

**KATHOLIEKE UNIVERSITEIT LEUVEN**  
**FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES**  
**DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE**  
**MASTER IN EUROPEAN POLITICS & POLICIES**

**NATO**  
Past, Present... Future?

Master Student:  
Michail Hamntan

**Paper presented in the 4<sup>th</sup> Euro-Atlantic Conference titled '21<sup>st</sup> Century: Challenges facing Europe and North America' on the 18<sup>th</sup> of March 2005 at the Egmont Palace in Brussels.**

**ACADEMIC YEAR: 2004-2005**

# CONTENTS

1.1 Introduction.....	3
1.2 THE ORIGINS OF THE ALLIANCE.....	3
2. Part I.....	8
2.1 NATO TODAY - FROM ROME TO ISTANBUL.....	8
2.1.1 THE ROME SUMMIT - NOVEMBER 1991.....	8
2.1.2 THE BRUSSELS SUMMIT - JANUARY 1994.....	10
2.1.3 THE MADRID SUMMIT - JULY 1997.....	11
2.1.4 THE WASHINGTON SUMMIT - APRIL 1999.....	12
2.1.5 THE PRAGUE SUMMIT – NOVEMBER 2002.....	14
2.1.5 THE ISTANBUL SUMMIT - JUNE 2004.....	15
2. Part II.....	17
2.1 NATO’s FUTURE: From ISTANBUL and beyond. ....	17
2.1.1 THE ‘BENEVOLENT’ SCENARIO.....	17
2.1.2 THE ‘BUSINESS AS USUAL’ SCENARIO.....	19
2.1.2 THE ‘DIVORCE’ SCENARIO.....	21
2.2 PRECONDITIONS.....	21
3. Conclusion.....	23
4. Bibliography.....	27

# NATO

## Past, Present... Future?

### ▪ Introduction

This paper, as the title suggests, will be occupied with the study of NATO. It will talk about the creation of NATO, its purpose and its history until now emphasizing on the major historical events in NATO's life.

Later on, it will be discussed how NATO developed in the last 50 years since its creation and especially how is adapting to the changes of the last 15 years after the collapse of the U.S.S.R. and the Warsaw Pact. It will try to answer the questions that will raise during the course of this paper concerning why these changes occurred and what are the new priorities and strategic goals that now the Alliance is setting up.

Under this changes it will highlight NATO's Defense and Security role in Europe and in the world in general. Having examined the above mentioned it will try to suggest different possible scenarios concerning NATO's future and finally, try to see whether there is a future for the Alliance and what future this might be.

### • THE ORIGINS OF THE ALLIANCE

From 1945 to 1949, Western European countries and their North American allies viewed with concern the expansionist policies and methods of the USSR.<sup>1</sup> In 1949 only small contingents of U.S. conventional forces were in Europe.<sup>2</sup> Having fulfilled their own wartime undertakings to reduce their defence establishments and to demobilise forces, Western governments became increasingly alarmed as it became clear that the Soviet leadership intended to maintain its own military forces at full strength. Moreover, in view of the declared ideological aims of the Soviet Communist Party, it was evident that appeals for respect for the United Nations Charter, and for respect for the international settlements reached at the end of the war, would not guarantee the national sovereignty or independence of democratic states faced with the threat of outside aggression or internal subversion. The imposition of undemocratic forms of government and the repression of effective opposition and of basic human and civic rights and freedoms in many Central and Eastern European countries as well as elsewhere in the world, added to these fears.

Between 1947 and 1949 a series of dramatic political events brought matters to a head. These included direct threats to the sovereignty of Norway, Greece, Turkey and other Western European countries, the June 1948 coup in Czechoslovakia, and the illegal blockade of Berlin which began in April of the same year. The signature of the *Brussels Treaty* of March 1948 marked the determination of five Western European countries -

---

<sup>1</sup> NATO "*The Origins of the Alliance*"

<http://www.nato.int/docu/handbook/2001/hb0101.htm>

<sup>2</sup> Paul E. Gallis, July 1997, "*NATO: Article V and Collective Defense*"

<http://www.fas.org/man/crs/pointv.htm>

Belgium, France, Luxembourg, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom - to develop a common defence system and to strengthen the ties between them in a manner which would enable them to resist ideological, political and military threats to their security.<sup>3</sup> The aim of the Treaty was to promote collective defence and improve cooperation in the economic, social and cultural fields.<sup>4</sup>

Negotiations with the United States and Canada then followed on the creation of a single North Atlantic Alliance based on security guarantees and mutual commitments between Europe and North America. Denmark, Iceland, Italy, Norway and Portugal were invited by the Brussels Treaty powers to become participants in this process. These negotiations culminated in the signature of the *Treaty of Washington* in April 1949, bringing into being a common security system based on a partnership among these 12 countries.

The North Atlantic Alliance was founded on the basis of a Treaty between member states entered into freely by each of them after public debate and due parliamentary process. The Treaty upholds their individual rights as well as their international obligations in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations. It commits each member country to sharing the risks and responsibilities as well as the benefits of collective security and requires of each of them the undertaking not to enter into any other international commitment, which might conflict with the Treaty.<sup>5</sup>

In 1948, following the strong advice of secretary of State and former General George C. Marshall, Congress approved a sweeping foreign aid program for Europe that would later be known as "the Marshall Plan."<sup>6</sup> Between 1947 and 1952, the Marshall Plan provided the means of stabilising Western European economies. NATO's role as a political and military alliance was to provide for collective defence against any form of aggression and to maintain a secure environment for the development of democracy and economic growth. In the words of the then US President Harry S Truman, the Marshall Plan and NATO were "two halves of the same walnut".<sup>7</sup>

The founding members of NATO - Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, the United Kingdom and the United States - committed themselves to come to each other's defence in the event of military aggression against any one of them. Accordingly, NATO member states increased their efforts to develop the military structures needed to implement their commitment to joint defence. Nevertheless, NATO remained a politically led organisation catering for the interests of all its members.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> NATO "*The Origins of the Alliance*"

<http://www.nato.int/docu/handbook/2001/hb0101.htm>

<sup>4</sup> Neil Nugent, 2003 fifth edition, "*The Government and Politics of the European Union*", p.518

<sup>5</sup> NATO "*The Origins of the Alliance*"

<http://www.nato.int/docu/handbook/2001/hb0101.htm>

<sup>6</sup> "*Rebuild Europe After World War II*"

<http://www.brook.edu/dybdocroot/gs/cps/50ge/endeavors/europe.htm>

<sup>7</sup> NATO "*The Origins of the Alliance*"

<http://www.nato.int/docu/handbook/2001/hb0101.htm>

<sup>8</sup> NATO, "*Understanding NATO*"

In accordance with Article 10 of the Treaty, the Alliance remained open to accessions by other European states in a position to further its principles and to contribute to the security of the North Atlantic area. In 1952, Greece and Turkey joined the original twelve member countries of the Alliance, followed in 1955 by the Federal Republic of Germany and in 1982 by Spain. In July 1997, at a Summit Meeting in Madrid, the Heads of State and Government of the Alliance invited three more countries to begin accession talks, and on 12 March 1999 the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland formally became members of NATO. The Alliance then linked 17 European countries with the United States and Canada.<sup>9</sup>

By binding North America to the defence of Western Europe, the Alliance would demonstrate that any attempt at political and military coercion against Western Europe would fail. Simultaneously, it would provide a framework for preventing the resurgence of militant nationalism in Europe.

Through the Alliance, Western Europe and North America not only jointly defended their independence but also achieved an unprecedented level of stability. Indeed, the security provided by NATO has been described as the “oxygen of prosperity” which laid the basis for European economic cooperation and integration. It also paved the way for the end of the Cold War and of the division of Europe at the beginning of the 1990s.<sup>10</sup>

In parallel with the internal and external transformation of the Alliance, which has taken place since the end of the Cold War, NATO has established the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council or “EAPC” as a forum for consultation and cooperation with Partner countries throughout the Euro-Atlantic area. It has developed an intensive programme of practical cooperation and regular consultation with 27 countries participating in the Partnership for Peace initiative launched in 1994. It has created new structures reflecting intensified cooperation with Russia and partnership with Ukraine as well as an enhanced dialogue with interested Mediterranean countries. It has undergone far-reaching internal and external reform and has made itself the instrument of peace and stability in the Euro-Atlantic area at the start of the new millennium.

