

THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION AND
UNITED STATES RELATIONSHIP: A STUDY OF ITS
DEVELOPMENT AND POSSIBLE FUTURE

A Thesis
Presented
to the Faculty of
California State University, Chico

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts
in
Political Science

by
© Noah M. Smith 2015
Spring 2015

THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION AND
UNITED STATES RELATIONSHIP: A STUDY OF ITS
DEVELOPMENT AND POSSIBLE FUTURE

A Thesis

by

Noah M. Smith

Spring 2015

APPROVED BY THE DEAN OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
AND VICE PROVOST FOR RESEARCH:

Eun K. Park, Ph.D.

APPROVED BY THE GRADUATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE:

Matthew O. Thomas, Ph.D.
Graduate Coordinator

James E. Jacob, Ph.D., Chair

Matthew O. Thomas, Ph.D.

John Crosby, M.A.

PUBLICATION RIGHTS

No portion of this thesis may be reprinted or reproduced in any manner unacceptable to the usual copyright restrictions without the written permission of the author.

DEDICATION

I would like to dedicate this paper to all those who diligently work, strive, and fight to make the world a free and peaceful place for everyone.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to thank my wife for the unconditional support she provided as I pursued my master's degree over the past two years. After all the days and nights in class, studying in the library, and researching or writing, she was always there when I needed her. I could never have been as successful as I was without her steady and absolute love, encouragement, and understanding, and I am truly blessed to have her in my life.

I would like to thank Dr. Jim Jacob for agreeing to be the chair of my thesis committee and providing me with his unparalleled guidance and mentorship on the broad and complex subject of International Relations. His expert knowledge always kept me focused on my particular area of study and led me to discover new insights on my chosen topic. I was extremely fortunate that he was willing to share with me his many years of personal experience engaged in issues regarding the global community.

I would also like to thank my two advising committee members. Dr. Matthew Thomas has been an instrumental part of my pursuit of an advanced degree from the very beginning, and his guidance was crucial to my success. Professor John Crosby provided expert feedback and advice on how to move forward with my writing and ensured I created the strongest arguments possible. I am deeply thankful for the support they both provided.

Finally, I would like to thank Dr. Diana Dwyer and Mr. Carson Medley. Dr. Dwyre's assistance was an immense help in the beginning of my thesis process and Mr. Medley's help was critical at the end. To both, I am very grateful.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Publication Rights.....	iii
Dedication.....	iv
Acknowledgments.....	v
List of Tables	ix
Abstract	x
 CHAPTER	
I. Introduction.....	1
Background.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	2
Purpose of the Study	3
Definition of Terms.....	4
Limitations of the Study.....	6
II. Theoretical Framework for the US and NATO Relationship.....	8
Introduction.....	8
Motivation for US Involvement in NATO.....	9
A Foundation	12
Evolving Ideas	15
Contemporary Theory	18
Constructivist Approach	21
A Complex World.....	26
III. A Critical Pivot Point for the NATO Alliance.....	29
Introduction.....	29
Bosnia Pivot Point.....	29
Changing Roles for the US and NATO	31
Navigating a Complicated Conflict	33
US/NATO Successful Employment	36
Future NATO Missions.....	39

CHAPTER	PAGE
IV. The Influence of Public Opinion on NATO Participation	41
Introduction.....	41
Significant Influence on Decisions	42
US Foreign Policy Formation and Public Opinion	44
European Foreign Policy and Public Opinion	48
When Public Opinion Prevents NATO Membership.....	52
Influence of Global Opinion on US Policy	54
Losing Domestic Public Support for NATO	57
Public Opinion Matters	59
V. The Relevancy of NATO and Its Security Role in the World	61
Introduction.....	61
A Unique Treaty and Alliance	62
The NATO and EU Difference	65
Small Arms and Light Weapons Proliferation.....	73
International Criminal Activity.....	76
Fighting Terrorist Organizations.....	79
Cyber Security	82
NATO is Relevant.....	83
VI. A Historical Comparison for the Future Evolution of NATO	86
Introduction.....	86
Predicting NATO's Development.....	87
America's Transition and NATO.....	91
Anarchy with Order	95
A Standing NATO Military	98
Arguments Against Standing-NATO.....	103
A Reasonable Future.....	107
VII. Conclusions and Recommendations	110
Conclusion	110
Recommendations.....	113
Bibliography	122

CHAPTER	PAGE
Appendices	
A. The North Atlantic Treaty.....	115
B. NATO Operations.....	117

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
1. 2009 Pew Global Attitudes Survey on Afghanistan Support	69

ABSTRACT

THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION AND
UNITED STATES RELATIONSHIP: A STUDY OF ITS
DEVELOPMENT AND POSSIBLE FUTURE

by

© Noah M. Smith 2015

Master of Arts in Political Science

California State University, Chico

Spring 2015

This thesis argues the NATO has established itself in the global community as an enduring multinational political alliance with a collective security component, and as such, the United States should continue to support it in the evolution of its political and military capabilities to combat existing and emerging international threats. To support this argument, this thesis highlights how IR theory helps to explain why it was not abandoned at the end of the Cold War, and Alexander Wendt's Constructivist theory of IP may specifically help explain its future evolution, as NATO could be an increasing influence in the international system.

When the Cold War ended in the early 1990's, the US led NATO through a major transition and turned it into an international security crisis management organization. This transition may indicate how it could evolve in the future. Public

opinion in the US and abroad is identified as a critical variable that may have a strong influence on the outcome of that evolution. In addition, it is determined NATO still has a relevant security role in the world, as there are many threats left for it to combat. Finally, a historical comparison to the revolutionary US illustrates how NATO could go through similar changes as it evolves in the future.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background

States in the international community have created treaties and formed alliances with each other since the days of the ancient Greek Hellenic and Delian Leagues that existed thousands of years ago around 400 – 500 BC.¹ Since that time, much has happened in the world. Not only have many treaties and alliances been formed and dissolved, but also languages have been developed and forgotten, cities were built and destroyed, and even entire states rose only to fall into the depths of history. But throughout all the turmoil and loss in history, given time those things were eventually rebuilt. Perhaps not in the same form as the originals, but languages, cities, and states exist and thrive today. And thanks to wealth and technology, they do so at a level of prosperity that has never before been experienced in human history. And so too today, there exists what is in all probability the most comprehensive and binding treaties and alliances between states that have ever existed.

The physical landmass alliances occupy has expanded well beyond the regional constrictions of the past, and treaties in today's international community bind states together from all over the world. Also, alliances are expanding on their traditional

¹ John V. A. Fine, *The Ancient Greeks: A Critical History* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press), 1983, 331-332.

military role and have become major tools of economic and political development for participating states. It seems that even the military components of some alliances have evolved to become less of a representation of a blunt military instrument of war and more of a symbol of solidarity in mutual security, especially to ensure the maintenance of peace and justice in the global community. And as these alliances continue to exist and evolve, they seem to take on more permanent roles concerning interactions between all states on the international stage.

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) is one such modern alliance that illustrates the idea that certain treaties and alliances have developed and continue to evolve toward increased responsibility and permanence in the world. It and its relationship with its largest member state, the United States (US), is the topic of this thesis, and they will be examined together.

Statement of the Problem

Since the end of the Cold War and the dissolution of the Soviet Union and Warsaw Pact, NATO's existence has been in question. To start with, some wonder why NATO, an alliance that was originally created to deter Soviet aggression, still exists when the threat of the Soviet Union does not. The US led the creation of NATO in 1949 and its transition to focusing on security crisis management in the early 1990's. But some say that the US should no longer support NATO for a variety of reasons, including, but not limited to, the fact that the US bears an unfair burden of the financial cost, personnel requirements, and resource demands of the alliance.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to explore the US and NATO relationship. It does that by critically analyzing facts surrounding NATO's past and present existence, assessing the US's role in that existence, and presenting a plausible scenario for the future of NATO that the US could support. Each chapter in this thesis attempts to answer a unique question in order to help address this purpose. They are as follows:

1. How can International Relations (IR) theory help explain US motivation to support NATO?
2. What was a critical moment in NATO's history, and what were its implications?
3. What is a variable with enough influence to cause the US to abandon or continue its support of NATO?
4. Is NATO still a relevant political and security alliance in the world?
5. Will NATO continue to grow, and if so, what might its evolution look like?

In addressing these questions in the following chapters, this thesis argues that despite the claims of its critics, NATO has established itself in the global community as an enduring multinational political alliance with a collective security component, and as such, the US should continue to support NATO in the evolution of its political and military capabilities to combat existing and emerging international threats. The support for this argument will be presented throughout the thesis.

Definition of Terms

Certain terms that are used throughout this thesis will be identified and defined here. Some terms are relatively straight forward, but some can be broad and have different meanings depending on use and interpretation. Since this study is focused on international issues that incorporate political, military, and security considerations, there are different interpretations of some terms. In order to provide clarity and remain focused on the main points of this thesis, some important terms will now be clarified.

North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)

As described by the basic points on its official website, NATO is an alliance of 28 countries from Europe and North America. It is “a political and military alliance,” and its “essential purpose is to safeguard the freedom and security of its members through political and military means. It provides a unique link between these two continents for consultation and cooperation in the field of defence and security, and the conduct of multinational crisis-management operations.”²

Treaty

While there are unique requirements for individual states in their adoption of treaties, this thesis recognizes almost all treaties, including NATO’s, would fit under the general definition from Merriam-Webster’s online dictionary. It states a treaty is “an agreement or arrangement made by negotiation [and] a contract in writing between two or more political authorities (as states or sovereigns) formally signed by representatives

² “Basic Points,” What is NATO?, accessed on March 17, 2015, <http://www.nato.int/nato-welcome/index.html>.

duly authorized and usually ratified by the lawmaking authority of the state.”³

Alliance

As defined by the Department of Defense (DoD) in its *Dictionary of Military and Associate Terms*, dated January 15, 2015, an alliance is “the relationship that results from a formal agreement between two or more nations for broad, long-term objectives that further the common interests of members.”⁴

State and Agent

While the traditional primary agent in IR was considered to be the state, there continues to be debate between different theories about who might actually be considered an agent.⁵ This thesis adopts the constructivist viewpoint that non-state agents can exist in the international community and develop similar influence that some IR theories traditionally reserve for states.

State Sovereignty

While scholars like Steven Krasner debate the intricate details of what state sovereignty means, such debate is beyond the scope of this thesis. Therefore, sovereignty will be defined as what Krasner describes as what is generally understood for political scientists. He says that sovereignty is the idea that states do not have the right to interfere with other states internal affairs, and states are rational, unitary, and independent agents

³ “Treaty,” Merriam-Webster, accessed on March 17, 2015, <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/treaty>.

⁴ “Joint Publication 1-02; Department of Defense Dictionary of Military and Associated Terms; 8 November 2010; As Amended Through 15 January 2015,” Defense Technical Information Center (DTIC), last modified January 2015, accessed March 17, 2015, http://www.dtic.mil/doctrine/new_pubs/jp1_02.pdf.

⁵ Martin Griffiths, ed., *International Relations Theory for the Twenty-First Century: An Introduction* (New York: Routledge, 2007), 147,152.

in the international community.⁶

Military Employment of Forces

As defined by the Department of Defense (DoD) in its *Dictionary of Military and Associate Terms*, dated January 15, 2015, employment means “the strategic, operational, or tactical use of forces.” The same source defines force as “an aggregation of military personnel, weapon systems, equipment, and necessary support, or combination thereof.”⁷

Limitations of the Study

While this study does its best to be as broad and inclusive as possible when considering the issues that most affect NATO and its relationship with the US, it is still limited in scope. It does not consider many international relations theories that could possibly provide useful insight into the US/NATO relationship, such as those focused more on geography, time, or other considerations. There are countless examples of variables that affect the relationship that could have been considered, but it focused on public opinion because it appeared to have a strong and unique influence. And this thesis’ prediction of the future is just that, a prediction, and is not certain.

The method used for this study is more qualitative than quantitative and has utilized more of a normative approach than empirical, although it has elements of both.

While there are many historical facts and some statistical data used as evidence to support

⁶ Stephen D. Drasner, “Problematic Sovereignty,” in *Problematic Sovereignty: Contested Rules and Political Possibilities*, ed. Stephen D. Drasner (New York Chichester, West Sussex: Columbia University Press, 2001), 1-2.

⁷ DTIC, “Joint Publication 1-02.”

the arguments in this study, the conclusions that are reached can be disputed because there may be alternate interpretations of the meaning of those facts and numbers. This study does its best to build the foundation of its conclusions on convincing evidence and thoughtful analysis.

CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK FOR THE US AND NATO RELATIONSHIP

“He who loves practice without theory is like the sailor who boards a ship without a rudder and compass and never knows where he may cast.”

- Leonardo da Vinci, Renaissance Man⁸

Introduction

This chapter will explore scholarly theories on International Relations (IR) and International Politics (IP) that are designed to explain interstate interaction and account for things like the existence of NATO and the US’s relationship with it. This chapter illustrates how IR and IP theory establish that NATO could be considered a substantial agent in the international system. The chapter will begin with a current example of IP that clearly identifies the US’s preference for NATO over Russia. It then goes on to consider how IR and IP theory explain this preference. Several theories are presented to specifically address the US relationship with NATO, but it is determined that Alexander Wendt’s Constructivist theory of IP is among the most useful as compared to other liberal and realist explanations. The chapter explores how some IR theories can be good in some respects and bad in others when analyzing the US and NATO partnership. It concludes that Wendt’s Constructivism provides a useful theoretical model in which to understand both the past and present relationship between the US and NATO and to

⁸ Bruce Simons-Morton, Kenneth Riley McLeroy, and Monica Wendel, *Behavior Theory in Health Promotion Practice and Research* (Burlington, MA: Jones and Bartlett Learning, 2012), 34.

predict their future involvement.

Motivation for US Involvement in NATO

On March 18, 2014 in the *New York Times*, Steven Myers and Ellen Barry quoted Russian President Vladimir Putin as saying; “They cheated us again and again, made decisions behind our back, presenting us with completed facts. That’s the way it was with the expansion of the NATO in the East, with the deployment of military infrastructure at our borders.”⁹ This was a clear sign of Putin’s frustration, as he expressed humiliation from what appeared to be disrespect from the international community. Meyers reported this as part of Putin’s larger speech to his country explaining why he annexed Crimea despite the fact the collapsed Soviet Union had relinquished control of it to the Ukraine almost twenty-five years ago. It is important to note Putin specifically mentioned NATO as a cause for their unilateral redrawing of international borders.

Putin’s actions and accusations have brought serious attention back to the US/NATO relationship. Most notably in this situation, the US played a critical role in supporting NATO’s eastward expansion that Putin referenced.¹⁰ Through supporting this growth, the US demonstrated it viewed the NATO alliance as an essential military and political investment. Furthermore, it showed the US continues to consider NATO’s

⁹ Steven Myers and Ellen Barry, “Putin Reclaims Crimea for Russia and Bitterly Denounces the West,” *New York Times*, March 18, 2014, accessed May 3, 2014, <http://www.nytimes.com/2014/03/19/world/europe/ukraine.html?action=click&contentCollection=Europe&module=RelatedCoverage®ion=Marginalia&pgtype=article>.

¹⁰ T.V., Paul, James J. Wirtz, and Michel Fortmann ed., *Balance of Power, Theory and Practice in the 21st Century* (Stanford CA: Stanford University Press, 2004), 11.

prominent role in the region more important than Russia's fear of Western European encroachment. This should not be too surprising because the US was instrumental in the creation of NATO. The US is often referred to as the leader of the alliance and provides significant support for the evolution of NATO.¹¹ But the Cold War has been over for quite some time now, and compared to their Soviet days, Russia has been on better terms with Europe and the US. So why would the US support NATO in a way that may intentionally instigate conflict with Russia or any other nation? What explains the motivation of the US to continue to tie itself to NATO and often lead the organization and its missions?

As mentioned before, the US shares a common history with NATO. The treaty was originally established following the end of World War II (WWII) and designed to deter Soviet expansion, prevent the revival of nationalist militarism in Europe, and encourage European political integration.¹² Commitments to NATO have continued to influence considerations regarding the creation and implementation of US foreign policy since NATO's creation in 1949. Originally focused on actions to deter Soviet aggression, these commitments evolved for over sixty years and have continuously contributed to the foundation on which the US builds strategies designed to be in its best interests. But historical allegiance alone may not fully explain why the US/NATO relationship endures and will continue to endure through changes in the international community.

¹¹ Stanley R. Sloan, *NATO, the European Union and the Atlantic Community, The Transatlantic Bargain Challenged* (Lanham MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers Inc., 2005), 241.

¹² "A Short History of NATO," North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), accessed May 3, 2014, <http://www.nato.int/history/nato-history.html>.

While the history of NATO suggests that the military alliance was an inevitable outcome of WWII, the collapse of the Soviet Union and what is perceived as a reduced threat in Europe raises questions about its continued existence and the US's participation.¹³ It appears that after decades of existence, and despite Russia's recent involvement in the Ukraine, NATO seems to be in transition and operating as an alliance in search of an updated mission. One could apply several IR theories to explain the international events and circumstances that have led NATO to this point, but some theories are better at explaining the past while others may be better at explaining the present or predicting the future. The main argument in this chapter is that Alexander Wendt's Constructivist theory of IP is extremely useful in explaining the motivation for the US to continue to maintain its membership in the alliance and support its growth. This chapter will proceed by discussing basic IR principles that provided the foundation of ideas for current US/NATO involvement. It will then continue by discussing why variations of classical IR theories developed close to the time of NATO's establishment may no longer be as applicable as they once were. Then it will consider contemporary theories and highlight how Wendt's constructivist argument may include important considerations that alternative theories may not adequately address. Finally, it will conclude by reiterating the main points and offering suggestions for future research.

¹³ Ted Galen Carpenter, "NATO at 60: A Hollow Alliance," *CATO Institute*, no. 635 (March 2009): 3, 12, accessed May 3, 2014, <http://object.cato.org/sites/cato.org/files/pubs/pdf/pa635.pdf>.

A Foundation

Social Contract, Liberalism, and Realism

IR theories posit unique and sometimes conflicting arguments attempting to explain why sovereign states forfeit some of their autonomy to form alliances like NATO. The concept of an alliance comprised of a group of independent states is founded on the principles Jean-Jacque Rousseau established in his social contract theory regarding the general role of participants in any freely established community. Rousseau viewed aggressive and dominating human relationships as an unnatural state of being for people and, as such, to be the cause of pain and suffering in the world.¹⁴ He therefore argued that happiness and satisfaction could only be achieved in a community of others where “the condition is equal for all, [and] it is in the interests of no one to make it burdensome to the rest.”¹⁵ This social contract theory provides an explanation of why an international alliance like NATO is successful, desirable for states like the US, and has the potential for growth. Technically, NATO is a voluntary multinational organization. Therefore, those who chose to be a part of it did so most likely because they felt it provided protection and some measure of equality in participation and freedom to choose their level of participation. But while Rousseau’s social contract theory may help provide an understanding of why the NATO community is appealing, it does not fully explain NATO’s role in the international community, and a complete understanding of the US and NATO relationship will require a deeper analysis of IR theory.

¹⁴ Nicholas Dent, *Rousseau* (New York NY: Routledge, 2005), 5.

¹⁵ Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *The Social Contract or Principles of Political Right*, trans. and ed. Fredrick M. Watkins (New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd., 1953), 15.

While the contemporary international climate illustrates that NATO is an integral part of interstate interactions, academics will differ in their explanations of US participation in the current system based on their principles grounded in either liberal or realist IR theories. Understanding the fundamental differences between these two ways of interpreting interstate interaction will help explain why Wendt's Constructivist theory is useful in explaining the US/NATO relationship. Jackson and Sorensen present an overview of liberalism and realism, which explains that each theory is centered on different basic social values.¹⁶ They explain liberalism, which is sometimes also referred to as Utopianism, emphasizes the expectation of states to uphold freedom at both the personal and national level through cooperation and progress so that states may resolve conflicts peacefully. Realism, on the other hand, emphasizes national security to defend against power politics from hostile states that would eventually seek conflict and war to resolve international disputes.

Upon first considering the differences between liberalism and realism, one might conclude that the US/NATO relationship exists in a world that most closely resembles the realist's perspective, which is focused on security and defense. After all, NATO is formed under a political treaty, available in Appendix A, with a collective security component that recognizes in Article 5 that "an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all."¹⁷ It

¹⁶ Robert Jackson and Georg Sorensen, *Introduction to International Relations* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), 4.

¹⁷ "The North Atlantic Treaty." *North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)*, last modified December 9, 2008, accessed May 6, 2014, http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_17120.htm.

seems reasonable to believe that the creation of NATO would originally be explained through the realist worldview because it was established at the start of the Cold War as a defensive alliance against the competing Soviet Union.¹⁸ This realist perspective promotes peace through a balance of power, but NATO does more than just promote peace through defense. It also fosters cooperation between members and encourages democratic freedoms, which are liberal ideals according to the definition presented earlier. This is evident in Article 12, which establishes that considerations for maintaining the treaty will include “development of universal as well as regional arrangements under the Charter of the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and security.”¹⁹

Despite recent territorial disputes between Russia and the Ukraine, it is important to understand that in today’s global society NATO’s focus on maintaining peace and promoting state development throughout the international community now appears more applicable to the alliance than simply the common defense of its members. Evidence of this exists in the fact that NATO intervenes on the behalf of many states. Although they may not be members of the alliance, states that are identified as having issues that threaten the peace of the international community are subject to NATO’s involvement, and examples of such interventions include NATO’s actions to stop genocide in the Balkans, to continue its counter-terrorism missions in Afghanistan and

¹⁸ Mahdi D. Nazemroaya, *The Globalization of NATO* (Atlanta GA: Clarity Press Inc., 2012), 16-17.

