and to establish that, the Baltic States have never accepted the membership of the CIS countries (commonwealth of independent states) even formally.

The Baltic States situated in the northeast region of the Europe serves as a gateway to Russia and the Europe. Russia as well as the West had their interest in the region and that's why from time to time both Russia and the West were trying to increase their influence in the region. The Political system of the Baltic States were characterised by the weak and large numbers of political parties, fighting for power and this situation was much more evident in Lithuania and Latvia which was creating a vulnerable situation in the Baltic States.

The fragmented political system and political conflict for power was posing serious threat to the democracy which was in infant stage after the independence of the Baltics states in 1991. Presence of the large numbers of the Russians in the Baltic States posing threat to democracy, because the weak and small political

organisations were very much susceptible to the interest of these group which could be useful politically (Grigas 2012) as a result all the Baltic States going through different stages and forms of democracy where they were trying to solve the problem of the presence of Russians and their integration into the politics (Steen 2000). Democracy was necessary to be saved for the future and for their successful transformation and therefore they needed a multidimensional approach for all the three Baltic States to get support of the ethnic minority (Ehin 2007).

In an attempt to establish their new identity, culture, economic and political system distinct from the Soviet Union, the Baltic States not only rejected the idea of joining the group of CIS countries (Denisen 2010) but also refused to accept Russian near abroad concept. The Baltic States for more than forty years were serving like a territory of Russia but now they were beneficial for both the East and the west represented by the Soviet Union and the US respectively. Russia wanted to keep every CIS country under its influence in the name of near abroad, but the Baltic States refused to accept this politics of influence (Rywkin 2003) by Russia. The Baltics States were not ready to accept any kind of intervention again and therefore, since the independence they were not only considering themselves geographically as a part of the Europe but also in the economic and political matters they were constantly trying to become the part of the Europe and the West.

The Baltic States reinvented new ways of economy near to the European economic model and to the West and they resorted to the market economy (Reardon 1996). Only development of the Baltic States was not the reason behind this change in their economic policies, the security perspective was also involved, because coming closer to the West, would ensure their safety and security. They also joined the western security structure by joining NATO they participated in certain programmes like (Partnership for peace programmes)

which means they were very clear about their idea, that their security is possible only to be an integral part of the US and the European Union security model.

“Western leaders feared that direct intervention in the Baltics would threaten negotiations with the Soviet Union over German reunification, and believed that Moscow would gradually move to grant the Baltic states independence” (Olcott 1991: 124). The US initially was bit reluctant in direct intervention in the territory of the Baltic States because this could bitter their relationship with Russia, but eventually all the Baltic States became member of the United Nations and also included in the conference on security and cooperation in Europe now OSCE (Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe). On the other hand Russia was still believed that the Baltic States belong to the erstwhile Soviet Union and therefore was very reluctant to a step, where the Baltic States became part of the European Union and integrating them into the Western Security Structure.

Russia raised its objection against the Baltic States becoming a part of the NATO. Russia was having security problems arising because of the Baltic States becoming a part of the NATO forces. The possibility of closeness of the NATO forces increases with the Baltic States becoming part of NATO. Actually Russia under different circumstances but remains one of the reason as a deciding factor for the security concern of the Baltics States. The presence of Russian minority and Putin government assertion against the US to establish Russia as a power centre a strong one, even if it could not establish itself as a superpower.

The Baltic States' integration into the Trans-Atlantic Security Structure was not an easy task and because to get that, the Baltics states had to fulfil the requirements and parameters of these international organisation, of being economically strong and militarily powerful. The political economy of the Baltic States was not so strong, nor their military power was according to the parameters of the Western Security Organizations and that's why the

Baltics adopted together the Western model for developing their economy and military power to get the membership of the NATO and other organisations (Larrabee 2003).

They resorted to the market economy and attracted significant foreign direct investment as well. They have signed also, the Europe agreement which later became one of the important reasons to get the membership of the Europe. They adopted to have regional integration and cooperation like with the Nordic countries, they followed and also pursued many military exercises with the Nordic countries (Archer 1998) to strengthen and to increase their capability to a certain limit from where it would be easy to get the membership of the Western Security Organisations and to become a part of the West and Trans-Atlantic Security Structure.

After September 11, 2001 terrorist attack on America, all the Baltic States as a member of NATO supporting the military campaign and “war on terror”. All the three Baltic States are also supporting the Iraq War with different capacity (Kundu 2003) and America’s military invasion in America’s biggest enemy nation Afghanistan. The Baltic States are supporting the NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization) operation and the presence of the Baltic troops in ISAF (International Security Assistance Force) missions in Afghanistan is the evidence of their support to the US and the West.

Participation of the Baltic States in the Transatlantic cooperation, their membership of the international security organisation like NATO, their relationship with the US reflects the desire of the Baltic States, to fulfil its deficit and fear of security from traditional as well as new security threats both, their support to the Trans-Atlantic Security Structure is equally important for the West, for instance all the Baltic States has been supported for their independence and their security concern regarding threat of Russia was shared by the US. Reluctance of the west had a reason that the US never wanted to have bad

relation with Russia without any reason, therefore the US thought that it will be in the interest of the West to have a peaceful relation with Russia, the US would have reluctant on their part, if the defensibility if provided by the US of the Baltic States would have danger for Russia (Wallin and Andersson 2001).

It is also not like that the Baltic States embraced the US without searching other options of security. All the three Baltic states Lithuania, Estonia and Latvia first of all tried to cooperate with each other on every matter including military to counter the Soviet factor, because all the three Baltic States were grappled by same problem and their security threats were to some extent were not different, but their collective strength was not enough to challenge or at least balance the Soviet Union. They moved to the Nordic countries to enhance the scope and intensity of their strength which was also not enough to challenge security threats the Baltic States were fighting with.

The Baltic States were highly suspicious about the intention of Russia, because from the very beginning, the Soviet Union was not in favour of the Baltic States joining the European Union. Also the economy of the Baltic States was coming out from the soviet structure, they were resorting to market economy. The Baltic States economy was completely under the soviet system which needed a complete overhaul; they also needed a strong military power as well to secure their borders. To accomplish the economic and political stability, the Baltic States decided to join the EU and other West Asian countries; the Baltic States joined NATO and the US (Lamoreaux and Galbreath 2008). European Union regarded the Baltic States as the most favoured nation and with Lithuania Europe Associate Agreement was signed in 1995 which came into force in 1998 (Peck 2003).

Even after the successful transition process, the biggest problem of the Baltic States was to overcome their identity as a Soviet Union's former territory. Other problems, included which were an outcome of the Soviet Union's influence

where their economy which was embedded in the Soviet economic structure. The problem of ethnicity, which was compelling the Baltic States not to have even mild relationship with Russia (Maley 1995), and because of the fear of this Russian minority, their policies gave upper hand to the Baltic people and giving less space to the Russian in their policies and states institutions (Budryte 2009) and on the other side Russia never accepted the Baltic States as an independent identity and remained very aggressive all the time, which was a big concern of the Baltic States about their security.

International politics and domestic politics are interrelated, so their priorities and influences. The policies of the Baltic States' since their independence, following the same rule, because they are not the decision makers at the global level like the US, especially after the world became unipolar in 1991. Foreign policies of Baltic States are just reaction to the domestic and international situations at that point of time. So it would be prudent to ponder on those situations to know the design of policy priorities of Baltic States.

After 1991, international world order was characterised by unilateral power centre and that was America, who wanted the world to be unipolar and to accomplish that America wanted to fulfil its dream of "New Europe" so both Europe and the US were trying to influence the Baltic States to be a part of the European Union because "Russia's discourse and policies demonstrate a resolve to maintain a "zone of privileged interest" in the Baltic region and post-communist Europe, often irrespective of the wishes of the countries concerned" (Grigas 2012: 2) and Baltic states were never completely out of fear of Russia because of its obvious interest in the region and these were two energy sector and geo political location of the Baltic States.

There were some domestic compulsions too, which were shaping the foreign policy of the Baltic States, like presence of large numbers of Russians in the territory of Baltic States, through these people Russia could establish its

network. Their situation both economically and politically was very weak; moreover their defence system was weak which a matter of great concern, because it could have acted as a hindrance in getting membership of NATO.

All these international and domestic factors contributed in making foreign policy of the Baltic States in favour of the EU and the US. Despite embargos and sanctions by Moscow, Baltic States were resolved to join the EU and the US, to accomplish that and to show their opposition to Russia, they refused to be a part of CIS (Commonwealth of Independent States) countries. Because of its geopolitical situation, it has always been an important area for both the West and the East. Baltic States could have served as a gateway to the East and access to the west. This was the reason the Soviet Union was not in favour of the Baltic States to join the EU, the US and NATO.

The Baltic States had no doubt about their strength, as far as their security is concerned because at that point of time they were lacking essentials to provide any kind of security to themselves infact "The Baltic states have consistently claimed that they are unable to guarantee their own security and that collective defence arrangements are more effective and cheaper than duplicating military resources" (Herd 1997: 185). They were still suspicious about the Russia's intention especially after its desire to join NATO which was an offensive move according to Russia because now they feeling that NATO will come closer to Russia. Now Baltic States have to respond to this extraordinary security problem for that there was only one way, go beyond the normal and traditional way of solving the security dilemma.

The Baltic States were very concerned about their position and status in "New Europe" because they don't wanted to be marginalised in the "New Europe" and to overcome this they had only one option, to be a part of international missions launched by NATO both militarily and economically they had problem of Russia which led them to support NATO unconditionally "Baltic leaders, believing that

only NATO provides hard security against their large neighbour, do everything in their power to demonstrate their value to the Alliance” (Binnendijk and Simon 1995: 4).

Through that alliance the Baltic States could gain some negotiating power in both the regional and international sense, because the integration of these three Baltic States (Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia) was not enough and their own security establishment, economic condition and their power as a participant in international issues, as a part of the international body was very weak. That situation prompted them to achieve something extraordinary, to avoid their marginalisation in the “New Europe”. To achieve that they started participating in international affairs so that they can get some reasonable position in “New Europe” because still they do not have any common vision for Russia and their regional institutions are weak in implementation (Vanags 2011) therefore the Baltic States are still not in position to balance Russian by their own.

Foreign policy of the Baltic States was Europe centric and the US centric, which they showed by becoming part of many international organizations which were promoting interest of the West. After September 11 attack on America new developments took place in the international world. As a consequence of the attack America declared “war on terror” proclaiming Iraq, Afghanistan one of the enemies of the West and America as a liberator of the world will establish democracy of their own version for which they will attack, torture and detain (Rajwade 2006). America with its most trusted ally Britain started campaigning all over the world that a war has begun against terrorism and the US started seeking support for the “war on terror”. In the name of anti-terrorism war they started “war on terror” and ruthless intervention into the countries like Afghanistan with a well-defined, but a hidden agenda of imperialism (Ikenberry 2002) to alter the emergence of Multipolarity into Unipolarity which emerged after the end of the cold war, which is necessary condition to further the interest and hegemony of America.

Actually this was the time of the finance capital, where the value of currency and the power of dictating terms to other countries is a prerequisite to enhance the economic interest and the necessary condition of hegemony. Above all energy need was one of the most important reasons behind this war, on which economy of America works. America was seeking complete and full support from Europe for that America was interested in developing the concept of "New Europe" so that no condition of opposition could emerge because big alliance can justify the war. "As with all wars, the U.S. military invasion of Iraq in 2003 needed to be portrayed as a just war in an attempt to garner support and legitimacy, domestically and internationally" (Falah, Flint, and Mamadouh 2006: 142) and the whole effort of making an alliance big, was to gain legitimacy for the war by the US.

The Baltic States did not want to remain a silent spectator in the European region; they wanted to raise some voice to further their security interest. These countries which still having problem and suspicion from Russian intention, so the Baltic States started to support America in every sphere and gave complete support through NATO in Afghanistan but "the 9/11 attacks pulled U.S. attention and resources away from Europe and toward the Middle East" (Asmus 2008, 95). In the present time America's claims about the security of the Europe in general and the eastern, post-communist Europe seems being faded with time especially after the "war on terror". Their domestic politics is also affected by all these activities, they have increased their defence budget and established new institution like Counter Terrorism Centre in their countries despite these countries have no problem of terrorism.

The Baltic States decided to become a part of Western Europe which was its main strategic objective. In 2002, the Baltic nations applied to become members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the European Union (EU). Membership of NATO was duly received on 29 March 2004, and accession to the EU took place on 1 May 2004. The Baltic States have been the

only former-Soviet states to join NATO or the EU at that time.

The Baltic States adopted alliance with Nordic countries and also became member of the EU (European Union) and NATO, but US is a very important part of Baltic States alliance and Security, their entry in the NATO even US plays a great role in the sustenance and functioning of the NATO, “this renaissance of NATO's has depended on an American commitment to remain strategically engaged in Europe and, at each critical juncture, to lead” (Hunter 1999: 191). Role of the US in the NATO was one of the reasons why Baltic States inclined and made an effort to be a member of NATO and to have strategic relations with United States. There was also another reason, that the Baltic States see the EU as a limited security provider and therefore their trust lies with the US. The scope of Europe is also changing, new post-communist states are coming along and America wanted to ensure, the making of this identity because America certainly had economic and other benefits by this and creation of this identity could enhance America's role and intervention in the region and it provided to America an opportunity to increase its hegemony. “For Centuries, Successive great powers in the region have tried to make the Baltic into *mare clausum* a “closed sea” dominated by single nation”(Bitzinger 1992: 607).

The Baltic States had adopted new ways of regional integration and besides the regional cooperation; they were coming closer to the Nordic states as well. After the Russian troops being removed in 1994, the Nordic countries supplied military assistance to the Baltic States. It started with cooperation among each other in different spheres like BALTBAT (Baltic Battalion) (Arter 1998), BALTRON (Baltic Naval Squadron), BALTNET (Baltic Air Surveillance Network) and DEFENCE COLLEGE.

As far as the security threats and measures adopted by the Baltic States are concerned they moved ahead for the development of the region and influencing and affecting the international security environment and system (Winnerstig et al. 2012) became their concern. They joined not only NATO but supported

American “war on terror” to cope with the development and security issues which were not possible to get resolved through traditional alliances, cooperation and security measures. This new strategy gave birth to new kinds of security threats also. The alliance of the Baltic States among themselves and their relationship with the US and their role in the “war and terror” was making the Baltic States as a part of the international community, where the issues confronting the Baltic States were international in nature and the measures adopted were also international in nature.

Security policies or foreign policy of the Baltic States were to a great extent were governed by the sole motive of managing their regional security deficit by becoming the trusted member and partner of the west and the Baltic States are still supporting NATO and ISAF with every single mission to enhance their economy base and to strengthen their identity as an important factor of the European Union.