During 1999, NATO celebrated its 50th anniversary year. A further Summit Meeting was held in Washington in April 1999, during the height of the conflict in Kosovo, when NATO countries conducted an air campaign to end the ethnic cleansing and repression of human rights perpetrated by the government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. The conflict ended in late June 1999, following the withdrawal of the Serb forces and the deployment of the NATO-led Kosovo Force (KFOR) tasked by the UN Security Council with the implementation of the Military Technical Agreement concluded on 9 June.<sup>11</sup>

---

<http://www.nato.int/docu/presskit/010219/004gb.pdf>

<sup>9</sup> NATO, 2001 “*NATO Handbook*”, p.3

<sup>10</sup> NATO “*Understanding NATO*”

<http://www.nato.int/docu/presskit/010219/004gb.pdf>

<sup>11</sup> NATO, 2001 “*NATO Handbook*”, p.3-4

On 21 November 2002 the NATO Heads of state and government Summit Meeting in Prague was held. It was designed to enlarge, transform and strengthen the Alliance. Alliance leaders made commitments to transform NATO, to take in new members, to develop the capabilities needed to meet new challenges and to further develop their relationship with partner countries. In the broader context, Allied governments emphasised their commitments to maintaining the transatlantic link, to fulfilling the Alliance's fundamental security tasks, including collective defence, to shared democratic values and to the United Nations Charter.

Seven countries – Bulgaria, Estonia Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia – were invited to begin accession talks. Highlighting the historic nature of the occasion, allied leader stated that the accession of these new members could strengthen security for all in the Euro-Atlantic area and help achieve the common goal of a Europe whole and free, united in peace and by common values. They reaffirmed that NATO's door would remain open to European democracies willing and able to assume the responsibilities and obligations of memberships, in accordance with Article 10 of the Washington Treaty.

In the light of the 11 September 2001 terrorist attacks on the United States, the Alliance leaders approved a comprehensive package of measures to strengthen their ability to meet security challenges facing their military forces, populations and territory. They underlined that none of the decisions taken to transform and adapt NATO should be perceived as a threat to any country or organisation, but rather as a sign of the Alliance's determination to defend and protect their member countries from attacks. Rapidly deployable, sustainable and effective forces are needed for this purpose.<sup>12</sup>

The Prague Summit was followed by the Istanbul Summit that took place on 28 and 29 of June 2004. Heads of State and Government of NATO's 26 member states gathered for the first time after the Alliance's fifth and largest round of enlargement. Allied leaders reinforced the vital transatlantic link and build bridges of cooperation to other regions. They decided to expand the scope and nature of Allied operations; took measures to continue improving Alliance capabilities; and endorsed initiatives to enhance relations with existing partners and forge relations with new ones.

The Istanbul package took forward the transformation process that was set in motion at the Alliance's 2002 Prague Summit. It also reinforces the importance of security cooperation between Europe and North America and the Allies' commitment to maintain NATO – the embodiment of the transatlantic link – as their central institution for collective defence, security consultation as well as crisis management and multinational military actions.<sup>13</sup>

Between the creation of the Alliance and the present day, half a century of history has taken place. For much of this time the central focus of NATO was providing for the

---

<sup>12</sup> NATO, 2003 *"The Prague Summit and NATO's Transformation, a Reader's Guide"*, p.10

<sup>13</sup> NATO, 2004 *"Nato after Istanbul, Expanding Operations, Improving Capabilities, Enhancing Cooperation"*, p.1

immediate defence and security of its member countries. Today this remains its core task, but its immediate focus has undergone fundamental change.<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup> NATO, "*The Origins of the Alliance*"  
<http://www.nato.int/docu/handbook/2001/hb0101.htm>

- **Part I**
- **NATO TODAY - FROM ROME TO ISTANBUL**

From time to time, at determining moments in NATO's history, the Alliance meets at summit level with the participation of Heads of State and Government. The presence of Prime Ministers and Presidents, and their direct participation in the process of taking decisions by consensus, raises the public profile of such meetings and bestows on them increased historical significance.

By 1991, the major transformation of the international security environment marking the end of the 1980's was dictating the shape of the new NATO, which was to emerge over the next few years.<sup>15</sup> At their meeting in London in July 1990, NATO's Heads of State and Government agreed on the need to transform the Atlantic Alliance to reflect the new, more promising, era in Europe.<sup>16</sup> The first of a series of six Summit Meetings, which were to plot the course of the Alliance's adaptation during the coming decade, took place in Rome in November 1991. It was to be followed by a further Summit Meeting in Brussels in January 1994 and four further decisive meetings in Madrid in July 1997, in Washington in April 1999, in Prague in November 2002 and in Istanbul in June 2004.

Frequent meetings of Foreign Ministers and Defence Ministers maintained the momentum of change instigated by these meetings in the intervening periods. The Foreign Ministers' meeting in Sintra, Portugal, in May 1997, in particular, heralded moves to extend security cooperation further afield and to provide appropriate structures for managing the process.<sup>17</sup>

## **THE ROME SUMMIT - NOVEMBER 1991**

The Declaration on Peace and Cooperation, which was signed in the Summit, underlined NATO's intention to redefine its objectives in light of changed circumstances. It outlined its future tasks in the context of a framework of interlocking and mutually reinforcing institutions, including the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE)\_now the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), the Western European Union (WEU), the European Community (now the European Union), and the Council of Europe, working together to build a new European security system.<sup>18</sup>

The Strategic Concept adopted by NATO Heads of State and Government in Rome outlined a broad approach to security based on dialogue, cooperation and the

---

<sup>15</sup> NATO, 2001 "NATO Handbook", p.17

<sup>16</sup> NATO, July 2000 "*The Alliance's Strategic Concept agreed by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council*"  
<http://www.nato.int/docu/basicxt/b911108a.htm>

<sup>17</sup> NATO, 2001 "NATO Handbook", p.17

<sup>18</sup> U.S. Department of State, November 1995 "*Fact Sheet The North Atlantic Treaty Organization*"  
[http://www.fas.org/man/nato/offdocs/us\\_95/dos951122.htm](http://www.fas.org/man/nato/offdocs/us_95/dos951122.htm)



maintenance of a collective defence capability. It brought together political and military elements of NATO's security policy into a coherent whole, establishing cooperation with new partners in Central and Eastern Europe as an integral part of the Alliance's strategy.<sup>19</sup> It was further decided to cut NATO military weapons and to reduce the number of NATO forces deployed in Central Europe from 2.8 million in 1991 to 2.1 million in 1994. This meant decreased military expenditure that could be justified as being in line with strategic security requirements.<sup>20</sup> Measures were also taken to streamline NATO's military command structure and to adapt the Alliance's defence planning arrangements and procedures, particularly in the light of future requirements for crisis management and peacekeeping.