¹⁹ NATO, “The North Atlantic Treaty.”

the Mediterranean, and to fight piracy off the Horn of Africa.²⁰ This evolution of its purpose relates to the liberal “idealist and holist commitments” that form Wendt’s constructivism, which will be explained further in this chapter.²¹

Evolving Ideas

Wilsonian Liberalism to Neoclassical Realism

Participation in NATO is not exclusive to either particular IR tradition and each has developed subsequent theories that provide a unique interpretation of why the US is a member of the alliance. Jackson and Sorensen explain that US President Woodrow Wilson developed Wilsonian Liberalism after WWI based on the idea that states participating in international organizations could end war and establish perpetual peace. While Wilson’s attempt at such an organization faltered with the US rejecting the League of Nations, others championed his cause.²² Norman Angell, an important liberal author, echoed Wilson’s idea in his book *Peace with the Dictators* when he made the argument that Europe must somehow consolidate its power to show Germany that war would be too costly, while also sending the message that no states wanted to harm Germany and that all states deserved political freedom in order to promote peace.²³ A few years into WWII, Angell reiterated his argument in another book, *Let the People*

²⁰ James M. Goldgeier, *The Future of NATO: Council on Foreign Relations, International Institutions and Global Governance Program* (New York: Council on Foreign Relations, 2010) 108, Kindle.

²¹ Alexander Wendt, *Social Theory of International Politics* (Cambridge UK: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 6.

²² Jackson and Sorensen, *Introduction to International Relations*, 38-39.

²³ Norman Angell, *Peace with the Dictators?* (New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1938), 206.

Know, that only an international government of some kind would be able to “preserve peace and permit freedom” between sovereign states.²⁴

Jackson and Sorensen go on to explain that the failure of Wilson’s League of Nations to prevent WWII left IR theorists looking for other ways to explain the conduct between states, which led to the development of Hans Morgenthau’s theory of Neoclassical Realism in his 1949 publication of *Politics Among Nations, The Struggle for Power and Peace*.²⁵ They define Morgenthau’s theory as based in Classical Realist thought that was pioneered by Thucydides, Machiavelli, and Hobbes centuries earlier, but they consider Morgenthau’s work unique to the twentieth-century and therefore classify it differently as Neoclassical instead of purely Classical Realism.²⁶ Morgenthau argued that international politics was nothing more than “a struggle for power” between states. He went on to say that if a state did something *not* in the pursuit of power then it was not engaged in politics at all, but rather, some other activity between states. In addition, he emphasized the natural human desire to dominate and explained how that tendency extended to states in the international political arena.²⁷

But both of these theories could be expanded upon to help better explain US motivations for maintaining its membership in NATO. International organizations, including NATO, still have not established a world that is perpetually at peace like Wilsonian Liberalism would suggest. On the contrary, evidence in the contemporary

²⁴ Norman Angell, *Let the People Know* (New York: The Viking Press, 1943), 245.

²⁵ Jackson and Sorensen, *Introduction to International Relations*, 41.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 70.

²⁷ Hans J. Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1961), 27-28.

international climate, such as the US's recent engagement in two wars lasting over a decade, underscores the fact that the elimination of violence between states may be an unrealistic goal. On the other side of the IR spectrum, Morgenthau's Realism seems to leave room for further explanation of why the US would maintain an extended military alliance with states that ultimately provide little to no power gain. By adding states in Eastern Europe to NATO, the US seems to go against Morgenthau's emphasis on domination because the expansion has actually hurt the legitimacy of the alliance by making it more probable that member states will decide *not* to fulfill the mutual defense agreement if some of the new smaller states are attacked.²⁸ Morgenthau's theory appears to leave room to wonder why the US would support the addition of weak states to NATO.

Wendt asserts that traditional liberal and realist theories are limited because they are what he calls 'reductionist' approaches to IR, which means that their theories are only focused on studying the state or other unit level agents within the international system, such as non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) or Intergovernmental Organization (IGOs) like NATO. But although liberal reductionists recognize NATO as an agent in the international community (unlike realist reductionists who do not), liberal reductionists are still not concerned with the structure of the international system and do not recognize that it can be an independent influence that can affect both the US's and NATO's behavior.²⁹ A highway analogy is appropriate when illustrating the importance of considering the structure of the international system in addition to states and agents in the system. If someone were to consider traffic patterns to better understand traffic

²⁸ Carpenter, "NATO at 60: A Hollow Alliance," 2, 4.

²⁹ Wendt, *Social Theory*, 11-12.

problems, they would not merely focus on individual cars to understand those traffic problems, but instead, would focus on the structure of the highway system as well. In this respect, one can think of states and agents as the cars on the highway and the international system as the highway itself. To fully appreciate both traffic patterns and, in this case, state or agent actions, one must consider the structure of the system on which they exist.

To better understand why the US maintains its membership in the alliance, explanations should first recognize the influence of non-state agents such as NATO, and second, they should include what Wendt calls ‘systemic’ theory that addresses the effects of the international system’s structure on the behavior of the state or agent. Although NATO is comprised of many states, the organization itself has evolved into a significant agent in the international community that both influences and is influenced by the international system separate from the states that comprise its members. There are other newer IR theories that incorporate systemic theory and consider the impact of system structure in their models in order to produce a more complete analysis of the international environment. Several of these contemporary IR theories will be explored next.

Contemporary Theory

Neorealism, Neoliberalism, and Offensive Realism

An overview of some current IR theories is appropriate to examine where they may fall short in their explanations of the current US/NATO alliance. Neorealism and Neoliberalism are popular IR models that include updated considerations in an attempt to

create models for what Morgenthau called a “science of international politics.”³⁰

Kenneth N. Waltz established Neorealism in his book *Theory of International Politics* so he could fix what he thought was wrong with other theories, including Morgenthau’s Realism.³¹ While Waltz pointed out many inconsistencies with the older theory and recognized structure as an influential factor on international politics, many academics argued that Waltz’s Neorealism was vastly incomplete. Most notably, Waltz’s major critic, Robert O. Keohane, argued that it ignored vital aspects of world politics such as economic interdependence, changes in government, the importance of non-state agents, and basic human history.³² Since Waltz’s model appears to leave out such considerations, especially an analysis considering the influence of non-state agents, it may not provide the most comprehensive way to analyze or explain why the US has maintained or would continue to maintain its NATO membership.

Wendt explained that as a response to the issues with Neorealism, Keohane presented his own theory that became known as Neoliberalism. But Wendt argued that Keohane accepted many aspects of Neorealism and only really differed in the belief that international organizations could greatly reduce the effects that power and interest had on the global community.³³ But Neoliberals still viewed the structure of the international system through a realist lens, agreeing that its primary purpose was to distribute material

³⁰ Robert O. Keohane, “Realism, Neorealism and the Study of World Politics,” in *Neorealism and Its Critics*, ed. Robert O. Keohane (New York: Columbia University Press, 1986), 10.

³¹ Kenneth N. Waltz, *Theory of International Politics* (Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press, Inc., 1979), 1.

³² Keohane, “Realism, Neorealism and the Study of World Politics: Theory of World Politics, Structural Realism and Beyond,” 18-24, 159.

³³ Wendt, *Social Theory*, 3.

capabilities. This was in stark contrast to the traditional liberal thought that the international system promoted cooperation through shared concepts of progress, liberty, and peace, which were earlier identified in this chapter as having a bigger impact on NATO today than materialist defense considerations.³⁴ Although Neoliberalism offered a few more considerations than its counterpart, Wendt made a convincing argument that they were too similar and that both lacked attention to how “actors in world politics are socially constructed”, something Wendt would address in his book.³⁵ This indicates that Neoliberalism may not do much more in explaining the US/NATO relationship than its close relative Neorealism.

Another popular theory used to explain the interactions between states is John Mearsheimer’s Offensive Realism. Mearsheimer explained that at its foundation Offensive Realism is a hybrid of theory that adopts Morgenthau’s Realist assumption that states seek as much power as possible and Waltz’s Neorealist belief that the structure of the system is why states struggle for power.³⁶ Although this is a systemic based theory, it is still formed from a realist perspective that is state centric and would not recognize NATO as an independent agent in the international system. This limits its analysis of NATO as only a tool for the US and does not consider the effect NATO, as an increasingly powerful organization, may be having on the US. There may be several other problems with this restricted perspective. Mearsheimer’s state survival strategies that involve cooperation between states, like *balancing* and *bandwagoning*, do not seem

³⁴ Jackson and Sorensen, *Introduction to International Relations*, 109.

³⁵ Wendt, *Social Theory*, 4.

³⁶ John J. Mearsheimer, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics* (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 2001), 21.

to fully explain why the US would maintain a close and lengthy relationship with NATO when there is not a dangerous aggressor poised to attack. In addition, with no immediate threat of war, his theory seems to be unclear as to why the US would share resources with NATO to conduct peacekeeping operations so far from US territory, such as the NATO missions discussed earlier in the Balkans and Africa.

There is no doubt that all the theories just presented, regardless of how old they are, provide meaningful insight into the international system and how it works. But as discussed, there are areas that could be improved upon, and alternate ways of approaching the study could allow for a better understanding of international organizations like NATO. Different theories may be useful when studying the international system, and Wendt's Constructivism should be seen as a unique model that considers different information, which may lead to a better analysis of the US and NATO relationship, especially considering its contemporary existence and future development.

Constructivist Approach

US/NATO Relationship Motivation

Wendt's Constructivist theory of IP provides a versatile and detailed model that could be used to identify the motivation and benefits or costs of the US maintaining its membership in NATO. Wendt (1999, 1) offered what he called an all-inclusive type of Structural Idealism that focused on "emergent powers of social structures" as opposed to the reductionist view that social structures should only be analyzed at the individual (meaning state or agent) level, and he emphasized the sharing of ideas as opposed to

materialism when defining international social life.³⁷ The liberal concept of sharing ideas highlights an especially important connection in the US/NATO relationship because they both attempt to promulgate that concept through ensuring a secure and peaceful environment. While Wendt acknowledged that there were other versions of constructivism, he defined his as a sort of moderate version that “endorses a scientific approach to social inquiry”.³⁸ Overall, Wendt’s focus on and explanation of the international system’s structure appears to give his constructivist theory more versatility than those from other constructivists such as Martha Finnemore or Peter J. Katzenstein, although they make their own contributions to the field of study.

Interestingly, Wendt’s theory itself would be consistent with both US and NATO liberal values. The US has historically embraced progress, such as its effort to create a “liberal world market economy” following WWII³⁹, and NATO has evolved into an efficient peacekeeping force that helps facilitate progress for its members by offering protection against a variety of global threats, including ones that could cause economic instability to both members and nonmembers.⁴⁰

Wendt (1999, 23-33) explained the differences between two pairs of sociologies: material versus ideational and individualism versus holism, in order to explain how ideas and structure affect states or agents such as NATO in the view of a constructionist. He argued that the idealist position explains the true force of ideas in international politics as oppose to the materialist view that disregards the influence of

³⁷ Wendt, *Social Theory*, 1.

³⁸ Ibid.

³⁹ Jackson and Sorensen, *Introduction to International Relations*, 191.

⁴⁰ Goldgeier, *The Future of NATO*, 374.

ideas. Idealists believe that material forces should not be separated from the ideas that created them, while materialists believe that it is only the material being used that matters.⁴¹ For example, a materialist would argue that one should only consider the strength of a state's army, while an idealist would argue that the strength of an army does not matter without the ideas its leadership has on how to use that strength.

He then explained that holism as oppose to individualism explained structural forces on the international community better because it allowed for the possibility for "social structures to have constitutive effects on agents," a concept that is excluded from individualism.⁴² What Wendt means by 'constitutive effect' is that the international structure itself has the ability to create, establish, or produce something that did not previously exist, and it is not just the state or agent that is responsible, but rather, the system itself that is the impetus for that creation. An example of this is that NATO, as part of the larger international structure composed of international agents, had a 'constitutive effect' on the US because NATO influenced how the US government conducted operations in Afghanistan. Such influence was evident when the US created policy regarding support and military operations based on NATO considerations.⁴³ A holistic understanding of events such as this offers the possibility of a broader analysis of the US and NATO relationship, and therefore presents the opportunity to gain the most insight into the effects of that relationship. Wendt's assessment differentiated him from

⁴¹ Wendt, *Social Theory*, 23-33.

⁴² Wendt, *Social Theory*, 27.

⁴³ "NATO's role in Afghanistan," The European Parliament, last modified January 20, 2010, accessed February 6, 2015, http://www.europarl.europa.eu/meetdocs/2009_2014/documents/sede/dv/sede250110natoroleafghanistan_/sede250110natoroleafghanistan_en.pdf.

the other IR theorists previously discussed because they subscribed to different combinations of the four sociologies discussed above.

The social structure's 'constitutive effects' that were mentioned in the previous paragraph supports Wendt's holist view that social structures exert influence on the international community because such effects highlight how the "structure of the international system matters to world politics."⁴⁴ Constitutive effects help explain why ideas and social structures create "phenomena that are conceptually or logically dependent on those ideas or structures that exists in virtue of them."⁴⁵ While this may sound like a tautological argument, it should still be considered relevant because often times certain things are dependent on each other to exist as they do. Consider again the traffic analogy that was used earlier. One cannot understand traffic patterns without considering both the highway system and the vehicles that travel on it. If one does not consider those things together as equally important, a study of traffic patterns becomes two independent studies, one of cars and one of roads, either of which alone does little for the study of traffic patterns.

As for NATO, consider its existence and its role as a peacekeeping force in the international community. NATO's role as peacekeeper developed with the existence of NATO and, likewise, NATO still exists because it was able to adapt to the changes in the international structure, such as when the Cold War ended. When that happened, NATO developed into an organization focused on peacekeeping in the international community instead of defense against an obsolete Soviet threat. While the third and fifth

⁴⁴ Wendt, *Social Theory*, 78.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 88.

chapters discuss its evolution in more depth, the fact that it has evolved highlights how NATO has learned to adapt to its changing role in the global community and continues to exist based on liberal values of peace and progress. In turn, this would appeal to the US government because it too has been maintained on the same liberal principles since its founding when George Washington “disbanded his troops and surrendered his sword to Congress” as a gesture of peace at the end of the American Revolutionary War.⁴⁶

Wendt argued that IR should focus on the debate of what makes up the international world, known as ontology, instead of “how we can know it”, known as epistemology.⁴⁷ In defining his ontology, he assumed that although the structure of international politics was anarchic, it was still defined by three social structures “based on what kind of roles [] dominate the system”, which he called Hobbesian (enemy), Lockean (rival), and Kantian (friend).⁴⁸ Unlike the previously mentioned IR theories, Wendt’s model provides the ability to consider the existence of NATO in an international social structure that falls along the spectrum of the liberal/realist continuum and not necessarily on one end or the other. NATO could not be maintained where a Hobbesian culture predominates because states could not trust each other, and conversely, it would be unnecessary in a fully developed Liberal Kantian society where states are in perpetual peace. But Wendt argued NATO, which he described as a North Atlantic security team, fit well in an early form of Kantian culture where states have begun to value nonviolence

⁴⁶ Akhil Reed Amar. *America’s Constitution, A Biography* (New York: Random House Trade Paperbacks, 2006), 141.

⁴⁷ Wendt, *Social Theory*, 90.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 247.

and focus more on team play than on old rivalries.⁴⁹ In this context, Wendt's Constructivist theory utilizes social structure to better explain the existence of NATO, its affect on the global society, and its role in helping the US and other states share ideas and develop identities.

NATO could be considered a rising international agent in its own right that, through its existence, creates its own power to affect individual state's identities through the operations it conducts in the international system. Wendt explained, "the process of interacting adds an irreducible and potentially transformative element."⁵⁰ In this context, NATO's interaction with individual states could begin to influence their behavior and, in turn, cause change in the global community, which could lead to what Wendt described as structural change in the international system.⁵¹

A Complex World

This analysis supports the claim that Wendt's Constructivist theory of IP is extremely useful in helping to explain why the US should maintain its membership in NATO and continue to support the growth of the alliance, despite the risk of alienating other countries such as Russia. While other IR theories discussed in this chapter provided useful insights, they seemed to be missing something that left them falling short of fully explaining the continued existence of NATO and, therefore, understanding the nature of the US's continued membership in the future. Among other things, Wendt made a compelling case that materialism should not be considered the primary driving

⁴⁹ Ibid., 297.

⁵⁰ Ibid., 366.

⁵¹ Ibid., 69.

force behind the international system. Instead, the driving force is the shared ideas between agents, which then influence the use of material forces. Those claims offer a good explanation for the relationship between the US and NATO because the two international agents share the same liberal values of peace and progress and a mutual understating of the need for defense. Those shared values should ensure they have a shared vision for the use of material forces now and in the future.

It is important to understand the motivations behind actions so that statesmen and national leaders can attempt to predict future actions, prepare for their effects, and possibly help shape favorable outcomes in a complex international environment. Academics and scholars should continue to diligently work to create and apply IR and IP theories that allow for the inclusion of as much pertinent data as possible so that one can develop the best picture or interpretation of international events, which could then help decision makers predict future action and decide on the best course of action possible. Further research into the topic presented in this chapter would benefit from the inclusion of additional IR and IP theories with an analysis of their applicability to current and historical events. Another area that could provide useful insight is an analysis of how social construction impacts the identity formation of NATO and its member states.

With the understanding that IR and IP theory, especially Wendt's Constructivism, are useful tools that help explain NATO's existence and the US's continued relationship with it, the following chapter will illustrate how the Bosnian War was a major transition point for the alliance. At this point, NATO began to make its mark as an enduring intergovernmental organization and started transitioning into what

Wendt would describe as a substantial international agent that influences state behavior. The chapter will illustrate the critical role the US played in that transition and highlight the major changes that occurred in NATO's operations.

CHAPTER III

A CRITICAL PIVOT POINT FOR THE NATO ALLIANCE

“It must make fundamental changes, or it will become obsolete. Today thus represents a moment of hope.”

- Ronald Reagan, Former President of the United States⁵²

Introduction

The first section of this chapter identifies the Bosnian War as a crucial moment in NATO’s history. The second section will go over the changing dynamic in the relationship between the US and NATO leading up to the intervention in Bosnia. The third section will emphasize how the complex nature of the Bosnian conflict made it a difficult venture for both the US and NATO. The fourth section highlights the success of NATO when the US led it in several first time endeavors, including its first combat operation and peacekeeping mission. The final section suggests that another pivot point may be on the horizon because of new threats and the changing circumstances of the international community.

Bosnia Pivot Point

It is important to identify and understand critical moments in history that shape the evolution of an institution like NATO and its relationship with its members.

⁵² Ronald Reagan, “Remarks on East-West Relations at the Brandenburg Gate, Delivered in West Berlin, Germany, June 12, 1987,” in *Classic American Speeches* (New York: Barnes and Nobels, 2014), 762.

So, when did such a defining moment occur for NATO? In the first half of the 1990s, the Bosnian War tested NATO's ability to adjust its mission to meet the demands of the changing security environment in Eastern Europe that had come about as a result of the collapse of the Soviet Union. On January 20th 1993, as Bill Clinton was being sworn in as the 42nd President of the United States,⁵³ a headline in the *New York Times* read, "Abuses by Serbs the Worst Since Nazi Era,"⁵⁴ and one in the *Los Angeles Times* stated, "Guns Speak Louder than Words: U.N., Vance, and Owen keep talking, Serbs keep fighting".⁵⁵ These headlines, and others like them, were a clear indication of the challenges the region would soon have to address as the old hatreds between ethnic divisions in Eastern Europe manifested into extreme violence during the Bosnian War. With conflict no longer suppressed by the iron curtain of the recently dissolved Soviet Union and Yugoslavian communist governments, this would become a critical moment in NATO's history, as it would intervene and stabilize the situation.

This chapter will explore this moment in NATO's history. It was a critical time that is important to consider when attempting to understand the US/NATO relationship because it is what this chapter identifies as a "pivot point" in the alliances existence. It is considered a pivot point because it illustrates a major change in NATO's

⁵³ "Swearing-In Ceremony for President William J. Clinton: Fifty-Second Inaugural Ceremonies, January 20, 1993," Joint Congressional Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies, accessed December 5, 2014, <http://www.inaugural.senate.gov/swearing-in/event/bill-clinton-1993>.

⁵⁴ Elaine Sciolino, "Abuses by Serbs the Worst Since Nazi Era, Report Says," *New York Times*, January 20, 1993, accessed December 5, 2014. <http://www.nytimes.com/1993/01/20/world/abuses-by-serbs-the-worst-since-nazi-era-report-says.html>.

⁵⁵ "Guns Speak Louder Than Words: U.N., Vance, and Owen Keep talking, Serbs keep fighting," *Los Angeles Times*, January 20, 1993, accessed December 5, 2014. http://articles.latimes.com/1993-01-20/local/me-1406_1_vance-owen-plan.

mission or operation that needed to happen for the alliance to remain relevant and meet the challenges of changing international circumstances in the global community.

Understanding the implications of this moment and the influence it had on further NATO decisions will hopefully provide some insight into the dynamic of the US/NATO relationship and assist in identifying future pivot points. While there are many moments that have undoubtedly affected the progress of NATO's development, the discussion that follows attempts to focus on one that should be considered very important. This chapter argues NATO's intervention in Bosnia was a critical pivot point for the alliance that substantially contributed to the growth of the organization through increased action and responsibility in the international community.

Changing Roles for the US and NATO

The Bosnian War from 1992 to 1995 in Bosnia and Herzegovina, also referred to as simply Bosnia or the Balkans, was not only the first time NATO had been employed as military force to stabilize a major security crisis that involved several independent states, it was also the first time it was used as a militarily offensive measure.⁵⁶ This was a time when America's relationship with NATO changed from one that appeared to be very limited to one that was actively engaged and encouraging NATO's involvement. The Clinton administration recognized the previous administrations struggle to adapt to the rapidly changing political and security environment in Bosnia and Herzegovina and decided that NATO could be of significant use in creating and maintaining stability in the

⁵⁶ Jacqueline Ching, *Genocide and the Bosnian War* (New York: The Rosen Publishing Group, 2009), 6-10.

region. But employing military action through NATO was a new concept, and an even more radical idea was for NATO to become involved in a nonmember's affairs.