The road to integration into the European Union was not difficult in the sense, that there was no ideological block in the minds of the European Union as well as not in the minds of the Baltic States because both had their vested interest. The Baltic States had to transform its political economy in consonance with the European Union and had to make changes from law to economy. The Baltic States had to reform its governance, market, political and economic stability. “Policymakers in each of the transitional nations are preoccupied with managing exchange rate regimes, trade relations, banking and currency board arrangements, and foreign direct investment schemes, in adherence to EU criteria for eastward enlargement” (Paas and Scannell 2002: 18).

The Baltic States successfully implemented those reforms and became successful in its aim and got integrated into the European Union, the Baltic States also got massive support from their public. The European Union just after the dissolution of the Soviet Union has given the Baltic States the status of most

favoured nations by signing Trade and Cooperation Agreements with them. In 1994 the Baltic States prospects to get the European Union membership was more clear. They applied for the membership in 1995 and gone under massive reforms and by 2002, it was sure that the Baltic States will get the European Union membership and finally they got the EU membership in 2004. Their integration promised them a better life, but it was the beginning of their Soviet past, with new set of rules, governed by new masters (Rucker 2004). Nine years after their integration in the EU and Trans-Atlantic Security Structure it doesn't seem beneficial to the Baltic States, because despite their domestic problems where they need money, they are investing in "war on terror". They are the fastest growing economies of Europe but investing lot of money only on defence budget, all the Baltic States have opened Counter Terrorism Centre despite they are not the victim of terrorism.

The US also had interest in including the Baltics States in NATO because firstly the US agenda of New Europe or try to create a Pan European identity and security is the objective of the United States. America claims for providing security to the whole Europe through NATO enlargement and secondly the enlargement of the NATO to include the Baltic had political reasons too. The politics of hegemony by the US is also one of the important reasons which they are doing by enlargement process, ensuring their presence militarily all over the world with a justified reason in the name of security. The US is trying to create Pan European Security Structure, through which they are also seeking to enhance and strengthen their Security Structure.

After the cold war, it was the end of the multipolar world order and was the beginning of an era of American dominance, but rise of china and EU as an economic power created challenge to the American hegemony and its military power. "War on terror" was a war by the US to meet this new challenge of the world order, which emerged after the cold war. America needed a justification for the war because "Hegemony without legitimacy is insufficient to deter violent

challenges to the international order, and may provoke attempts to build counter-alliances against the hegemony” (Griffiths 2004, 65).

The interest of the US in the Baltic States is also related to economy, the Baltic States in a short period of time have successfully transformed its economy from the USSR model to the market economy and their political was also transformed into democracy. The US was from the very beginning interested in the markets of the East and the Baltic States were a great option to enter into the market. Russia also could be kept in control if the reach of the US is to the Baltics States. Russia is also trying to create a distinct power centre, Russia is aware that it could not become superpower but it could create power centre and opposing the US also on many international issues. This attitude of Russia to a larger extent giving rise to the Multipolarity and the politics of the US is against the concept of Multipolarity which is clearly visible after the Cold War and especially in the “War on Terror”.

After the “war on terror” the US was making a new alliance to justify its “war on terror” and claiming that it is a war against terrorism and for that it has bypassed the UN and attacked on Iraq, because the September 11 attacks showed to the world, that even the only sole super power can be attacked (Patman 2006) which claims itself as the liberator of the world and assure the security of the whole world.. The Baltic States are not only giving ideological support but they are supporting the US both militarily and economically, they are present in the NATO force and they are also militarily present in the “war on terror” sites like Afghanistan. America on the basis of the support of the Baltic States is strengthening its ideological justification, because they have been occupied by the Soviet Union and now they are actually associated with another occupation in Afghanistan, therefore the US is proclaiming that this is not occupation, but a war against terrorism and the countries like the Baltic States vindicating the claims of the United States.

This mutual understanding of each other interests is still going on and cooperation among the Baltic State, the European Union and the US can be seen in different programmes and platforms, having not only domestic but international implications for instance the Energy sector. This alliance and a constant enlargement of the EU are making a situation where Russia is having security crisis. "European Union enlargement has left Russia on the margins of European political processes and led to widespread suspicion in the Moscow foreign policy establishment of European motives" (Averre 2005: 175)

Russia traditionally is a big supplier of energy to the European Union and for Russians the Europe is a big market, but Russia in a recent past also investing in the Baltic States in the form of FDI, though it is seen with suspicion in the Baltic States. Russia is also managing the whole situation arising out of EU enlargement and the presence of NATO, which is in favour of the US. Russia's investment is also increasing in the Baltic States for the last two years and the FDI form the Russia is seeing with suspicion in the Baltic states.

European Union wanted itself to be energy efficient and for that to make the Northern Europe including the Baltic sea region, more efficient in energy in 1998 they started a cooperation, in which they have included non-Nordic countries and the Baltic States in which the Energy ministers of the all the countries and the European commission participated, under this cooperation BASREC (Baltic Sea Region Energy Cooperation) because of this the energy growth and development will be benefited.

The Baltic States started developing and their dependence on the Soviet Union for energy and revenue is not that much and in the energy sector the Baltic States are speedily improving for, Energy sector of the Baltic Sea region capacity has been doubled in the last decade (Tapio, Varho and Heino 2013). For instance, BALTREL, the Baltic Countries power cooperation, which is an example for the improved energy sector and the BALTREL, is also proposing to supply the

energy resources to the Sweden and Finland. The cooperation of the Baltic States is also going on in the form of the Baltic States support to the war on terror and the US military campaign around the world.

There is also a row over the gas pipeline between the Germany and Russia where the Baltic Sea region is claiming serious threat to the environment which shows that the Baltic States is becoming self-sufficient in Energy Sector and no more dependent on Soviet Union. Not only energy cooperation but for the development of the Baltic States and to provide them security Europe Investment Bank is also established in the region to develop the region and provide them financial security. The Europe investment Bank is one of the world's multilateral financing institution dedicate to the development of the member of the Europe Union and the growth and development of the European Union. Baltic States is also a part of the OSCE (Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe).

The improvement in the Economy of the Baltic States, their raising of defence budget showed their commitment towards the West and the US .The US also supported and accepted this new strategic relationship between them and the Baltic States they have signed the Baltic Charter of Partnership in 1998 which gave the new emerging political, economic relation a new dimension. The Baltic States participated in the Partnership for Peace Programmes (PFP). The Baltic States also became the member of the WTO and to get that status they also improved their regional relationship.

The Baltic States to enhance their engagement with the US taking part in lot of exercise of the US like Sabre strike, which was a multinational air and land forciers training event because every participation in the exercise would ensure their better relationship with the US which was the need of the Baltic States, to get closer to the United States and their security structure. There was a council of the Baltic States which was also supporting and participating in the US,

beyond the traditional security concerns like the energy sector, nuclear radiation safety and other issues related to humanitarian crisis. In the course of this support and participation in international security cooperation, they also supported the “war on terror”.

The Baltic States have their soldiers in Afghanistan and they are also playing a very important role for instance, they are claiming for the development of infrastructure. Lithuania has provincial reconstruction team in Afghanistan which was justifying their claim to be devoted to the infrastructure development in the post war Afghanistan. “Within NATO, the Baltic States are perceived quite positively largely because of their commitment to the alliance and substantial participation in the ISAF mission in Afghanistan” (Rostoks 2012).

The Baltic States were cooperating among each other to modernize their military force in combination like BALTBAT a single infantry Battalion, where their sole intention is to get in compatibility with the NATO force. The Baltic States are also supporting the NATO and us in other new areas or defending from the new security threats like cyber-attacks. So the cyber security they have recently established a new centre which is NATO Cooperative Cyber Defence Centre of Excellence (NATO CCD COE) (NATO 2008) is one of the new way for cooperation with the NATO and to get important for the NATO and the US because constant importance can keep them attached and associated.

The journey of the Baltic State and their security policies which started with the joining of the EU, with a view to establish its identity separate and distinct from its erstwhile Soviet Union identity, was a successful transformation, their economic development and their security as a new nation, where Russia was a kind of fear, which culminated into getting membership of these international organisations and their incorporation into the Trans-Atlantic Security Structure. They became cause of the fear for Russia with all their effort and alliance because eastward NATO expansion was problematic for Moscow (Black 1999).

“America’s War on Terror has again resulted in extensive international involvement in Afghanistan and beyond, militarily and otherwise” (Veit 2002: 7). The Baltic States are supported the ISAF and NATO mission in Afghanistan which is going on despite, their history reveals to them a complete different story. For instance, Estonian Defence minister recently visited ISAF and deployed Estonian soldiers (ISAF 2013). Whatever is happening in Afghanistan now is not new to the Baltic States, on their own land just two decades back and from which they are still fighting in different ways and could not come out of the past. The future of the Baltic States is completely dependent on their past but again under the banner of capitalism they are supporting to recreate their own history on the soil of Afghanistan. Same ravaging, plundering and devastation are reality of the day in Afghanistan despite their numerous claims about democracy and peace.

Chapter 3

Participation of the Baltic States in the War and Occupation of Afghanistan

The Baltic States became a part of the international community by joining the NATO and the European Union, the obvious reason and compulsion behind this step was their foreign policy initiatives and the international system which was prevailing at that point of time. Under the scheme and objectives of Trans-Atlantic Security Structure, they started supporting the “war on terror” and the United States’ (US) intervention in Afghanistan, where all the three Baltic States started supporting the effort of the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) and shared the military activities of devastation, killing and plundering of Afghanistan’s people and resources.

The domestic problems of the Baltic States and the way they have chosen to get rid of those problems after their independence were the reasons which decided their future foreign policy and their allies. The problem of powerful and aggressive neighbour, the problem of ethnicity from which they are still fighting to some extent and the economic problem formed an environment out of which, facing towards the West and support the military campaign in the name of “war on terror” was the natural choice. They have their forces in Afghanistan, providing technological support and claiming about its role in rehabilitation of post war Afghanistan, but the question is whether these three countries with their limited resources would be in a condition to support in the reestablishment of Afghanistan or this is just another way of supporting and justifying the war, led by the US.

The role of the Baltic States is not only limited to the sending of troops in Afghanistan, but there are many dimensions and ways through which the Baltic States are participating in the war. The Baltic States besides providing ideological support to the “war on terror” and NATO intervention in

Afghanistan, are also sending many teams related to security issues of Afghanistan. They are also supporting the ISAF by giving technological support, providing health facilities and they have their Provincial Reconstruction Team (PRT). In providing cyber security, they are playing a very important role and above all they are giving route for the transportation, taking advantage of their geopolitical location. Northern Distribution Network which is facilitating transportation of arms and expected to be very useful in post war Afghanistan, when forces will leave Afghanistan.

The Baltic States under the occupation of the Soviet Union went under Sovietization process and humanitarian crisis. From the economy to the industry and the agriculture everything was grabbed by the Soviet Union and later all these sectors became part of the Soviet planned economy. The voice of dissent in these Republics (Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia) was subdued by mass deportation and killing, the Baltic States were kept aloof from the West and very few people allowed visiting to these states (Senn 1958). During that period, which stretched till 1990, was a bad period in the history of the Baltic States, because of the humanitarian crisis which was an outcome of the Soviet Occupation. Against all these humanitarian crisis and Problems of poverty, education and others, a voice of opposition was raised by the people and they underwent struggle for freedom, which finally culminated into the independence of the Baltic States. "The political result of glasnost and the new political thinking initiated by Mikhail Gorbachev has thus brought about demands from at least six republics for a divorce from a forced marriage" (Geron 1991: 135).

Now two decades after their transformation, the Baltic States in the name of Global and international Security, in the name of democracy and peace and in the name of Global terrorism are supporting the US, to the extent of the occupation of Afghanistan. In Afghanistan the severity of Humanitarian crisis is aggravating with the passage of time and with every single claims of the

establishment of democracy and peace. The policy documents of all the three Baltic States reveals that they are highly committed towards humanitarian values, but they understand the meaning of these values through the US interpretation. The US and its institutions like NATO are spreading their hands and doing enlargement process under the pretext of establishing democracy which is not true because NATO does not spread democracy (Reiter 2001).

The Baltic States are playing very important role in Afghanistan, because they as a member of the international security organisations and a close ally of the US not only participating in the occupation but also justifying it. Their role in Afghanistan becomes more important because of their historical understanding of occupation, its horrors and pains. They are in fact recreating their history in Afghanistan, from which they fought once. They got incorporated into the Western Security Structure as a natural ally, which is against terrorism and want to strengthen the International security dedicated to democracy and peace.

Every alliance has a cause, so is the participation of the Baltic states in the “War on Terror” and ‘occupation’ of Afghanistan. The choice of the Baltic States, to join the US was neither natural nor the only possible one. It is not very far from truth, that the cause is security, not only geopolitical but also energy and economic, from which they were grappled for long and after struggle they regain it very slowly. “The Baltic States are especially interesting cases. Following the dissolution of the former U.S.S.R., they embarked on ambitious stabilization and reform programs considerably earlier than other countries”(Cornelius and Weder 1996: 588)

Their existential crisis, suspicious neighbourhood, historical identity and their natural fear of smallness cause them worry, which lead the policymakers of these States to show their propensity toward the European Union and the US. In the course of events they incorporated into the Trans-Atlantic Security Structure

and ultimately joined NATO to further participate in the “war on terror” and occupation of Afghanistan.

International system plays bigger and important role in the policies of the small states (Mannik 2003); therefore the international system, which the Baltic States faced just after their independence shaped their policies. For instance, their economic structure was to a large extent was the structure of the Soviet Union, centralised and governed by the Soviet Union, certainly the Baltic States wanted desperately to come out from that structure, for that they adopted the market economy (Reardon and Lazda 1993), when they adopted the market system they gradually came out from the Soviet structure and witnessed an unprecedented boom in their economy.

They became part of the European Union and Russia’s fear undoubtedly influenced their decision to be a part of Trans-Atlantic Security Structure. “External environment shapes the policies of the small states” (Hey 2003: 186-187) with which the Baltic States are still influenced, out of which they became part of an international campaign and supporting occupation led by the US in Afghanistan. Since the independence, certainly those reasons are changing which are leading the Baltic States to participate in the “war on terror” and occupation of Afghanistan.

Baltics states had no specific problem of terrorism in their own countries but after their support in the “war on terror” constant threat of the proliferation of international terrorism and of weapons of mass destruction came into existence. To stop the proliferation of the weapons of mass destruction the United Nations adopted a resolution 1540 which Baltic States supported (MFA Lithuania 2005).

The Baltic States were encountering new of kind security threats, which were not traditional as it was earlier with these countries. Russia is not their biggest problem now, they had to fight with new international security problems some of

them were real for them and some of them were not, but they had to face, as they are claiming to be a part of the international community. To counter the situation arising out of being a part of the international community, they decided to develop their relationship with the international security organisations and to secure their security interest that they should have to get more stakes in these organisations. Their relationship especially with the US and their support in all the projects, initiated and led by the United States including the “war on terror” would determine their stake in the international community and “All co-operative projects were initially designed to involve the Baltic countries as closely as possible into the security network of West European and North American democracies” (Malakauskas 2007: 135).