Also, the Declaration on Peace and Cooperation, defined the future tasks and policies of NATO in relation to the overall institutional framework for Europe's future security and in relation to the evolving partnership and cooperation with the countries of Central and Eastern Europe. It underlined the Alliance's support for the steps being taken in the countries of Central and Eastern Europe towards reform; offered practical assistance to help them to succeed in this difficult transition; invited them to participate in appropriate Alliance forums; and extended to them the Alliance's experience and expertise in political, military, economic and scientific spheres.<sup>21</sup> To this end, created the North Atlantic Cooperation Council (NACC) to develop an institutional relationship of consultation and cooperation on political and security issues between NATO and its former adversaries.<sup>22</sup>

Following the publication of the Rome Declaration, additional measures were taken at Ministerial Meetings of Foreign and Defence Ministers and by the North Atlantic Council in Permanent Session to further the process of adaptation and transformation of the Alliance. Three areas of activity merit particular mention, namely the institutional, political framework created to develop the relationship between NATO and its Cooperation Partners in Central and Eastern Europe; the development of cooperation in the defence and military spheres; and NATO's role in the field of crisis management and peacekeeping.<sup>23</sup>

With the publication of the Rome Declaration in November 1991, the basis was laid for placing this evolving relationship on a more institutionalised footing. The establishment of the North Atlantic Cooperation Council (NACC) in December 1991 brought together the member countries of NATO and, initially, nine Central and Eastern European countries, in a new consultative forum. In March 1992, participation in the NACC was expanded to include all members of the Commonwealth of Independent States and by June 1992, Georgia and Albania had also become members.<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup> NATO, 2001 "*NATO Handbook*", pp.17-18

<sup>20</sup> Brian Ardy, 2005, "*NATO Military Expenditure in the Post Cold War Era*"  
<http://www.hatareview.org/ardy.html>

<sup>21</sup> NATO, 2001 "*NATO Handbook*", pp.17-18

<sup>22</sup> U.S. Department of State, November 1995 "*Fact Sheet The North Atlantic Treaty Organization*"  
[http://www.fas.org/man/nato/offdocs/us\\_95/dos951122.htm](http://www.fas.org/man/nato/offdocs/us_95/dos951122.htm)

<sup>23</sup> NATO, 2001 "*NATO Handbook*", pp.17-18

<sup>24</sup> NATO "*The Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC)*"

## THE BRUSSELS SUMMIT - JANUARY 1994

In January 1994, at the Summit Meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Brussels, NATO launched a major new initiative to enhance stability and security throughout Europe -the Partnership for Peace. It would operate under the authority of the North Atlantic Council, and it would forge new security relationships between the North Atlantic Alliance and its Partners for Peace. The Partnership would expand and intensify political and military cooperation throughout Europe, increase stability, diminish threats to peace, and build strengthened relationships by promoting the spirit of practical cooperation and commitment to democratic principles that underpin the Alliance.<sup>25</sup> It expanded and intensifies practical political and military cooperation between NATO and the former Soviet bloc, as well as some of Europe's traditionally neutral countries, and allowed them to consult with NATO in the event of a direct threat to their security.<sup>26</sup>

At Sintra, in May 1997, the NACC was succeeded by the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC), whose purpose was to launch a new stage of cooperation. The principles of the EAPC were developed in close cooperation between the Alliance and its Partner countries and were expressed in the EAPC Basic Document.

The adoption of the EAPC Basic Document signalled the determination of the then 44 participating countries to raise political and military cooperation between them to a qualitatively new level. The document reaffirmed the joint commitment of the member countries to strengthening and extending peace and stability in the Euro-Atlantic area. The shared values and the principles underlying this commitment are set out in the Framework Document of the Partnership for Peace (PfP). The EAPC in fact provides the overall framework for political and security-related consultations and for enhanced cooperation under the Partnership for Peace.

In December 1997 the EAPC endorsed an Action Plan, which reflected the desire of EAPC members to develop a stronger, more operational partnership between them. One of the underlying aims of the Action Plan was to give political and security-related consultations and cooperation in the EAPC framework even greater focus and depth and to increase transparency among the 44 participating states. EAPC Foreign Ministers also endorsed the principle of establishing a Euro-Atlantic Disaster Response Coordination Centre and Euro-Atlantic Disaster Response Unit.<sup>27</sup>

---

<http://www.nato.int/docu/handbook/2001/hb020202.htm>

25 NATO, January 1994, "*Partnership for Peace: Invitation*"

<http://www.nato.int/docu/comm/49-95/c940110a.htm>

<sup>26</sup> U.S. Department of State, November 1995 "*Fact Sheet The North Atlantic Treaty Organization*"

[http://www.fas.org/man/nato/offdocs/us\\_95/dos951122.htm](http://www.fas.org/man/nato/offdocs/us_95/dos951122.htm)

<sup>27</sup> NATO, 2001 "*NATO Handbook*", pp.19-20

## THE MADRID SUMMIT - JULY 1997

The Summit Meeting held in Madrid in July 1997 was a landmark event which saw the accomplishment of major initiatives undertaken by the Alliance during the preceding five or six years. At the same time, it heralded the transition to a new and challenging phase in NATO's development, in which innovative structures and policies introduced to respond to new circumstances would be tried and tested in practice. The task of Alliance leaders at Madrid was therefore to pull together the central strands of future Alliance policy as a whole and to ensure their overall integrity and coherence.

At the Madrid Summit Meeting, the extent of the Alliance's commitment to internal and external transformation was fully demonstrated through further concrete and far-reaching measures in all the key areas of concern: the beginning of accession talks with the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland<sup>28</sup> - The three new member countries acceded to the Alliance in March 1999 - <sup>29</sup>and the endorsement of an "open door" policy on future accessions; of the Partnership for Peace and the establishment of a new forum in the shape of the EAPC to take cooperation forward; the opening of a brand new chapter in NATO-Russia relations; the formalisation of a growing partnership with Ukraine; the intensification of the dialogue with Mediterranean countries; progress with respect to the European Security and Defence Identity within NATO; and the definition of the Alliance's radically reformed military command structure. This full agenda bore witness to a NATO able to take on new challenges without prejudice to its traditional tasks and to base its future role on its proven ability to adapt to evolving security requirements.<sup>30</sup>

Spain announced its readiness to participate fully in the Alliance's emerging new command structure, once this had been agreed. In December 1997, an agreement was reached on a new command structure as a whole, and in particular on the type, number and location of military headquarters. In their end of year communiqués, NATO Foreign and Defence Ministers welcomed Spain's announcement that it would join the new military structure and take part in the new command structure which had just been agreed.<sup>31</sup>

The Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC), was set up in 1997 to succeed the North Atlantic Cooperation Council. It brings together the 19 Allies and 27 Partners in a forum providing for regular consultation and cooperation. It meets periodically at the level of Ambassadors and Foreign and Defence Ministers.<sup>32</sup> The EAPC provides a general

---

<sup>28</sup> NATO, 2001 "NATO Handbook", p.21

<sup>29</sup> NATO, "Enlargement and the Accession of New NATO members"  
<http://www.nato.int/docu/handbook/2001/hb1208.htm>

<sup>30</sup> NATO, 2001 "NATO Handbook", p.21

<sup>31</sup> *Consensus Politics and Joint Decision-Making*  
<http://www.nato.int/docu/handbook/2001/hb0702.htm>

<sup>32</sup> NATO, "The North Atlantic Cooperation Council"  
<http://www.nato.int/docu/handbook/2001/hb020201.htm>

opportunity for political negotiations on all aspects of NATO-Partner cooperation, for example Partnership for Peace (PFP) activities<sup>33</sup>

The Madrid Summit has given a new political impetus to the Mediterranean dialogue and created the Mediterranean Cooperation Group (MCG). This decision reflects the Alliance's view that security in Europe is closely linked with security and stability in the Mediterranean, and that the Mediterranean dimension is consequently one of the various components of the European security architecture. It marks a further step in the Alliance's policy - following from the 1994 Brussels Summit - of enhancing in a progressive way Alliance relations with non-NATO Mediterranean countries through political dialogue and cooperation.<sup>34</sup>

## **THE WASHINGTON SUMMIT - APRIL 1999**

From 23-25 April 1999, NATO held the 15th Summit in its 50 year history in Washington, DC. The Summit took place during an exceptional period in the Alliance's history in the midst of a commemoration of its 50th Anniversary, tempered by an unprecedented NATO air campaign aimed at bringing peace to Kosovo. Although much of the focus at the Summit was necessarily on the crisis in Kosovo, NATO leaders nonetheless put their imprimatur on a host of other programmes and accomplishments with long-term implications for the Alliance.

In Washington, the leaders of these three countries - Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland - took their place for the first time at the Summit table, and the Alliance unveiled an initiative designed to help other interested countries prepare for possible membership in the future. "*The three new members will not be the last*" Alliance leaders stated in the Washington Summit Communiqué.