Previous American presidents did not seem to consider NATO as a means to engage in multinational security operations with nonmember states, such as Bush Sr.'s American led ventures into Kuwait and Somalia that required the formation of a new multinational coalition each time. In fact, Bush's only experience with NATO was limited to dealing with membership for the recently unified Germany.⁵⁷ Perhaps this limited experience with the alliance led him to pursue a policy of nonintervention in Bosnia. Since there was no precedent for NATO involvement, Bush may have been concerned with the US becoming independently involved in a Bosnian security issue with no support from Europe. The concern over involvement was so great that the Bush administration actually played down allegations of serious Serbian atrocities, such as concentration camps for Muslim Bosnians, to prevent any requirement to intervene based on its commitments to the 1951 Genocide Convention.⁵⁸ It would not be until his successor Clinton came into office that NATO would be seriously considered as part of the solution and eventually receive support from the US to engage in the Balkans.

Navigating a Complicated Conflict

But the hesitation for NATO to become involved, even with a US led

⁵⁷ "American President: A Reference Resource for George H.W. Bush," Miller Center: University of Virginia, accessed February 11, 2015, <http://millercenter.org/president/bush/essays/biography/5>.

⁵⁸ Patrick Glynn, "See No Evil: Clinton-Bush, and the truth about Bosnia," *The New Republic*, 209, no. 17 (1993), <http://web.b.ebscohost.com.mantis.csuchico.edu/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=1&sid=eb665490-3c2e-4981-8c6d-6447ccd6efd7%40sessionmgr198&hid=105>.

campaign, was due to fears of becoming locked in a complicated conflict with no end in sight. During the war the Bosnian Serbs, Croats, and Muslims were the three main ethnic groups that formed the majority of combatants.⁵⁹ But although there were three belligerent groups, there were only two sides. The Serbs and Muslims comprised the majority of each side, while the Croats alternated their alliance during the war. This complex and changing interaction between the groups fighting made it difficult for outside assistance to mediate between them. Overall, it was a brutal war motivated by long held political and ethnic disputes over territory and government, which ultimately led to nearly 100,000 deaths in total, to include the systematic slaughter of about 33,000 Muslim civilians, including men, women, and children for the purpose of ethnic cleansing.⁶⁰ The conflict produced so many accusations of war crimes that it inspired the international community to establish special war crimes tribunals at the Hague that are still going on today for actions that happened almost twenty years ago.⁶¹ But although the Christian Serbian and Croatian armies engaged in significantly more ethnic cleansing than did their Muslim counterparts in this conflict, all the belligerent groups committed war crimes in some form.⁶²

⁵⁹ Ching, *Genocide*, 6-10.

⁶⁰ Luc Reydam and Jan Wouters, "The Politics of Establishing International Criminal Tribunals," in *International Prosecutors*, ed. Luc Reydam, Jan Wouters, and Cedric Ryngaert (United Kingdom: Oxford University Press, 2012), 26.

⁶¹ Julian Borger, "Radovan Karadzic tells war crimes trial there was no ethnic cleansing in Bosnia," *The Guardian*, October 1, 2014, accessed December 5, 2014. <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2014/oct/01/radovan-karadzic-war-crimes-trial-no-ethnic-cleansing-bosnia>.

⁶² Paul Mojzes, "From Genocide to Dialogue: Christian-Muslim Relations in the Former Yugoslavia," *Occasional Papers on Religion in Eastern Europe*, 34, no. 3 (2014): 23-24, accessed December 5, 2014, <http://eds.b.ebscohost.com.mantis>.

Clinton was initially conflicted about if, when, and how the US should become involved in the conflict. Since Clinton criticized his predecessor George Bush Sr. for his inaction in the region, he was expected to fulfill his campaign rhetoric by leading the US and Europe in peacekeeping operations. But this was easier said than done because there was already a European led UN protection force present and the NATO member states frequently had competing alliances, such as the British and French initially siding with the Serbs who were carrying out the majority of the war time atrocities.⁶³ Clinton not only faced opposing political viewpoints and actions from his allies in NATO, but he also had to overcome the UN Protection Force (UNPROFOR) commander in Bosnia, Michael Rose. Rose continually underplayed the failure of his own military and political initiatives such as the ineffective 1993 Vance-Owen Plan and the 1994 Contact Group Plan and emphatically disagreed with Clinton's proposal to force the hostile Bosnian Serbs into peace talks through the use of an aggressive air bombing campaign.⁶⁴

Although Clinton vowed to do more in Bosnia to curb the violence than his predecessor, his own policy limited his tactical options to only air power due to his early rejection of undertaking any role in providing ground forces while hostilities still continued.⁶⁵ This decision also reduced NATO's opportunities for engaging in the region

csuchico.edu/eds/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=ea1cc5f1-da54-41eb-bb2f-5e36528f9d88%40sessionmgr198&vid=36&hid=120.

⁶³ Sidney Blumenthal, *The Clinton Wars* (New York: Macmillan, 2003), 62.

⁶⁴ Michael C. Williams, "Perception of the War in Bosnia," *International Affairs (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1944-)*, 75, no. 2 (1999): 378, accessed December 8, 2014, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2623350>.

⁶⁵ Michael Moodie, "Tragedy in the Balkans: A Conflict Ended – Or Interrupted?," in

and substantially limited their ability to order military action, such as using ground troops to protect safe zones that NATO helped to establish, which could have degraded the Bosnian Serbs ability to fight and potentially have brought the conflict to an end sooner.⁶⁶ But Clinton had more to consider than just military expediency and was also motivated to limit US involvement because of his own political considerations that included the opinions of his constituency, the American public, who viewed the recent loss of American soldiers lives in Somalia as a failure in his administrations foreign policy and were hesitant to support any direct involvement in either a unilateral or multinational security operation that again put US soldiers lives at risk.⁶⁷ But multinational involvement would eventually provide motivation to support NATO intervention because the American public would feel more comfortable with action from the alliance as opposed to just the US.

US/NATO Successful Employment

Clinton spearheaded NATO bombing operations, even in the face of the Great Britain and French objections, and authorized the US to fly attack missions that amounted to 80% of NATO's aerial operations.⁶⁸ In addition, he agreed with his domestic political opponents to lift an arms embargo against Bosnia that would allow the Bosnian Muslims

Toward Responsibility in the New World Disorder: Challenges and Lessons of Peace Operations, ed. Max G. Manwaring and John T. Fishel (Portland: Frank Cass, 1998), 19.

⁶⁶ David Rohde, "The Fall of Srebrenica," in *War and Change in the Balkans: Nationalism, Conflict and Cooperation*, ed. Brad K. Blitz (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 135.

⁶⁷ Douglas C. Foyle, *Counting the Public In: Presidents, Public Opinion, and Foreign Policy* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999), 263.

⁶⁸ Thomas H. Henriksen, *Clinton's Foreign Policy in Somalia, Bosnia, Haiti, and North Korea* (New Jersey: Hoover Press, 1996), 18.

easier access to the weapons and training they needed to defend against the attacking Bosnian Serb forces.⁶⁹ The combination of US led NATO airstrikes, weapons delivery, and military training would ultimately turn the tide of the war in favor of the Bosnian Muslim forces on the ground and lead to the end of formal hostilities in the region with the signing of Dayton Peace Accords at the end of 1995.

The Dayton Peace Accords was the final solution of a US and NATO led compromise between the Serbs, Muslims, and Croats that were based on the territorial boundaries that were produced because of the fighting. It gave each ethnic majority the responsibility to govern their area peacefully, with the support of the international community, while also participating in the larger Bosnian national government without returning to cultural division and fighting.⁷⁰ Clinton had taken a gamble to become involved in this complex peace process that could have easily ended in failure, as it had in the past, and won.⁷¹ After years of failed peace negotiations, his efforts came out on top, and Clinton could take credit for the successful establishment of an international peace treaty with strong credibility because it included the US, Great Britain, France, Germany, Italy, and Russia. It limited US military involvement to acceptable levels by directing a multinational UN authorized NATO Implementation and Stabilization Force

⁶⁹ Mark Wintz, *Transatlantic Diplomacy and the Use of Military Force in the Post-Cold War Era* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2010), 68.

⁷⁰ Mark Baskin and Paula Pickering, "Former Yugoslavia and Its Successors," in *Central and East European Politics: From Communism to Democracy*, ed. Sharon L. Wolchik and Jane L. Curry (United Kingdom: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 2011), 286.

⁷¹ Bruce S. Jansson, *The Sixteen-Trillion-Dollar Mistake: How the U.S. Bungled Its National Priorities from the New Deal to the Present* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2001), 324.

(IFOR/SFOR) to enforce the terms of the agreement.⁷² For the first time in history NATO was engaged in a peacekeeping operation, and it lasted for nine years.

The pivot point in Bosnia represents the first time NATO engaged in operations and missions that it continues to conduct today. This was NATO's first military engagement and offensive operation, its first prolonged peacekeeping operation, which started with 60,000 troops from both alliance and nonmember states, and its first intervention in a nonmember states affairs.⁷³ It was a point that redefined what NATO meant and what it was capable of doing. It paved the way for future operations that required decisive multinational military operations and long-term commitments such as its eleven-year security and ongoing training mission in Afghanistan, its continuing seven-year antipiracy mission off the Horn of Africa and the Gulf of Aden, and a variety of other missions listed in Appendix B.⁷⁴ NATO's actions in Bosnia set a precedent for conducting air strikes in Libya in 2011, security operations in Macedonia for two years, and continuing operations in Kosovo with 4,500 multinational troops.⁷⁵ In addition, NATO's actions in Bosnia also secured its ability to expand its membership because it proved it could actually resolve a severe security conflict and maintain peace in Europe. Before this, NATO's relevancy was seriously doubted because it was unclear what

⁷² Kimberly Z. Marten, *Enforcing the Peace: Learning from the Imperial Past* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2004), 46-49.

⁷³ Ronald D. Asmus, *Opening NATO's Door: How the Alliance Remade Itself for a New Era* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2002), 125.

⁷⁴ "NATO's Operations 1949 - Present," Allied Command Operations (ACO), accessed February 26, 2015, <http://www.aco.nato.int/resources/21/NATO%20Operations,%201949-Present.pdf>.

⁷⁵ "NATO Operations and Missions," North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), last updated January 14, 2015, http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_52060.htm.

benefit NATO could provide in a post-Cold War environment that no longer required a Western deterrent.⁷⁶ Following Bosnia, NATO was viewed as one of the most important security crisis management organizations in the region.⁷⁷

Future NATO Missions

But while NATO may have been successful in expanding upon its original purpose as a deterrent to Soviet aggression during the Cold War, the situation in the international community continues to evolve and managing ethnic conflict in Eastern Europe is just one of many problems NATO now faces. New threats have emerged like transnational terrorist organizations such as Al Qaeda and the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS). International criminal activity and the proliferation of conventional small arms are also emerging concerns that threaten regional security. These new and emerging threats are an extremely important consideration for NATO and indicate that the alliance may be at a new pivot point in its history that it must navigate successfully if it wants to remain relevant in the future, much like its pivot point during the Bosnian War. But although these new considerations exist, there are still old ones as well.

Russia may be considered a reemerging threat as it has recently been active in Georgia and the Ukraine, but this thesis considers Russia an old established threat that NATO has never stopped considering. The only difference now is that since Russia has recently been active, NATO may need to give it more attention and refocus on some old Cold War era deterrent measures. While this would certainly affect NATO's ability to

⁷⁶ Asmus, *Opening NATO's Door*, 124.

⁷⁷ Michael F. Harsch, *The Power of Dependence, NATO-UN Cooperation in Crisis Management* (United Kingdom: Oxford University Press, 2015), 12.

address the newer threats previously mentioned because it has finite resources, no one should expect that NATO would drop everything and only focus on Russia, except of course in a worst-case scenario where Russia conducts a full-scale attack on the West, which is highly unlikely. Although this new Russian threat exists with new considerations compared to the Soviet Union threat, the thought of Russia as NATO's enemy is a relatively old and established one with established doctrine. So while this thesis recognizes Russia as a variable in NATO's calculus, it will focus on NATO's newer threats. Future research on this subject could benefit from increased attention to this area.

The main argument of this chapter, that Bosnia was a critical pivot point in NATO's history, is sufficiently supported. NATO's first mission as a deterrent against the Soviet Union lasted just over forty years, and it has been over twenty years since its pivot point in Bosnia. Now NATO may be approaching a new pivot point, and its members, including the US, should be prepared to transition the alliance in a manner that allows it to continue to focus on Russia while engaging the newer threats previously mentioned. In addition to developing new military capabilities, this approach will likely require more diplomatic and political solutions as well. This would keep the alliance relevant and pursuing the most advantageous missions in the contemporary international environment. Chapter five will discuss in more detail the new and emerging threats, and chapter six will explore how NATO may evolve during a new pivot point in its history. But first, the next chapter will consider a significant variable that was mentioned previously in this discussion. That variable is public opinion, and it proved to be a serious

factor that President Clinton had to consider when deciding if the US should pursue and support NATO military action in Bosnia. The next chapter explores how public opinion could dramatically affect the US/NATO relationship.

CHAPTER IV

The Influence of Public Opinion on NATO Participation

“One cannot wage war under present conditions without the support of public opinion. Nothing was more astonishing in the progress of the war than the place which public opinion occupied.”
 - General Douglas MacArthur, US Army Pacific Commander in WWII⁷⁸

Introduction

This chapter identifies public opinion as a substantial variable that can influence the US’s decision to adhere to NATO’s policies and participate or not participate in its military actions. As was mentioned in the previous chapter, it was a significant factor in determining how the US supported NATO operations in Bosnia. This chapter first explains why public opinion should be considered a significant influence on decisions regarding NATO and then presents five areas of discussion on how public opinion influences the US and other states interaction with the alliance. The first area explains why public opinion is important to US foreign policy and how it affects it. The second discusses how public opinion influences European state politics and how that then affects US positions on its foreign policy. The third illustrates the power of public opinion to prevent involvement with NATO by considering how the circumstances in Finland led to such a result. The fourth area of discussion explains how global opinion affects US policy and the fifth section discusses the possibility of NATO losing support from the US. The final section identifies some areas for continued study

⁷⁸ Douglas MacArthur, “Value of Press in Wartime,” *The Examiner*, March 25, 1942, accessed March 2, 2015, <http://trove.nla.gov.au/ndp/del/article/91505914>.

of this topic and reemphasizes the importance of public opinion support for NATO.

Significant Influence on Decisions

Younghoon Moon, a contributor to the *Harvard International Review*, questions the future of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and argues the distribution of burden between the United States (US) and the rest of the predominantly European alliance must be equalized in order for NATO to have a stable existence, which he defines as financial and material support, a dedicated command organization, and multinational resource sharing. Currently only five of the twenty-eight member-states meet their agreed upon defense-to-GDP spending ratio, and the US is shouldering 75% of NATO's overall defense cost. Because of this inequality, former Defense Secretary Robert Gates' warned Europe that American politicians may no longer view the high price of investing in NATO worth the cost.⁷⁹ Gates' warning seems to be more relevant than ever since NATO's current mission in Afghanistan is coming to an end, and the US is reevaluating its investment in the predominantly European alliance.

The US's future relationship with NATO seems to be in question and attention is drawn to the uncertain relevancy of the aging organization. But after so many years of championing NATO and its cause, does a budget dispute really provide enough reason for the US to cut its ties with the alliance? This question solicits an even more basic query; what variable could be powerful enough to influence American politicians to

⁷⁹ Younghoon Moon, "The Future of NATO, The Purpose of the Alliance after the Cold War," *Harvard International Review* 34, no. 3 (December 2013): 19-21, accessed May 10, 2014, <http://eds.a.ebscohost.com.mantis.csuchico.edu/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=e13481f0-6173-4ab8-8f2e-d99faf956fe2%40sessionmgr4001&vid=1&hid=4205>.

abandon or continue our support of NATO? Although Secretary of State John Kerry stated that the US would like to continue its relationship with NATO, he did not specify any conditions to meet that objective.⁸⁰ So one is still left wondering what would influence American politicians to decide to stay with or leave NATO.

To answer that question, it is reasonable to assume that what affects the US's interaction with NATO would also be something that affects individual politicians and their decision-making process. One variable that clearly presents itself to American politicians when making almost any decision on domestic or foreign policy issues is public opinion. Without support of the general public, elected officials could not survive in office and would soon be replaced. While there can be no doubt that there are many factors that influence the evolving relationship between the US and NATO, public opinion in both the US and abroad would likely play a significant role in shaping the US's future relationship with the alliance.

One should consider GEN MacArthur's quote at the beginning of the chapter, where he stated the importance of public opinion support for military operations during WW II. His remarks are as applicable today as they were in 1942, and should be remembered when considering the reality of the US/NATO relationship, which is founded in mutual defense and focuses heavily on military action and security operations. As America's contemporary politicians choose to support or not support NATO led military operations and political initiatives, their decision will come largely from the

⁸⁰ "Secretary Kerry at NATO Headquarters in Brussels." Embassy of The United States – Brussels, Belgium, last modified December 3, 2013, accessed March 18, 2015, <http://www.uspolicy.be/headline/secretary-kerry-nato-headquarters-brussels>.

influence of public opinion on those matters. This chapter argues that if public opinion supports US foreign policy issues and goals that involve participation in NATO, then the US should continue to advocate for, support, and lead NATO operations while fulfilling its defense spending requirements to the alliance.

US Foreign Policy Formation and Public Opinion

First one must consider how US foreign policy that drives NATO involvement is established in order to accurately assess how public opinion could affect it. According to the Critical Issue Theory as described by Donald Kelley, foreign policy issues are identified through the circumstances that evolve in the international community itself. The public then helps determine which policy should be adopted to address the critical issue through public debate.⁸¹ And Page and Shapiro confirm that “government responsiveness to public opinion is substantial.”⁸² The public communicates their preference through opinion polls and surveys, such as when public opinion changed regarding the governments policy in Vietnam in the 1970’s, which led to the government changing its policy.⁸³ While critical issues do not always involve NATO, those that do are subject to the same influence from public opinion.

For example, a majority of Americans eventually supported a NATO military intervention in Libya in 2011, and the government acted accordingly by participating in

⁸¹ Donald R. Kelley, ed., *Divided Power: The Presidency, Congress, and the Formation of American Foreign Policy* (Fayetteville: The University of Arkansas Press, 2005), 151-155.

⁸² Benjamin I. Page and Robert Y. Shapiro, *The Rational Public* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1992), 393.

⁸³ Marie T. Henahan, *Foreign Policy and Congress: An International Relations Perspective* (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 2000), 96.

the mission.⁸⁴ In addition, according to Gallup polling on Afghanistan since 2001, a majority of the public has consistently supported the war as conveyed through their responses on several questions regarding the conflict, such as respondents ‘not thinking the US made a mistake sending military forces to Afghanistan’ and them thinking things in Afghanistan were going ‘moderately well’ verses ‘moderately badly’.⁸⁵ Despite the second set of responses fluctuating slightly more than the first, overall public support influenced the US government to make and maintain foreign policy that kept American forces in Afghanistan and supporting a NATO military intervention.

Congressional members pay attention to public opinion of presidential foreign policy and base their support of such policy on an assessment of the public's support instead of strictly adhering to party ideologies.⁸⁶ In other words, congressional members largely support foreign policy based on public opinion. So if the public is in favor of a certain policy on a critical issue in foreign policy that involves NATO and demonstrates that view through opinion polls to its elected representatives, then the US will meet its requirements to the organization like it did in the examples mentioned in the previous paragraph. This is a vital piece of information that supports my hypothesis by explaining how public opinion could influence government foreign policy decisions about NATO.

Henehan describes the development of the Critical Issue Theory as rooted in the changing dynamics of US government around the 1970's. She stated that during this

⁸⁴ Ben Clements, “Public Opinion and Military Intervention: Afghanistan, Iraq and Libya,” *The Political Quarterly* 84, no. 1 (January – March 2013): 122-123, accessed March 18, 2015, doi: 10.1111/j.1467-923X.2013.02427.x.

⁸⁵ “Afghanistan,” Gallup, accessed May 13, 2014, <http://www.gallup.com/poll/116233/afghanistan.aspx>.

⁸⁶ Kelley, *Divided Power*, 54.

post-Vietnam time period, US public opinion on foreign policy mobilized and began to substantially influence Congressional behavior through a notable increase in organization. The “number, type, and influence of interest groups related to foreign policy” has largely increased in Washington and given the general public a louder voice to address Congress on international issues.⁸⁷ This amplified impact has caused new tensions both within Congress and between Congress and the President concerning foreign affairs because the public’s role in foreign policy has increased by influencing Congressional members to be more assertive, respond rapidly to public objections, and become more sensitive to opinions on policy concerning foreign affairs.⁸⁸

But even presidents pay attention to public opinion for guidance in establishing foreign policy in the hopes of pleasing the majority of Americans. Page and Shapiro (1992) pointed this out when they discussed how President Johnson changed his administrations foreign policy focus from victory in Vietnam to negotiations for peace on March 31, 1968 after the enemy’s Tet offensive indicated the war was far from over. Johnson responded to drastic changes in public opinion that shifted from 36% to 43% in favor of “getting out as quickly as possible” and dropping support of increasing US troop levels in Vietnam from 40% to 20%.⁸⁹ Another example Page and Shapiro discussed was after Ronald Reagan defeated Jimmy Carter in 1980. After his victory he increased defense spending to combat the Soviet Union during the Cold War in accordance with a public opinion poll that showed 60% of Americans favored more military spending in

⁸⁷ Henehan, *Foreign Policy*, 30.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, 30-32.

⁸⁹ Page and Shapiro, *The Rational Public*, 233-234.

response to what was perceived as weak policy by the Carter administration.⁹⁰

In an example in recent history, and one that deals with possible NATO involvement, President Obama asked for congressional approval to take military action against the Syrian government after they used chemical weapons to attack their own people. He did not have to do this as Commander in Chief of US military forces, but he did.⁹¹ Even though Obama could have followed through with his threat against Syria, he wanted the approval of Congress in order to ensure he had as much public support as possible. Ultimately, it makes sense that presidents would react to public opinion on what could be viewed as critical issues, like those discussed above, because they could personally benefit during a re-election cycle or help build support for fellow party members as they compete in national elections across the country.