Transatlantic relationship also brought an opportunity to influence and make an impact on the world and get a bigger role. The Baltic States could have utilized their resources towards the development of their own people rather than investing it to maintain international standard of their defence forces. The Baltic States prepared and improved their military according to the NATO standards and plans (Winnerstig [ed.] 2012). The Baltic States made an effort for the development of a common foreign policy with the EU; they also saw their relation with the USA as the most important. To strengthen this relationship they have to take part in every activity including campaigning against terrorism as “war on terror”.

Security challenges faced by all the Baltic States are not very different and so are their ways of framing security priorities whether it was traditional security threat like Russia, or the new security threat like terrorism and their interest also does not vary. So their integration in the NATO and the EU is very much in need of these Baltic states and their views and understanding about the challenges they are facing not as a nation states but as a part of the international security bodies are same and that’s why, to be an integral part of these bodies is very much part of the strategic concern and policy of the Baltic states.

Before the September 11 attack, the US was little reluctant in providing membership to the Baltic States but Change in the US foreign policy especially with the commencement of the “war on terror” against international terrorism, new security arrangement in Europe was started before the “war on terror” but after the attack the improved Russian relations with the US had hastened the issue (Kramer 2002)

In reality the support of the Baltic States in the occupation of Afghanistan was dependedon how the European Union and the United States view the Baltic States; as weak states or as strong states. This is one of the most important reasons behind the enhancement of the security and defence establishment of the Baltic States. Now their national security threats comprises of energy dependency, cyber threats and other threats to society also. For instance, the Germany and Russia gas pipeline of 1200 km passing the Baltic States on which the Baltic States showed their opposition (Karm 2008).

Constant changes in the US foreign policy priorities, for instance in the “war on terror” or the US led campaign against “Global terrorism”,Russia also supported the campaign and they on many strategic and military treaties came little closer with the US. Russia has denied terrorism as their problem till 1998 but now supporting “war on terror” (Blank 2003).

This situation wascertainly,could be an alarming situation for the Baltic States because Russia is always the primary threat for the Baltic States. Russia also does not share very friendlyrelations with the Baltic Statesnor do they seem interested. This is a very important kind of threat from which the Baltic States are aware;the rise of nationalism in the Easter European countries also is a cause of concern among the Baltic States. “The enlargement of both NATO and the European Union was supposed to consolidate political and economic reform in the region and aid its integration with the West” (Larrabee 2006: 117).

Therefore it will be against any kind of US interest where it is affecting integration of the European Union and expediency shown by NATO in its enlargement is the effect of this phenomenon. The Role of the Baltic States got intensified because Russia's support to the "war on terror" and its support to the US in military campaign and ISAF in Afghanistan.

Under the scheme of the expansion of NATO, new non soviet Warsaw pact states have been included and under which all three Baltic States (Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania) desire to become a part of NATO became fulfilled in the year 2004 (Gidathubli 2004). No matter how effectively the Baltic states have demanded NATO membership and no matter how they proved their mettle, the US wouldn't have reacted positively if the US wouldn't have interest in the region, under that scheme the US initiated the process of turning the territory of the member states into the bases and potential centres of launching war at any time, in the course of this the US has deployed troops, air missiles, anti-ballistic missile system in the territory of the member states including the Baltic states.

In the context and circumstances of the need and aspirations of the Baltic states to support NATO and the US they tend to support "war on terror" a military campaign against global war on terrorism and in that context they all have been provided with a membership of NATO. The Baltic states had no doubt and confusion over their policy of supporting the US and "war on terror", infact they were eager to be a part of this international ideological and military campaign because the memory of Russian troops invasion in their territory was still alive, so it was the need of the hour (Coleman 1997)and to achieve this, the Baltic States had taken few steps for instance, All three countries have deployed troops assisting NATO and ISAF missions in Afghanistan. Lithuania has provided secret detention centre for CIA.

All the three Baltic States have very aggressive policy towards terrorism or rather called global terrorism, because they have understood terrorism from the

perspective of their global partners like the European Union and the US, as the objective of the treaty on EU “is to provide citizens with a high level of safety within an area of freedom, security and justice by preventing and combating crime in particular among others also terrorism” (Lugna 2006: 101) and not as a problem of their own land. These countries did not encounter the problem of terrorism as such, in their own countries and presence of Russian troops for their invasion was a different problem, which cannot be associated with what is called terrorism. All the Baltic countries supporting the US understanding of terrorism, because they as a part of the Western Security Structure and the EU Defence system giving the overall ideological support to the US war against global terrorism and NATO mission in different countries like Afghanistan at a very large scale. The Baltic States are part of many UN conventions on terrorism and had taken lot of initiatives on their part as Lithuanian, Estonian and Latvian policy document illustrate its commitment to the global vision of the terrorism.

Lithuania has considered terrorism as a very important problem internationally existing since 1934. They are the part of many UN conventions on terrorism, in which the most important is UN Security Council Resolution No. 1373, which has been adopted after the September 11 attack (MFA Lithuania, NATO Partnership). Estonia and Latvia also supported the convention in which the States involved will check in their territories about any kind of financing and economic resources should not be provided to the terrorist or their organisation, providing assistance to the investigation and criminal proceedings and free exchange of information among each other and implement resolutions like 1269(1999) and 1369(2001) (UN Resolution 1373,2001). Global initiative to combat Nuclear Terrorism (GICNT) has been initiated by 85 countries including Latvia, Estonia and Lithuania with an objective to check nuclear terrorism, to check the fall of nuclear power in the hands of terrorists and to their organisations. European Union has also taken an initiative called Plan of Action on Combating Terrorism based on four main principles Prevention, Protection, Pursuit and Response.

A UN Security Council Resolution (UNSC) 1363(2001) adopted more than a month before the September 11 attack, in which it was decided that the “Situation in Afghanistan constitutes a threat to international peace and security in the region” (UNSC 2001,1363) and decided for a Monitoring Committee and Sanctions Enforcement Support Team and all states including UN and other institutions should support the monitoring mechanism and the member states should take necessary steps and make changes in their domestic laws to incorporate the recommendations of the resolution. In another Resolution which has been adopted by the UNSC after the September 11 attack in which they supported the international efforts against terrorism, condemn Taliban and cherished the feeling afghan people for a better government and system (UNSC 2001, 1378).

The Resolution 1363 adopted before the attack and the Resolution 1378 adopted after the attacks, to some extent had same resolutions regarding terrorism and Afghanistan. It shows that the understanding and view of the United Nation regarding the terrorism and Afghanistan was very clear and the war on terror by America was not an outcome of the September 11 attack, it was not sudden sprouted but a well-planned campaign by America which got a right opportunity with the incident.

The Baltic States were part of all these happening at the international level and their role in the forthcoming war had been decided by their outlook about terrorism and Afghanistan. They are participating in the war in every possible manner even before getting the membership of NATO they sent their teams and provided spaces, playing role especially Estonia in providing cyber security and their participation is enhancing. Now the Baltic States want to play even more important role in the post war Afghanistan means after 2014. Contradiction between their domestic need and international relation is visible from its role in Afghanistan. The role and engagement of the Baltic States in Afghanistan is on

three levels military, civil and Humanitarian which according to the Baltic States are leading towards the establishment of democracy and peace in Afghanistan.

In Afghanistan the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) is working and furthering NATO missions with a stated claim to check terrorism and insurgency, support to the Afghanistan National Security Force (ANSF) and facilitate development and governance. ISAF with its Provincial Reconstruction Teams (PRT) and of other States like Lithuania also has its PRT working in Ghor province they help the afghan government in the development of Infrastructure, good governance and human rights. Estonia shares almost same world view, as far as terrorism and Security is concerned. Estonia is also participating in the all on-going mission of NATO and ISAF as a member of these international organisations; they are also contributing in the development of Afghanistan. In health sector Estonia is working and they are fully dedicated to the post war Afghanistan establishment.

“Estonian units have been active in Afghanistan within the framework of NATO since 13 March 2003, when a six-member mine-clearing squad joined the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF)” (MFA, Estonia, Estonia and Afghanistan).Latvia is also dedicated to the development process led by the NATOand the entire mission led by the ISAF forces in Afghanistan. The Baltic States have showed their inclination towards the development of strong relation with the NATO, as a part of the establishment which ensures the global security.As a part of the Trans-Atlantic Security Structure they have showed their inclination towards the establishment of democracyand peace in Afghanistan.

The claims of the Baltic States for the establishment of democracyand peace in Afghanistan and their role in these international security organisations which also claims for the development, peace and democracy is in doubt, because the situation in Afghanistan is becoming worse and the false hope and illusion of

democracy with the election in 2004 is no more in the minds of the people there. Afghanistan government and institutions are fragile and despite the claims and presence of the PRT of different countries in different regions, which is providing a lot of aid is not going to help Afghanistan till when they have weak government institutions (Lieven 2003). So the main purpose of these claims is to present a different picture and to put a different perception into the minds of the world community.

The perspective of the Baltic States about security and terrorism was constructed in complete agreement with the US, after the incident of September 11, which is “changing our view of the threat of international terrorism completely. The 11 March 2004 explosions in passenger trains in Madrid, Spain, and on 7 July 2005 in the London transport system” (MFA Latvia, Security Policy) again shows that the world is not safe and every nation is under the threat of terrorism. Therefore Latvia started a Government Action Plan, which was prepared mainly with a focus on stopping and checking of the financial support to the terrorist organisations and to curb the Banking facility they sometimes manage to get and which was considered as a main source of their functioning.

“The Baltic States, but in contrast to Poland and Slovakia, the Czech Republic has formulated a publicly available National Action Plan to Combat Terrorism” (Spencer 2006). Under the international conventions all the Baltic Countries established a Counter Terrorism Centre whose main objective was to increase cooperation among different agencies to make the investigation faster and effective; they were dedicated to the exchange of information and provide easy coordination among the institutions, within a country and also internationally. All the three Baltic States are participating not only in international efforts and institutions regarding terrorism but also individually they are taking lot of efforts against global terrorism.

Latvia supported almost every single move taken by any international organisations; it has introduced, followed and implemented in every possible manner 13 UN conventions and protocols and incorporated, the deliberations of these conventions in its laws and formed institutions and facilitates to smoothen the implementation of the deliberations of the convention and protocols. Latvia has supported and cooperated with North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO), Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) and the European Union (EU), EU has initiated many programmes and conventions to fight terrorism for instance the year the Baltic States have joined NATO, the EU has initiated the EU solidarity program on the consequences of terrorist threats and attacks which was a major contribution to strengthening and facilitating co-operation at EU level (Council of EU 2004). Latvia also facilitates the international investigative process and helped institutions involved in investigation. Latvia also supported the European Declaration of Combating terrorism, in which they advocated about the enhancement of support among the European countries. Latvia was involved in such legislation and incorporated all these laws in its own country and tries to make the system and institutions in consonance with all these laws. The Baltic States were fighting terrorisms whether at the regional level, within European Union or at the international level, like in Afghanistan where they have sent soldier and teams to support the “war on terror”.

The Baltic States besides became the member of the international security due to which among “all the states of the former Soviet Union, the three Baltic states are the great economic and social success stories”(Lieven 1996), consequently they became an integral part of these organisations and supporting the “war on terror” and giving the US a full opportunity to justify their NATO intervention, with an argument that this is an international security organisation and therefore any action taken on by the NATO is an international issue. Any decision taken collectively represents American authority and interest because the NATO forces have majority of American forces. They are also

supporting the NATO intervention in Afghanistan military sending their troops, Since 2003 Latvian National Armed Forces (LNAF) are supporting and participating with the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) in Afghanistan and they will continue till the Afghan National Forces will take the responsibility (Dombrovskis 2012).

LNAF is participating in the “war on terror” and in Afghanistan with a purpose to support the Government of Afghanistan to raise the security to check the insurgency in consonance with the NATO parameters and Standards so that there will be safe and peaceful environment so that the Afghan government would be in a condition to function properly in the field of development. “The state-building endeavour in Afghanistan came to the brink in 2008 with the Taliban insurgency taking control of some southern districts” (Mullen 2009: 28). The role of NATO and others seemed to be failed with this development in Afghanistan. It was an objective to facilitate economic growth, infrastructure development better administration and system supportive to the need of all section of people. Latvia was supporting them by providing 175 soldiers in the ISAF mission, as staff officers and at different level but these efforts are far from their destination.

Since 2005 LNAF sent to Afghanistan its staff personnel in Kabul Multinational Brigade and they have participated as Explosive Ordinance Disposal (EOD) team and in 2006 all Latvian all Latvian soldiers were deployed to the Regional command North (RC N). In “2008 Latvia deployed Infantry Kandak Operational Mentor Liaison Team (OMLT) with 41 soldiers, to the Regional Command East (RC E) area of operation” (United States Central Command).

On November 7, 2008 the operational mentoring and liaison team was sent to the provinces of the Kunarand Nurestanin Afghanistan. The task of this is to train the soldier of the afghan national army and to participate with them in the ISAF operation. 160 Latvian troops are stationed in the NATO led ISAF mission

in Afghanistan and 120 troops are just a part of the Latvian contingent serving in Afghanistan Faryaloprovence as part of the Norwegian-led Provincial Reconstruction Team (PRT). There are 175 Latvian troops deployed in Afghanistan and the rotation takes place twice a year (MFA Latvia 2013). Latvia has joined the new Nordic Transition Support Unit (NTSU) which will render joint force contribution in support of afghan security structures ahead of the withdrawal of the Nordic and Baltic ISAF forces in 2014.

An approximate number of 250 Lithuanian soldiers are currently serving in Afghanistan as part of the NATO led ISAF in the south of the country (Lithuania Armed Forces MND 2012). Lithuania has been leading a provincial reconstruction team (PRT) of Ghor province in Afghanistan and will continue its support for the reconstruction (The Lithuania Tribune 2012). Since 2005 over 1200 Lithuanian armed forces have been deployed to Afghanistan under NATO and operation enduring freedom. Over 10 civilian from the Lithuanian military defence and police have played an active role in assistance the afghan authorities.

The Estonian Afghanistan Contingent is a joint military force of the Estonian Defence Forces deployed mainly in the southern region of Afghanistan. Estonia has participated in Afghanistan since March 2003 under the NATO mission International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) in Afghanistan. The first Estonian to rotate in the country was an anti-landmine team in Kabul. In 2005 most of the Estonian units were relocated into northern Afghanistan in Mazar-e-Sharif province and in 2006 into the Helmand province in south Afghanistan. Cargo transportation through Latvia to Afghanistan, as a part of the Northern Distribution Network (NDN), started in 2009. Cargo transportation that started as a single container train is now turned into a multidimensional transportation way bringing financial and political benefits for Latvia.