At Madrid, NATO leaders had pledged to enhance the Partnership for Peace programme and the full range of Alliance partnership activities; in Washington, leaders noted the progress achieved in this regard and unveiled new initiatives designed to continue the work. At Madrid, Alliance leaders had requested a review of the Strategic Concept (in essence the roadmap of Alliance tasks and the means to achieve them); in Washington a new Strategic Concept was approved, reflecting the transformed Euro-Atlantic security landscape at the end of the 20th century.<sup>35</sup> The updated Strategic Concept provides overall guidance for the development of detailed policies and military plans. It describes the *Purpose and Tasks of the Alliance* and examines its *Strategic Perspectives* in the light of the evolving strategic environment and security challenges and risks. The Concept sets out the *Alliance's Approach to Security in the 21st Century*, reaffirming the importance of the transatlantic link and of maintaining the Alliance's military capabilities.<sup>36</sup> At

---

<sup>33</sup> NATO "*The Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council: A framework for political negotiations*" <http://www.nato.int/issues/eapc/index.html>

<sup>34</sup> NATO, "*The Mediterranean dialogue: Dispelling misconceptions and building confidence*" <http://www.nato.int/docu/review/1997/9704-6.htm>

<sup>35</sup> NATO, 2001 "*NATO Handbook*", p.21-25

<sup>36</sup> NATO, "The Role of Allied Military Forces and the Transformation of the Alliance's Defence Posture"

Madrid, NATO and Ukraine had signed a Charter on a Distinctive Partnership; in Washington NATO leaders and the Ukrainian President held their first Summit meeting and acknowledged the importance of Ukraine to Euro-Atlantic security and stability.

An important feature of the transforming posture of NATO is the development of the European Security and Defence Identity (ESDI) within the Alliance. At the Washington Summit, Alliance leaders welcomed the progress achieved so far and called for continuing work to make ESDI a reality. NATO also launched a Defence Capabilities Initiative, designed to help Alliance military forces become more mobile, interoperable, sustainable and effective. Similarly, the Alliance introduced changes in the integrated military command structure reflecting the transformed security environment. These changes are designed to enable NATO to carry out its operations more efficiently.<sup>37</sup>

The Washington Summit outlined another new Alliance initiative, on Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD). In spite of some progress in strengthening international non-proliferation regimes in recent years, the proliferation of nuclear, biological and chemical weapons and their means of delivery can pose a direct military threat to Allies populations, territory, and forces. The WMD Centre was created in response to these concerns and draws its mandate directly from the Alliance's 1999 Washington Summit and the WMD Initiative.<sup>38</sup>

Even as they welcomed three new members to their first Summit, NATO leaders emphasised that the door would remain open to others. A Membership Action Plan (MAP), the “*practical manifestation of the Open Door*,” was unveiled at the Summit. The MAP is a programme of activities from which interested countries may choose, on the basis of national decisions and selfselection. The programme covers five areas: political and economic issues, defence/military issues, resources, security and legal issues.

Although Russia declined to participate in the Washington Summit because of the events in Yugoslavia, NATO leaders reiterated their commitment to partnership with Russia under the NATO-Russia Founding Act. They also underscored the fact that close relations between NATO and Russia are of mutual interest and of great importance to stability and security in the Euro- Atlantic area.

NATO leaders also held their first-ever summit with the President of Ukraine. Both sides welcomed the progress in their Distinctive Partnership and discussed a variety of Euro-Atlantic security issues.

The Washington Summit Communiqué reiterated the importance of NATO's Mediterranean Dialogue as an integral part of the Alliance's cooperative approach to security. NATO leaders directed the Alliance to pursue early implementation of enhancements to the political and practical cooperation initiated under the Dialogue.

---

<http://www.nato.int/docu/handbook/2001/hb0204.htm>

<sup>37</sup> NATO, 2001 “*NATO Handbook*”, p.21-25

<sup>38</sup> NATO, “*Weapons of Mass Destruction Centre*”

<http://www.nato.int/docu/facts/2000/wmd.htm>

The achievements of the Washington Summit were both practical and conceptual, the fruit of several years of work. They also reflected the immediate priorities of NATO member countries, in particular the urgency of bringing to an end the conflict in Kosovo and restoring the rights of the people of Kosovo.

In the ensuing months, the influence of the Kosovo conflict was also to be seen in the implementation of a number of the initiatives introduced at the Washington Summit in April 1999 and subsequent decisions taken by the Alliance. In particular, it gave added impetus to the move to establish a stronger European Security and Defence Identity and to build up European capabilities commensurate with the task of intervening in crisis management and peacekeeping roles in the event of future conflict in which the Alliance as a whole might not be involved.<sup>39</sup>

## **THE PRAGUE SUMMIT – NOVEMBER 2002**

At the Prague Summit, NATO Heads of State and Governments took a number of crucial decisions affecting the Alliance's role in Euro-Atlantic security and its ability to adjust to new priorities and to adapt its capabilities in order to meet new challenges. They set an ambitious new agenda for the Alliance to ensure that it can continue to serve as the foundation of the Allies security and as one of the principal international agents of stability and democratic reform throughout a wider area. This new agenda will have important consequences for virtually every aspect of the Alliance including its tasks, its membership, its relationships with its partner countries and with other organizations, its decision-making practices and internal structures, and its ability to conduct modern military operations successfully across the full spectrum of the Alliance's missions.<sup>40</sup>

Specific decisions taken at the Prague include the following most important:

- The creation of an effective, technologically advanced NATO Response Force (NRF) designed to be flexible, rapidly deployable, interoperable and sustainable.
- The streamlining of NATO's military command arrangement, in order to make them more efficient and effectively adapted to the operational requirements of the full range of Alliance missions.
- Approval of the Prague Capabilities Commitment (PCC) involving firm, specific political commitments by individual Allies to improve capabilities.
- Endorsement of an agreed military concept for defence against terrorism, as part of a package of measures to strengthen NATO's anti-terrorism capabilities.
- Implementation of a Civil Emergency Planning (CEP) Action Plan for civil preparedness against possible attacks involving chemical, biological or radiological (CBR) agents.
- Implementation of specific initiatives to enhance the Alliance's defence capabilities against chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear (CBRN) attacks.
- Initiation of measures to strengthen defence against cyber attacks.

---

<sup>39</sup> NATO, 2001 "*NATO Handbook*", pp.21-25

<sup>40</sup> NATO, 2003 "*The Prague Summit and NATO's Transformation, a Reader's Guide*", p.3

- Launching of a new NATO Missile Defence feasibility study to examine options for protecting Alliance territory, forces and population centers against missile threats.
- Alliance leaders emphasized that the new members would enhance NATO's ability to face future challenges. They stipulated that accession talks would begin immediately, with a view to signing Accession Protocols by the end of March 2003 and with the aim of achieving ratification and membership by May 2004, at the latest.
- The decision was taken by Alliance leaders to upgrade cooperation with Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council/Partnership for Peace (EAPC/CfP) countries.<sup>41</sup>

Since the terrorist attacks of 11 September 2001, NATO's Mediterranean Dialogue has come under increased scrutiny both in the Mediterranean region and beyond. This has raised a number of questions about its future development, especially in connection with the much broader issue of the Alliance's role in the post-9/11 security environment.

At the Prague Summit, Alliance leaders agreed a package of measures to upgrade the Mediterranean Dialogue. This package has the potential fundamentally to change the nature of this important relationship between NATO members and Partners in the wider Mediterranean region to the benefit of both sides<sup>42</sup>

## **THE ISTANBUL SUMMIT - JUNE 2004**

The Istanbul Summit following the Prague Summit was focused with three main issues. Expanding Operations of the Alliance, Improving Capabilities and Enhancing Cooperation. The decisions in relation to these issues are as follows.