Henehan emphasizes that government representatives and their constituents do not create critical issues, but rather, critical issues develop organically in the international political environment.⁹² This is based on the international relations theory that the international system itself can affect an individual country's domestic politics, which in turn affects its foreign policy. Once issues are identified, the public plays an important role in influencing government priorities to address those issues, including any issues that involve NATO. Kelley provides an example of that with America's response to the terrorist attacks on 9/11, which illustrated overwhelming bipartisan public support for the

⁹⁰ Ibid., 270.

⁹¹ Peter Baker and Jonathan Weisman, "Obama Seeks Approval by Congress for Strike in Syria," *New York Times*, August 31, 2013, accessed April 21, 2013, http://www.nytimes.com/2013/09/01/world/middleeast/syria.html?_r=0.

⁹² Henehan, *Foreign Policy*, 5.

Bush administration's foreign policy that focused on addressing the threat of terrorism.⁹³ That public support resulted in the US engaging in two wars simultaneously and leading NATO forces in the largest multinational military coalition in history.⁹⁴ In this instance, US public opinion highly supported NATO operations that ultimately resulted in the government's full support and maximum participation.

European Foreign Policy and Public Opinion

Just like in the US, other states public opinions affect their government's decisions regarding foreign policy and, therefore, impact their relationship with NATO. Fitzpatrick examined public opinion in Germany, the United Kingdom (UK), and France regarding foreign policy initiatives on NATO nuclear arms control policies and identified noticeable impacts on their domestic politics in the recent past. He stated that German public opinion shifted to supporting further nuclear weapons removal in 2009 when the Social Democratic Party was voted out of office in favor of the Free Democratic Party because of their focus on implementing NATO arms control measures. On the other hand, he noted that popular UK public opinion rejected the notion of significantly reducing its access to nuclear weapons. This was evident when the Labour Party lost elections in 1987 because it opposed NATO's nuclear deterrent program that would have added US nuclear cruise missiles to its inventory. Public opinion forced the Labour Party to change its tone and be more supportive of NATO sanctioned nuclear deterrence while still supporting NATO led disarmament. Public opinion in France has supported a strong

⁹³ Kelley, *Divided Power*, 164.

⁹⁴ "About ISAF," International Security Assistance Force (ISAF), accessed April 21, 2014, <http://www.isaf.nato.int/history.html>.

nuclear deterrence policy since the end of World War II and continues to do so today despite NATO's disarmament program.⁹⁵

The public opinions mentioned above successfully influenced the foreign policies within their respective political structures, but adherence to NATO policy is another factor to consider in regards to US support of individual alliance members. Fitzpatrick's study also provides a foundation of information that could be used for considering undesirable second and third order effects when one considers other variables such as NATO funding as presented by Moon. Germany and the UK have adopted policies more congruent with both NATO's nuclear deterrent and disarmament policy, while France has resisted the disarmament portion in favor of the deterrent option. France has paid about .5% over its required dues, according to Moon, so it may be able to maintain its resistance to disarmament while still receiving support from the US to maintain its current nuclear capability. Germany, however, is paying only about half of what it owes to NATO, so it may have a difficult time convincing the US to support NATO initiatives to implement the disarmament that it desires within its borders. The UK is paying about the same as the French, but because the UK's foreign policy seems to be more in line with NATO programs, the US would most likely be willing to support NATO programs that relate to the UK as oppose to France.

Another example of Britain and France acting in accordance with popular public opinion is explored by Clements. His article on the military intervention in Libya

⁹⁵ Mark Fitzpatrick, "How Europeans View Tactical Nuclear Weapons on Their Continent," *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* 67, no. 2 (March – April 2011): 58-64, accessed March 18, 2015, doi: 10.1177/0096340211399405.

in 2011 when Gaddafi attempted to subdue the ‘Arab Spring’ rebellion underscores the influence NATO member publics have in the international community. The British Prime Minister, David Cameron, and the French President, Nicolas Sarkozy, were ardent advocates for firm action against Gaddafi through NATO intervention and pushed for more than just a ‘no-fly zone’. The United Nations (UN) responded favorably by approving the use of military force under Resolution 1973, which gave NATO led forces specific authorization to use ‘all necessary measures’ to prevent the deaths of innocent civilians. Of all the NATO member countries that were involved, Britain and France had the most public support for military action against Gaddafi’s forces throughout the entire conflict so they were able to push the UN for strong action.⁹⁶

Clements notes that the British and French incumbent leaders gained approval from their citizens as measured by favorable results on public opinion polls. In Britain specifically, Cameron wanted to avoid the situation his predecessor, Tony Blair, found himself in when he supported military action in Iraq only to have it become a highly controversial issue that may have accelerated his departure in 2007. Cameron paid attention to public opinion and emerged from the conflict with Libya as a strong leader focused on achieving specific goals that were important for the well being of Britain. He seemed to learn from Blair’s experience with Iraq and dodged several unpopular aspects of that conflict. In Libya, Cameron avoided major ground operations in favor of air strikes, kept the focus on humanitarian support, only acted with specific UN approval,

⁹⁶ Clements, *Public Opinion*, 120-122.

and ended operations in seven months.⁹⁷

Clements shows that the public opinion polls of how Cameron handled the situation in Libya reveal that his plan was widely supported in the beginning with around 50% approval, then fell a few months later to around 30%, and then rose again until the end of the conflict to a high of around 55%.⁹⁸ It appears as though this dip in support might have come from the general public being uncertain if Cameron would be able to keep their involvement limited like he promised. Cameron would have noticed the drop in his approval and most likely been motivated to do everything in his power to quickly meet his objectives. When it was apparent that Gaddafi would be defeated and Cameron would be able to end British involvement, the public shifted again and became satisfied with his performance and the opinion polls rose to reflect that result. While this proposition seems possible, it would need to be further investigated to firmly identify this as the cause for the fluctuation in his performance rating.

Overall, the US was also in support of military intervention in Libya but most likely would not have acted without the strong support of both Britain and France. The predictable nature that their governments acted with when responding to their public opinion support helped the American public justify their support for participation in the NATO led mission.

⁹⁷ Ibid., 122-124.

⁹⁸ Ibid., 122.

When Public Opinion Prevents NATO Membership

Rahkonen (2007) describes Finland as another country in Europe where public opinion has played a major role in foreign policy decisions. The difference with Finland, however, is that public opinion has kept it *out* of the NATO alliance. Finland has been the focus of possible membership since the collapse of the Soviet Union in the early 1990's and the dissolution of any and all treaties associated with it. While there has been much attention given to the debate over whether or not to join the alliance, public opinion has remained strongly against the military union at 58 to 79 percent, competing against only a small supporting minority of 16 to 34 percent. But even with such a seemingly wide gap, there are ardent supporters who push for total inclusion. Membership is such a precarious issue within the political environment in Finland that all three major political parties in the country have unanimously agreed that any attempt at joining the organization should be preceded with a public referendum in favor of such action or, at a minimum, overwhelming public support (Rahkonen 2007).⁹⁹

This is a good case to study because it illustrates how public opinion has kept the country resistant to NATO membership. Rahkonen admits the reasons for that resistance are complicated, and while certain events such as the war in Kosovo, Afghanistan, and Iraq might have triggered a decline in support for membership,

⁹⁹ Juho Rahkonen, "Public Opinion, Journalism and the Question of Finland's Membership of NATO," *Nordicom Review* 28, no. 2 (November 2007): 82, accessed March 18, 2015, <http://eds.a.ebscohost.com.mantis.csuchico.edu/eds/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=6&sid=395ef5e0-b3f7-4d28-87e3-bfca41c21b43%40sessionmgr4002&hid=4205>.

Finland's resistance cannot be attributed exclusively to these kinds of events because no correlation has been found over a longer period of time. The fact that the Iraq War solicited a decline in support is curious in itself because that conflict was not even a NATO action. It may make more sense, however, when one considers that most Finnish citizens believe NATO is a "US led military alliance" instead of a "modern crisis management organization," and the average Finnish voter does not consider NATO membership an important enough issue to understand when other domestic issues consume their political attention.¹⁰⁰

The situation in Finland is also interesting because Rahkonen provides an example of how a non-member country can still be heavily involved with NATO operations without being beholden to the Article 5 mutual collective defense stipulation. This noncommittal position keeps Finland's government involved with the NATO alliance while allowing it to bow out of any situation public opinion might not favor. While there was no mention of financial commitments to NATO for partial members, such contributions would most likely be extremely limited and much less than that of full members. But less financial responsibility most likely means less input, if any, in what operations are to be undertaken and how they are executed, as well as an exclusion from any command position or authority. Additional research should include a cost/benefit analysis between full and partial membership to understand how public opinion then affects foreign policy with respect to NATO involvement. Such an examination could prove useful to the US if public opinion ever pushes the government to consider

¹⁰⁰ Rahkonen, *Public Opinion*, 91.

suspending or limiting its membership in NATO.

Influence of Global Opinion on US Policy

Positive *foreign* public opinion for political actions abroad could be an important factor that influences the US's continued support of NATO and its membership requirements. Rudesill states that foreign interests and opinions have been an important part of state security since the time of ancient Rome and China, but not to the extent that they are today. He argues the biggest evolution of this importance has been in the contemporary international system where foreign public opinion has become substantially more important for relatively new global powers like the US. As compared to the thousands of years prior to today where statesmanship was only focused on influencing the perceptions of the business, social, and ruling class elites who controlled the fate of the masses, now political leaders are concerned with the public at large.¹⁰¹ Through years of globalization and democratic expansion that promoted the exchange of information and ideas, the world has become a more thoughtful community that now requires independent states to solicit positive *foreign* public opinion in order to be successful in international pursuits.

The US should be especially concerned about foreign public opinion when undertaking endeavors that require international support to complete successfully or where such support would greatly assist in a favorable outcome. The US was successful in this respect when the international community strongly supported pursuing its enemies

¹⁰¹ Dakota S. Rudesill, "Foreign Public Opinion and National Security," *William Mitchell Law Review* 36, no. 1 (March 2010): 2-3, accessed March 18, 2015, <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2111595>.

into Afghanistan through UN sanctioned NATO operations in 2001.¹⁰² However, on the reverse side of the same issue, the failure to secure favorable foreign public opinion can have detrimental effects that result in the rejection of foreign support, even from allies of well-established treaties. For instance, Rudesill discusses how the US failed to gain popular public support in Turkey, a fellow democracy and NATO member, for the Iraq War. So the Turkish parliament acted in accordance with its domestic public opinion that *opposed* US action and *did not* allow the US to move through it in order to enter Iraq.¹⁰³ It appears the US cannot hope for support from other states just because they may be members of the same multinational organizations, but instead must strive to win foreign public opinion that will then steer the foreign governments to adopt domestic policies that favor US objectives. Rudesill describes this public diplomacy as “foreign public opinion policy” and highlights its importance for the foreseeable future.¹⁰⁴

Taking that into account, the US should still want to continue to support NATO or some equivalent in the future. Goldsmith (2005) and his colleagues highlight an important fact that multinational organizations like NATO, along with economic interdependence, positively affect foreign public opinion from the international community.¹⁰⁵ NATO support should therefore benefit the US and help create the foreign public opinion policy that Rudesill proposed previously. Such a policy could

¹⁰² ISAF, “About ISAF.”

¹⁰³ Rudesill, *Foreign Public*, 6.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, 12.

¹⁰⁵ Benjamin E. Goldsmith, Yusaku Horiuchi, and Takashi Inoguchi, “American Foreign Policy and Global Opinion: Who Supported the War in Afghanistan?,” *The Journal of Conflict Resolution* 49, no. 3 (June 2005): 425, accessed March 18, 2015, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/30045121>.

then continuously guide the efforts to improve America's international image. In addition, Goldsmith and his colleagues point out that although US economic aid in itself has no influence on US international public opinion, the act of giving that aid may generate positive international public opinion through the news media.¹⁰⁶ This information could help the US focus its resources in the future when trying to establish a positive image abroad.

Losing Domestic Public Support for NATO

If positive public opinion for NATO would ensure US involvement in the organization in the future, than conversely, the loss of that support could push the government to take action that might push the US to withdraw from the alliance. There are citizens such as Ted Carpenter who feel that US membership in NATO is no longer worth the cost¹⁰⁷, but this would not be the first time there has been public dissent against America's involvement in a multinational coalition. Page and Shapiro illustrate this fact in the mid-1960s when support for the UN declined, reaching a low of 53% in 1964. This was due in part by America's resentment of other states disapproving of US actions in Vietnam and Arab countries bothering its partner Israel. US ambassadors to the UN and Presidents such as Nixon and Reagan openly criticized the alliance. Between 1956 and 1976 less Americans said they wanted to stay in the UN and more said they wanted to resign membership, although those who supported the UN never fell short of majority.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid.

¹⁰⁷ Ted Galen Carpenter, "NATO at 60: A Hollow Alliance," *CATO Institute*, no. 635 (March 2009): 1, accessed May 3, 2014, <http://object.cato.org/sites/cato.org/files/pubs/pdf/pa635.pdf>.

The lowest support ever got was the previously mentioned 53%. Eventually support for the UN resurfaced and reached highs of 89% or better in 1990.¹⁰⁸ But if NATO loses support, there is no guarantee that it would bounce back like it did for the UN.

Public support for NATO could follow a similar downward spiral but with less hope of a rebound due to the treaty's unique military requirements. Carpenter makes a strong case that NATO has become a liability for the US and that its relevance to the challenges faced in the 21st century is doubtful. The countries that have been added to the alliance over the past decade are more liabilities than assets and have questionable governments that do more to provoke Russia than stabilize Europe. Conflicting ideas on how to deal with Russia separate the old members from the new and again highlight the danger of small confrontational border nations.¹⁰⁹

Carpenter's biggest argument is that European member countries have reduced defense spending and allowed their military capabilities to shrink and their forces to deteriorate. This leaves America shouldering the cost of protecting Europe while other states shirk the responsibility of spending to build and maintain their own defense.¹¹⁰ In addition, the difference in public opinion between member countries regarding what campaigns to embark on is leading to fractures in the alliance that could serious revolts against support for conflicts in the future.¹¹¹ If the American public begins to seriously consider the consequences of further involvement with NATO and determines that the US is no longer benefiting from the relationship, support could quickly drop and public

¹⁰⁸ Page and Shapiro, *The Rational Public*, 219.

¹⁰⁹ Carpenter, *NATO at 60*, 3.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 9-12.

¹¹¹ *Ibid.*, 6-7.

opinion could direct the government to dissolve its ties to the alliance. But such a break from the organization could have unforeseen consequences, such as a loss in global support for US foreign policy, as discussed earlier.

Public Opinion Matters

This chapter established public opinion as a significant factor in influencing US decisions regarding NATO participation. It then presented five areas of discussion to ascertain whether or not public opinion could our membership in NATO. The first discussion focused on the formation of US foreign policy, and evidence was presented that public opinion influenced government decisions in the context of the Critical Issue Theory. The second was to illustrate how European public opinion affects their government's foreign policy, which then affects US foreign policy as well. The chapter then considered how that could subsequently influence America's domestic public opinion regarding its involvement with NATO. The third area was to demonstrate how public opinion could have the *opposite* effect and keep a country, in this case Finland, *out* of commitments with multinational alliances while leaving room for limited participation. This reinforces the part of the argument that assumes public opinion could affect a countries relationship with international alliances. The fourth discussion was on the influence of global opinion to show that public opinion is so important to todays governing officials, that they are not limited to seeking only domestic opinion support. In certain situations, they desire support from foreign countries publics as well. And the fifth discussion was to highlight that the general public could have a thoughtful understanding of issues regarding NATO and choose not to support them for valid

reasons. This is important because it shows that NATO considerations cannot be generalized as too complicated for the general public, and therefore the public could realistically develop an informed opposition to the alliance.

The literature considered and referenced provides a strong theoretical base and practical examples in support of the hypothesis. Based on the discussion in this chapter, it can be reasonably argued that there is enough evidence to support the notion that public opinion could influence high-level international political decisions like the funding of NATO and even its membership. But more exact studies could be done to measure the specific influence of public opinion on NATO operations, not just NATO policies. Although policies often dictate what operations will be executed, the operations themselves are unique and sometimes very complicated endeavors that the general public may not understand. In this context, it is unclear if public opinion could actually have an impact on what specific NATO missions the US supports, and if that could then affect membership. However, despite any areas that could be further investigated, the information presented shows that public opinion can be very involved in critical issues regarding foreign policy. In conclusion, the chapter's argument, which states that the US should continue to support and lead NATO operations as long as public opinion supports the associated foreign policy, is sufficiently supported.

CHAPTER V

THE RELEVANCY OF NATO AND ITS SECURITY ROLE IN THE WORLD

“I strongly believe that, no matter what happens beyond our borders, our transatlantic community of nations (NATO) must remain a beacon of freedom. And that we must be prepared to act whenever necessary to keep the flame of freedom burning bright.”

- Anders Fogh Rasmussen, Former Secretary General of NATO¹¹²

Introduction

This chapter establishes NATO as a unique multinational political alliance that plays a critically important role in the international community. It presents six sections that argue in favor of NATO’s relevancy and potential for development despite the existence of the EU and its venture into peacekeeping operations. The first section considers the persistence of multinational alliances between states and presents the argument that NATO’s potential for expanding its capabilities to conduct more operations is far greater than that of its decline. The second explores some of the critical differences between NATO and the EU. It considers the structure of the EU and explains why it does not offer a significant challenge to NATO’s dominance in establishing multinational security forces.

The chapter then shifts focus and presents threats NATO should consider in order to secure its relevancy in the future. Although NATO is most often viewed in its

¹¹² Anders Fogh Rasmussen, “NATO: A long blue line for security, Speech by NATO Secretary General Anders Fogh Rasmussen at the United States Military Academy at West Point,” last modified October 8, 2014, http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/opinions_113265.htm?selectedLocale=en.

European role as a defense mechanism against Russian aggression, which is a legitimate frame of reference, this chapter will consider NATO in regards to different threats it should take into consideration as it develops a future based on all its principles, not just mutual defense against a large scale invasion of Europe. Keeping this in mind, the third and fourth sections discuss two unique transnational threats to security and stability that provide often overlooked opportunities for NATO to broaden its sphere of influence through a measured application of both diplomatic and security solutions. Those threats are conventional small arms and light weapons (SALW) proliferation and international criminal activity. The fifth section explains NATO's unique and ongoing role in combating transnational terrorist organizations as they persist in causing instability in various regions around the world. And the sixth section considers the emerging cyber security threat. The chapter ends with a brief summary of the major points and suggestions for future research.

A Unique Treaty and Alliance

Because there is a significant amount of time and money involved in the creation of formal treaties and alliances made between states, like NATO, it is reasonable to assume such endeavors signify the participating governments intend to establish friendly relations to each other.¹¹³ In general, states pursue treaties to develop alliances that are designed to maintain peace between them for a variety of reasons, including

¹¹³ Jeffrey L. Roberg, "The Importance of International Treaties; Is Ratification Necessary?," *World Affairs* 169 (2007): 181, accessed November 21, 2014, <http://eds.b.ebscohost.com.mantis.csuchico.edu/eds/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=9e85ec30-e900-4650-9159-6182c40be069%40sessionmgr111&vid=4&hid=114>.

economic or security benefits, and NATO is a major example of a lasting union between sovereign states. But some treaties are less successful, such as the one attempted between Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union during World War II. Hitler needed this treaty to execute his invasions of Poland and France. Their agreement initially indicated the possibility of a burgeoning alliance as the Nazi's promised the Soviet's territory from Poland and Eastern Europe, and the Soviet's effectively ended their mutual assistance treaty with France and promised not to interfere with Germany's invasion of Poland.¹¹⁴ Indeed, this treaty seemed to have potential because in 1939 in a letter to Mussolini, Hitler described the German-Soviet alliance as "the most extensive nonaggression pact in existence."¹¹⁵ But as history unfolded, it was soon relegated to the annals of history, as it lasted only a little over a year-and-a-half before it ended. More recently, Russia broke its nearly 20-year-old international treaty to respect Ukraine's sovereign territory when it unilaterally annexed a large part of the state known as Crimea.¹¹⁶ So, as one can see from these examples, not all treaties are kept and alliances can fail.

But despite these and other failures to honor international agreements, alliances and treaties between states continue to be widely used tools in international politics, as evidenced by the long list of US treaties and agreements found on the US

¹¹⁴ Roderick Stackelberg and Sally A. Winkle, ed., *The Nazi Germany Sourcebook: An Anthology of Texts* (New York: Routledge, 2002), 246.

¹¹⁵ Adolf Hitler to Benito Mussolini, 25 August 1939 in *Nazi-Soviet Relations 1939-1941, Documents from the Archives of The German Foreign Office*, ed. Raymond J. Sontag and James S. Beddie (Washington D.C.: Department of State, 1948) 80-81.

¹¹⁶ Anders Fogh Rasmussen, "Joint press point with NATO Secretary General Anders Fogh Rasmussen with the President of Romania, Traian Basescu," North Atlantic Treaty Organization, last modified May 19, 2014, http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/opinions_109865.htm.

Department of State's website.¹¹⁷ Today the global community is bonded together through many such treaties and alliances, like NATO, that influence states to act in a certain manner even if there are disputes about the terms of the agreements.¹¹⁸ While state leaders may make treaties that sometimes appear random, when they are evaluated in the context of international considerations they actually make sense. For example, when President Carter was negotiating the terms of release for US hostages in Iran, he entered into an executive agreement (similar to a treaty in the US) with their government that no private legal claims could be made against Iran in America without first going through a special US-Iranian tribunal.¹¹⁹ This agreement may at first seem irrelevant or trivial, but it was actually a necessary step to ensure that US hostages would be released.

But fulfilling commitments to international obligations becomes complicated as states enter into multiple treaties with different requirements and possible conflicts arise. Such potential conflict leads one to consider what might happen to alliances that have many of the same members and occupy the same territory such as NATO and European Union (EU). Some think the EU and its potential capacity for a robust fighting force would make the US led NATO obsolete.¹²⁰ But would it? While such an outcome may be possible, is it really probable or likely? And should NATO even be compared to the EU, or is there simply a fundamental difference in purpose between the two. Is

¹¹⁷ "Treaties and Agreements," U.S. Department of State, accessed November 24, 2014, <http://www.state.gov/t/isn/c18882.htm>.