Latvian Ministry of Foreign affairs from 14 to 18 June, 2010 in association with the State Police College is carrying out a development co-operation project with Afghanistan in the field of strengthening the rule of law. Since 2007, Latvia has been participating in the development co-operation projects in Afghanistan in the fields such as strengthening the rule of law, the promotion of social and economic integration of women, and the improvement of the water supply system.

Herat road project also known as the East-West corridor initiated by Lithuania is a declared priority of the Afghan Government. The road is essential for the isolated province of Ghor and other close regions, as it would increase accessibility to the markets, schools, social and health services, and the reconstruction of Chaghcharan airport is very important to assure that the airport will be good enough to answer needs of PRT as well as to assure a proper economic development of the whole region.

Lithuania is also involved in the Establishment of Civil Service Training Center for Ghor Province in Chaghcharan and developing skills of officials to effectively perform their functions and improve their service delivery. Lithuania was also providing forensic training to local ANP (Afghan National Police) forces and established a well-organized and professional police force in eight districts that is trained and equipped to provide safety and security for the people of Ghor with minimal international assistance. Lithuania is providing equipment and basic provisions for strengthening capacity of the Department of national security to fulfil its mandate.

Lithuania is supporting capacity building of the Department through education and training and by raising awareness about political participation and role of civil society. Lithuania Increasing operational capacity of justice institutions through the construction of a multipurpose Centre of Justice, Appeals Court and renovation of the current Prosecutor's Office.

Lithuania financed construction of micro-hydro power stations which provide electricity to remote villages. Lithuania supporting Construction of 19 low-cost durable schools in the Ghor Province: Improving access to primary school for 6,000 children. Community-based education in remote villages: Striving to provide basic education to children in remote areas who cannot access formal, government-supported schools. 1500 students enrolled in 1st year program, 3000 students in 2nd 4500 in 3rd year. Lithuania is providing school furniture, tents, textbooks, schoolbooks and schoolbags. In 2007 and 2008 Lithuanian archaeologists organized expeditions and research studies in the province of Ghor. During the expeditions ancient remains of unknown castles, caves, pottery and other objects were discovered, registered and presented for the Afghan and international society.

Estonia considers close co-operation between international organisations (including the UN, the European Union and the NATO) to be very important because the biggest development challenges are prolonged instability and a lack of security. For rebuilding a state, close co-operation between civilian and military actors is crucial. Estonia's activities in Afghanistan are based on an Afghanistan plan that is also reflected by the development co-operation action plan approved by the Estonian government. The development co-operation action plan covers the period from 2011 to 2015, and in it Afghanistan is named as one of the priority partners for development cooperation.

In 2012 the Foreign Ministry has allocated over 650 000 Euros for carrying out development cooperation projects. The support Estonia has given to Afghanistan between the years 2002 and 2011 totals over 3.2 million Euros in value. 64,000 EUR from the Estonian Red Cross in 2002 for sending bed linens, mattresses and first aid kits to Afghanistan. A total of 70,000 Euros in voluntary donations to support the UN High Commissioner of Refugees (UNHCR) in 2002, 2003 and 2007 in easing the situation of refugees in Afghanistan. 42,000 Euros toward the

fight against narcotics in Afghanistan. The funds went to the Counter Narcotics Trust Fund (CNTF) in December 2005. The fund was created with the goal of providing the Afghan government with more opportunities to implement their strategy to fight against narcotics, and it is managed by the UNDP.

Donations through the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) in 2007 for the Afghanistan Population and Housing Census project and in 2009 through the UNDP project "Elect" to help support the presidential and local elections; each time around 32,000 Euros. 32,000 Euros to the Afghanistan Peace and Reconciliation Programme (APRP). 70,300 EUR for the paediatric ward of the Helmand central hospital in 2007 in co-operation with the Estonian Red Cross, which was used to purchase portable oxygen generators and warming beds for underweight and premature infants. Within the framework of the non-profit organisation Mondo's project, medical equipment with a value of 185 000 EUR was donated to the central hospital of Helmand Province. The main goal of the project was to procure a medical oxygen delivery system for Bost Hospital and improve the selection of available medical equipment. There is a strong geopolitical reason behind the importance they got in the politics of the west and which resulted in the integration of the Baltic states because it provided great network for the supplies of the arms and other material reaching directly to the Afghanistan which make the trade and transport easy and cheap especially Lithuania plays an important role in this because of the reason that it is important in providing two kinds of roots

Lithuania being at the geographic centre of Europe, Lithuania is ideally situated to become a regional transportation hub (Pipikaite 2013). Two strategic transportation lines cross Lithuania: the North-South highway and railway line connecting Scandinavia with Central Europe, and the East-West Transport Corridor between enormous eastern markets and the European Union. The latter is considered among the ten most important corridors in Europe. It provides two

ways first transport corridor Europe Caucasus Asia (TRACECA), and the other one is sun train which connects Western Europe with china.

The Baltic States are supporting the “war on terror” in every possible manner. The support is to the great extent is related to the help provided to the NATO and ISAF forces present in Afghanistan. The Baltic States are claiming for the reconciliation and development of the infrastructure and other things which are important for rebuilding Afghanistan, but the question remains that whether with such limited resources the Baltic States would be in a situation to rebuild Afghanistan because proclamation of the withdrawal of the NATO and ISAF forces is questionable on different grounds.

The international coalition of states holds the UN Security Council mandate which was granted under the UN Security Council’s Resolution No. 1890. The whole European Union supported the “war on terror” and occupation of Afghanistan. Therefore it is the policy of Baltic States that NATO is the priority of security policy of the Baltic States and Afghanistan is the priority of NATO. The International Security Assistance Force in Afghanistan (ISAF) operation began in December 2001. The ISAF operation in Afghanistan was initiated by the U.S., but on 11 August 2003, NATO took over the strategic command of the operation. ISAF is composed of 102,550 troops from 42 countries (28 NATO Member Countries and 18 other countries). 26 Provincial Reconstruction Teams are also operational.

The role of the Baltic states in “war on terror” and occupation Afghanistan can be found at three levels: military involvement, humanitarian activity and rebuilding efforts. All the three Baltic countries have deployed troops assisting NATO and ISAF missions in Afghanistan. The Latvian National Armed Forces (NAF) has participated in the ISAF mission since February 2003. There are 175 Latvian military personnel serving in the ISAF mission in Afghanistan. In 2008, the Operational Mentoring and Liaison Team were sent to the provinces of

Kunar and Nurestan in Eastern Afghanistan. This group's task is to train the soldiers of the Afghan National Army and to participate with them in the ISAF operations. Lithuania has 245 troops currently serving in the ISAF and it has joined on 24 July 2003 and they deployed in the regional command capital. Since the summer of 2005 Lithuania has been part of the International Security Assistance Force in Afghanistan (ISAF), leading a Provincial Reconstruction Team (PRT) in the town of Chaghcharan in Ghor province.

Estonia joined the war on terror in Afghanistan in 2002, taking part in the US-led operation "Enduring Freedom". Since 2003, Estonia has taken part in the NATO-led International Security Assistance Force in Afghanistan (ISAF). Currently Estonia has about 140 troops in Afghanistan, located mainly in the southern province of Helmand together with the armed forces of the United Kingdom and Denmark. Another area of the Baltic States involvement is developmental assistance and diplomatic relations. Latvia has provided significant support for the development of the rule of law in Faryab Province and of its infrastructure (Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Latvia 2008). During the period of 2008-2009, Some of the most successful projects that have been carried out for the development are the water collection and supply project launched in May 2008 providing around 4800 inhabitants drinking water, a newly opened police station in February 2009, the project of building three court houses and the training of judges and prosecutors in summer 2009. In 2007 Lithuania increased its development assistance budget for Afghanistan up to 2.5 million USD. Lithuania is also involved in the several developmental projects like Kabul Chaghcharan.

Herat road project also known as the East-West corridor, reconstruction of Chaghcharan airport, Establishment of Civil Service Training Centre for Ghor Province in Chaghcharan, Afghan National Police (ANP) Capacity Development in the Rural Areas of Ghor Province, Support to the Department of National Security, Capacity Building for the Department of Women's Affairs,

Strengthening the Capacity of the Judiciary in Ghor Province, Chaghcharan orphanage and children's centre designed and engineered by Lithuanian architects will highly reduce the number of Afghan children who lack a proper care and social attention, Strengthening Rural Livelihoods through Livestock Services in Ghor, Support to pupils from the most vulnerable families, Lithuania financed construction of micro-hydro power stations which provide electricity to remote villages, Construction of 19 low-cost durable schools in the Ghor Province, PRT of Lithuania and its "project significantly contributed to the stabilization effort in the Ghor province and reconstruction" (Leika 2009) in a limited location. Lithuania is also giving full support to the Department of Education, in providing school furniture, tents, textbooks, schoolbooks and schoolbags and Protection of Cultural Heritage.

In 2006, the Estonian Ministry of Foreign Affairs sent its first diplomat to Afghanistan's Helmand province. In 2007, the Estonian special mission to Afghanistan moved to Kabul, and in March 2008 an Estonian medical expert from the mission was sent to the LashkarGah PRT to focus on the development of the Helmand province's health sector, as part of the international Provincial Reconstruction Team. In 2008, Estonia's development aid to Afghanistan has increased three times (MFA Estonia 2013).

Estonia's development co-operation projects are focused on Helmand province and Kabul. In Helmand, medical equipment with a value of \$109,200 was given to the paediatric section provincial hospital (Bost Hospital), in cooperation with the Estonian Red Cross, with the goal of improving the quality of treatment of children and reducing child mortality in the hospital. Estonia provided financing to cover the cost of the fuel for the power generator of the Bost Hospital for the winter months. Special attention is being paid for improving the situation of children and women in Afghanistan. Estonia will continue to assist the provincial hospital by donating medical equipment, necessary to provide

comprehensive healthcare services and is considering expanding the project to district hospitals in Helmand province (Estonia Today 2008).

The Baltic States have decided to continue post 2014 developmental assistance and cooperation with Afghanistan. With America, the Baltic States also proclaimed for the restoration of peace and democracy and rebuilding of the infrastructure and institutions in Afghanistan but despite their engagement in rebuilding through various programs like Lithuanian provincial reconstruction team (PRT), Latvian development cooperation project, and the reconstruction of Chaghcharan airport their proclamation of 2014 is far from truth.

One of the objectives of the Defence policy of the Lithuania which is in compliance with other two Baltic States Estonia and Latvia is that “To contribute to the strengthening of NATO defence capacity and to other international-security building initiatives, including participation in multinational operations” (Ministry of National Defence Lithuania 2011) and under this objective they are forming their policies multilateral cooperation to work in Afghanistan.

The Baltic States notwithstanding with their domestic problems were supporting the west unconditionally which was making the claims for the post war Afghanistan role more dim because their role in Afghanistan extends from military to infrastructure and health and development in Afghanistan but one hand they are putting claims of investing money and resources there and on the other side they are undergoing under certain problems from which they need to come out Whether by the way of Russification or by the war by Moscow the Baltic States always had some problem of national identity which they are creating by different means and one of them is started using their language in their territory instead of using Russian.(Mezs, Bunkse and Rasa 1994).

The Baltic States are also fighting with their economic problem after the 2008 recession. They were rising in economic activity since they became part of the European Union but when recession hit the entire Europe they there arose a great problem of economic crisis and unemployment which are very important sector for their development and stability. They are investing lot of money in Afghanistan when they themselves need it and secondly with this fragile economic and political situation their claims in Afghanistan would be counted as rhetoric.

The Baltic States with this unconditional support, are justifying the invasion of many countries especially in Afghanistan, they are part of the NATO, OSCE and WEU. As a member of the community they are providing technological support and security. With the development of the war in Afghanistan the US wanted to make the full use of Silk route and Northern corridor while the war is going on or even after that. The Baltic States are also supporting the Afghanistan to rebuild the infrastructure.

Chapter 4

Policy of Baltic States in Post War Afghanistan

Reconstruction and Peace in Afghanistan, in a country which has been devastated and plundered since three decades, first in the hands of the Soviet Union and in the last decade in the hands of the US in the name of “war on terror”. Reconstruction and peace building is not an easy job in Afghanistan, because the commitment of the states, who claimed to establish democracy and peace ruined the economy and infrastructure, firstly for the sake of their political motive, now they want to use reconstruction and development in Afghanistan to further their political and economic interest. Rebuilding and peace in post war Afghanistan cannot be done only on the basis of establishing institutions for instance Presidential elections or Prime ministerial elections. Afghanistan is battling hard with problems arising out of drought, weak economy, education, food crisis and migration, the condition of women and children is worst and even the basic needs are not there. Those attempting to carry out humanitarian relief face many daunting challenges, such as reaching remote locations, coping with a dangerous security situation, and working with limited resources (Sharpet al. 2002).

The focus of the UN in Afghanistan is democratic peace building, and the UN provides no dedicated program to situation of women and girls in Afghanistan. Whereas the UN came out strongly against the lax punishment of rapists in a statement made in August 2008, (online <http://www.iht.com/articles/ap/2008/08/28/asia/AS-Afghan-Rapists-Freed.php>, accessed on 24 2 April 2013) there have been reports of child abuse and exploitation by UN Peace Keepers themselves in Afghanistan and elsewhere (Shabazz 2008: 2-2). The U.N. special representative for children in armed conflict is preparing a report on the current condition of Afghan children after the establishment of a system to monitor and report child abuse in the summer of 2008. In 2006, the UN called for expansion of the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) in Kabul with its approval of Resolution 1707. Currently

the UN considers the most urgent need of all Afghans to be food aid, seed and fertilizer for food production. UN Resolution 61/18 of January 2007 acknowledges constitutional efforts to improve the political situation of women in Afghanistan, meanwhile indicating that women's empowerment is necessary at both the national and provincial level. In addition, the resolution makes specific mention of the continued violation of human rights of women and children. The resolution condemns violence against women activists and activists promoting women's rights while emphasizing the need for investigation of allegations of violence against women and children in general (Baines and Foley 2009).

Afghanistan needs a complete overhauling of the whole system because the intention of the international organisation is in serious doubt including the United Nations (UN) since there are resolutions but all these resolutions are being broken by the peacekeepers and troops deployed there and to check all this they need a strong system with a strong intention, despite all those efforts of reducing problems including efforts by the international organisations, the situation in Afghanistan becoming from bad to worse, because the main cause behind all these humanitarian crisis is the armed conflict, which is still creating lot many problems, for instance, there are American drones killing civilians and destroying infrastructure, also many Afghan soldiers who are under training by the US soldiers fight with them and in the retaliation they are being killed by the US soldiers. All these incidents are merely escalating tensions and conflicts, which further creates problems for civilians.