- Aiding Afghanistan: Allied leaders agreed to continue to expand NATO's presence in the country through the establishment of additional Provincial Reconstruction Teams (PRTs).
- Increasing involvement in Iraq: NATO leaders agreed to assist the new Iraqi Interim Government with the training of its security forces and asked the North Atlantic Council to develop ways to implement this decision.
- Evolving engagement in the former Yugoslavia: The Alliance is bringing its mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina to a conclusion at the end of 2004. The Alliance will maintain a military headquarters in the country to assist in the areas such defence reform, counter-terrorism activities and the pursuit of war crime suspects. In Kosovo, NATO will also retain a robust military presence in the form of Kosovo Force (KFOR)
- Making capabilities more operational: NATO leaders endorsed measures aimed at improving the Alliance's ability to take on operations whenever and wherever necessary.

---

<sup>41</sup> NATO, 2003 *"The Prague Summit and NATO's Transformation, a Reader's Guide"*, pp.10-14

<sup>42</sup> NATO *"Enhancing NATO's Mediterranean Dialogue"*

<http://www.nato.int/docu/review/2003/issue1/english/art4.html>

- Combating terrorism: NATO leaders increased the Alliance's anti-terrorism efforts with an agreement to improve intelligence sharing and develop new, high-tech defences against terrorist attacks.
- Deepening Partner relations: In order to deepen relations with Partners, Allied leaders agreed to provide increased opportunities for them to contribute to NATO-led operations.
- Extending relations with Southeastern Europe: The Istanbul Summit was the first attended by leaders of the seven new Alliance members. Allied leaders made clear that NATO's door remains open to new members.
- Developing the Mediterranean Dialogue: NATO leaders invited the seven countries participating in the Alliance's Mediterranean Dialogue to establish a more ambitious and expanded partnership.
- Launching the Istanbul Cooperation Initiative: This initiative that reaches to the broader region of the Middle East seeks to promote practical cooperation with interested countries, starting with the countries of the Gulf Cooperation Council.<sup>43</sup>

---

<sup>43</sup> NATO, 2004 "*Nato after Istanbul, Expanding Operations, Improving Capabilities, Enhancing Cooperation*", pp.2-6



- **Part II**

- **NATO's FUTURE: From ISTANBUL and beyond.**

Having gone through an overlook of NATO's past from its creation since our present-day naturally the question emerges 'What about the future?'. Will the Transatlantic security relationship that NATO preserved and fostered change? And if this is the case how? Is and should the character of the NATO from a defence alliance change? If the answer is yes, change into what? What global role can and should NATO play? Should and will counter-terrorism be the new function for the Alliance and should and will Middle East be the new central frond? Can NATO continue growing and remain at the same time an effective military and political alliance? What role Europe and the E.U. will play in NATO's future?.

Thinking about the future of NATO the next decade three most probable scenarios come up – the 'benevolent' scenario, the 'business as usual' scenario and the 'divorce' scenario. I will begin with the 'benevolent' scenario, which is based on Michael Rühle's "*Imagining NATO 2011*" essay presented in Autumn's 2001 NATO review.

- **THE 'BENEVOLENT' SCENARIO**

Perhaps the most obvious characteristic of "a future NATO" is that it will be larger. After several waves of enlargement, the Alliance will have grown to much more than 26 members. It will therefore still have more members than an enlarging European Union. Even so, the overlap in memberships will remain close enough to enable both organizations to continue their institutional rapprochement. Fears that NATO's decision-making process will be unduly compromised by the growth of Alliance membership will have been put to rest. The unique political and military role of the United States in Euro-Atlantic security will remain and will continue to help ensure a pre-disposition among Allies to seek common solutions.

The European Union's ambition to develop a European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP) will have manifested itself in an even stronger European military role in the Balkans, as well as in more coherent foreign-policy initiatives regarding the Caucasus, the Middle East and Northern Africa. Mainly as a result of streamlining procurement practices and pooling European military assets, E.U. countries will have made some progress towards improving their defence capabilities. However, continuing shortfalls in capabilities critical for high-intensity conflict will remain, making it necessary to maintain close links between the European Union and NATO.

The E.U.-NATO relationship will have significantly broadened beyond ESDP to include regular consultations on southeastern Europe, the Mediterranean, Russia, terrorism and particularly crisis prevention. Regular back-to-back E.U.-NATO ministerial meetings will be held, underlining the will of Europe and North America to maintain coherence in institutions and policies.

The scale of the Alliance's military presence will have been greatly reduced in the Balkans, as a result of political and economic progress in the region. Bosnia and Herzegovina and Yugoslavia will have long ago joined the Partnership for Peace and will both be formal aspirants for NATO membership.

With proliferation risks having ever-deepening significance, NATO Allies will have established a coordinated policy on preventing the spread of weapons of mass destruction through diplomatic and economic means. The United States will have deployed a rudimentary defence against strategic missiles. Several European Allies will have fielded tactical missile defences within their armed forces. This new relationship between deterrence and defence will also be reflected in NATO's military strategy, which will feature counterproliferation elements and an increased emphasis on active defence and counterterrorism.

The Euro- Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC) will have developed formal links to the Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe and will have become a steering organ for pan-European disaster relief. Exchanges on terrorism will have intensified. It will also have acquired a role as a facilitator of regional cooperation in the Caucasus, Central Asia and the Middle East where it will serve as a framework for addressing issues such as border control and energy security.

The Partnership for Peace will have developed further as the hub of pan-European military cooperation and, together with the EAPC, serve as a means to keep Partners, particularly the remaining non-NATO EU members, closely associated with NATO. The Partnership will cover the full range of military cooperation between NATO and Partner nations, including defence planning and defence reform. It will feature a stronger focus on regional cooperation and on crisis prevention, for example, through targeted security cooperation programmes, confidence-building measures, preventive deployments and consultation mechanisms.

While repeated Russian overtures to join the Alliance will not yet have borne fruit, the NATO-Russia relationship will have significantly improved and will resemble a quasiassociate status. In the context of the Baltic states' accession to NATO. The dialogue will have expanded to cover the full range of issues specified in the 1997 NATO-Russia Founding Act, such as nonproliferation, defence reform and civil-emergency planning. The relationship will also include serious military cooperation beyond the Balkans, *inter alia* in the framework of an experimental joint NATO-Russian peacekeeping brigade. It will also include armaments cooperation, for example, on tactical missile defence.

NATO's relations with the United Nations will have been consolidated both formally and conceptually. Formally, a permanent liaison office at UN Headquarters will underline NATO's role as an institution central to European crisis management. Conceptually, NATO's experience in the Balkans will form an important part of the United Nations' reform of its own approach to peacekeeping.

The rising strategic importance of the southern Mediterranean region will have elevated the Mediterranean Dialogue out of its role as the stepchild of NATO's outreach activities. It will have evolved along similar lines to the Partnership for Peace, with serious military cooperation, notably in the field of crisis management, and a strong focus on non-proliferation, counter-terrorism etc.

Reflecting the growing importance of the Asia-Pacific region, the bi-annual Japan-NATO conferences will have been superseded by a broader Asia-NATO Dialogue, modelled after the Mediterranean Dialogue.<sup>44</sup>

- **THE 'BUSINESS AS USUAL' SCENARIO**

This above as it has already been mentioned is the – the 'benevolent' scenario – it will continue with the 'business as usual' scenario.

In this scenario as in the previous one the most obvious characteristic of "a future NATO" is that it will be larger but more or less the same size as the European Union. NATO's growth with not an equivalent deep institutional reform will make it even harder as it enlarges to take decisions based on unanimity. So with the E.U. rapidly changing after the ratification of the European Constitution and NATO still having remained stuck to its old structure they will witness a slow but steady institutional distancing from each other. The political and military role of the United States in Euro-Atlantic security will be reducing as its interests are moving away from Europe and consensus is becoming more and more difficult to achieve.

The European Union will continue to build and strengthen its European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP), which will have manifested itself in an even stronger European military role in the Balkans, as well as in more coherent foreign-policy initiatives regarding the Caucasus, the Middle East and Northern Africa. As a result E.U. countries will have made progress towards improving their defence capabilities and will begin to depend more on their own abilities for their defence and less on NATO.