¹¹⁸ Roberg, "The Importance of International Treaties," 185.

¹¹⁹ James Dull, *The Politics of American Foreign Policy* (New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc., 1985), 111.

¹²⁰ John Pinder, *The European Union: A Very Short Introduction* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), 111.

NATO's security role on the decline, or is it destined to lead the world toward a secure, just and international peace? This chapter argues that although the development of an EU fighting force has raised questions about the future of NATO, the potential for NATO expanding its capabilities to conduct more operations far outweighs the possibility of its decline as demonstrated by its unique security role in the global community and the existence of serious security threats left to combat.

The NATO and EU Difference

NATO, which is comprised of mostly European countries, the US, Canada, Iceland, and Turkey, is likely to continue to operate and grow even as the EU continues to expand its own security mission.¹²¹ This is because NATO is a political alliance, just like the EU, but with an older mutual security component that has been focusing on multinational security operations since shortly after the end of World War II. It is important to remember that NATO is not just a coalition of military forces, but a political alliance bound by a treaty that ensures signatories agree not only to Article 5, which ensures mutual defense in case of attack, but to all fourteen articles, which can be referenced in Appendix A. Notably, Article 1 states:

The Parties undertake, as set forth in the Charter of the United Nations, to settle any international dispute in which they may be involved by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security and justice are not endangered, and to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.¹²²

¹²¹ "NATO Member Countries," North Atlantic Treaty Organization, last modified March 27, 2014, accessed March 19, 2015, http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/nato_countries.htm.

¹²² "The North Atlantic Treaty," North Atlantic Treaty Organization, last modified December 9, 2008, accessed March 19, 2015, <http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/>

This very first article explicitly states that all members must make international peace, security, and justice top priorities, and the treaty goes on to establish the North Atlantic Council (NAC) to ensure that all aspects of the treaty are implemented properly, including settling *any international dispute*, whether between members or nonmembers.

The NAC is then responsible for making NATO policy that is implemented through its two bureaucratic structures; one is civil and the other is military. The civil structure is headed by the NAC and has subcommittees that are focused not solely on security and defense, but also on a variety of other issues including political affairs, economic affairs, information and culture relations, science, and environmental concerns. The highest authority in the military structure is the Military Committee, but it is politically subordinate to the civil structure and can only make recommendations to the NAC and other departments.¹²³ The subordination of NATO's military structure to its civil counterpart, the civil structure's focus on areas other than defense, and the treaties' explicit focus on international peace indicate that the alliance is political in nature and founded on political principles.

Even so, NATO's critics often raise questions about its relevancy, especially when it is not involved in many military conflicts and the EU's security component is growing.¹²⁴ But this criticism is based on the assumption that NATO's primary purpose

official_texts_17120.htm.

¹²³ Todd Sandler and Keith Hartley, *The Political Economy of NATO; Past, present, and into the 21st century* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 242-244.

¹²⁴ The Future of NATO, "NATO flexes its muscle memory," *The Economist*, August 30, 2014, accessed March 5, 2015, <http://www.economist.com/news/international/21614166-russias-aggression-ukraine-has-made-natos-summit-wales-most-important>.

is military and does not consider the information presented previously, which indicates that it is a political alliance with security operations that are employed as a means to its stated political ends of maintaining international peace. Instead of questioning its relevance, NATO's critics should recognize NATO as such a political alliance. It has established a robust multinational military component that is greater than that of its EU counterpart and is actually capable of enforcing peace and maintaining stability, such as in the Balkans, Afghanistan, and off the Horn of Africa.¹²⁵ This ability to enforce peace through security measures should be seen as a testament to the progress NATO has made towards its political purpose of maintaining international peace. Its relevancy should not be questioned simply because it may need to reevaluate how it employs its security component as political considerations evolve. However, this is not to dissuade criticism entirely. On the contrary, criticism can be useful. But instead of focusing on whether or not a trans-Atlantic alliance is relevant, critics should recognize the need for NATO and focus on how to maximize its civilian components in addition to its military ones in order to achieve its ultimate goal of ensuring security, justice, and international peace.

While what would eventually become a major security component of the EU began around the same time as NATO in the form of the Western European Union, it was not until 1993 and the establishment of its Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) that the EU began to consider how to engage in security operations for Europe and its

¹²⁵ Jens Ringsmose and Sten Rynning, ed., *NATO's New Strategic Concept: A Comprehensive Assessment, DIIS Report* (Copenhagen: Danish Institute for International Studies, 2011), 26.

neighbors.¹²⁶ But security continued to remain an afterthought, and it was not until 1998 that the EU decided to pursue its own unique military capability.¹²⁷ But even after that, the CFSP's function in providing security was not firmly established because there continued to be organizational restructuring. In 2009, the Treaty of Lisbon changed the original European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP), which guided the military considerations of security operations for the CFSP, to the Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP).^{128, 129} The EU's frequent policy and organizational changes, such as those mentioned, may be the reason or part of the reason as to why they have been so slow to develop a robust military capability. Based on this evaluation, the likelihood of the EU establishing a multinational military organization that can seriously compete with NATO anytime soon is low.

The simple fact 22 members overlap between NATO and the EU should not been viewed as an indication that the NATO alliance is destined to be consumed by the EU.¹³⁰ On the contrary, the NATO alliance has focused heavily on developing its security component since its creation, while the EU has focused on other matters such as

¹²⁶ Annegret Bendiek, "Two-Track Realism: Transatlantic Cooperation in Fighting Terrorism," in *Routledge Handbook on the European Union and International Institutions: Performance, Policy, Power*, ed. Knud E. Jorgensen and Katie V. Laatikainen (New York: Routledge, 2013), 76, 447.

¹²⁷ Charlemagne, "NATO versus the European Union," *The Economist*, April 10, 2003, <http://www.economist.com/node/1699200>.

¹²⁸ David Marquand, *The End of the West: The Once and Future Europe* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2011), 102.

¹²⁹ "Common Security and Defence Policy," Europa; Summaries of EU Legislation, last modified July 5, 2010, http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/institutional_affairs/treaties/lisbon_treaty/ai0026_en.htm.

¹³⁰ Frank Ninkovich, "The United States, NATO, and the Lessons of History," in *The European Union: From Jean Monnet to the Euro*, ed. Dean J. Kotlowski (Athens: Ohio University Press, 2000), 211.

trade and commercial policies for its member states.¹³¹ The EU's choice to focus its energy on agendas other than security operations may be motivated by pacifistic tendencies as illustrated by the 2009 Pew Global Attitudes survey shown in Table 1 below.¹³²

Table 1

2009 Pew Global Attitudes Survey on Afghanistan Support

State	Approve More Troops In Afghanistan	Disapprove More Troops In Afghanistan	Keep NATO Troops In Afghanistan	Remove Troops In Afghanistan
United States	54%	42%	57%	38%
Canada	42%	55%	43%	50%
Spain	41%	50%	44%	46%
Britain	41%	51%	46%	48%
France	37%	62%	50%	49%
Germany	32%	63%	48%	47%
Poland	28%	57%	30%	57%
Turkey	16%	49%	15%	63%

Pew Research Center, 2009

The table highlights how several NATO member European states consistently gave the least support to troop increases or continuing NATO's mission in Afghanistan. This indicates a pacifist tone on the continent and may help to explain why many European states fail to meet their defense spending requirements, as mentioned in the previous chapter. But even though NATO has many European members, its development of crisis management and enforcing peace would have also been influenced

¹³¹ Clive Archer, *The European Union*, (New York: Routledge, 2008), 100.

¹³² "Few in NATO Support Call For Additional Forces in Afghanistan," Pew Research Center: Global Attitudes and Trends, last modified August 31, 2009, accessed March 5, 2015, <http://www.pewglobal.org/2009/08/31/few-in-nato-want-more-troops-in-afghanistan/>.

in part by the fact it is not a purely European alliance but, instead, a broader alliance with members and partners around the world. And since the US is NATO's largest financier, as discussed in the previous chapter, its relatively high level of support for the Afghanistan War as shown above in Table 1 ends up having more influence. That influence could then be attributed to why NATO still has troops in Afghanistan today, six years after this poll was taken that showed so little European support for a continued NATO presence. This non-European influence provides an advantage to NATO over the EU. Since the US and other NATO member states are outside of Europe, they push the European community to focus on larger security focused goals that transcend the EU's internal divisions and therefore give NATO more legitimacy when engaging in security peacekeeping operations.¹³³ And since the EU has focused on areas other than security for so long, NATO has had the opportunity to have more years of experience developing and enhancing its military organizational structure and joint operations between member states.

But while pacifistic tendencies may exist in NATO members, there are also indications of members beginning to embrace the idea that enforcing peace and security through some conflict is a worthwhile endeavor. For example, the German army has not had a medal for valor since the end of World War II, but the Spiegel International reported that the government reestablished the award as the Cross of Honor for Bravery in 2009 because they wanted to honor the exceptionally courageous actions their soldiers performed in Afghanistan. Reestablishing such an award was politically controversial

¹³³ Charlemagne, "NATO versus the European Union."

and indicated the state's possible shift away from pacifism and toward the use of force for those dedicated to what German Defense Minister Franz Josef Jung described as "justice and freedom".¹³⁴

NATO's usefulness has been established over many years of increasing military action in support of its political foundation that has endured through changes in the international order. This illustrates it can be an enduring institution in the global arena and continue to advance and remain relevant in Europe and elsewhere such as it did in Afghanistan and Iraq with its integral roles in the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF), its NATO Training Mission – Afghanistan (NTM-A), and its NATO Training Mission – Iraq (NTM-I).¹³⁵ In addition, NATO showcased its ability to utilize air power to rapidly defeat threats when it quickly overwhelmed Qaddafi's regime in Libya in 2011.¹³⁶ This victory was reminiscent of its first successful military operation in Bosnia as discussed in chapter three, which also relied heavily on air operations. And it proved NATO could still conduct those operations and produce a decisive outcome. Additionally, it continues the employment and sustainment of ground forces with success as well. This is evident in NATO's ongoing mission in Kosovo called Joint Guardian that utilizes 4,500 soldiers and its new mission in Afghanistan called Resolute Support,

¹³⁴ "First Military Medal for Bravery Since WWII: Germany Awards Military Cross of Courage," *Spiegel Online, International*, July 6, 2009, accessed March 5, 2015, <http://www.spiegel.de/international/germany/first-military-medal-for-bravery-since-wwii-germany-awards-military-cross-of-courage-a-634601.html>.

¹³⁵ Sten Rynning, *NATO in Afghanistan: The Liberal Disconnect* (California: Stanford University Press, 2012), 174, Kindle edition.

¹³⁶ Thomas Shanker and Eric Schmitt, "Seeing Limits to 'New' Kind of War in Libya," *New York Times*, October 21, 2011, accessed March 5, 2015, http://www.nytimes.com/2011/10/22/world/africa/nato-war-in-libya-shows-united-states-was-vital-to-toppling-qaddafi.html?_r=0.

which utilizes over 12,000 troops.¹³⁷

NATO will be able to continue to conduct operations because there is little actual conflict between it and the EU since the European Council (EC) agreed to develop their rapid deployment forces under the condition that they would only be used in areas that NATO is not present.¹³⁸ In addition, Europe's rapid deployment forces, known as EU Battlegroups (EUB), are specifically designed to provide a complementary capability to the more comprehensive NATO Response Force (NRF). While the NRF is capable of participating in a full range of military operations, the EUB is not designed for high intensity combat and only intended for limited use when significant peace enforcement is required. On top of being designed for a different purpose than NATO, their actual viability as a fighting force has yet to be determined. Although they have been certified as operational since 2007, they have yet to be utilized in any operations because of resourcing conflicts and a lack of political will to employ them.¹³⁹ While the EU may decide to pursue a larger force in the future, this should not necessarily be viewed negatively because, as will be discussed throughout the chapter, a variety of threats continue to exist in Europe and around the world.

If NATO is in search of a mission, there are no shortages of threats NATO could focus on to achieve its previously mentioned Article 1 goal of settling any international disputes peacefully and justly. But the threats that influence its mission

¹³⁷ NATO, "Operations and Missions."

¹³⁸ Pinder, *The European Union*, 121.

¹³⁹ Anna Barcikowska, "EU Battlegroups – ready to go?," *European Union Institute for Security Studies* 40 (2013): 1-2, accessed November 29, 2014, http://www.iss.europa.eu/uploads/media/Brief_40_EU_Battlegroups.pdf.

today are different from those of the Cold War. They are less structured and need more flexibility when considering solutions to the problem.¹⁴⁰ It is becoming more common these increasingly complex threats require non-military solutions because many problems demand special skills in crisis management, political negotiations, and careful diplomacy as oppose to traditional military force.¹⁴¹ In addition, such complex threats are often a multinational problem and would therefore be handled better by an alliance such as NATO instead of a unilateral action by a single state that may not be able to actually address the root cause of an issue. Four such complicated threats that are transnational by their nature will be examined in the following sections. They are small arms and light weapons (SALW) proliferation, international criminal activity, the continued threat of terrorism, and the growing problem regarding cyber security. While these four threats often overlap in many ways and influence one another on a regular basis,¹⁴² they will be separated in this analysis so they may be closely examined to determine if and how NATO could become involved in defeating them.

Small Arms and Light Weapons Proliferation

When most people think of the proliferation of weapons, they probably think specifically of nuclear weapons and how the US and the UN have pushed to reduce the number of nuclear weapons in European countries, Russia, and China. But the proliferation of SALW is just as important and the UN recognizes this through the

¹⁴⁰ Mario Zucconi, "Reconciliation of Western Security Institutions," in *NATO and Collective Security*, ed. Michael Brenner (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1998), 278.

¹⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 227.

¹⁴² Gargi Bhattacharyya, *Traffick: The Illicit Movement of People and Things*, (Michigan: Pluto Press, 2005), 1.

programs they have established to combat it such as the Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in SALW in All Its Aspects.¹⁴³ Although NATO recognizes the Programme of Action and takes some action to meet its intent, the alliance may find it beneficial to become more active in reducing SALW. The proliferation of these weapons is not a new problem and continues to threaten peace and stability of regions all over the world by allowing a steady supply of assault rifles, rockets, mines and other similar traditional infantry military weapons into the hands of civilians, militias, or private armies who are determined to use them for violence against their enemy.¹⁴⁴ And because these basic weapons require little to no training, are inexpensive, and nearly indestructible, they account for around 90% of deaths in contemporary warfare.¹⁴⁵

Since SALW are used in conflicts NATO ends up engaging in, such as those in the Balkans and Afghanistan, it would be logical for NATO to increase its level of action in preventing the spread of these weapons in an attempt to reduce the scale of, or possibly prevent, these conflicts. Since there are approximately 105 states with around 1,085 weapons manufacturing facilities that produce weapons to sell,¹⁴⁶ this task would require NATO to employ a skilled combination of diplomatic and military actions and

¹⁴³ “Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects,” United Nations Programme of Action, last modified June 20, 2014, accessed March 16, 2015, <http://www.poa-iss.org/PoA/pohtml.aspx>.

¹⁴⁴ Michael Renner, *Small Arms, Big Impact: The Next challenge of Disarmament*, (Washington D.C.: World Watch Institute, 1997), 5-7.

¹⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 5.

¹⁴⁶ Mike Bourne, “Small arms and light weapons spread and conflict,” in *Small Arms, Crime and Conflict: Global governance and the threat of armed violence*, ed. Owen Greene and Nicholas Marsh (New York: Routledge, 2012), 30.

would need to depend more on diplomatic action to achieve long lasting results. NATO would not only have to identify where most of the illegal sales of existing weapons are occurring, but they would also have to work with the governments of the states that are producing the weapons in order to determine best way to limit and control their production. In addition, NATO would have to create and lead the process to determine the appropriate combination of NATO and host state involvement to enforce those limits.

While working with official governments, NATO would also need to simultaneously work with other international and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) that are dedicated to reducing the SALW industry. This is a proven approach to influence national and international policy on some SALW reduction as it has worked well in the past. In 1997, many NGOs came together to create the International Campaign to Ban Landmines and convinced 122 governments to sign the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production, and Transfer of Antipersonnel Mines and on Their Destruction, which was held in Ottawa, Canada. By 2002, 142 states had agreed to the convention, including all the NATO states except the US and Turkey.¹⁴⁷ This, however, also illustrates a unique and difficult challenge for NATO if it is to pursue any reduction in arms.

The challenge is that the US is both the largest financial contributor to NATO and a consistent manufacturer and seller of SALW in the world.¹⁴⁸ This conflict of interest indicates that the US would likely resist any significant NATO effort to reduce

¹⁴⁷ Jo L. Husbands, "Conventional Weapons," in *Arms Control: Cooperative Security in A Changing Environment*, ed. Jeffrey A. Larsen (Colorado: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2002), 174.

¹⁴⁸ Renner, *Small Arms, Big Impact*, 6.

SALW production and sale. But although this is true, it does not mean that a SALW reduction is impossible. There are twenty-seven other states in NATO that could push this issue. They need to treat this endeavor as an ongoing task for the foreseeable future because they still need to convince the US that such an effort would be worthwhile. And as long as states retain the incentive and capability to mass-produce these weapons, they will continue to do so and fuel the regional contemporary wars that NATO ends up fighting.

Nicholas Marsh (2012, 13) argues that a large part of contemporary conflict is fueled by the proliferation of SALW around the globe due to “conflict intensity, technology, arms competition and the use of child soldiers.” The identification of this threat, which is applicable to both current and future conflicts, reinforces the idea that NATO would still require conventional weapons to combat the threat that SALW presents to security operations. The ‘child soldier’ threat that Marsh mentions only highlights the complex nature of evolving warfare that NATO should prepare for and train to defend against. But fighting an army composed of child soldiers raises complex moral issues and ethical dilemmas that would be better solved through preventative measures and political means. NATO fighting the proliferation of SALW could lead to the reduction of conflict and use of child soldiers. It could prove to be an extremely beneficial way to promote peace by preventing violence.

International Criminal Activity

The second transnational threat NATO should target in its effort to ensure international peace and justice is international criminal activity. This threat is often

overlooked in regards to international security because states tend to associate criminal activity with local police action and not state military, but this is to severely underestimate the influence crime has on international activities, especially crime that involves terrorism. While terrorism will be discussed later as its own unique threat, it is important to understand its link to international criminal activity because it is significant. The US Department of Defense has said that terrorism and organized crime are increasingly intertwined, citing examples such as the Taliban's increased sale of heroin and drug trafficking to raise funds and, conversely, criminal organizations adopting terrorist tactics like beheadings.¹⁴⁹

Frank Madison, who is a former Interpol officer and current researcher on transnational organized crime at the University of Cambridge, raises important considerations on the relationship between criminal activities and terrorism. He states that although they have little in common because criminals are primarily motivated by money as oppose to terrorists that are primarily motivated by specific political or religious ideology, it is apparent that one type of individual may incorporate the others methodology into their own operations to achieve a desired result, such as terrorists resorting to drug trafficking, extortion, and robbery to raise funds while criminals may use terrorist torture tactics to send messages.¹⁵⁰ Indeed, Yvon Dandurand and Vivienne Chin, each an expert in international criminal law and justice, implicate both organized crime and terrorism as entities engaged in human trafficking and identify it as a serious

¹⁴⁹ Karen Parrish, "Link Grows Between Terrorism, Organized Crime, Officials Say," *Department of Defense News*, March 28, 2012, <http://www.defense.gov/news/newsarticle.aspx?id=67721>.

¹⁵⁰ Frank G. Madsen, *Transnational Organized Crime* (New York: Routledge, 2009), 64.

threat to security.¹⁵¹ NATO should pay close attention to criminal activities because it could be an indicator they are actually dealing with terrorist or militant groups. Properly identifying criminal activity that is related to terrorism could mean the difference between the successful completion or the tragic failure of their efforts.

International criminal activity in the form of piracy is another major concern for NATO because it has been combating the activity regularly since it began security operations through escorting and protecting ships off the Horn of Africa in the Gulf of Aden and in the Indian Ocean in 2008.¹⁵² Piracy had once thought to be virtually eliminated by the nineteenth century, but it has made a modern comeback due to the development of private speedboats, easy access to small arms weapons, and the terrorists desire to smuggle weapons of mass destruction.¹⁵³ NATO is doing the right thing in fighting piracy on the high seas, and it should continue to expand this mission. It is completely within the spirit of NATO's objective to promote justice in the international community because modern international law is founded in ancient Roman justice that legally defined piracy as the first crime against civilization.¹⁵⁴

¹⁵¹ Yvon Dandurand and Vivienne Chin, "Human security objectives and the fight against transnational organized crime and terrorism," in *Human Security, Transnational Crime and Human Trafficking: Asian and Western perspectives*, ed. Shiro Okubo and Louise Shelley (New York: Routledge, 2011). xi-xii, 36-37.

¹⁵² "Counter-piracy operations," North Atlantic Treaty Organization, last modified June 17, 2014, accessed March 19, 2015, http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/topics_48815.htm.

¹⁵³ Peter Andreas and Ethan Nadelmann, *Policing the Globe: Criminalization and Crime in International Relations* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 26.

¹⁵⁴ Rob Coniglio, "Piracy and the Law of Nations," *The Cornell Daily Sun*, April 21, 2009, <http://cornellsun.com/blog/2009/04/21/piracy-and-the-law-of-nations/>.