Severe food insecurity and high maternal death rates have the most dramatic impact on the health of Afghan women. More women die in childbirth in Afghanistan than elsewhere. The superlative temperatures of the winter early in 2008, followed by the drought, have both extended the strain on the insufficient food supply, but also augmented hardships that women and children face as a result of no heating and no access to water. Remote areas of the country have no electricity, and even in Kabul electricity is available only a few hours each day.

Reports from July 2008 assert that “humanitarian problems [in Afghanistan] were getting worse as a result of soaring food prices, declining security and increasing civilian deaths.”The situation, furthermore, is deteriorating.Increasing costs of food as a result of the global food Crisis, in addition to drought and the resettlement of returning refugees from Pakistan and Iran have added to the strain.There have also been increases in civilian deaths (from both insurgency and friendly fire) and internally displaced people.The lack of security complicates the delivery of food aid and humanitarian supplies (Baines and Foley 2009).

All these problems creating an environment unbearable to the common men and women, the condition of women and children is very bad, since burden of any war is more for women and children. The education system is completely demolished, food crisis is there, water scarcity, problems arising out of insurgency are also turning the situation unbearable. The biggest problem is that the US is unsuccessful in its effort to counter insurgency because Taliban with its finest organisation and leadership cultivating the situation emanated from war and American and its allies attack to expand its network, when any aid and support comes in the territory of Afghanistan insurgents don't let the help reach to the people which blocks the way by which Afghanistan people can be helped by the concerned states at least to some extent. There is no denying to the fact that the war allies have no real intention to help and support Afghanistan but keeping apart the politics behind at least bare minimum needs to few people can be fulfilled for some time which can keep them alive.

The story of devastation, humanitarian crisis and war in not new to Afghanistan, it started with the occupation of Afghanistan by the Soviet Union. So Afghanistan, which is a war-torn country, sometimes devastated by the Soviets and sometimes by the US. Afghanistan needs a great effort for the establishment of peace and development.

No other country in Asia has suffered so much of physical and material destruction in recent years as Afghanistan. It is the only country which faced the attack and occupation of world's two super powers, the Soviet Union and the United States in quarter of a century. The civil war shattered the entire economic structure and nothing was left intact from 1992 to 1996, Kabul and other cities saw worst form of destruction. The present day Afghanistan is nothing but a legacy of blood and fire caused by the Mujahideen in fighting and battles between the Taliban and the northern alliance forces. It continues to be ripe with daunting task of rebuilding Afghanistan involves not only educational judicial and administrative system" (Kidwai and Saleem 2009).

In a country like Afghanistan which is having high humanitarian crisis, economic crisis and other problems emerged out of the intervention of the US; need a comprehensive mechanism to resolve all these related problems. But American intentions are not clear in this direction, they are certainly claiming about leaving the country, but there are two things which are not explained by America, firstly, its allies and NATO forces will remain there certainly less in numbers, these forces will assist Afghan National Forces (ANF) to counter insurgency, but it is not clear that what is their planning regarding the development, reconstruction and peace because Taliban as such is not finished on the land of Afghanistan in fact they are raising in rural areas and destruction caused by American army justifies the politics of Taliban and they are spreading in the rural areas so the claim of America and their allies is seem to be a fallacy.

The Taliban are a revolutionary movement, deeply opposed to the Afghan tribal system and focused on the rebuilding of the Islamic Emirate. Their propaganda and intelligence are efficient, and the local autonomy of their commanders in the field allows them both flexibility and cohesion. They have made clever use of ethnic tensions, the rejection of foreign forces by the Afghan people, and the lack of local administration to gain support in the population. In doing so, the Taliban have achieved their objectives in the South and East of the country, isolating the

Coalition, marginalizing the local Afghan administration, and establishing a parallel administration (mainly to dispense Sharia justice and collect taxes). In recent months, a more professional Taliban have succeeded in making significant inroads by recruiting from non-Pashtun communities(Dorrnsoro2009).

Their presence will be there, they have strong and efficient leadership, organisation and administration so it became very unclear and ambiguous that what would be the future of this presence, when the insurgent forces are there and getting strong? In the near future the situation can be again the same, as it is nowadays.

The Baltic states are also participating and claiming to be a part of the development and the peace building process, for instance, when Latvian foreign minister visited on 26 to 28 march 2013 to Afghanistan and The minister met with the Foreign Minister of Afghanistan Dr. Zalmay Rassoul, Advisor to the President of Afghanistan Dr.Rangin Dadfar Spanta and the Governor of the Balkh Province, Atta Mohammad Nur. In the meetings with Afghan officials, Foreign Minister emphasised Latvia's readiness to continue supporting Afghanistan's development with training and civil renewal projects following the completion of the ISAF (International Security Assistance Force) mission in Afghanistan at the end of 2014 (Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Latvia 2013).

In the same way Estonia and Lithuania also accepting and highlighting the critical humanitarian crisis in Afghanistan and accepting their civil assistance a very important factor to resolve the existing problems in Afghanistan, for instance, Estonia helping to make a support system for women and children and providing to improve health conditions there giving economic aid entrepreneurship training for graduates of Afghanistan's Kabul and Mazaruniversities. But one thing is important is that all these programmes of rebuilding of Afghanistan is not running in isolation with the US and NATO.

Afghanistan is one of the poorest countries on earth and its human development statistics are among the world's lowest. A large part of the country's population lives in extreme poverty, especially widowed women and their children. Close to 70% of the people are illiterate and 46% of Afghan children lack access to education.

The biggest development challenges are prolonged instability and a lack of security. Achieving stability is a prerequisite for sustainable development. Yet the challenges Afghanistan and the entire international community are facing cannot be solved by military means alone. For rebuilding a state, close co-operation between civilian and military actors is crucial. Estonia considers close co-operation between international organisations (including the UN, the European Union and the NATO) to be very important (Estonian, Ministry of Foreign Affairs 2012).

All the three Baltic countries under the rebuilding and peace process are eager to rebuild and develop the demolished structure and institutions of Afghanistan, but their seriousness is not emanating from the understanding that there must be a resolution regarding the humanitarian crisis in Afghanistan. It is also not coming from the understanding that the Baltic States themselves have some history, which to a great extent resembles with whatever is happening in Afghanistan. The sense of the Baltic states to be a part of the rebuilding and peace process is because of their need of security, their economy, energy need, and to be a part of international power structure. It reminds that how the new world order which means change in the fundamental power structure changes the perception of the states among each other. It can change the basic preposition of the international relation because here with the Baltic States same thing is happening, if there had been a situation of multi polar world order, certainly the stand of the Baltic States on the rebuilding and peace process would have something different.

The Baltic States believe out of their security compulsion, that the resolution of the existing problems is only possible through the ways of the NATO's rebuilding missions. The Baltic States are also not in a position to launch any kind of mission for reconstruction and rebuilding, since their own economic conditions do not allow them to invest in such a quantity which can bring substantial changes in the situation of Afghanistan.

Any planning of the Baltic states about the rebuilding of Afghanistan via NATO missions cannot lead and bring the desired results, because the way they are claiming for leaving and for any kind of rebuilding process is full of doubts, it is nowhere mentioned that NATO and the ISAF will leave the place completely in fact it is clear from Obama's speech that how these international forces will remain in the territory of Afghanistan. According to the official reports their role would be to assist and train Afghan forces to combat the insurgent forces but under the given power structure and situation in Afghanistan these forces will only rule Afghanistan as they are doing before 2014.

President Barack Obama announced in his State of the Union speech on Tuesday night that some 34,000 U.S. troops in Afghanistan will have returned home by this time next year. The move will reduce the number of U.S. forces in the country by more than half. There are now about 66,000 U.S. troops in Afghanistan.

The White House has been considering a range of troop levels – from up to 15,000 to none – to remain in Afghanistan once the combat mission officially ends at the end of 2014. A senior administration official told CNN on Tuesday that in addition to withdrawing 34,000 U.S. troops by next February, more reductions will continue through the end of 2014 as Afghans take full responsibility for their security (Tapper, CNN 2013).

The US President Barack Obama in his state of the union speech explained about leaving of NATO and its forces from Afghanistan after 2014, but

simultaneously he is saying that the troops are not going to leave the country completely instead they will be there to assist the Afghan forces to combat Taliban and these forces will leave when it is not clear and the assistance will be there will leave gradually is also sceptical because Taliban is not finished there in fact the force and capability of the Taliban has increased in the rural areas especially after the devastation which makes the whole role and claim of the US about Afghanistan.

The Baltic States' foreign policy regarding rebuilding and peace process in context of their own dilemma of security, which compels them not to take any independent decision regarding peace and development. The Baltic States effort in Afghanistan seems far from truth and is not going to have much impact despite their effort for the same they are investing substantially in Afghanistan.

Baltic States giving support to Afghanistan which is running under high humanitarian crisis especially in the last past decade and they have launched some programmes in areas like giving basic facilities, infrastructure, women and child health care, development of important buildings and giving training to the officials of Afghanistan.

Islamic Republic of Afghanistan Ministry of Transport and Civil Aviation Flight Safety Department has issued to the Baltic Aviation Academy (Lithuania) an approval certificate to operate the initial, type rating training, recurrent training, proficiency and instrument training and all weather operations training for Boeing 737 aircraft.

Baltic Aviation Academy's approval in Afghanistan is related to company's plans to support development in aviation market by improving airlines' flight safety when providing aviation training solutions based on adapted European practice. "Training at our training centre is approved by JAR/EASA certification ensuring highest European quality training. Being approved by Afghanistan

aviation authorities, Baltic Aviation Academy is positioning in country's market as a credible partner to raise safety and reliability of Afghanistan aviation services," commented Egle Vaitkeviciute, CEO at Baltic Aviation Academy.

Next to Islamic Republic of Afghanistan Ministry of Transport and Civil Aviation Flight Safety Department approval, course completion certificates issued by Baltic Aviation Academy are valid in the European Union, Ukraine, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan. Pilots at Baltic Aviation Academy are being trained by 150 training instructors, most of which come from Western European countries (www.aviasg.com. 2013).

Baltic States' media centre also providing community radio in Afghanistan to assist the effort of reconstruction and peace building through improving governance and community development, providing assistance and training to the afghan pilots to develop their aviation industry. There are lot many other areas in which the Baltic States providing their assistance like child development and women welfare.

Foreign Minister Rinkēvičs Edgars Rinkēvičs commended security policy cooperation among Baltic, Nordic and Visegrad states. Cooperation is of key importance in the development of defence capability, including military exercises, for instance, the upcoming NATO exercise Steadfast Jazz to be held this year in Poland and the Baltic states. "The region also needs to cooperate in the enhancement of civilian and military capabilities for crisis response, including the involvement of the Eastern Partnership countries," the minister indicated. Minister Rinkevics urged to devote greater attention to the dialogue with the Central Asian states, in view of security challenges following the reduction of coalition forces in Afghanistan after 2014 (Ministry of Foreign affairs of the republic of Latvia2013).

The Baltic States are also giving its full assistance to the development of the demolished structure which is necessary for the smooth function of life of people and more importantly afghan economy. For instance, Herat road project also known as the East-West corridor initiated by Lithuania is a declared priority of the Afghan Government. The road is essential for the isolated province of Ghor and other close regions, as it would increase accessibility to the markets, schools, social and health services, and the reconstruction of Chaghcharan airport is very important to assure that the airport will be good enough to answer needs of PRT (provincial reconstruction team) as well as to assure a proper economic development of the whole region.

Estonia also extended its support and efforts to unite those countries that are ready to help Afghanistan after 2014 and also planning to support it after 2015 on priority basis. Estonian minister of foreign affairs Urmas Paet attended the GLOBSEC forum At the forum discussion “Afghanistan after the year 2014” on Thursday evening, Paet noted that Estonia will continue to be included in the civilian and reconstruction work in Afghanistan after the year 2014.

“Estonia has also joined the Danish initiative, the objective of which is to continue expressing political support for Afghanistan and to unite countries that would be prepared to contribute to guaranteeing development of security forces of Afghanistan after the transitional period as well – from the year 2015 onwards,” said the Estonian minister. He emphasised, however, it is important for the Government of Afghanistan to assume responsibility and leadership in reforming their country and achieving reconciliation. During the years 2012-2015, Afghanistan will continue to be a priority country for Estonia’s development cooperation (The Baltic Course 2013).

At the policy level it is evident that the Baltic States is absolutely in favour of the reconstruction and development of Afghanistan and they also have long term planning, being a part of the NATO and having their troops in the ISAF in

Afghanistan. The Baltic States through these international organisations are planning to be a part of the development process which is going on in Afghanistan, and which is also being proclaimed and by the US also. The prime intention, to establish democracy in Afghanistan for which the US is also claiming, under which presidential and prime ministerial election were held to justify its claim of establishing democracy in Afghanistan. But only having elections would not be able to bring democracy because democracy which has a wider connotation especially in a war torn country, to have democracy there must have sovereignty which is again in question because of the presence of NATO even after 2014. These international bodies will certainly share some sovereignty, especially when there is allegation against the government that the existing government is a puppet government and do not represent the real wishes and aspirations of Afghanistan people.

As far as concerned the role of the Baltic States after 2014 in Afghanistan their role cannot go beyond their assistance to the international organisations in the rebuilding and peace process because their role in the peace process is not out of their genuine interest in Afghanistan, but because of their security concerns and secondly and most importantly the Baltic States do not have enough resources to carry forward what they preaching. In whatever areas they are claiming to support Afghanistan despite their economy percentage is high they are also fighting with lot many problems in their own country for instance the need for energy security from which the Baltic States are grappling with nowadays.

For the first time in modern history, the Baltic States can rely on their own actions to attain energy security. By implementing the European Union's reforms aimed at creating a unified European energy market, the political leaders of Lithuania, Estonia and Latvia are enabling their countries to secure supplies of oil, natural gas, and electricity at prices determined by market forces rather than by monopolists with divergent commercial and geopolitical interests.

All three Baltic States enjoy reliable supplies of oil, though this was not always the case. Immediately after the fall of the USSR, Latvia became one of the world's leading oil exporting countries from which significant volumes of Russian and Kazakhstani crude were exported to European markets. Significant volumes of oil exports continue to flow via Latvia's port of Ventspils and via Estonia's port of Muuga in Tallinn. Lithuania, however, faced greater difficulty. It relied on the Mazeikiiai Refinery, the Baltic region's only refinery and largest industrial concern, for oil products critical to its economy and for export (via the sea terminal at Butinge). The refinery depended entirely on Russian crude oil supplied by the Druzhba Pipeline.