The E.U.-NATO relationship will face more and more difficulties, as Europe will want to create clear and distinct policies that do not correspond with the priorities set by NATO. A European force as a result of the implementation of the Petersburg tasks and the strengthening of a common European defence identity will replace NATO troops in the Balkans. The scale of the Alliance's military presence will have been greatly reduced, as a result of political and economic progress in the region. Bosnia and Herzegovina and the ex-Yugoslavian countries will have long ago joined the Partnership for Peace and will both be formal aspirants for NATO membership.

Proliferation risks will have a great significance; NATO Allies will have established a coordinated policy on preventing the spread of weapons of mass destruction through

---

<sup>44</sup> NATO review- NATO's evolving partnerships, Autumn 2001, "Imagining NATO 2011: Michael Rühle imagines how the Alliance and the Euro-Atlantic security environment might look in ten years.", pp.18-21 <http://www.nato.int/docu/rev-pdf/eng/0103-en.pdf>

diplomatic and economic means. The United States most probably will have deployed a rudimentary defence against strategic missiles against the objections of the Europeans resulting in a stronger orientation towards a common European Security and Defence Policy from the part of the Europeans. The different views between Europe and the U.S.A as how to address problems as proliferation and terrorism will hinder any substantial decision making on these matters in NATO.

The 'business as usual scenario' continues in the same path more or less as did the previous 'benevolent scenario' in relation to the remaining aspects not mentioned. The cornerstone of this scenario is the difficulties of cooperation inside NATO because of a) structural reasons and b) political reasons resulting in an ever-growing diminishing importance of NATO as a military and political organisation. Too great an effort at refocusing the Alliance in a new and divisive direction (terrorism) will be a cause for more disappointments and further disillusionment on both sides of the Atlantic. Doubtless, leaders in this scenario will continue signing up to some grand statement that means different things to each of them.<sup>45</sup>

The structural reasons are the overgrown of NATO incorporating more than 26 members that have to function and take decisions based on unanimity. Also by having grown to such a great number NATO will have incorporated a vast range of countries of different size and scale and of quite different military capabilities making their forces impossible to satisfactory co-operate on the ground. I quick example would be to imagine the military capabilities of some newly NATO members in relation to those of the founding fathers lets say the U.K.<sup>46</sup>. Last but not least are the vast differences in budgetary spending and inadequate military reform between the United States and the European counterparts.<sup>47</sup> The gap is so big that in some years the military capabilities will grow so apart that will be impossible to virtually cooperate in common missions.

The political reason are that the political leaders on the two sides of the Atlantic are finding it increasingly difficult to find common ground in their views of the world.<sup>48</sup> NATO by deciding to make the war on terrorism one of its issues, in the Istanbul Summit, will further deepen the transatlantic divide on both strategy and tactics. Its members are not prepared to sign a blank cheque to underwrite a US view of how to tackle terrorism.<sup>49</sup> Especially since the Prague Summit NATO has begun to move away from its original focus on Europe. However, some in Europe oppose what they see as an effort to 'globalise' NATO. They argue that NATO should remain focused on the threats in the European area and its periphery.<sup>50</sup> Also the trend, already evident, towards US unilateralism and increasing disengagement from the organisation deepens the gap in finding common ground and taking common decisions.<sup>51</sup>

---

<sup>45</sup> NATO, 2004 "*For and Against, Debating Euro-Atlantic Security Options*", p.55

<sup>46</sup> NATO, 2004 "*For and Against, Debating Euro-Atlantic Security Options*", p.58

<sup>47</sup> NATO, 2004 "*For and Against, Debating Euro-Atlantic Security Options*", p.62

<sup>48</sup> NATO, 2004 "*For and Against, Debating Euro-Atlantic Security Options*", p.63

<sup>49</sup> NATO, 2004 "*For and Against, Debating Euro-Atlantic Security Options*", p.53

<sup>50</sup> NATO, 2004 "*For and Against, Debating Euro-Atlantic Security Options*", p.28

<sup>51</sup> NATO, 2004 "*For and Against, Debating Euro-Atlantic Security Options*", pp.29-30

- **THE ‘DIVORCE’ SCENARIO**

Ending, there is also the third and final ‘divorce scenario’. It could be argued that this scenario is a natural evolution of the previous ‘business as usual scenario’. The main aspects of this scenario focus on the following issues. Firstly the Euro-Atlantic perception of the world has grown rapidly differently and in such a way that no really cooperation can be achieved inside NATO. Europe relying more on diplomacy, negotiations and so called ‘soft power’ to resolve world problems in contrast to the United States that relies on military solutions ‘hard power’.

The objectives and priorities of Europe and the United States have grown so differently that no longer coincides. Europe is interested about it’s Continent and it’s near abroad in contrast to the United States that have a more global perception. The United States are more focused in its war against terrorism and the dealing of rogue states in contrast to Europe which is more concerned to the economic, political and cultural roots of terrorism; on spending on development assistance to the world’s poorest countries; on signing and respecting international treaties and organisations; and its desire to trade with rather than isolate and threaten rogue states.<sup>52</sup>

Having all the above in mind NATO in this scenario has become an organisation which no decision can any longer be taken and is a theatre of continuing disputes and quarrels amongst its members. Europe from it’s side has rapidly advanced it’s common E.S.D.P. in such an extend that it feels confident to rely on itself for its security and to stand as a distinct player in the world arena. Under this developments it is decided that it is better for all the parts involved to dissolve NATO’s structure as everyone new it and maybe replace it with a looser and less powerfull Euro-Atlantic Alliance with those states that are willing to participate. The whole process of the ‘divorce’ could begin by an initiative of France maybe along with Germany and a core of states that disagree with the direction that the Alliance has taken and decide that they do not want to be part of it.

- **PRECONDITIONS**

All the above three scenarios have certain preconditions in order to be achieved. The most important are the following:

✓ ***Russia’s positive evolution will be a decisive condition for both three scenarios.***

This is quite debatable, since the last events, where Russia is seen to withdraw from its democratic process towards a more authoritarian rule. Should Russia’s Political and Economical scene decline further it is unpredictable the effect that it will have on NATO.

✓ ***Another condition for the first scenario but not for the following two is coherence in the enlargement processes of the European Union and NATO.*** NATO and the E.U. should more or less have the same number of members in order of common and coherent policies to be produced.

✓ ***The sound development of a European Security and Defence Policy is another major variable.*** It is an imperative that for the first scenario to come true that an E.S.D.P., which will not sought to be a counter-weight to the U.S. dominance be

---

<sup>52</sup> NATO, 2004 “*For and Against, Debating Euro-Atlantic Security Options*”, p.63

developed. In contrast, in order for the other two scenarios to be fulfilled a strong and autonomous E.S.D.P. should be formulated or begin to.

✓ ***Continued US interest in Europe.*** This is the case for the first scenario but exactly the opposite for the other two scenarios.

✓ ***Coping with the evolution of military technology.*** In order for the military gap to begin narrowing Europe should begin to spend more money on its military budget and incorporate all the new military technology in its armies. This is a precondition for the first scenario but not for the other two. On the contrary not doing so will facilitate the fulfillment of them both.

✓ ***Sufficient resources.*** In order for NATO to continue being functional and effective sufficient resources should be allocated to it. If not a further condition against the first and in favor of the other two scenarios will have been fulfilled.

✓ ***The evolution of risks and threats in and around Europe.*** If Europe continue being a stable Continent and no major threat arises inside or at its surrounding environment then less need for NATO will there be and it will help the fulfillment of the 'Business as usual' or the 'Divorce' scenario.<sup>53</sup>

✓ ***Finally, America's Unilateralism.*** In order for the 'Business as usual' or the 'Divorce' scenario to come true the United States have to continue to act in a more unilateral manner, as was the case in Afghanistan and Iraq.