Fighting Terrorist Organizations

Terrorist organizations, the third threat to be considered, are a persistent danger that NATO will absolutely be needed to continue to combat in one form or another. Where the previous two threats mentioned were areas of concern that NATO has not totally ventured into when considering how to best realize its goal of international peace and justice, the terrorist threat based in extremist political and religious ideology is something NATO has gained much experience in over the past few decades, especially during its still ongoing mission in Afghanistan. It is apparent that activities through transnational terrorist groups like Al-Qaeda are difficult to stop, as evidenced by situations like Operation Lion Heart in Afghanistan where NATO forces drove Taliban militants out of the eastern Hindu Kush in early 2009 only to have new fighters return to the same location later that year.¹⁵⁵ But although this kind of determined enemy may be difficult to combat and require long term planning, they are not impossible to defeat. Recently in October, the Taliban's terrorist operations were severely disrupted when two of their senior Haqqani militant leaders were captured and detained under Afghan custody.¹⁵⁶

Waging war against international terrorism is not just limited to the current operations in Afghanistan but is fought all over the world and, sadly, there are many examples of unfortunate events. One that quickly comes to mind is that of Iraq. Three

¹⁵⁵ Syed Saleem Shahzad, *Inside Al-Qaeda and the Taliban: Beyond Bin Laden and 9/11* (London: Pluto Press, 2011), 114.

¹⁵⁶ Declan Walsh, "2 Haqqani Militant Leaders Are Captured, Afghan Officials Say," *The New York Times*, October 16, 2014, http://www.nytimes.com/2014/10/17/world/asia/haqqani-leaders-arrested-afghanistan-khost.html?_r=0.

years ago in 2011, the US led coalition that had been assisting Iraq in stability and security operations for nine years came to an end when Prime Minister Nouri Maliki and a bitterly divided Sunni and Shiite dominated Parliament, all elements plagued by corruption, failed to agree on terms for the US force to continue its support in Iraq.¹⁵⁷ ¹⁵⁸ Without the US's pressure to curb corruption and support Iraq's nascent military and government, the states survival was in question. And as feared, Iraq has recently come into jeopardy as large pieces of its territory have been overrun by a group of militant Islamic extremists known as ISIL (Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant) who have been on the US State Departments list of Foreign Terrorist Organizations since 2004¹⁵⁹ and identified by the UN Al-Qaida committee as an associated terrorist entity.¹⁶⁰ They are brutal killers perpetrating genocide on those that disagree with them and their claim to have created a caliphate, or Islamic holy state.¹⁶¹

Since the corruption continued in Iraq, many members of Iraq's military chose to abandon the national government in fear of the perceived Shia sectarian government force, and their military units simply dissolved in many areas of the state.¹⁶² The Iraq

¹⁵⁷ Tim Arango and Michael S. Schmidt, "Last Convoy of American Troops Leaves Iraq," *The New York Times*, December 18, 2011, http://www.nytimes.com/2011/12/19/world/middleeast/last-convoy-of-american-troops-leaves-iraq.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0.

¹⁵⁸ Jonathan Marcus, "Factors behind the precipitate collapse of Iraq's army," *BBC News*, June 13, 2014, <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-middle-east-27838435>.

¹⁵⁹ "Foreign Terrorist Organizations," U.S. Department of State, accessed March 14, 2015, <http://www.state.gov/j/ct/rls/other/des/123085.htm>.

¹⁶⁰ "Sanctions List," United Nations, last modified March 13, 2015, accessed March 14, 2015, <http://www.un.org/sc/committees/1267/1267.pdf>.

¹⁶¹ Gershon Gorenberg, "Danger Signals," *The American Prospect* 25, no. 5 (2014), <http://search.proquest.com.mantis.csuchico.edu/docview/1614143079?accountid=10346>.

¹⁶² Matt Bradley and Julian E. Barnes, "Iraq Army's Ability to Fight Raises Worries,"

government has since asked for US support, and Martha Raddatz of ABC News recently reported that the US has deployed 3,100 troops back to Iraq to reengage in advising their military operations and support their fight against ISIS.¹⁶³ This illustrates the continuing threat terrorist organizations pose to international peace and security throughout the world, and NATO should follow the actions of the US and reengage in Iraq. NATO should reestablish and improve the capabilities of the previously mentioned NTM-I so that it can develop and train Iraqi soldiers with new techniques, tactics, and procedures to help stay ahead of the terrorist threat.

And not only should it reengage in this matter, NATO should ensure these violent situations are avoided by working diligently to create the conditions for it to maintain a significant presence in unstable regions of the world that need assistance, even if those regions, like Iraq, make it difficult at times. NATO can take advantage of the fact that the global community is more interconnected than ever in history and actively strive to involve itself wherever it is needed in order to achieve its goal of a secure and just international peace, or it can passively watch as the world is held hostage through fear by violent extremists like ISIS who call on their followers to hunt down their enemies through social media so that they can go to their homes and kill them and their families.¹⁶⁴

The Wall Street Journal, June 23, 2014, <http://search.proquest.com.mantis.csuchico.edu/docview/1539241971?accountid=10346>.

¹⁶³ Martha Raddatz, "Obama Plans to Send 1,500 More Troops to Iraq," ABC News, World News, November 7, 2014. <http://abcnews.go.com/International/president-obama-plans-send-1500-troops-iraq/story?id=26765896>.

¹⁶⁴ Christopher Carson, "Servicemembers warned anew to scrub social media accounts," *Stars and Stripes*, December 1, 2014, <http://www.stripes.com/news/servicemembers->

Cyber Security

Finally, a growing issue worth mentioning because it is becoming more prevalent is the threat to cyber security. In his book *Divided Nations*, Ian Goldin states ‘cyberaggression’ creates a unique challenge for the future. He explains it is a very serious threat in a world connected by vast digital networks and governments, industries, and businesses that are heavily reliant on computer systems. Goldin highlights this importance through the example of Russia hacking thousands of Estonian computers in 2007 because Estonia wanted to remove an old Soviet statue. He explains that this attack compromised government and financial computers, and because Estonia does ninety percent of its banking online, it was estimated that the economic impact on Estonia was substantial.¹⁶⁵

The impact that cyber security has on the operations of private and government organizations is also evident in the recent situation involving North Korea and Sony. Kaz Hirai, the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of Sony at the time, pronounced that the attack was one of the worst hacks in modern history.¹⁶⁶ US investigators claim North Korea conducted an aggressive cyber attack against the Sony Company because Sony had made and was releasing a movie called *The Interview*, which depicted the assassination of its leader, Kim Jung-un.¹⁶⁷ Now, because of North Korea’s

warned-anew-to-scrub-social-media-accounts-1.316754.

¹⁶⁵ Ian Goldin, *Divided Nations: Why global governance is failing, and what we can do about it* (Oxford UK: Oxford University Press, 2013), 27-28.

¹⁶⁶ Jonathan Gabay, *Brand Psychology: Consumer Perceptions, Corporate Reputations* (Philadelphia PA: Kogan Page Limited, 2015), 77.

¹⁶⁷ Lee Garber, ed., “Hackers Hit Sony with Devastating Attack,” *Computer* 48, no. 1

cyberaggression, the US government has imposed sanctions on three North Korean organizations and 10 individuals, which senior White House officials said were aimed at further weakening its defense activity and deter future cyber attacks.¹⁶⁸ But while the US may have the power to unilaterally deter such network-based warfare, other states may not. However, NATO could act on the behalf of those less capable states and become a powerful force in defending against cyberaggression in the international community if it could develop its cyber security capabilities.

NATO is Relevant

While this chapter provides a brief overview of evidence supporting the idea the EU does not pose a threat to the existence of the NATO alliance and NATO is more likely to expand its capabilities to conduct more missions in response to new threats to international instability, there are several areas that could be improved upon. A thorough review of all the articles of the NATO treaty compared to the most recent charter of the EU would provide a deeper understanding of the divisions, and similarities, between the two organizations. The discrepancy between US policy and NATO policy that was mentioned in the third section could be investigated further to determine if there is a pattern of disagreement that significantly influences NATO policy or operation selection. A review of member state's domestic and foreign policies to determine if they conflict with NATO policies may provide some useful insights as well. In addition, research

(January 2015): 22, accessed March 14, 2015, <http://ieeexplore.ieee.org.mantis.csuchico.edu/stamp/stamp.jsp?tp=&arnumber=7030214>.

¹⁶⁸ "Sony cyber-attack: North Korea faces new US sanctions," BBC: News US and Canada, last modified January 2, 2015, accessed March 14, 2015, <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-30661973>.

could be done to detail exactly how NATO could become involved with governments and NGOs to reduce the threat of small arms proliferation. And finally, it would be useful to understand how NATO could cooperate with and share diplomatic and military resources with local government authorities in order to combat criminal activity.

Whether or not NATO is destined to lead the international community toward a peaceful global society is yet to be determined. But it is clear, however, in the discussion and examples presented in the second section of this chapter that NATO is much more capable than the EU, at least presently, of engaging in stability operations that can actually enforce principles that are consistent with that end. NATO provides unique security capabilities directed by civilian policies that the EU cannot match, and it has an organizational structure founded in civil agencies designed to engage in political matters.

The third section explained the direct impact the proliferation of small arms has on NATO security operations due to the nature of contemporary warfare. It would be extremely beneficial to NATO if it could prevent future conflicts by restricting the small arms and light weapons that are used to engage in those conflicts. The fourth section explained that reducing international criminal activity was important for NATO because such activities are often associated with terrorism and fund regional wars that eventually involve NATO. The fifth section explained why NATO must continue to focus on eliminating terrorism wherever it presents itself and actively pursue its first article principles that requires it to ensure a secure, just, and international peace. And the sixth section illustrated why cyber security is a growing threat in the world. While the areas of further research previously mentioned, and perhaps others not mentioned, would

undoubtedly add legitimacy to the overall argument of this chapter, there is sufficient evidence indicating the chapter's main argument is supported. Having established that NATO is more likely to expand its capabilities to combat the threats discussed previously, the next chapter considers a historical comparison to the revolutionary US to suggest how NATO might develop in the future.

CHAPTER VI

A HISTORICAL COMPARISON FOR THE FUTURE EVOLUTION OF NATO

“Study history, study history. In history lie all the secrets of statecraft.”
- Winston Churchill, Former British Prime Minister¹⁶⁹

Introduction

This chapter, which is divided into six sections, will offer a prediction on the possible future evolution of NATO based on comparisons to how the US evolved early in its history. The first section presents the main argument for this chapter and defines certain terms and concepts used within the argument. The second section will explore how the US’s transition from the weak Articles of Confederation to the stronger Constitution might be similar in some respects to what would be proposed for NATO’s evolution. To a certain extent, one could use this analogy to help understand what NATO has already experienced and possibly provide insight into what it might encounter in the future. The third section will apply some of theory as discussed in Chapter Two to help explain why NATO is likely to continue to evolve. It also suggests that NATO may currently exist in an international environment of ‘anarchy with order’ and explains how that relates to NATO’s possible evolution from a lightly bound treaty organization to a firm governing alliance. The fourth section describes what the NATO military might look like if it were to evolve into a self-sustaining and permanently manned defense

¹⁶⁹ Terry Reardon, *Winston Churchill and Mackenzie King: So Similar, So Different* (New York: Dundurn, 2012), 16.

organization. And the fifth section presents three arguments that might be encountered against this chapter's claims and a brief rebuttal for each. Finally, the sixth section will provide a brief summary of the main points and make suggestions for future research.

Predicting NATO's Development

Portia Walker from USA Today recently reported that NATO is receiving considerable attention after Russia recently annexed Crimea and supported separatist movements in Eastern Ukraine in what appears to an effort by Russia to regain control of former Soviet territory. She said this happened a few months after the Ukraine overthrew its totalitarian dictator in an attempt to bring a more pro-Western government into power. Walker stated Russia did not recognize the legitimacy of the new government so it invaded the country with military force on the pretext that it was protecting ethnic Russians in the region.¹⁷⁰ The recent outbursts of civil unrest in the Ukraine leading to the Russian invasion of the region has magnified the importance of NATO and, for some, reinforced the view that the alliance must continue to develop so that it can maintain international order.

Auerswald and Saideman state this is not the same NATO that operated immediately after WWII, the Cold War, or even the early 1990's. They explain today's NATO is an advanced mainstream international organization that responds to unique security threats that are limited in scope but decisive in nature.¹⁷¹ The success of the

¹⁷⁰ Portia Walker, "Ukraine Open to Peace Talks with Militants," *USA Today*, May 12, 2014, accessed May 13, 2014, <http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/world/2014/05/11/ukraine-referendums/8964471/>.

¹⁷¹ David P. Auerswald and Stephen M. Saideman. *NATO in Afghanistan: Fighting*

organization that has brought it to its current form is built on a complex history of adaptation and transformation that has arguably made it one of the most effective and dynamic alliances in history.¹⁷² One only needs to reference chapter three of this thesis, where a major ‘pivot point’ in NATO’s purpose and mission were identified, to better understand the ability of NATO to adapt to changing global politics and maintain relevancy in the contemporary international community.

NATO’s development has been gradual and steady with the addition of new members over the course of its life. The total number has grown from 12 original founding members in 1949 to the 28 members that make up the organization today.¹⁷³ Croatia was the last edition to join in 2009, and there are currently four countries on the waiting list: Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia,¹⁷⁴ and Georgia.¹⁷⁵ The world continues to evolve, and while it is unlikely there will ever be permanent peace between states anytime in the foreseeable future, NATO will most likely develop in a world with a shrinking number of enemies, and the US should support that development. This is because, much like the thirteen colonies in the early US, sovereign states around the world continue to band together to form

Together, Fighting Alone (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2014), 18.

¹⁷² Todd Sandler and Keith Hartley, *The Political Economy of NATO; Past present, and in to the 21st century* (New York NY: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 1.

¹⁷³ “Member Countries,” *North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)*, last modified March 27, 2014, accessed May 6, 2014., http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/nato_countries.htm.

¹⁷⁴ “Membership Action Plan,” *North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)*, last modified June 10, 2014, accessed March 19, 2015, http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/topics_37356.htm.

¹⁷⁵ “NATO’s relations with Georgia,” *North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)*, last modified November 18, 2014, accessed March 19, 2015, http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/topics_38988.htm.

political organizations where disputes can be addressed in a peaceful manner. This is evident with the growing membership of the UN the EU and the recent creation of the African Union (AU)¹⁷⁶, along with the coalitions and alliances in Asia and the Middle East. But does that mean NATO's political and military institutions will continue to grow and evolve? If so, how would it continue to do so in a more unified international community, and what might it look like? And is there any model or historical example that can help determine how NATO could continue to evolve?

Predicting the future of anything is difficult because there are so many unknown factors that may have an impact on development in a way that may not even be possible yet. But this should not preclude the investigation and speculation of what a potential future for NATO could look like because such an endeavor is bound to reveal some insights that could be useful for the purpose of that development or at least provide a better understanding of what could affect that development. Since any worthwhile prediction should have a solid foundation, this chapter is based in Alexander Wendt's constructivist theory, as discussed in Chapter Two, which says that states and international agents such as IGOs like NATO are likely to evolve toward more stable entities that embrace liberal values of peace and freedom.¹⁷⁷ This may also help explain why NATO is slow to employ military force. This chapter argues that as NATO grows and evolves toward increased stability, it could experience similar changes to what the

¹⁷⁶ Alfredo Tjiurimo Hengari, "EU-UN partnership in military conflict management: Whither the African Union security infrastructure?," *African Journal on Conflict Resolution* 11, no. 1 (2011): 155, accessed March 19, 2015, <http://www.ajol.info/index.php/ajcr/article/view/68158/56248>.

¹⁷⁷ Alexander Wendt, *Social Theory of International Politics* (Cambridge UK: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 251.

US went through when it transitioned from the Articles of Confederation to the Constitution, and so, the US should support such a change. As a result, NATO could evolve into a more firm governing alliance with a self-sustaining and permanently manned military force dedicated exclusively to NATO operations.

For this argument, the concept of a ‘more firm governing alliance’ is meant as a generic idea that refers to a type of multinational coalition where NATO members would be held more accountable to the decisions of the North Atlantic Council (NAC) than they are presently. Currently, NATO makes all its decisions by consensus only. This means there is no voting and that an actionable decision, such as intervening in Afghanistan, can be made even if there are members who simply “agree to disagree on an issue”, leaving those members free to abstain from action if they wish.¹⁷⁸ Perhaps a more firm governing alliance could look like something that more closely resembles a confederation where members are bound by the results of voting, or perhaps it could develop into an organization that the world has not yet experienced.

Under this stronger governing body, an enhanced military force could be established and developed. It would be more flexible and able to adapt to changing threats while engaging in a variety of defense related actions including limited security operations either on the periphery or outside the immediate physical proximity of its member states. A transition to this kind of NATO assembly and security model would promote progress on a large scale by ensuring stability among the member states and

¹⁷⁸ “Consensus decision-making at NATO,” *North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)*, last modified August 22, 2014, accessed October 5, 2014, http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/topics_49178.htm.

fostering the development of a peaceful global community in regions of the world that might still be experiencing violent conflict, issues with the rule of law, or continually violate human rights.

America's Transition and NATO

In his book *Peace Pact*, David Hendrickson presents an analysis of early American history that diverges from the traditional understanding of the American Revolution where it is commonly believed that the 13 colonies were relatively homogenous, friendly, and shared a common sense of nationality.¹⁷⁹ On the contrary, Hendrickson describes an America that was divided by notions of colonial loyalties, state sovereignty, and limited trust between associates who were loosely connected under the Articles of Confederation.¹⁸⁰ In 1775, it was under these precarious and stressful circumstances that “the first great compromise in American history” occurred when the Congress in Philadelphia authorized the establishment of the Continental Army. He states that the creation of a national army was designed to ensure the distribution of colonial leadership that was loyal to the Continental Congress across all the American provinces. He explains that such a distribution would prevent the consolidation of regional power under local army leaders whose loyalties were with the individual colony and who then might use that army in the interest of the colony as opposed to the unified colonies as a whole. Hendrickson uses the example that since Congress was worried about the Massachusetts army turning on a neighboring state after dealing with the

¹⁷⁹ David C. Hendrickson, *Peace Pact: The Lost World of the American Founding* (Lawrence KS: University of Press Kansas, 2003), ix.

¹⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 257.

British, they appointed General Washington who was a Virginian to lead the force because he was primarily concerned with Congress's orders and not Massachusetts's interests.¹⁸¹

Similar logic is most likely used today in appointing military leadership in NATO and has even been considered in the development of other national armies such as in Afghanistan where individual loyalty to local tribes and villages is still an issue.¹⁸² A current example of the distribution of loyalty in NATO is in the command structure of the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) in Afghanistan where leaders come from six different countries,¹⁸³ much like the revolutionary US military units were purposefully comprised of leaders from different American states. By ensuring that the military power of NATO is not consolidated under one member states control, the organization increases its legitimacy and has a better chance of ensuring everyone involved is treated fairly, regardless of troop contributions from any individual NATO member. In addition, by sharing the burden of responsibility for the organizations actions, it is safe to assume each member state is inherently saying it trusts the other states to act in a manner consistent with its values, which includes values on human rights, morality, and ethical behavior. This is an important step toward creating a governing alliance between states and a permanent defense organization designed to promote and secure the shared values of liberty and freedom.

¹⁸¹ Ibid., 108-109.

¹⁸² Arturo Munoz, *U.S. Military Information Operations in Afghanistan: Effectiveness of Psychological Operations 2001-2010* (Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation, 2012), 20-21.

¹⁸³ "Leadership, About ISAF," *International Security Assistance Force (ISAF)*, accessed March 19, 2015, <http://www.isaf.nato.int/leadership.html>.

But Hendrickson also points out the Continental Army was a weak and disorganized organization that was comprised of units that sporadically disbanded at the end of individual enlistments. He pointed out that there were disagreements between local militias and the national government on term limits, disputes over command, and an unsteady stream of supplies that left the army to fight nature's elements as much as the British.¹⁸⁴ And the Continental Congress had little authority under the Articles of Confederation to change things because the states were responsible for maintaining both their militias and their contributions to the colonial national force.¹⁸⁵ When the founders met to revise the Articles, they knew that the federal government had to have more authority to raise and sustain an army, and that is why in the new Constitution they empowered both the Congress and the President to ensure that end.¹⁸⁶

Although not usually as severe as during the American Revolution, Auerswald and Saideman highlight that NATO deals with many of the same complications and disputes that the Continental Army dealt with. They include a variety of issues including manning and equipment requirements, funding allocations, and disagreements over authority.¹⁸⁷ Much like the Continental Army under the Articles of Confederation, NATO has a good grasp on tackling the issue of loyalty to the alliance by ensuring a mixed member state command structure, but it is limited in its general ability to maximize its function as an organization because it lacks a central authority to defer to

¹⁸⁴ Hendrickson, *Peace Pact*, 115.

¹⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, 131.

¹⁸⁶ Akhil Reed Amar. *America's Constitution: A Biography* (New York NY: Random House Trade Paperbacks, 2006), 106, 142.

¹⁸⁷ Auerswald and Saideman, *NATO in Afghanistan*, 58-61.

for administration of itself. This quality separates it from the standard national military that finds its authority in its government and ultimately limits the NATO forces potential. Unfortunately, this leaves NATO without any “real ability to reward or sanction officers.”¹⁸⁸ There are several organizational changes that could remedy this, but the most overarching would be to either amend the current NATO charter so that member states gave more authority to the command structure itself, or abolish the current NATO military treaty and replace it with a governing alliance charter that would control NATO like the US federal government controls its military. While the execution of such actions would be entirely unique and difficult, it seems these transitions would be similar to the changes that the US military experienced when it transitioned from existing under the authority of the Articles of Confederation to the authority of the federal Constitution.

Anarchy with Order

Even in an international community that is considered to be constantly in the throes of anarchy by International Relations (IR) and International Politics (IP) scholars,¹⁸⁹ it is hard to deny that over the course of history the global community has appeared to progress toward a more unified existence. Wendt identified the ‘social structure’ of the international system as a key factor in determining state interactions and argued the international community generally tended to continue to evolve toward peaceful interaction and not devolve back into violent conflict once a peaceful norm had

¹⁸⁸ Ibid., 60.

¹⁸⁹ Robert J. Art and Kenneth N. Waltz, “Part I: Strategies for the Use of Force,” in *The Use of Force: Military Power and International Politics*, ed. Robert J. Art and Kenneth N. Waltz (Lanham MA: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 1999), 6.

been established. He based this claim on an examination of history, and although there have been a few major and several minor wars that seem to signal a reversal of progress, he concluded that the states that attempted to move away from liberal ideals like universal freedom and progress eventually either failed or adopted a more reformed model of government.¹⁹⁰ After centuries of trial and error in statecraft, independent states have steadily increased their preference for peaceful political discourse over violent destructive warfare. As states have evolved, they replaced old international orders with stronger and more representative multinational political organizations that reinforce a stable international structure. With this development, the probability that those structures will recede or fail is highly unlikely, especially for ones like NATO that are built on the democratic liberal values of peace and progress.