Unified energy market and the European market which is highly helpful for the Baltic States to come up successfully with the economic problems in which the concept of the US of 'New Europe' where it wants to create a new identity as a European state, which is highly important for the Baltic States. In that condition the politics behind the "war on terror" and the rebuilding and peace process after 2014 becomes very important for the Baltic States. Even their integration into the economy of the Europe and their membership of NATO or having good relations and alliance with the US is also a part of the politics, because at the time after the independence the Baltic States had no considerable features to include them in the structure of NATO. Their support to the US and NATO even before 2014 is also a part of larger politics and is concerned only to the national interest of the Baltic States. The Baltic States got integrated into the international power structure even after their own history of devastation when occupied by the Soviet Union just for the sake of national interest. The role of the Baltic States in Afghanistan after 2014 cannot isolate from the politics going on in the name of "war on terror". America's presence after 2014 in Afghanistan as a provider of the assistance to the Afghan forces is a part of politics behind the war because they proclaimed that Afghan forces are incapable of handling the situation and insurgency by the Taliban, but according to the whole philosophy of the "war on terror" a fight against terrorism was constantly justified.

All these web of happenings clearly shows America's interest in the region, it also found a chance to challenge the Multipolarity arising in different regions of the world. It was a kind of an assault on the dissent with the American policies and hegemony across the world. So America also want to justify this "war on terror", in a journey of thirteen years till 2014 fighting Taliban insurgency and the claim of the US for restoration of peace falls short of their promises.

This propaganda of leaving Afghanistan by the US is also a part of the justification, that the on-going was for fighting terrorism and to establish peace and democracy in Afghanistan, which will support their image as the liberator of the world, where America is good for everyone and this will enhance the hegemony of the US, but simultaneously America does not want to go out of the region, because restoration of peace and democracy is highly problematic for America certainly it goes against America's politico-economic interests and that's why this claim of leaving the country, but to be remain there in the name of providing security and assistance is part of the strategy.

The Baltic States are aware from all this and that's why the development process which is being claimed by the US is in reality not a serious issue for America. The Baltic States are also having their politico-economic interest in the alliance they cannot perform and initiate any kind of development program in Afghanistan not only because they do not have enough resources but also it will be against the politics behind the war.

Over the last twenty years, the United States joined with its Nordic partners to support the restoration of independence of the Baltic States, secure their sovereignty, and support their successful efforts to join NATO and the EU. As we look toward the next twenty years, increasing regional integration and cooperation offers the prospect of the region playing a much larger role in transatlantic and global security. The countries of the region are already

significant contributors to NATO and EU missions, ranging from Afghanistan to the Horn of Africa, and Sweden and Finland are today close NATO partners as well as active players in the formulation of the EU's external policies. With deepening regional cooperation on defence, security, and foreign policy, the Nordic-Baltic region is poised to assume more responsibility as a constructive leader in transatlantic and global security in concert with the United States, NATO, and the EU (Nurick and Nordenman 2011).

The Baltic States are supporting the US to get more shares in transatlantic and global security, the same logic is working as far as rebuilding and peace process and the Baltic role in the post war Afghanistan is concerned. Actually the post war policies in Afghanistan of the Baltic States are subversive to NATO and the US and do not hold any independent weight for instance training to the Afghan pilots is nothing but to assist Afghanistan security establishment to make it efficient and all other roles in other areas where the Baltic States are present are to justify their role in the international organisations.

Policies of the Baltic States in post war Afghanistan is not an outcome of sudden change in their foreign policy, it is not happening in isolation, no country follows foreign policy for any specific nation in contradiction to the existing foreign policy of the state as a whole. Same thing with the Baltic States are happening where post war policies are not contradictory to the post 9/11 policies. The policies which the Baltic States are announcing in post war Afghanistan are also a part of the whole foreign policy of the Baltic States. On the one side they are saying that they are with the US and following the same policy as by the US as a part of the campaign in the name of "war on terror" on the other side they cannot take a different view. It was all planned because when America proclaimed "war on terror" in Afghanistan it blamed Taliban and Afghanistan as shielding the Taliban but entered into the country with the claim that it is for the restoration of peace. So this is evident that the whole strategy was pre-decided. If the "war on terror" is in question then this rebuilding and peace process also need to be questioned.

All the Baltic States have initiated their aid programs. Their current aid flows are channelled to their neighbouring countries in Europe and Central Asia. These are not typical North-South flows as from rich OECD countries to the poorest countries in the south. If one looks at the bilateral development assistance that the Baltic States provide, Estonia chose Afghanistan, Georgia, Moldova and Ukraine as priority countries (Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Estonia 2011). Latvia chose Belarus, Georgia, Moldova and Ukraine as its development cooperation priority countries (Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Latvia 2011). Lithuania selected Afghanistan, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Moldova and Ukraine for its development cooperation and democracy promotion projects (Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Lithuania 2011). The Baltic States are thus sharing their transition experience with countries further to the south and east. What is also unique about their selection of priority countries is that they are mainly middle income countries and not the poorest countries in the world (Hilmarrsson, Hilmar Þór 2011).

The Baltic states aid priorities also shows that there is a politico-economic interest behind the aid because in the process those countries chosen were not the most poorer countries of the world, instead they were mainly middle income countries and Lithuania and Estonia keeps Afghanistan the top most priority for the development cooperation.

The Baltic States are constantly under pressure from their own requirements and security concern, and above all their identity as European nations, where they are supposed to support the European Union and the west to maintain that identity. The policies of the Baltic States are just to strengthen this condition of the world power structure which is ultimately to support their interest.

Chapter 5

Conclusion

Despite the great effort, put forth by the United States of America in the form of justifications, sometimes in the name of terrorism and sometimes in the name of establishing democracy and peace, its efforts to categorise this on-going war as opposition or rather more specifically a military counter to the terrorism which started after 9/11 have completely failed. This war is successful as far as the US is concerned not because of their ideology, but because of the hidden interests of the protagonists, the United States of America and its allies including the Baltic States.

It is not very far from the truth that the terrorism is not a sudden phenomenon which suddenly erupted after the September 11 incident, though this incident could be interpreted as an enhancer in the realization of the horror of terrorism, but it could not be said that it is the incident which awakened the whole world automatically. Infact, terrorism was one of the important issues at the international level prior to this incident and it was always been there and many a times it has been raised by many countries, and one among them was India. But the United Nations (UN) or America never put any attention to the issue of terrorism. They did not pay any attention because they were not serious about the terrorism per se or more specifically for them that was not the matter which was affecting the United Nations as an international body nor was it affecting the United States of America. Suddenly after the 9/11 incident the US and its allies awakened and started a full-fledged war called as “war on terror” with the terrorist organisations all over the world and also with those nations who were supporting these terrorist organisations or outfits. The definition of terrorism changes in the course of the events related to “war on terror”. Initially it started with the Taliban and the US also blamed Afghanistan for shielding Taliban, Al Qaeda and their leader Osama Bin Laden. Later on it came as

any nation which is against the west. America and its allies are free to wage war against the state which is terrorist nation.

In the changed international system, and the world order especially after a decade of the cold war, America and the west felt the need to raise their voice vehemently against those regimes which were susceptible to the terrorism, but their very definition of terrorism is also changing with time and the justification too. America's politico-economic interests collaborating with its main allies Britain and other western countries are very important. For instance, at a time when the world was changing from unilateralism to multilateralism, which was not acceptable to America because multilateralism will not serve America's interest, how the US will pursue the matter is yet to be seen. Multilateralism was really challenging the monopoly of the United States of America and posing strong threat to the monopoly of America in the international economy which was certainly not acceptable to the United States of America.

The location of Baltic States, Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia, as sandwiched between Asia and Europe and between two great powers Russia and Germany determines their destiny as evident in history. Throughout the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries these nations were a battleground of different powers like Sweden, Denmark, Germany, Russia, Poland, etc. The strategically significant location made the Baltic States the victims of rivalry and competition of clearly two great powers: Russia and Germany during Second World War. The War confirmed the competition for spheres of influence between Germany and Russia. Even today their situation remains vulnerable. After the disintegration of Soviet Union they gained much consideration in the Western policies and entered in the Western security structures. US support during the Cold War through non-recognition of Soviet occupation policy made the Baltic States to remain morally obliged towards the United States in supporting "war on terror".

The Baltic States got an assurance from NATO and America as far as their security was concerned and they also got success in establishing their European identity as a nation. They got new opportunities for trade and development and new horizons of economic and technological development came into the picture as a follower of market economy but as a close ally of America they supported the later developments in the arena of international relation and became a partner of America in every mission like 'war on terror', a war against the threat of global terrorism. The international coalition of states holds the UN Security Council mandate which was granted under the UN Security Council's Resolution No. 1890. The whole European Union supported the "war on terror" and occupation of Afghanistan.

The Baltic States supported America and "war on terror" despite their experience as a state under the occupation by the Soviet Union; they faced same problems as Afghanistan is facing at the moment. Afghanistan is facing lot many problems because of the war and occupation in the name of "war on terror"; its infrastructure has completely failed and the economic condition is very bad. In the same way the Baltic States faced same kind of problems and even after the independence, fear of Russia is still working in the mind of the Baltic States. That fear or threat influences their policy decisions; for instance, their tilt towards reviving their European identity and seeing the US and NATO as their prime security provider make it clear that there is no doubt in front of the Baltic States that Russia is always a kind of fear and any time can pose threat to the existence of the Baltic states, or atleast can affect their politico-economic interests. In seeking their own security, the Baltic States are supporting another kind of occupation in Afghanistan and not only supporting it ideologically, but militarily through NATO and ISAF by providing troops and giving way to the transport of the arms.

All the allies in the “war on terror” are claiming that this war is against terrorism and the objective behind the war is the restoration of peace which is highly susceptible. When American president Barack Obama proclaimed that the force or troops will leave the country, it is high time to reconsider the situation or to judge that whatever is happening now in Afghanistan could really bring peace. It didn't and possibly it could not. Their claim is absolute false because on one hand America is talking about peace and on the other is destroying infrastructure, economy of Afghanistan and completely neglecting the post-war humanitarian crisis.

The Baltic States are recreating their history of Soviet Occupation in the soil of Afghanistan in the form of American occupation; the most important proposition which is influencing the Baltic States to support this recreation of horror history is that they are seeking better development of their countries. The biggest role is their security problems which, the Baltic States think, would be provided by NATO and the west; their integration into these organisations was the testimony of this.

The other reason was their identity. After the independence of the Baltic States, they were not ready to be a part of the Russian identity, and as a lot of people migrated from Russia to the Baltic States with Russian identity, the Baltic nations were particular about their identity. And that's why adoption of the Russian identity was not good for the Baltic States. Then it would have possibility with the Baltic people to get co-opted by the Soviet Union. The Baltic States have adopted the European Identity, which was important or in fact necessary for two reasons. Firstly the Baltic States wanted to come out completely from the Soviet structure and secondly their European identity would be very useful and be helpful for the Baltic States to come out from the economic shambles.

The Baltic States could have maintained stable relation in the region and in the meantime could have tried to mend their relationship with the Soviet Union but that

was not possible, because they were also in need of changing their poor political and economic condition not necessarily structurally but qualitatively. The Baltic States changed their economic system completely and turned its economy into a market economy and completely tilted towards the west; they got benefits also from this change. But the point is that if they could have been in a better economic situation they could have stable relation with USSR. After the independence of the Baltic States, they were in a bad situation both economically and militarily. Moreover, the overambitious Russians did not recognize their independence at first and they did only after they realized that now the situation is changing the world is recognizing the Baltic States.

The claim of the Baltic States to restore peace in Afghanistan is a fallacy. In rebuilding and restoring peace, the Baltic States need a lot of material resources which these countries are seriously lacking in. It is therefore a false claim and argument that War is for peace. The various troops will be withdrawn from Afghanistan in 2014 and therefore the US and its allies' claims of restoring peace will demand justification. After the independence, NATO was rethinking over the issue of giving them the membership because their economic and military condition was very weak, and now after the withdrawal of the forces the Baltic States want to be a part of the post-2014 mission and claim for the restoration of the infrastructure and development.

The Baltic States regained independence through non-violent methods of resistance. There was a human chain of more than 2 million people, 600 kms long which came to be known as the Baltic way during the "Singing Revolution" which drew inspiration from the philosophies of Gandhi and Martin Luther King. They considered the period of 1940-1991 as Soviet occupation and colonization. After independence as part of the Europeanization process they have decided to support the occupation of another country in the 21st century!

The Baltic States may have gained their independence through democratic means, through peaceful means, but the point is that the Baltic States were not in a position to sustain and to forward that philosophy of non-violence. To serve interest of the security in a post-independence era, they tend towards the US and support “war on terror” which is opposed to their philosophy of independence. It is not that only the Baltic states were in need of the US support for their security but simultaneously the US and the west realized their interest in the Baltics States and the American dream of “New Europe” also helped in that. Secondly, if the Baltic States were not in a weak position, there could have been possibility to keep their philosophy of non-violence intact and not to get inclined towards the west and there could have some regional alliance through which the Baltic States could have solve their security problems.

The Baltic States tried for the same; they tried to cooperate with each other on every problem, after the realization that their problem and security issues are not different, and these problems can be challenged only when they will take this challenge collectively. There were some alliances in this direction, but having relationship with the Nordic countries was also difficult, not a viable solution at least, not enough for providing them security. The most important was the European Union which was having relationship with the US and it was totally tilted towards the west. Even the EU was not in a position to provide them security and the Baltic States had lot of apprehensions because of Russia. So they were left with only one option and that was to make and develop its relationship with the US.

References

(*indicates as primary source)

- Archer, Clive (1998), "Nordic Involvement in the Baltic States Security Needs, Response and Success", *European Security*, (7)3: 43-62.
- Archer, Clive. (1998), "The Nordic States and Security", *Irish Studies in International Affairs*, (9): 55-60.
- Armitage, Richard L and Samuel R. Berger (2010), "U.S. Strategy for Pakistan and Afghanistan", *Independent Task Force Report No. 65*, New York: Council on Foreign Relations.
- Arter, David (1998), "An Agenda 2000 for the Nordic Region", *Economic and Political Weekly*, (33) 35: PE 79-PE 86.
- Asmus, Ronald D. (2008), "Europe's Eastern Promise: Rethinking NATO and EU Enlargement", *Foreign Affairs*, (87)1: 95-106.
- Averre, Dr Derek (2005), "Russia and the European Union: Convergence or Divergence"? *European Security*, (14)2: 175-202.
- BBC (2013), "Obama announces 34,000 troops to leave Afghanistan", [Online: web] Accessed 13th February 2013. URL: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-us-canada-21431423>.
- Beeson, Mark (2006), "The Rise of the 'Neocons' and the Evolution of American Foreign Policy", in Vedi Hadiz (eds.), *Empire, neoliberalism, and Asia*, London: Routledge.
- Binnendijk, Han, Jeffrey Simon (1995), "Baltic Security and NATO Enlargement" *Strategic Forum*, (57) 1-6.
- Bitzinger, Richard A. (1992), "The Baltic: A Changing Security Situation", *Scandinavian Studies*, (64) 4: 606-613.
- Black, J.L. (1999), "Russia and NATO Expansion Eastward: Red-Lining the Baltic States", *International Journal*, (54) 2: 249-266.
- Blank, Stephen (1998), "Russia, NATO Enlargement and the Baltic States", *World Affairs*, (160)3: 115-125.
- Blank, Stephen (2003), "An ambivalent war: Russia's war on terrorism", *Small Wars & Insurgencies*, (14)1: 127-150.