---

<sup>53</sup> NATO review- NATO's evolving partnerships, Autumn 2001, "*Imagining NATO 2011: Michael Rühle imagines how the Alliance and the Euro-Atlantic security environment might look in ten years.*", p.20  
<http://www.nato.int/docu/rev-pdf/eng/0103-en.pdf>

## ▪ Conclusion

It is clear that as it enters the 21st century, NATO faces a new set of strategic challenges quite different from the one it faced in the past.<sup>54</sup> Which direction the Alliance will take, as it has been shown, it is highly debatable. Whether one of the three previously examined scenarios will take place and in what form and degree exactly will depend from a number of factors, easily or difficulty, predicted. But there are certain factors that will unmistakably shape the faith of a future NATO.

The fact that NATO will in the future grow even beyond 26 members may be an indication of an 'overstretch' of the organisation if we take into account that all the decision making is based on **unanimity**.<sup>55</sup> A fact that is highly unlikely to change in the future, especially after the several enlargements, since it will also require all the members to agree on abandoning unanimity in favour of a more flexible decision making mechanism. This could easily lead to a functional paralysis of the Alliance if you take into account that for every matter decided unanimity is to be sought.

Another factor is, from the part of the E.U. and its member states, the development of the C.F.S.P., the position of the High Representative, the 'Petersberg Tasks' and the creation of a Rapid Reaction Force and after the ratification of the European Constitution a position for a E.U. Minister of Foreign Affairs. How will this effect NATO and could this not be developed in the expense of NATO's security role in Europe.<sup>56</sup> In the long run some kind of supranationality will have to be introduced in order the Alliance to be functional.<sup>57</sup> Having this in one hand and a rigid inflexible organization, as is NATO, on the other hand will consequently lead the Europeans to rely more on their own capabilities.

After the Prague Summit and especially the Istanbul Summit one of the main objectives of NATO became counter-terrorism and tackling of W.M.D. '*Combating terrorism: NATO leaders increased the Alliance's anti-terrorism efforts with an agreement to improve intelligence sharing and develop new, high-tech defences against terrorist attacks.*'<sup>58</sup> The question that therefore rises is whether NATO is the appropriate tool to handle such issues. I argue that it is not and rather that there is a need for a multi-dimensional strategy that relies not just on military force but also on new forms of diplomatic, financial, economic, intelligence, customs and police cooperation. NATO is not the forum for such intricate and complex approached.<sup>59</sup> A large multinational bureaucracy with more than 25 members may not be well suited to such a struggle. The

---

<sup>54</sup> NATO, 2004 "*For and Against, Debating Euro-Atlantic Security Options*", p.28

<sup>55</sup> NATO, 2004 "*NATO Transformed*", p.40

<sup>56</sup> NATO, 2004 "*For and Against, Debating Euro-Atlantic Security Options*", p.13

<sup>57</sup> NATO, 2004 "*For and Against, Debating Euro-Atlantic Security Options*", p.48

<sup>58</sup> NATO, 2004 "*Nato after Istanbul, Expanding Operations, Improving Capabilities, Enhancing Cooperation*", pp.2-6

<sup>59</sup> NATO, 2004 "*For and Against, Debating Euro-Atlantic Security Options*", p.52

same argument applies to W.M.D. Is not NATO too leaky and slow moving to manage an offensive operation that would, for example, be applied to WMD.<sup>60</sup>

Last but not least is the issue of the growing American unilateralism when it is dealing with international issues and the further disengagement of the U.S. from Europe. It was the United States that refused the intervention of NATO in the fight against terrorism in Afghanistan and a good reason was the lessons that the Kosovo intervention gave to the American Pentagon. That was that NATO was a very slow and inflexible organisation to fight that war.<sup>61</sup> Also the U.S. divided the Alliance between 'Old and New Europe', refused to sign or ratify world treaties (Kyoto), or intervened in Iraq and Afghanistan. This along with some 92 percent of the US force structure outside NATO, raises questions about the future of NATO's interoperability.<sup>62</sup>

Pondering on the above mentioned it is difficult to see how indeed NATO can effectively be a functioning and efficient organisation as it enters the 21<sup>st</sup> century.<sup>63</sup> It is becoming more and more clear that if NATO does not go through a drastic transformation the following years theoretical scenarios that have been introduced here referring to a possible dissolution of the Alliance can quite as well seize to be just theoretical. Having all these in mind I see 2 possible solutions regarding 'NATO's future' dilemma.

The first, NATO as it has been seen from the Balkans is good in stabilising tasks. Such tasks have not gone away. Indeed, they have assumed even greater importance. Failed states are the breeding grounds for terrorism. NATO can help bring order and the rule of law.<sup>64</sup> Thus NATO in a more realistic scope can narrow its objectives and its targeting of issues to the things that is proven good and can raise the maximum consensus from all the member states than wander in different and some times controversial tasks (from police training to counter-terrorism).

The second possibility would be that the new, post-enlargement NATO would not be a strong military organisation. The alliance would remain politically significant, but its military importance would be diminished and would continue to diminish further. Thus NATO becoming a pan-European security organisation that would still have a military structure, a structure that would be focused principally on Europe and it's near abroad.<sup>65</sup>

But isn't this function more or less in the competences of the OSCE? I therefore suggest a more daring and imaginative solution for the future transformation of NATO. The incorporation of NATO in a new organisation along with the OSCE, with NATO acting as the executive branch of the organisation and the OSCE as the decision-making body of it. On a first look this idea looks quite impossible to be implemented since there is a big difference between the member states of the two organisations (OSCE has far more

---

<sup>60</sup> NATO, 2004, "*For and Against, Debating Euro-Atlantic Security Options*", p.62

<sup>61</sup> NATO, 2004, "*For and Against, Debating Euro-Atlantic Security Options*", p.59

<sup>62</sup> NATO, 2004, "*For and Against, Debating Euro-Atlantic Security Options*", p.30

<sup>63</sup> NATO, 2004, "*NATO in the 21<sup>ST</sup> Century*", p.22

<sup>64</sup> NATO, 2004, "*For and Against, Debating Euro-Atlantic Security Options*", p.56

<sup>65</sup> NATO, 2004, "*For and Against, Debating Euro-Atlantic Security Options*", pp.58-60



member than NATO 55 to 26). This is true but if we take into account along with the member states the partner countries the figure raises to 46 with all these countries also being members of the OSCE. If we also see the Mediterranean Partners of co-operation of the OSCE (six countries) and the Alliance's Mediterranean Dialogue countries (seven countries) we will observe that these countries are the same in both cases.<sup>66</sup>

In the field of co-operation the organisations have a long common history both on institutional level and on practical areas. Since 1996, the OSCE and NATO have been engaged in an expanding process of interaction and co-operation. Regular contacts take place between the OSCE Chairman-in-Office and the North Atlantic Council. OSCE officials regularly participate in NATO meetings such as those of the Political-Military Steering Committee/*Ad Hoc* Group on Co-operation in Peacekeeping, while the NATO Secretary General (or one of his representatives) attends appropriate OSCE meetings. There is also regular exchange of information on the implementation of CSBMs between the OSCE Secretariat and the Verification and Implementation Co-ordination Section of the NATO Secretariat.<sup>67</sup>

There is a steady development of OSCE/NATO relations as one of the post-cold-war patterns in inter-organizational co-operation. The two organizations have worked in synergy in the monitoring of sanctions implementation and verification of arms control in the Balkans. NATO's Implementation Force (IFOR) and, subsequently, Stabilization Force (SFOR) have provided vital support for the OSCE in Bosnia and Herzegovina. This includes security for OSCE personnel and human and material assistance to the election efforts. Co-operation has been very close in Kosovo, where the previous OSCE Kosovo Verification Mission (which was withdrawn in March 1999) operated in synergy with NATO aerial verification. Since the deployment of the OSCE Mission in Kosovo, in July 1999, the Office in Pristina has developed links with the Kosovo Stabilization Force (KFOR), which provides a secure environment for OSCE activities in Kosovo.<sup>68</sup>

All the above mentioned in relation with the fact that both organisations are of an inter-governmental nature and after the last transformation of NATO they share a lot of common interests and objectives could make the case for a new inter-governmental organisation incorporating OSCE and NATO or at least a new loose scheme where NATO could in fact play the role of the executive arm of OSCE implementing on the ground its basic priorities:

- to consolidate the participating States' common values and help in building fully democratic civil societies based on the rule of law;
- to prevent local conflicts, restore stability and bring peace to war torn areas;
- to overcome real and perceived security deficits and to avoid the creation of new political, economic or social divisions by promoting a co-operative system of security.<sup>69</sup>

---

<sup>66</sup> NATO, 2001, "*Partnership in Action*", pp.12-13

<sup>67</sup> OSCE, July 2002, "*OSCE Handbook*", p.154

<sup>68</sup> OSCE, July 2002, "*OSCE Handbook*", pp.159-160

<sup>69</sup> OSCE, July 2002, "*OSCE Handbook*", p.154

It is self-evident that, such an endeavour to finally be concluded, a strong political incentive and will be needed from all the participating states and especially the most influential of them in both organisation. Nonetheless, NATO in the end will have to further continue to evolve and adapt if it is not to become an obsolete organisation.