It is important to note that anarchy in respect to the study of the international community is not defined by chaos, but instead, by a lack of central authority.¹⁹¹ By this definition, individual states are usually not anarchic, but the international community they exist in is. However, since states in the international community continue to join multinational organizations that bind them to treaties that limit their ability to act as completely sovereign entities,¹⁹² it appears that the structure of the international system is developing into a kind of ‘anarchy with order’. While there may not be a global government to hold individual states accountable for their actions, there are several large multinational treaty organizations that influence their members. But this influence is

¹⁹⁰ Wendt, *Social Theory*, 312.

¹⁹¹ Kenneth A. Oye, ed., *Cooperation Under Anarchy* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1986), 1.

¹⁹² Hengari, “EU-UN partnership,” 3.

mild because international alliances do not have very strong mechanisms to force compliance to treaty requirements. An example of this is that most NATO member states do not meet their required defense-to-GDP spending ratio.¹⁹³ A similar situation happened in the US in 1787 during the brief period when America was only bound together by the weak Articles of Confederation. During that time, most of the states “resolved to send no more funds to the general treasury” and there was no way that the early Congress could make them comply.¹⁹⁴ One could argue the colonies existed in a state of ‘anarchy with order’ under the Articles of Confederation because the early government was not effectively binding, as stated by Jefferson when he said, “the Confederation provides no compulsory power.”¹⁹⁵ The same thing could be said about the power of NATO and other multinational organizations today.

But existing in a situation that appeared to be in an environment of ‘anarchy with order’ was only a phase for the US, and it did not fall back into disorder, but rather, evolved toward the federal government that exists today. This could be the same situation for the current NATO community, and it too could continue to evolve into creating a stronger multinational government that would exist in conjunction with sovereign states and perform the same function that the federal government does with the states in America. Because the US went through an ‘anarchy with order’ phase analogous to what NATO may be going through now, the alliance could follow a similar

¹⁹³ Younghoon Moon, “The Future of NATO, The Purpose of the Alliance after the Cold War,” *Harvard International Review* 34, no. 3 (December 2013): 19-21, accessed May 10, 2014, <http://eds.a.ebscohost.com.mantis.csuchico.edu/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=e13481f0-6173-4ab8-8f2e-d99faf956fe2%40sessionmgr4001&vid=1&hid=4205>.

¹⁹⁴ Hendrickson, *Peace Pact*, 3.

¹⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, 154.

path and evolve beyond its function as a security organization and into a multinational governing body. Hendrickson emphasizes it is important to remember that during the founding of the US those who were involved in the process viewed the union of colonies as a coalition of separate independent states that did not desire a powerful central government. John Adams, a founding father and the second US president, recalled how each colony “had grown up under constitutions so different, there was so great a variety of religions, they were composed of so many different nations, their customs, manners, and habits had so little resemblance, and their intercourse had been so rare, and their knowledge of each other so imperfect, that to unite them in the same principles in theory and the same system of action, was certainly a very difficult enterprise.”¹⁹⁶ Adams’ letter describes the founders overcoming the same challenges that face the establishment of a NATO governing alliance today.

A Standing NATO Military

The colonial leaders in the US understood that if they were not united by a central governing body that could organize to fight in their common defense then the conditions for doubting one another’s intentions would lead to paranoia and a constant fear of aggression, if not *actual* aggression, from their neighboring state.¹⁹⁷ This is one of the reasons why they stated in the US Constitution they were seeking “a more perfect union [to]... provide for the common defense.”¹⁹⁸ According to Sandler and Hartley, the

¹⁹⁶ Hendrickson, *Peace Pact*, 124.

¹⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, 141.

¹⁹⁸ “Constitution of the United States,” *The Charters of Freedom*, accessed May 13, 2014, http://www.archives.gov/exhibits/charters/constitution_transcript.html.

NATO alliance was created under a similar idea to provide for the common defense of Western Europe against the Soviet Union and Warsaw Pact countries.¹⁹⁹ But NATO has evolved, much like the US military, to operate in a current environment that is vastly different today than it was at its founding.

While this analysis has looked to the past for comparison in order to assist in understanding how NATO has and may develop, one must not forget that such an endeavor is in an effort to address what form the evolution of NATO might take. As such, it has identified the possibility of a governing alliance that provides the NATO military new authority to execute operations. But whether it is through this proposed governing alliance or simply adjustments to the current treaty, NATO's security force will most likely develop like the US military has and mature into a permanently manned air, land, and sea military organization to address the future security threats of its members. Although at times it may be slow, this development is already happening and is evidenced in actions such as the NATO Defence Ministers recent agreement to establish six new command and control units in Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland and Romania and a new Spearhead Force designed to lead 30,000 ground troops.²⁰⁰ Since NATO continues to develop, it is important to understand what a NATO force as an independent military structure might look like in the future and why. Regardless of the governing mechanism, what follows is an illustration of how the NATO military could evolve.

¹⁹⁹ Sandler and Hartley, *The Political Economy*, 22.

²⁰⁰ "Defence Ministers agree to strengthen NATO's defences, establish Spearhead Force," *North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)*, last modified February 6, 2015, accessed March 19, 2015, http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/news_117188.htm.

To create a permanent multinational military organization that is solely dedicated to protecting democratic principles of freedom and progress should not be considered as overly ambitious or controversial. On the contrary, NATO could very realistically evolve into what this paper will refer to as ‘Standing-NATO’. Standing-NATO can be thought of, as discussed previously, as the natural evolution of the NATO military into a more formidable defense force that provides member state’s citizens the ability to focus on what the US founders would have called “life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.”²⁰¹ Standing-NATO would still be funded and manned by the member states under the direction of the NAC, but the troops would be recruited and used exclusively for NATO units, similar to how American regular army soldiers are only assigned to regular army units, not to state National Guard units. Keohane and Milner argue that internationalization has already substantially connected the political entities of the world through a robust global economy, so funding the manning and equipping of a large-scale multinational shared protective force in the name of mutual security and global stability seems reasonable.²⁰² The organization of such a force would look similar to an advanced contemporary military but with greater capability and less cost because it would be spread among all the members. In addition, it would outperform the current NATO model because it would have better integration of the alliance member’s troops, equipment contributions, and a streamlined defense structure designed to predict, adapt,

²⁰¹ “Declaration of Independence,” *The Charters of Freedom*, accessed May 13, 2014, http://www.archives.gov/exhibits/charters/declaration_transcript.html.

²⁰² Robert O. Keohane and Helen V. Milner, “Internationalization and Domestic Politics: An Introduction,” in *Internationalization and Domestic Politics*, ed. Robert O. Keohane and Helen V. Milner (New York NY: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 3.

and quickly resolve security issues. If there are members who oppose force in any circumstance, they could be offered roles in logistical or administrative support to the military force, or member states could come to some other arrangement.

Since Auerswald and Saideman describe the NATO led ISAF in Afghanistan as an extremely large and complex multinational force, they provide an indication of what a Standing-NATO defense organization might look like. Its composition would be similar to ISAF's in the sense that the force would consist of many states soldiers fully incorporated together under the unity of a single command with a common mission. But it would require more formal cohesiveness through administration and operations institutions to operate as a permanent force.

A large difference would be that individual states soldiers would no longer be only accountable to the state that sponsors them, but would be held responsible under their Standing-NATO's direct leadership regardless of national origin. This direct control would help address the issues of rewarding and sanctioning officers that was previously mentioned during the historical comparison section, but it would require Standing-NATO member states to agree upon a standard set of regulations regarding military customs and justice. In essence, it would necessitate an international version of what the US currently calls the Uniformed Code of Military Justice (UCMJ), which is the legal authority governing the US Department of Defense and a key tool for commanders enforcing regulations and maintaining good order and discipline in a unit.²⁰³

Standing-NATO would also consist of a more even mix of soldiers and

²⁰³ John G. Meyer Jr., *Company Command: The Bottom Line* (Alexandria, VA: Byrrd Enterprises, Inc., 1996), 50.

civilians from participating states to meet required combat troop levels and support operations that deal with the development and governance of local populations, like Auerswald and Saideman recommended for a future NATO force.²⁰⁴ This mix of soldiers and civilians would be required because the Standing-NATO force would have to be properly set up to fight a broad range of threats, such as those discussed in chapter five. It would need the most advanced weapons systems, digital technology, and training on the most current techniques, tactics and procedures for combating different generations of warfare, as described by Colonel Thomas X. Hammes in his book *The Sling and The Stone: On War in the 21st Century*. Hammes argues that 4th Generation Warfare (4GW) has been occurring since the end of World War II after the previous generation's warfare, maneuver warfare, reached its peak. 4GW occurs when an adversary uses every political, economic, social, and military network available to them to convince their enemy's political policy makers that their "goals are either unachievable or too costly for the perceived benefit."²⁰⁵ 4GW can be understood as an evolved insurgency that is executed through a wide range of mediums and incorporates a variety of threats that a Standing-NATO military would need to defend against. A Standing-NATO force would require a robust permanent organization to combat such a threat and others like it.

A Standing-NATO army would provide a marked advantage over the current temporary force model because it would be able to address security issues and threats through strategies that require a long-term approach such as combating the proliferation

²⁰⁴ Auerswald and Saideman, *NATO in Afghanistan*, 224.

²⁰⁵ Thomas X. Hammes, *The Sling and The Stone: On War in the 21st Century* (St. Paul MN: Zenith Press, 2004), 2.

of SALW and ‘child soldier’ armies, dismantling international criminal networks, or fighting transnational terrorist organizations as discussed in chapter five. However, these are only a few examples of the many threats existing in the world that Standing-NATO could better address in order to promote global peace and prosperity. Other serious threats to progress in the global community include, but are not limited to, oppressive governmental regimes, human trafficking networks and violent drug cartels in underdeveloped parts of Latin America, Africa, and Asia.²⁰⁶ All of these threats could be better fought with a self-sustaining and permanently manned NATO military force.

Arguments Against Standing-NATO

While one could use many of arguments that were raised by the *Federalist Papers* or anti-federalist writings during the adoption of the US Constitution and apply them to the establishment of a stronger NATO, number forty-six addresses the very salient issue that a large professional military might decide to turn on or bring violence upon the member states that created it.²⁰⁷ James Madison, writing as Publius, dealt with the issue of how a professional military apparatus could possibly infringe upon the liberty and freedom of the states by attacking them through force. This was a very serious concern for colonial America and is applicable to the establishment of an enhanced NATO. But Madison argued that a military created by the sovereign states would be unlikely to take such action. He explained it was ridiculous to think “that the governments and the people of the states should silently and patiently behold the

²⁰⁶ Nicholas Marsh and Owen Greene, ed., *Small Arms, Crime, and Conflict* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012).

²⁰⁷ Amar, *America’s Constitution*, 117.

gathering storm, and continue to supply the materials, until it should be prepared to burst on their own heads” and concluded that such notions appeared to be the “incoherent dreams of a delirious jealousy, or the misjudged exaggerations of a counterfeit zeal, than like the sober apprehensions of genuine patriotism.”²⁰⁸ In addition, he pointed out that the federal army would be relatively small and each state would still retain a militia that could form with the other states militias to defeat any aggression from the federal army.²⁰⁹

The fears of a permanent NATO military organization should be calmed according to the same logic. Each member nation would still have a domestic military completely separate from the Standing-NATO force, so it would be likely that they would be able to defend off any attack. In addition, Standing-NATO would be much smaller than the individual states, and other members would most likely rally together to support the nation under attack. And as Madison pointed out, it would be unlikely that such an attack would ever even occur because the members of the alliance would never let a situation like that develop.

Another argument is that the comparison between NATO’s alliance and colonial America is missing an immediate external threat, like America faced from Britain, to encourage NATO members to establish a more robust union. But anyone making such a claim has not considered that America and other NATO member countries

²⁰⁸ Madison, James. “Fourty-Six (No. 45 in Newspapers), The Subject of the Last Paper Resumed; with an Examination of the Comparative Means of Influence of the Federal and State Governments.” In *The Federalist: Alexander Hamilton, James Madison, John Jay*, edited by J.R. Pole (Indianapolis IN: Hackett Publishing Company, Inc., 2005), 258.

²⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, 259.

such as the United Kingdom, Spain, and Turkey have already experienced an invasion and are living under a similar danger.²¹⁰ NATO members have felt the threat to their peace and prosperity when Al Qaeda trained terrorists attacked civilian targets in their home territories and surrounding international neighbors, effectively declaring war on the Western part of the world and democratic lawful society in general. Terrorist fighters do not abide by any international rules or laws of war and will most likely create weapons that can produce the highest number of casualties from regularly available items.²¹¹ The constant concern for such international terrorism and insurgencies are today's major threat to life and liberty. It provides a similar motivation to strengthen the NATO alliance like the threat of invasion from Europe strengthened the colonial alliance in the summer of 1787.²¹²

The War on Terror today and the Revolutionary War are undoubtedly two completely different kinds of wars, but what matters is the perceived threat to the liberal ideals of progress that the US and NATO member states were founded upon. The developed states of NATO today do not tolerate high death rates in conflict like the numbers experienced in World War II or revolutionary wars of the past.²¹³ While this distaste of death in conflict may have led to a higher degree of pacifism by certain liberal states in an effort to prevent bloodshed, it has also galvanized such states efforts together against even the smallest threat and produced a desire to unite in an effort to both support peace and freedom and to defeat those who would attempt to achieve their goals through

²¹⁰ Auerswald and Saideman, *NATO in Afghanistan*, 17.

²¹¹ Hammes, *The Sling and The Stone*, 219-221.

²¹² Hendrickson, *Peace Pact*, 40.

²¹³ Auerswald and Saideman, *NATO in Afghanistan*, 19.

the use of violence.

A third argument against the evolution of NATO into a governing alliance with a permanent military is that NATO is already used by the UN as a military resource for the global community, so in essence, the UN already acts as its governing body. But this is a misguided understanding of the UN/NATO relationship. While the NATO alliance was formed under the “faith in the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and their desire to live in peace with all peoples and all governments” (as referenced from the treaty in Appendix A),²¹⁴ the UN’s ability to regulate NATO’s actions is limited by the UN Charter, where interpretations are sometimes disputed between members of the international community. So while NATO normally waits to receive authorization from the UN before it acts, it does not have to and can intervene without a UN mandate, as it did in Kosovo in 1998.²¹⁵ But because this raises concerns about adhering to international rules regarding armed conflict set forth in the UN Charter, NATO’s decision to act without the UN’s consent is rare, so it may appear at times as though it requires the UN’s approval.

A Reasonable Future

NATO could choose to strengthen its position in the world by creating a more comprehensive governing alliance and establishing a permanent self-sustaining military force. The arguments presented in this paper illustrate that the evolution of NATO into a

²¹⁴ “The North Atlantic Treaty.” *North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)*. Last modified December 9, 2008. Accessed May 14, 2015. http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_17120.htm.

²¹⁵ Auerswald and Saideman, *NATO in Afghanistan*, 34.

stronger and more robust multinational alliance is not outside the realm of possibility. This paper has demonstrated, through the comparison to Revolutionary America, that independent states with considerable differences have sought to strengthen their allegiance to one another in the past under similar pressures from enemies that threaten the liberal ideals of peace and freedom. Several examples were presented of how NATO's current situation parallels that of colonial America's experience as it evolved and eventually formed a tightly bound federal government with a national army. Thus, NATO's evolution could reasonably lead to a tighter bond between member states with a more robust governing alliance and a permanent military structure. In addition to the historical comparison, IR and IP theory was used to help explain why NATO currently exists in an international community that is in a state of 'anarchy with order'. And in such an existence, the NATO military is likely to form a Standing-NATO defense force that has advanced capabilities and is permanently manned.

While there are many arguments as to why such an evolution of NATO is unlikely or unwanted, the arguments in favor of this transformation are extremely reasonable and compelling. It is evident that people now and at the time of America's founding had similar fears of relinquishing some sovereignty in exchange for protection, but many of those fears are unfounded when the authority established to protect is based on the liberal ideals of freedom, liberty and progress for all people. Sometimes in order to ensure those values are secured, it is required to join forces with likeminded people, establish a strong defense, and move forward together in peace and prosperity. The US should be open to such an evolution in NATO and continue to support the alliance.

While the evidence presented supports the central argument that NATO could evolve into a stronger governing alliance with a permanent military, a comparison of the history of NATO to other multinational organizations histories (especially the UN since the NATO treaty mentions it by name) could provide valuable insights into its own development. In addition, an assessment of its successes and failures could lead to recommendations on what actions to take for future development. A thorough review of the organizations rules and customs could explain why NATO has developed a certain way, and an extensive comparison of member state governments could identify the motives for decisions on certain policy choices and provide insight into possible future actions by the alliance.

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to answer several questions about NATO and the US in an attempt to explore their relationship and produce unique insights into that dynamic. Specifically, each chapter was designed to support the primary argument that NATO has established itself in the global community as an enduring multinational political alliance with a collective security component, and as such, the US should continue to support NATO in the evolution of its political and military capabilities to combat existing and emerging international threats. And while the primary finding of this thesis concludes there appeared to be sufficient evidence to support that argument, it is also clear there is much room for further research and analysis.

This thesis presented five chapters in support of its main argument that revolve around five questions presented in the purpose section of this study. The first chapter provided an introduction and laid out the primary argument. The second chapter illustrated how IR theory could be useful in helping to explain why the US created NATO and has maintained its membership in the alliance. It also identified Alexander Wendt's Constructivist theory of IP as an important theoretical tool that could provide useful insight into the motivation behind the US's continued support of NATO in the future.

The third chapter identified a major period of transition for NATO, or what the chapter referred to as a 'pivot point' in the alliance's history, and explained how another pivot point may be in its future. The first pivot point was during the Bosnian War in the 1990's just after the fall of the Soviet Union and end of the Cold War. NATO's old purpose as a deterrent to Soviet aggression was no longer applicable, so the US led the alliance to utilize the employment of its forces to end the fighting in Bosnia and enforce peace. At that point, NATO had transitioned from focusing on Soviet deterrence to focusing on international security crisis management. Now, changes taking place in the international community such as concerns over Russian aggression or transnational terrorist organizations may indicate the alliance is facing a new pivot point in its history.

As noted in the third chapter, public opinion was a significant variable in creating US policy on the employment of forces with NATO in Bosnia. The fourth chapter isolated public opinion for closer examination and determined it was an important variable that could greatly influence whether or not the US supports NATO policies and operations. It illustrated how, through the Critical Issue theory, US and European public opinion could influence their governments in a way that affected US foreign policy supporting NATO involvement. It also demonstrated how public opinion could influence states to stay out of NATO, specifically Finland. It then discussed how global public opinion actually affected domestic foreign policy and ended with evidence indicating that the general public can have a thoughtful and understanding opinion regarding NATO, which would mean their opinion matters. So if the US public supports NATO, the US

government would be likely to as well.

The fifth chapter established that NATO is still a relevant multinational political alliance in the international community that plays an important role in collective security and suggested it should increase its focus on four developing threats. It highlighted how treaties and alliances are a persistent part of the international system and explained how NATO is a unique political alliance as compared to other competing alliances, such as the EU. It then illustrated why NATO would most likely continue to stay ahead of the EU in multinational security operations. The four identified threats that NATO should increase its focus on are small arms and light weapons (SALW) proliferation, international criminal activity, transnational terrorist organizations, and cyber security.

The sixth chapter considered how NATO might develop in the future to combat the threats previously discussed and used a historical comparison to the revolutionary US to suggest how such development might occur. It explained that what happened to the US when it transitioned from the Articles of Confederation to the Constitution might bear some resemblance to what could happen with NATO's evolution, and suggested that NATO exists in an international environment described as being 'anarchy with order' because independent states, much like the independent revolutionary US colonies, are held accountable to other states for their actions due to treaties and alliances they have with them, such as NATO. It proposed that NATO could develop into a more firm governing alliance with a self-sustaining and permanently manned military force dedicated exclusively to NATO operations, and the US should support

such development. It presents a few arguments against this and a rebuttal for each.

Given the information presented in this thesis, the US should continue to support NATO as it evolves to meet the demands of current and future threats to international security. This thesis has provided a large amount of evidence that NATO has established itself in the international community as an enduring multinational political alliance with a robust security crisis management component. And as such, the US should continue to support NATO in the evolution of its political and military capabilities to combat existing and emerging international threats.

Recommendations

When considering the large field of Political Science and International Relations, this study was only able to address a few issues regarding NATO, the US, and their relationship. While these issues were carefully chosen to produce as much insight into the topic as possible, the analysis of the NATO and US relationship could take many forms, and the depth of this topic should realistically be considered unlimited. But analyzing something to determine probable outcomes so that recommendations can be made should be considered a critical element of statecraft, and the process that takes place in developing the arguments for those recommendations should be considered just as important, if not more so, than the actual recommendation itself. And so when a thoughtful new idea is formed or conclusion reached in this field, it is imperative to not simply disregard it because it does not fit what may have been considered the accepted way of thinking, but rather it should be examined, dissected, proven right or wrong, and argued for or against.

And so, this thesis attempts to present a unique analysis on the topic of multinational treaties and alliances, a topic that is, as mentioned at the start, thousands of years old. It is hoped that it will add to the conversation about interstate interaction and specifically, spur conversation about the evolution of NATO and its future with the US. It is recommended that future research include a deeper analysis of how other member states of NATO have influenced the development of the alliance and possible evolution into the future. Also, different IR theories should be applied to help to better explain and predict the future interactions between states in NATO and in the international community. And finally, a future study should include a comprehensive analysis of specific actions NATO and other alliances could take to help lead the world toward a truly secure, just, and peaceful environment for all people.