- Boyle, J Michael (2008), "The war on terror in American grand strategy", *International Affairs*, 84(2): 191-209.
- Brixiova, Z. and B. Egert (2010), "*Modeling Institutions, Start-ups and Productivity during Transition*", OECD Economics Department Working Papers, No. 773, OECD Publishing.
- Brown, Vanda Felbab. (2013), "Afghanistan in 2012: Limited Progress and Threatening Future", *Asian Survey*, (53)1: 22-33.
- Brzezinski, Zbigniew (1997), *The Grand Chessboard: American Primacy and its Geostrategic Imperatives*, New York: Basic Books.
- Budryte, Dovile, and Vilana Pilinkaite Sotirovic. (2009) "Lithuania: Progressive Legislation Without Popular Support." *Minority Rights in Central and Eastern Europe*, Ed. Bernd Rechel. London: Routledge. Quoted in Agarin, Timofey (2011), "Civil society versus nationalizing state? Advocacy of minority rights in the post-socialist Baltic states", *Nationalities Papers: The Journal of Nationalism and Ethnicity*, (39)2: 181-203.
- Burke, Jason (2012), *The 9/11 Wars*, Britain: Penguin Group.
- Bush, George W. (2001), "Address to a joint session of Congress and the American people", September 20, 2001, [Online: web] Accessed 12 June 2013. URL: <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/09/20010920-8.html>.
- Byman, Daniel (2006), "Remaking Alliances for the War on Terrorism", *The Journal of Strategic Studies*, 29 (5): 767-811.
- Caldwell, Dan (2011), *Vortex of conflict: U.S. Policy Toward Afghanistan, Pakistan, and Iraq*, California: Stanford University Press.
- Callahan, Kathe et al. (2006), "War Narratives: Framing our Understanding of the War on Terror", *Public Administration Review*, vol. 66(01): 554-588, Melvin J. Dubnick, and Dorothy Olshfski.
- *Carpenter, Slok (2012), "Wounded in the Financial Crisis Baltic States are regaining strength", *Emerging Money*, [Online: web] Accessed 11 July 2013, URL:<http://emergingmoney.com/frontier-markets-2/baltic-states-fm-ewd/>.
- Ciziunas, Pranas (2008), "Russia and the Baltic States: Is Russian Imperialism Dead"? *Comparative Strategy*, (27)3: 287-307.

- Coleman, Fred (1997), "Kalingrad Scenario: Expanding NATO to the Baltics", *World Policy Journal*, (14) 3: 71-75.
- Conley, Heather (2004), *The Baltic States in the World*, Los Angeles, US Department of State Archive, [Online: web] Accessed 10 July 2013, URL: <http://2001-2009.state.gov/p/eur/rls/rm/32363.htm>.
- Cornelius, Peter K. and Beatrice S. Weder (1996), "Economic Transformation and Income Distribution: Some Evidence from the Baltic Countries", *International Monetary Fund*, (43) 3: 587-604.
- *Crowley, Michael (2013), "Can Obama End the War on Terror", [Online: web] Accessed 9 July 2013, URL: <http://swampland.time.com/2013/05/24/can-obama-end-the-war-on-terror/>.
- Denisen, Viktor (2010), "CIS as a Geopolitical Ghost", [Online: web] Accessed 26 June 2013, URL: <http://www.eurodialogue.org/CIS-As-A-Geopolitical-Ghost>.
- Deshpande, J.V. (2003), "Muslim Worlds Dilemma" What Went Wrong? The Clash between Islam and Modernity in the Middle East by Bernard Lewis", *Economic and Political Weekly*, (38) 45: 4761-4762.
- *Dombrovskis, Valdis (2012), "Annual Report by the Minister of Foreign Affairs on activities performed and planned in national foreign policy and European Union matters", [Online: web] Accessed 7 July 2013, URL: http://www.am.gov.lv/data/foreign_policy_report_for_2012_eng_2301.pdf.
- *Dotan, Tom (2012), "Obama: US Troops to Leave Afghanistan by 2014", [Online: web] Accessed 11 July 2013, URL: <http://www.neontommy.com/news/2012/05/obama-us-troops-leave-afghanistan-2014>.
- Doyle, Richard B. (2007), "The US National Security Strategy: Policy, Process, Problems", *Public Administration Review*, (67) 4:624-629.
- Dudzinska, Kinga (2013), "The Baltic States' Success Story in Combating the Economic Crisis: Consequences for Regional Cooperation within the EU and with Russia", *The Polish Institute of International Affairs*, (54) 6: 1-6.
- Dupree, Louis. (1983), "Afghanistan in 1982: Still No Solution", *Asian Survey*, (23) 2: 133-142.
- Ehin, Piret (2007), "Political support in the Baltic States, 1993-2004", *Journal of Baltic Studies*, (38)1: 1-20.

- *Europa (2007), "European Union, Press Release Rapid, Action plan on enhancing the security of explosives", [Online: web] Accessed 2 July 2013, URL: http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-07-450_en.htm?locale=en.
- Evera, Stephen Van (2006), "Assesing U.S. Strategy in the War on Terror", *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 607(01): 10-26.
- Falah, Ghazi-Walid, Colin Flint, and Virginie Mamadouh (2006), "Just War and Extraterritoriality: The Popular Geopolitics of the United States War on Iraq Reflected in Newspaper of the Arab World", *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, (96) 1: 142-164.
- Freiberger, Vaira Vike, President of Latvia (2000), "The Baltic Countries Between East and West", *American Foreign Policy Interests, The Journal of the National Committee on American Foreign Policy*, (22)3: 22-31.
- Friedman, George (2013), "Beyond the Post-Cold War World", *Geopolitical Weekly*, Stratfor Global Intelligence, [Online: web] Accessed 13 April 2013, URL: <http://www.stratfor.com/weekly/beyond-post-cold-war-world>.
- Fukuyama, Francis (1992), *The End of History and The Last Man*, London: Penguin.
- Garthoff, Raymond L. (1997), "NATO and Russia", *The Brookings Review*, (15) 2: 8-11.
- Geron, Leonard (1991), "Roads to Baltic Independence", *The World Today*, (47) 8/9: 135-138.
- Ghufran, Nasreen (2006), "The Challenges of Reconstruction", *Asian Survey*, (46) 1: 85-94.
- Gibbs, David (1987), "Does the USSR Have a 'Grand Strategy'? Reinterpreting the invasion of Afghanistan", *Journal of Peace Research*, (24) 4: 365-379.
- Gidadhubli, R.G. (2004), "Expansion of NATO: Russia's Dilemma", *Economic and Political Weekly*, (39)19: 1885-1887.
- Gilpin, Robert (2002), "The Rise of American Hegemony", in Patrick Karl O'Brien and Armand Clesse (eds.) *Two Hegemonies: Britain 1846-1914 and the United States 1941-2001*, Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, Ltd., pp. 165-182.

- Gill, Bates and Nicholas Lardy (2000), "China: Searching for a Post: Cold War Formulae", *The Brookings Review*, (18)4: 15-18.
- Goldman, Minton F. (1984), "Soviet Military Intervention in Afghanistan: Roots & Causes", *Polity*, (16) 3: 384-403.
- Griffiths, Martin (2004), "Beyond the Bush Doctrine: American Hegemony and World Order", *Australian Journal of American Studies*, Vol. 23(1): 63-75.
- Griffiths, Martin (2004), "Beyond the Bush Doctrine: American Hegemony and World Order", *Australian Journal of American Studies*, (23) 1: 63-75.
- Grigas, Agnia (2012) "*Legacies, Coercion and Soft Power: Russian Influence in the Baltic States*", Russia and Eurasia Programme. Chatham House, London.
- Ham, Peter Van (1995), "Introduction", in Peter Van Ham(eds.) *The Baltic States: Security and Defense After Independence*, Institute for Security Studies of WEU, Paris.
- *Herb, Jeremy and Carlo Munoz (2013), "Obama Keeping Post-2014 Plans for Afghanistan Under Wraps", Washington, The Hill, [Online: web] Accessed on July 2013, URL: <http://thehill.com/blogs/defcon-hill/policy-and-strategy/302887-obama-keeps-plans-for-afghanistan-under-wraps>.
- Hey, J.A.K. (2003), "Refining Our Understanding of Small State Foreign Policy", in Hey J.A.K. (ed) *Small States in World Politics: Explaining Foreign Policy Behaviour*, Boulder, London, Lynne Rienner Publisher. Quoted in Mannik, Erik. (2003), "Security Options of the Baltic States After the Gulf War II", *Baltic Defence Review*, (9) 1: 135-140.
- Herd, Graeme P. (1997), "A Helping of Alphabet Soup", *The World Today*, (53)7: 185-186.
- Hirsh, Michael (2013), "Obama Hesitant to Commit Troops in Afghanistan Beyond 2014", *National Journal*, Washington, 3 June 2013.
- Hudson, Michael C. (1996), "To Play the Hegemon: Fifty Years of US Policy Toward the Middle East", *Middle east Journal*, (50)3: 329-343.
- Hudson, Michael C. (2001), "The Middle East", *Political Science and Politics*, (34) 4: 801-804.
- Huittinen, Erkki (2001), "*Back to the West, the Reintegration of the Baltic Countries to the European Union and other Western Organizations*" Cambridge: Harvard University.

- Hunter, Robert E. (1999), "Maximizing NATO: A Relevant Alliance Knows How to Reach", *Foreign Affairs*, (78) 3: 190-203.
- Huntington, Samuel P. (1996), *The Clash Of Civilizations And The Remaking Of World Order*, Penguin.
- Ikenberry, John (2002), "America's Imperial Ambition", *Foreign Affairs*, (81) 5: 44-60.
- *ISAF, NATO (2013), International Security assistance force, [Online: web] Accessed 30 June 2013. URL: <http://www.isaf.nato.int/article/isaf-releases/estonian-minister-of-defense-visits-isaf-and-deployed-estonian-forces.html>.
- *ISAF News, "Lithuanian Chief of Defence Visits Soldiers, PRT in Ghor", [Online: web] Accessed 11 July 2013, URL: <http://www.isaf.nato.int/article/news/lithuanian-chief-of-defence-visits-soldiers-prt-in-ghor.html>.
- Izulis, Isadors(1990), *The Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact of 1939: The Baltic Case*, New York: Praeger Publishers.
- Jekabsons, Anete (2013), "The Baltic States and Central Asia", *Open Society Foundation*, (11).
- Karm, Ellen (2008), "Environment and Energy: The Baltic Sea Gas Pipeline", *Journal of Baltic Studies*, (39) 2: 99-121.
- Katzman, Kenneth (2013), "Afghanistan: Politics, Elections and Government Performance", *CRS Report for Congress*.
- Koehler, Hans (2002), "The War on Terror: Its Impact on the Sovereignty of States, and Its Implications for Human Rights and Civil Liberties", Lecture delivered at International Ecumenical Conference on Terrorism in a Globalized World, place
- Koshy, Ninan (2001), *The War on Terror: Reordering the world*, New Delhi: LeftWord.
- Kramer, Mark (2002), "NATO, the Baltic States and Russia: A framework for Sustainable Enlargement", *International Affairs*, (78) 4: 731-756.
- Kucukaksoy (2013), "Yet Another Step Forward for NRF 2014", [Online: web] Accessed 12 July 2013. URL: <http://www.jwc.nato.int/jwc-news/yet-another-step-forward-for-nato-response-force-2014>

- Kuniharu, Kakihara (2003), "The Post-9/11 Paradigm Shift and Its Effects on East Asia", *Institute for International Policy Studies*, IIPS Policy Paper 292E, Tokyo, January 2003.
- Lamoreaux, Jeremy W., and David J. Galbreath (2008), "The Baltic States As Small States: Negotiating The 'East' By Engaging The West", *Journal of Baltic Studies*, (39)1: 1-14.
- Laqueur, Walter (1987), *The Age of Terrorism*, Boston: Little Brown
- Larrabee, Stephen F. (2006), "Danger and Opportunity IN Eastern Europe", *Foreign Affairs*, (85) 6: 117-131.
- Larrabee, F. Stephen, "*the Baltic States and NATO Membership*", Pittsburg: RAND Publication.
- Layne, Christopher(1993), "The Unipolar Illusion: Why New Great Powers Will Rise", *International Security*, Vol. 17(4): 5-51
- Leika, Almantas (2009), "The Lithuanian-Led Provincial Reconstruction Team in Afghanistan-Achievements and Challenges" in Gediminas Vitkus (ed) *Lithuanian Annual Strategic Review 2008*, Lithuania: Institute of international relations and political science of the university of Vilnius And military academy of Lithuania.
- Lieven, Anatol (2003), "Don't Forget Afghanistan", *Foreign Policy*, (137): 54.
- Lieven, Anatol (1996), "Baltic Iceberg Dead Ahead: NATO Beware", *The World Today*, (52) 7: 175-179.
- *Lithuania DefenceMinistry (2011), "Ministry of Nation Defence Republic of Lithuania", [Online: web] Accessed 1 July 2013. URL: http://www.kam.lt/en/defence_policy_1053/defence_policy_of_lithuania.html.
- *Lithuanian Armed Forces (2012), "International Operations of Ministry of National Defence", [Online: web] Accessed 7 July 2013, URL: http://kariuomene.kam.lt/en/structure_1469/land_force/structure_1299/infantry_brigade_iron_wolf/battalions_of_motorised_infantry_brigade_iron_wolf/general_romualdas_giedraitis_artillery_battalion/international_operations_2641.html.
- Ljung, Bo,Malmlof, Tomas. Neretnieks, Karlis and Winnerstig, Mike [ed.] (2012), "*The Security and Defensibility of the Baltic States' A Comprehensive Analysis of a Security Complex in the Making*", Stockholm: FOI, Swedish Defence Research Agency.