As an NATO military official has stated 'I see *NATO as an elephant which is now asked to do the tasks of a tiger. This cannot happen – first the elephant has to die and then a tiger to be born*'.<sup>70</sup> This notion is becoming more and more evident not only amongst scholars and officials but also to politicians of the highest magnitude. The latest appeal from the German chancellor Gerhard Schroeder for institutional change of the Alliance has not passed unnoticed. He has openly stated through a speech deliver by his defence minister that "[NATO] in no longer the primary venue where transatlantic partners discuss and coordinate strategies".<sup>71</sup> His appeal has been picked up by NATO's General Secretary De Hoop Scheffer who in a confidential letter to the 26 NATO ambassadors said that the body had to sharpen its political profile, " *NATO must become a political forum and must engage more closely as an alliance in the relevant political forums if we want to make better use of political will,*" he wrote. Furthermore, he said that NATO must cooperate more with the United Nations and that he would present a list of reforms recommendations soon.<sup>72</sup> To what extent these reform proposals will touch the fundamental problems of the Alliance that is it's future structure along with the nature of the organisation itself and it's future mission(s) is something to be seen.

---

<sup>70</sup> Michail Hamntan, March 2005, "private discussions with NATO military official"

<sup>71</sup>European Voice, 2005, "*Different Voices*", p.12

<sup>72</sup> Agence France-Presse, 15 February 2005, "*NATO chief supports German leader's call for Alliance reform: report*"

<http://www.spacewar.com/2005/050215194446.j7g7ijpg.html>

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ◆ Gerhard Schroder, 2005, “*Different Voices*” The European Voice, Volume 11, Number 6, Brussels, Belgium
- ◆ Michail Hamntan, March 2005, “*Private discussions with a NATO Military Official keeping his anonymity*”.
- ◆ NATO, 2004, “*Nato after Istanbul, Expanding Operations, Improving Capabilities, Enhancing Cooperation*”, NATO public diplomacy division, 1110 Brussels – Belgium.
- ◆ NATO, 2004, “*NATO Transformed*”, NATO public diplomacy division, 1110 Brussels – Belgium.
- ◆ NATO, 2004, “*NATO in the 21<sup>ST</sup> Century*”, NATO public diplomacy division, 1110 Brussels – Belgium.
- ◆ NATO, 2004, “*For and Against, Debating Euro-Atlantic Security Options*”, NATO public diplomacy division, 1110 Brussels – Belgium.
- ◆ NATO, 2003, “*The Prague Summit and NATO’s Transformation, a Reader’s Guide*”, NATO public diplomacy division, 1110 Brussels – Belgium.
- ◆ NATO, 2001, “*Partnership in Action*”, NATO Office of Information and Press, 1110 Brussels – Belgium.
- ◆ NATO, 2001, “*NATO Handbook*”, NATO Office of Information and Press, 1110 Brussels – Belgium.
- ◆ Neil Nugent, 2003 fifth edition, “*The Government and Politics of the European Union*”, Palgrave Macmillan, New York. p.518
- ◆ OSCE, July 2002, “*OSCE Handbook*”, the Secretariat of the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, Vienna, Austria.

## WEBSITES

- ◆ Agence France-Presse, 15 February 2005, “*NATO chief supports German leader's call for Alliance reform: report*”  
<http://www.spacewar.com/2005/050215194446.j7g7ijpg.html>

- ◆ Brian Ardy, 2005, “NATO Military Expenditure in the Post Cold War Era”, Hellenic Treaty Association Review  
<http://www.hatareview.org/ardy.html>
- ◆ Bureau of Public Affairs-U.S. Department of State, November 1995 “*Fact Sheet The North Atlantic Treaty Organization*”, U.S. Department of State  
[http://www.fas.org/man/nato/offdocs/us\\_95/dos951122.htm](http://www.fas.org/man/nato/offdocs/us_95/dos951122.htm)
- ◆ NATO, X, “*Understanding NATO*”, NATO Office of Information and Press, 1110 Brussels – Belgium.  
<http://www.nato.int/docu/presskit/010219/004gb.pdf>
- ◆ NATO, January 1994, “*Partnership for Peace: Invitation*”  
<http://www.nato.int/docu/comm/49-95/c940110a.htm>
- ◆ NATO, August 1997, “*The Mediterranean dialogue: Dispelling misconceptions and building confidence*”  
<http://www.nato.int/docu/review/1997/9704-6.htm>
- ◆ NATO, July 2000, “*The Alliance's Strategic Concept agreed by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council*”  
<http://www.nato.int/docu/basicxt/b911108a.htm>
- ◆ NATO, August 2001, “*NATO Enlargement and the Accession of New NATO members*”  
<http://www.nato.int/docu/handbook/2001/hb1208.htm>
- ◆ NATO, August 2001, “*Consensus Politics and Joint Decision-Making*”  
<http://www.nato.int/docu/handbook/2001/hb0702.htm>
- ◆ NATO review- NATO’s evolving partnerships, Autumn 2001, “*Imagining NATO 2011: Michael Rühle imagines how the Alliance and the Euro-Atlantic security environment might look in ten years.*”, Director of Information and Press NATO, 1110 Brussels, Belgium. Printed in Belgium by Editions Européennes., p.18-21  
<http://www.nato.int/docu/rev-pdf/eng/0103-en.pdf>
- ◆ NATO, October 2001, “*The Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC)*”  
<http://www.nato.int/docu/handbook/2001/hb020202.htm>
- ◆ NATO, April 2002, “*Weapons of Mass Destruction Centre*”  
<http://www.nato.int/docu/facts/2000/wmd.htm>

- ◆ NATO, October 2002, “*The Origins of the Alliance*”  
<http://www.nato.int/docu/handbook/2001/hb0101.htm>
- ◆ NATO, October 2002, “*The North Atlantic Cooperation Council*”  
<http://www.nato.int/docu/handbook/2001/hb020201.htm>
- ◆ NATO, October 2002, “*The Role of Allied Military Forces and the Transformation of the Alliance's Defence Posture*”  
<http://www.nato.int/docu/handbook/2001/hb0204.htm>
- ◆ NATO, spring 2003, “*Enhancing NATO's Mediterranean Dialogue*”  
<http://www.nato.int/docu/review/2003/issue1/english/art4.html>
- ◆ NATO, February 2005, “*The Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council: A framework for political negotiations*”  
<http://www.nato.int/issues/eapc/index.html>
- ◆ Paul E. Gallis, July 1997, “*NATO: Article V and Collective Defense*” CRS Report for Congress Congressional Research Service The Library of Congress  
<http://www.fas.org/man/crs/poartv.htm>
- ◆ The Brookings Institution, 2005, “*Rebuild Europe After World War II*”, The Brookings Institution, 1775 Massachusetts Ave NW, Washington DC 20036  
<http://www.brook.edu/dybdocroot/gs/cps/50ge/endeavors/europe.htm>