- Lugna, Lauri (2006), "Institutional Framework of the European Union Counter-Terrorism Policy Setting", *Baltic Security and Defence Review*, (8): 101-127.
- Malakauskas, P. (2000), "Baltic Defence Co-operation: Prospects and Priorities", *European Security*, (9) 3: 134-138.
- Maley, William (1995), "Does Russia Speak for Baltic Russians"? *The World Today*, (51)1: 4-6.
- Maley, William (2012), "Afghanistan in 2011: Positioning for an Uncertain Future", *Asian Survey*, (52)1: 88-99.
- Mannik, Erik (2003), "Security Options of the Baltic States After the Gulf War II", *Baltic Defence Review*, (9) 1: 135-140.
- Mead, Walter Russell (1989-1990) "The United States and New Europe", *World Policy Journal*, (7)1: 35-70.
- *MFA, Lithuania (2005), Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Lithuania, [Online: web] Accessed 30 June 2013. URL: <https://www.urm.lt/index.php?3997250056>.
- *MFA Lithuania (2005), "Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Lithuania", [Online: web] Accessed 1 July 2013. URL: <http://www.urm.lt/index.php?3141136642>.
- *MFA Lithuania, Human Rights. "Human Rights", [Online: web] Accessed 11 July 2013, URL: <http://www.urm.lt/index.php?1517329145>.
- *MFA Lithuania, DCDP. "Development Cooperation and Democracy Promotion", [Online: web] Accessed 11 July 2013, URL: <http://www.urm.lt/index.php?-205079309>.
- *MFA Lithuania, "Nuclear and cyber Security fight against terrorism", [Online: web] Accessed 3 July 2013. URL: <http://www.urm.lt/index.php?2574435344>.
- *MFA Lithuania, "NATO Partnership", [Online: web] Accessed 3 July 2013. URL: <https://www.urm.lt/index.php?602492799>.
- *MFA Estonia, "Estonia and Afghanistan", [Online: web] Accessed 3 July 2013. URL: <http://www.vm.ee/?q=en/node/7997>.
- *MFA Estonia (2008), "Estonia's Contribution to Rebuilding Afghanistan", [Online: web] Accessed 7 July 2013. URL: <http://www.vm.ee/?q=node/8449/7913>.

- *MFA Estonia (2013), “Bilateral Relations Estonia and Afghanistan”, [Online: web] Accessed 7 July 2013. URL: <http://www.vm.ee/?q=en/node/7997>.
- *MFA Latvia (2008), “Third political and development advisor from Latvia destined for Afghanistan”, [Online: web] Accessed 7 July 2013. URL: <http://www.am.gov.lv/en/eu/news/4341/?pg=10989&print=on>.
- *MFA Latvia (2013), “Participation in Military Operations in Afghanistan”, [Online: web] Accessed 7 July 2013, URL: <http://www.mfa.gov.lv/en/security/Directions/InternationalOperations/#Afghanistan>.
- *MFA Estonia, Human Rights. “Human Rights and Estonia”, [Online: web] Accessed 12 July 2013. URL: http://www.vm.ee/?q=en/human_rights.
- *MFA Estonia, DCHA. “Development Co-operation and Humanitarian Aid”, [Online: web] Accessed 12 July 2013. URL: <http://www.vm.ee/?q=en/taxonomy/term/55>.
- *MFA Estonia, Afghanistan. “Estonia’s Contribution to Rebuilding Afghanistan”, [Online: web] Accessed 12 July 2013. URL: <http://www.vm.ee/?q=en/node/4080>.
- *MFA Estonia (2011), “Foreign Minister Urmas Paet in Bonn: Estonia Will Help to Build Up Afghanistan After 2014 As Well”, [Online: web] Accessed 12 July 2013. URL: <http://www.vm.ee/?q=en/node/13172>.
- *MFA Latvia, DC. “What is Development Cooperation” [Online: web] Accessed 12 July 2013. URL: <http://www.am.gov.lv/en/policy/DevelopmentCo-operation/dc/>.
- *MFA Latvia, Latvia’s Contribution, “Latvia’s Contribution to Development Assistance”, [Online: web] Accessed 12 July 2013. URL: <http://www.am.gov.lv/en/policy/DevelopmentCo-operation/finance/>.
- MFA Latvia (2013), “Fighting International terrorism”, [Online: web] Accessed 4 July 2013. URL: <http://www.mfa.gov.lv/en/security/Directions/Terrorism/>.
- *MFA Latvia (2013), Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Lithuania, [Online: web] Accessed 7 July 2013. URL: www.am.gov.lv/en.
- Mezs, Ilmars, Edmunds Bunkse, Kaspars Rasa.(1994), “Ethno-Demographic Status of the Baltic Status”, *GeoJournal, Baltic Peoples, Baltic Culture and Europe*, (33) 1: 9-25, 121.

- Miller, Paul D. (2013), "The US and Afghanistan After 2014", *Survival: Global Politics and Strategy*, (55)1: 87-102.
- Mockunas, Jonas (1993), "Transition to Market Economies: Scenarios from the Baltic States", *Australian Journal of International Affairs*, (47)1: 31-46.
- Mullen, Rani D. (2009), "Afghanistan in 2008: State Building at the Precipice", *Asian Survey*, (49) 1: 28-38.
- Mueller, John(2004), "What Was the Cold War About? Evidence from Its Ending", *Political Science Quarterly*, 119(4): 609-631.
- Muiznieks, Nils. R (1995), "The Influence of Baltic Popular Movements on the Process of Soviet Disintegration", *Europe-Asia Studies*, (47)1: 3-25.
- *NATO (2004), North Atlantic Treaty Organization, "Secretary General of NATO to Travel to Washington for United States Ceremony Marking the Accession of Seven New NATO Members" 29 March 2004.
- *NATO (2008), North Atlantic Treaty Organization, [Online: web] Accessed 29 June 2013.URL: http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/news_7266.htm?selectedLocale=en.
- Nevers, Renee De (2007), "NATO's International Security Role in the Terrorist Era", *International Security*, (31) 4: 34-66.
- Nivedita, Das Kundu (2003), "The Baltic states' search for security", *Strategic Analysis*, (27)3:463-488.
- Olcott, Martha Brill (1991), "The Soviet (Dis) Union", *Foreign Policy*, (82): 118-136.
- Paas, Tiiu and Nancy J. Scannell (2002), "Financial Sector Restructuring and Monetary Reform: Precursors to European Union Accession of Estonia and the Baltic States", *Russian and East European Finance and Trade*, (38) 3: 18-33.
- Patman, Robert G. (2006), "Globalisation, The New US Exceptionalism and the War on Terror", *Third World Quarterly*, (27) 6: 963-986.
- Peck, Bryan T. (2003), *The Baltic States, Education and the European Union: Education-Emerging Goals in the New Millennium*, New York, USA: Nova Science Publisher.
- *Pipikaite, Algirde (2013), "Lithuania's Role in the Northern Distribution Network, Global Research analysis", [Online: web] Accessed 7 July 2013.

URL:[http://www.jamestown.org/programs/edm/single/?tx_ttnews\[tt_news\]=40408&tx_ttnews\[backPid\]=27&cHash=61ea54f688beed2a495adb8720128c64#.Udliem2W28s](http://www.jamestown.org/programs/edm/single/?tx_ttnews[tt_news]=40408&tx_ttnews[backPid]=27&cHash=61ea54f688beed2a495adb8720128c64#.Udliem2W28s).

Rajwade, A. V. (2006), "Bush's War on Terror", *Economic and Political Weekly*, (41)47: 4863-4865.

Rawi, Marium (2009), "Afghan Women, Violence and Abuse of Human Rights", in Mondira Dutta, (eds.) *Emerging Afghanistan in the Third Millennium*, New Delhi: Pentagon Press.

Reardon, Jack and PaulisLazda (1993), "The Development of the Market System in the Baltic Republics", *Journal of Economic Issues*, (27) 2: 537-545.

Reardon, Jack (1996), "An Assessment of the Transition to a market Economy in the Baltic Republics", *Journal of Economic Issues*, (30) 2: 629-638.

Reiter, Dan "Why NATO Enlargement Does Not Spread Democracy", *International Security*, (25) 4: 41-67.

Resolution 1373 (2001), UN 4385th Meeting, Adopted by the Security Council, on September 28, 2001.

Rippenburg, Carol J. (2006), "Afghanistan: Out of the Globalisation Mainstream"? *Third World Quarterly*, (27) 3: 507-524.

Rollins, John (2011), "Perspective, Global Presence and Implications for US policy", Congressional Research Survey.[Online: web] Accessed on 12 July 2013. URL: www.crs.us.gov.

*Rostoks, Dr. Tom (2012), "Baltic States and NATO", *The Lithuanian Tribune*, Riga, 01/10/2012.

*Rozoff, Rick. (2010), "Baltic States: Pentagon's Training Grounds for Afghan and Future Wars", [Online: web] Accessed 11 July 2013. URL:<http://www.globalresearch.ca/baltic-states-pentagon-s-training-grounds-for-afghan-and-future-wars/21269>.

Rubinovitz, Ziv (2009), *Geopolitics and American Policy on Use of Force: Somalia, Rwanda and Afghanistan Compared*, University of Haifa, [Online: web] Accessed 12 July 2013. URL: http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1643871

Rucker, Martin (2004), "European Integration, Unplugged", *Foreign Policy*, (144) sep-oct : 60-65.

- Rywkin, Michael (2003), "Russia and the Near Abroad Under Putin, American Foreign Policy Interests", *The Journal of the National Committee on American Foreign Policy*, (25)1: 3-12.
- Senn, Alfred Erich (1958), "The Sovietization of the Baltic States", *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, (317): 123-129.
- Sharp, Trueman, W. Frederick, M. Burkle Jr., Andrew F. Vaughn, Rashid Chotani, and Richard J. Brennan (2002), "Challenges and Opportunities for Humanitarian Relief in Afghanistan". *Oxford Journals*, (34) Issue Supplement 5Pp: S215-S228.
- Shetty, Shatabhisha et al. (2012), "The Baltic States, NATO and Non-Strategic Nuclear Weapons in Europe" *Royal United Services Institute for Defence and Security Studies*, place: Ian Kearns and Simon Lunn.
- Shroder, John (2007), "Afghanistan's Development and Functionality: Renewing a Collapsed State", *Geo Journal*, (70) 2/3: 91-107.
- Smith, Keith (2004), "Russian Energy Politics in the Baltics, Poland, and Ukraine: A New Stealth Imperialism"? Washington, DC: The Centre for Strategic and International Studies Press.
- Spencer, Alexander (2006), "Counter-Terrorism in New Europe. What Have the New EU members done to Combat Terrorism After September 11th?" *International Public Policy Review*, (2) 2: 92-112.
- Staines, Deborah (2007), "Interrogating 'War on Terror' Paradigm", in Deborah Staines (eds.) *Interrogating the War on Terror: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Steen, Anton (2000), Ethnic relations, Elites and Democracy in the Baltic States, *Journal of Communist Studies and Transition Politics*, (16)4: 68-87.
- Suri, Jeremi (2009), "American Grand Strategy from the Cold War's End to 9/11: Debating American Grand Strategy after Major War", *Orbis*, 53(4): 611-627.
- Sutter, Robert G. (2005), "China's Rise in Asia—Promises, Prospects and Implications for the United States", Occasional Paper Series, *Asia-Pacific Centre for Security Studies*, HI: Honolulu.
- Tannenwald, Nina and William C. Wohlforth (2005), "Introduction: the Role of Ideas and the End of the Cold War", *Journal of Cold War Studies*, 7 (2): 3-12.

- Tapio, Petri, ViljaVarho and Hanna Heino (2013), "Renewable Energy in the Baltic Sea Region 2025", *Journal of East-West Business*, (19)1-2: 47-62.
- The Council of the European Union (2004), *Council Conclusions on Prevention, Preparedness, Response to Terrorism Attacks*, 14814/04, REV 1, Brussels.
- *The Lithuania Tribune (2012), "Lithuania Will Continue to Support Development Projects in Afghanistan and Will Seek to Strengthen Bilateral Cooperation, Foreign Minister Says", [Online: web] Accessed 7 July 2013. URL:<http://www.lithuaniatribune.com/15960/lithuania-will-continue-to-support-development-projects-in-afghanistan-and-will-seek-to-strengthen-bilateral-cooperation-foreign-minister-says-201215960/>.
- *The Lithuania Tribune (2010), "President: By being in Afghanistan you protect the interests of Lithuania", [Online: web] Accessed 11 July 2013. URL:<http://www.lithuaniatribune.com/2214/president-by-being-in-afghanistan-you-protect-the-interests-of-lithuania-20102214/>.
- Trapans, Jan Arveds (1998), "The Baltic States: Defence and Geopolitics", *European Security*, (7)3: 92-100.
- Tristam, Pierre (2001), "President Bush Declares War on Terror", Speech to a Joint Session of Congress, September 20, 2001, *Middle East Issues, About.com*, [Online: web] Accessed on 12 July 2013. URL: <http://middleeast.about.com/od/usmideastpolicy/a/bush-war-on-terror-speech.htm>.
- *UNDP (2013), United Nations Development Programme, *The Development Advocate, Afghanistan Edition*, [Online: web] Accessed 7 July 2013. URL:<http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/corporate/the-development-advocate--afghanistan-edition/>.
- *UN Resolution 1373: (2001), "United Nations Security Council Resolution 1373(2001), Press Release SC/158", [Online: web] Accessed 3 July 2013. URL: <http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2001/sc7158.doc.htm>.
- *UNSC (2001), "United Nation Security Council, "Resolution 1363", [Online: web] Accessed 4 July 2013. URL:http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/1363%282001%29.
- *United States Central Command, "Latvia support to the war on terror", [Online: web] Accessed 5 July 2013. URL: <http://www.centcom.mil/latvia/>.

- *U.S. Department of State, "The Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism", [Online: web] Accessed 2 July 2013. URL: <http://www.state.gov/t/isn/c18406.htm#>.
- U.S. Department of State(2013), "Winning the War on Terror", U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Public Affairs.
- Veit, Raphael (2002), "Afghanistan: War on Terror/ War in Error"? *Australian Quarterly*, (74) 4: 7-11.
- Vanags, Alf (2011), "Economic Integration and Cohesion in the Baltic Sea Region: A Critical Perspective From the Baltic States", *Journal of Baltic Studies*, (42)1:91-102.
- *Vardys, V. Stanley (1966), "*How the Baltic Republics Fare in the Soviet Union*", Accessed on 25 June. 2013, <http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/23796/v-stanley-wardys/how-the-baltic-republics-fare-in-the-soviet-union>
- Verma, Priya, Carol Anne Douglas, Rachel Pleatman, Annsley Chapman, Angelita Manzano and Karla Mantilla (2005), "Afghanistan: Women's Lives Still in Danger", *Off Our Backs*, (35) 5/6: 5-6.
- Wallin, Lars and Bengt Andersson (2001), "A defence model for the Baltic States" *European Security*, (10)1: 94-106.
- Winnerstig, Mike et al. (2012), *The Security and Defensibility of the Baltic States: A Comprehensive Analysis of a Security Complex in the Making*. FOI, Swedish Defence Research Agency: Bo Ljung, Tomas Malmlöf, and Karlis Neretnieks.