APPENDIX A

The North Atlantic Treaty
Washington D.C.
4 April 1949

The Parties to this Treaty reaffirm their faith in the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and their desire to live in peace with all peoples and all governments. They are determined to safeguard the freedom, common heritage and civilisation of their peoples, founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty and the rule of law. They seek to promote stability and well-being in the North Atlantic area. They are resolved to unite their efforts for collective defence and for the preservation of peace and security. They therefore agree to this North Atlantic Treaty:

Article 1

The Parties undertake, as set forth in the Charter of the United Nations, to settle any international dispute in which they may be involved by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security and justice are not endangered, and to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.

Article 2

The Parties will contribute toward the further development of peaceful and friendly international relations by strengthening their free institutions, by bringing about a better understanding of the principles upon which these institutions are founded, and by promoting conditions of stability and well-being. They will seek to eliminate conflict in their international economic policies and will encourage economic collaboration between any or all of them.

Article 3

In order more effectively to achieve the objectives of this Treaty, the Parties, separately and jointly, by means of continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid, will maintain and develop their individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack.

Article 4

The Parties will consult together whenever, in the opinion of any of them, the territorial integrity, political independence or security of any of the Parties is threatened.

Article 5

The Parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all and consequently they agree that, if such an armed attack occurs, each of them, in exercise of the right of individual or collective self-defence recognised by Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, will assist the Party or Parties so attacked by taking forthwith, individually and in concert with the other Parties, such action as it deems necessary, including the use of armed force, to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area. Any such armed attack and all measures taken as a result thereof shall immediately be reported to the Security Council. Such measures shall be terminated when the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to restore and maintain international peace and security .

Article 6 (1)

For the purpose of Article 5, an armed attack on one or more of the Parties is deemed to include an armed attack:

- on the territory of any of the Parties in Europe or North America, on the Algerian Departments of France (2), on the territory of or on the Islands under the jurisdiction of any of the Parties in the North Atlantic area north of the Tropic of Cancer;
- on the forces, vessels, or aircraft of any of the Parties, when in or over these territories or any other area in Europe in which occupation forces of any of the Parties were stationed on the date when the Treaty entered into force or the Mediterranean Sea or the North Atlantic area north of the Tropic of Cancer.

Article 7

This Treaty does not affect, and shall not be interpreted as affecting in any way the rights and obligations under the Charter of the Parties which are members of the United Nations, or the primary responsibility of the Security Council for the maintenance of international peace and security.

Article 8

Each Party declares that none of the international engagements now in force between it and any other of the Parties or any third State is in conflict with the provisions of this Treaty, and undertakes not to enter into any international engagement in conflict with this Treaty.

Article 9

The Parties hereby establish a Council, on which each of them shall be represented, to consider matters concerning the implementation of this Treaty. The Council shall be so organised as to be able to meet promptly at any time. The Council shall set up such subsidiary bodies as may be necessary; in particular it shall establish immediately a defence committee which shall recommend measures for the implementation of Articles 3 and 5.

Article 10

The Parties may, by unanimous agreement, invite any other European State in a position to further the principles of this Treaty and to contribute to the security of the North Atlantic area to accede to this Treaty. Any State so invited may become a Party to the Treaty by depositing its instrument of accession with the Government of the United States of America. The Government of the United States of America will inform each of the Parties of the deposit of each such instrument of accession.

Article 11

This Treaty shall be ratified and its provisions carried out by the Parties in accordance with their respective constitutional processes. The instruments of ratification shall be deposited as soon as possible with the Government of the United States of America, which will notify all the other signatories of each deposit. The Treaty shall enter into force between the States which have ratified it as soon as the ratifications of the majority of the signatories, including the ratifications of Belgium, Canada, France, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom and the United States, have been deposited and shall come into effect with respect to other States on the date of the deposit of their ratifications. (3)

Article 12

After the Treaty has been in force for ten years, or at any time thereafter, the Parties shall, if any of them so requests, consult together for the purpose of reviewing the Treaty, having regard for the factors then affecting peace and security in the North Atlantic area, including the development of universal as well as regional arrangements under the Charter of the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and security.

Article 13

After the Treaty has been in force for twenty years, any Party may cease to be a Party one year after its notice of denunciation has been given to the Government of the United States of America, which will inform the Governments of the other Parties of the deposit of each notice of denunciation.

Article 14

This Treaty, of which the English and French texts are equally authentic, shall be deposited in the archives of the Government of the United States of America. Duly certified copies will be transmitted by that Government to the Governments of other signatories.

- 1 The definition of the territories to which Article 5 applies was revised by Article 2 of the Protocol to the North Atlantic Treaty on the accession of Greece and Turkey signed on 22 October 1951.
- 2 On January 16, 1963, the North Atlantic Council noted that insofar as the former Algerian Departments of France were concerned, the relevant clauses of this Treaty had become inapplicable as from July 3, 1962.
- 3 The Treaty came into force on 24 August 1949, after the deposition of the ratifications of all signatory states.

APPENDIX B

NATO Operations 1995 - Present

1. Operations DEADEYE and DELIBERATE FORCE, 30 - 31 August 1995 & 5 - 14 September 1995
After a mortar attack caused heavy loss of life at a marketplace in Sarajevo, UN peacekeepers requested NATO airstrikes, which began on 30 August against Bosnian Serb air defences (Operation DEADEYE). When a bombing pause failed to result in Bosnian Serb compliance with the UN's demands to withdraw, Operation DELIBERATE FORCE targeted Bosnian Serb command & control installations and ammunition facilities. These airstrikes were a key factor in bringing the Serbs to the negotiating table and ending the war in Bosnia.
2. Operation JOINT ENDEAVOUR, 20 December 1995 - 20 December 1996
NATO's first peacekeeping operation – the Implementation Force (IFOR) – which had the mission of implementing the military aspects of the peace agreement for Bosnia (separation of warring factions and creating safe and secure conditions for the other tasks associated with the peace agreement). Approximately 60,000 troops from the 16 NATO members and 17 non-NATO countries including Russia participated in IFOR initially.
3. Operation JOINT GUARD, 20 December 1996 - 20 June 1998
Following the end of Operation JOINT ENDEAVOUR and the completion of the initial military tasks for implementing the peace agreement, NATO continued leading the international peacekeeping operation in Bosnia with a new focus and a smaller force now bearing the name Stabilisation Force (SFOR) instead of Implementation Force (IFOR).
4. Operation JOINT FORGE, 20 June 1998 - 2 December 2004
After the situation in Bosnia continued to improve, requiring fewer peacekeepers, and the Bosnian state acquired increased sovereignty including control of its airspace, NATO again reduced the size of the SFOR (Stabilisation Force) peacekeeping operation and made changes to the mission, which finally ended on 2 December 2004 when a European Union-led force (EUFOR; the operation was named ALTHEA) took over.
5. Operation EAGLE EYE, 30 October 1998 - 24 March 1999
At the request of the United Nations Security Council, NATO aircraft conducted aerial monitoring of the situation in Kosovo to verify Serb compliance with UN resolutions regarding a ceasefire and with NATO-Serb agreements regarding force reductions in Kosovo. The Serbs did not comply with these resolutions and agreements, and Operation EAGLE EYE ended when the Kosovo Conflict began.
6. Operation JOINT GUARANTOR, 4 December 1998 - 20 March 1999
NATO prepared plans and made preparations for the evacuation of OSCE (Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe) monitors in Kosovo, which did not prove necessary. The OSCE's Kosovo Verification Mission was expelled from Kosovo by the Serbs on 20 Mar 1999, four days before the start of the Kosovo Conflict.
7. Operation ALLIED FORCE, 24 March - 20 June 1999
NATO's air campaign against the Former Republic of Yugoslavia (FRY: Serbia & Montenegro) and its forces deployed in Kosovo. During this operation NATO used a wide range of aircraft and naval weapons against the FRY including submarine-launched cruise missiles, fighters, fighter bombers, air defence aircraft and AWACS. NATO also assembled a ground force in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (FYROM) led by the ACE Rapid Reaction Corps (ARRC) headquarters. This force served as a confidence- building measure for the FYROM authorities and eventually became the Kosovo Force (KFOR).
8. Operation ALLIED HARBOUR, 16 April - 30 August 1999
To help the Albanian authorities deal with the massive influx of refugees from Kosovo during the Kosovo Conflict, NATO deployed the ACE Mobile Force (Land) [AMF (L)] to establish the Albania Force (AFOR) that provided humanitarian assistance in Albania.
9. Operation JOINT GUARDIAN, 12 June 1999 – Present
The NATO-led KFOR (Kosovo Force) deployed into Kosovo to implement the peace settlement, which included the Military Technical Agreement signed by Serbia and the undertaking by the Kosovo Liberation Army (UCK) to demilitarise and transform itself. KFOR's mission was to establish a military presence, deter renewed hostilities, verify

and if necessary enforce the terms of the MTA and UCK undertaking, establish a secure environment for the return of internally displaced persons (IDPs) and refugees and international organisations, provide immediate basic life support to IDPs in Kosovo, provide initial basic civil administration and other non-military functions pending the arrival of international organisations and control the borders of the FRY in Kosovo with Albania and FYROM. On 28 April 2005 the KFOR operation became part of OPLAN 10501 JOINT ENTERPRISE for the Entire Balkan Operation Area. There are currently 4,500 troops provided by 30 countries.

10. Operation ESSENTIAL HARVEST, 27 August - 27 September 2001

In 2001 FYROM was on the brink of civil war, but with international mediation a peace settlement was reached between the government and the ethnic Albanian National Liberation Army (NLA). On 7 June 2001 the FYROM President requested NATO support to ensure the withdrawal and disarmament of the NLA, and the NAC agreed. On 27 August 2001 NLA fighters began handing over weapons to the NATO-led Task Force Harvest in FYROM. This force also secured and assisted the transportation of weapons and ammunition to the main destruction site in Greece.

11. Operation AMBER FOX, 27 September 2001 - 16 December 2002

Following the end of Operation ESSENTIAL HARVEST on 27 September 2001, NATO began a new mission of providing active and pre-arranged support measures to EU and OSCE monitors in FYROM who were observing the parties' compliance with the Ohrid Peace Agreement, in particular the re-entry of FYROM police into contested areas. This mission was initially conducted by the troops of Task Force Harvest until they were replaced by Task Force Fox on 4 October 2001. At the request of the FYROM government, Operation AMBER FOX was extended four times until 15 December 2002. The name of this operation proved controversial after journalists searched for it on the internet and discovered that it was also the name of a homosexual night club in Paris.

12. Operation EAGLE ASSIST, 9 October 2001 - 15 May 2002

Following the 11 September terrorist attacks against the United States, NATO provided five NAEW&CF (NATO Airborne Early Warning and Control Force) aircraft to the US to support the US Operation NOBLE EAGLE to defend its airspace and prevent further attacks like those of 11 September. The aircraft deployed to Tinker Air Force Base on 9 October 2001 and conducted the first NATO flight to protect US airspace on 15 October. On 16 January 2002 the NAC authorised the deployment of two additional NATO E-3A aircraft for EAGLE ASSIST. During the more than seven months of Operation EAGLE ASSIST, NATO E-3A aircraft flew 447 sorties with a total of 4,719 flying hours.

13. Operation ACTIVE ENDEAVOUR, 26 October 2001 – Present

On the day after the terrorist attack on the US on 11 September 2001 the NAC decided that if the attack had been perpetrated from abroad, it would be considered an act covered by Article 5 of the Washington Treaty. The NAC confirmed this declaration on 2 October 2001, and the following day the US requested that NATO provide a presence in the Eastern Mediterranean to demonstrate resolve during the crisis. The NAC agreed on 4 October, and after the OPLAN was promulgated on 26 October, naval patrols in the Eastern Mediterranean began. Subsequent revisions to the plan including providing escorts to Allied shipping through the Straits of Gibraltar, conducting Mine Counter Measures (MCM) route surveys in defined areas and ports, boarding suspect vessels, and extending the scope of the operation from the Eastern Mediterranean to the entire Mediterranean.

14. Operation ALLIED HARMONY, 16 December 2002 - 31 March 2003

This operation replaced Operation AMBER FOX and continued NATO support to international monitors in FYROM and assistance to the efforts of the FYROM government to improve security throughout the country. This operation was followed by the EU-led Operation CONCORDIA on 31 March 2003.

15. Operation DISPLAY DETERRENCE, 20 February 2003 - 16 April 2003

During the second Gulf Conflict NATO deployed NAEW aircraft and air defence batteries to enhance the defence of Turkey. The NAEW portion of the operation was known as Operation CRESCENT GUARD and consisted of more than 100 missions and 950 flying hours.

16. (No Operation Name) NATO Command of ISAF, 11 August 2003 – 28 December 2014

On 20 December 2001 the UN Security Council authorised the establishment of an International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) in Afghanistan, following the defeat of the Taliban in November 2001. ISAF was to assist the Afghan Interim Authority maintain security in Kabul and surrounding areas and to enable the Interim Authority and the UN to operate in a safe environment. Four NATO countries – the United Kingdom, Turkey, Germany and the Netherlands – provided most of the personnel for the first three rotations of ISAF, but this was not a NATO-led operation, and the burden of force generation proved very difficult for the countries involved. In December 2002 Germany recommended that NATO assume command of ISAF IV, and the NAC agreed to this in April 2003. NATO then assumed command of

ISAF on 11 August 2003. Subsequent additions to the ISAF OPLAN added Strategic Reserve Forces and then expanded ISAF's mission beyond the Kabul area. Stage 1 Expansion began on 31 Dec 2003 when the German PRT in Kunduz transferred to ISAF Control. On 1 July 2004 nine provinces in Area North were added to ISAF's area of operations. Stage 1 expansion was completed on 1 Oct 2004. Stage 2 expansion into the Central Region and Area West began in April 2005. Under Stage 3 ISAF assumed command of southern Afghanistan from the US-led coalition on 31 July 2006. The final phase of ISAF expansion was Phase 4 on 5 October 2006, which placed eastern Afghanistan under ISAF control, thus making ISAF responsible for all of Afghanistan.

17. Operation DISTINGUISHED GAMES, 18 June - 29 September 2004

In response to a request by the Greek government, NATO provided assistance to the Olympic and Paralympic Games held in Athens on 13-29 August and 17-28 September 2004. NATO assistance consisted of intelligence support, provision of CBRN (Chemical Biological Radiation and Nuclear) defence assets, and NAEWF&C aircraft. On 3 August 2004 the Joint Forces Command Naples Joint Operations Centre and its Forward Command Element in Athens began 24-hour operations in support of the Olympic Games. Deployed assets included a CBRN Task Force, Joint Special Operations Task Force (JSOTF) assets and NAEWF&C aircraft. This was the first operation in which non-Article 4 or 5 NATO assistance was provided within the borders of a member nation.

18. (No Operation Name) NATO Training Mission in Iraq, 7 August 2004 – 17 December 2011

On 20 March 2003 a US-led coalition invaded Iraq and successfully completed its major combat operations on 1 May 2003. On 8 June 2004 the UN Security Council requested that member states and regional organisations such as NATO contribute assistance to meet the needs of the Iraqi people for security and stability plus humanitarian and reconstruction assistance. On 20 June 2004 the Iraqi Prime Minister asked the NATO Secretary General for NATO help in training, equipping and providing other technical assistance to the Iraqi security forces. NATO Heads of State and Government responded favourably to this request at the Istanbul Summit on 28 June 2004, and on 30 July 2004 the NAC agreed to establish a NATO Training Implementation Mission in Iraq (NTIM-I). A small advance party left for Iraq on 7 August 2004, followed by the main party of 45 personnel in mid-August. Further political discussion in the NAC led to the decision to create a larger training mission to be known as the NATO Training Mission-Iraq (NTM-I). It replaced the initial NTIM-I on 9 October 2004.

19. (No Operation Name) NATO Support to the African Union Mission in Sudan, 23 June 2005 - 31 December 2007

On 28 May 2004 the African Union (AU) deployed a small military monitoring force called the AU Mission in Sudan (AMIS) to the crisis-stricken area of Darfur. Following a request for assistance from the AU, NATO announced it would help the AU by airlifting AU peacekeepers and assisting them with training, organising headquarters and managing intelligence. SACEUR's Strategic Military Mission Order for NATO Logistical Support to the African Union Mission in Sudan was agreed by the NAC on 22 June 2005 and issued the following day. Subsequent revisions to the Strategic Military Mission Order included the deployment of NATO teams to Khartoum to assist in staff capability building. The AU Mission in Sudan continued until 31 December 2007.

20. (No Operation Name) NATO Relief Mission to the United States after Hurricane Katrina, 9 September - 2 October 2005

After Hurricane Katrina struck the southern portion of the United States on 29 August 2005, causing many fatalities and widespread damage and flooding, the US government requested food, medical and logistics supplies and assistance in moving these supplies to the stricken areas. One day later, on 9 September 2005, the NAC approved SACEUR OPLAN 10304 for the provision of NATO assistance to the US. NATO then assisted in the coordination of the movement of urgently needed material and COM JC Lisbon conducted selected NRF operations in support of humanitarian relief operations in the US. During the operation nine nations provided 189 tons of material to the US, which were moved by NRF and NAEW cargo flights as well as national flights coordinated by NATO.

21. (No Operation Name) NATO Humanitarian Assistance to Pakistan, 11 October 2005 - 1 February 2006

On 8 October 2005 a devastating earthquake struck northern Pakistan, killing at least 53,000 people, injuring 75,000 and making at least 4,000,000 homeless. The Pakistani government requested NATO assistance, and on 11 October the NAC approved SACEUR OPLAN 10305 to establish an air bridge to Pakistan using NRF air transport. COM JC Lisbon coordinated and delivered to Pakistan aid provided by the nations. On 21 October 2005 the NAC revised the OPLAN to provide additional assistance, and JC Lisbon deployed a Deployable Joint Task Force HQ (tactical) to Pakistan on 25 October, a force that was soon renamed the NATO Disaster Relief Team (NDRT) to better reflect its mission and avoid misperceptions by the Pakistanis. NATO assistance included Dutch military hospital, a Spanish engineering company and German helicopters. NATO forces completed their deployment to Pakistan on 6 December 2005 and the mission ended on 1 February 2006 at the request of the Pakistani government.

22. (No Operation Name) NATO Support to Latvia during the Riga Summit, 22 August - 29 November 2006
In response to a Latvian government request for assistance in assuring the security of the Riga Summit, NATO provided technical security, CBRN response capabilities, air and sea policing, improvised explosive device (IED) detections, communications and information systems and medical evacuation support.
32. (No Operation Name) NATO support to the African Union Mission in Somalia, 7 June 2007 - Present
On 22 May 2007 the African Union requested possible NATO airlift support to the African Union Mission in Somalia (AMISOM). The NAC approved this request on 7 June 2007 and has continued to approve NATO support to AMISOM every six months since then. No requests for strategic airlift support have been received thus far, but NATO currently has a Senior Military Liaison Officer and two military planners deployed to the AU headquarters in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
23. Operation ALLIED PROVIDER, 24 October - 12 December 2008
In response to a request by the UN Secretary General for NATO assistance, warships from the Standing NATO Maritime Group 2 (SNMG 2) escorted World Food Programme (WFP) ships carrying relief supplies to Somalia in order to protect them against pirate attacks. The NATO warships provided close protection to the WFP chartered ships and also conducted deterrence patrols in the area most susceptible to pirate attacks against merchant shipping. The NATO ships also escorted a ship carrying vital military supplies for a Burundi battalion in AMISOM. Operation ALLIED PROVIDER was followed by the EU's Operation ATALANTA.
24. Operation ALLIED PROTECTOR, 24 March – 17 August 2009
To deal with the growing threat off the Horn of Africa and in the Gulf of Aden, NATO added a counter-piracy mission to the planned deployment of the Standing Naval Maritime Group 1 (SNMG1) to Asia. These counter-piracy operations off the Horn of Africa began on 24 March 2009 and continued until 20 April 2009, when SNMG1 departed for its long-planned visit to Karachi, Pakistan. But on 24 April NATO decided to cancel the other two port visits planned to Singapore and Australia, enabling the second phase of the operation to be brought forward to 1 May 2009 instead of the originally planned 30 June 2009. On 29 June SNMG2 took over responsibility for the operation from SNMG1.
25. Operation OCEAN SHIELD, 17 August 2009 – Present
On 17 August 2009 the North Atlantic Council approved a new counter-piracy operation containing a more comprehensive approach to the problem. Operation OCEAN SHIELD has therefore replaced the previous Operation ALLIED PROTECTOR. A key new element is NATO's efforts to assist states in the region to improve their own ability to combat piracy. The day-to-day maritime efforts against pirates are being conducted by Standing NATO Maritime Group 2 (SNMG2), which had previously been responsible for Operation ALLIED PROTECTOR.
26. Operation UNIFIED PROTECTOR, 31 March 2011 – 31 October 2011
Designed to enforce the UN Security Council Resolution 1970 and 1973, which included a no-fly-zone, an arms embargo, and the authorization to take all necessary measures to protect civilians in Libya. NATO took sole control of these operations under UNIFIED PROTECTOR and oversaw the enforcement of the arms embargo on the high seas of the Mediterranean to prevent the transfer of arms related material and mercenaries to Libya. They also enforced the no-fly-zone in order to prevent any aircraft from bombing civilian targets, and they employed air and naval strikes against those military forces involved in attacks or threats to attack Libyan civilians and civilian-populated areas.
27. Operation Resolute Support 1 January 2015 – Present
Resolute Support employs over 13,000 NATO troops in a follow-on mission to the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF). ISAF was under NATO leadership from August 2003 to December 2014. It was established under a request for assistance by the Afghan authorities and by a UN mandate in 2001 to prevent Afghanistan from once again becoming a safe haven for terrorists. In addition, ISAF was tasked to develop new Afghan security forces and enable Afghan authorities to provide effective security across the country in order to create an environment conducive to the functioning of democratic institutions and the establishment of the rule of law.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ACO. "NATO's Operations 1949 – Present." Allied Command Operations (ACO).
 Accessed February 26, 2015. <http://www.aco.nato.int/resources/21/NATO%20Operations,%201949-Present.pdf>.
- "American President: A Reference Resource for George H.W. Bush." Miller Center:
 University of Virginia. Accessed February 11, 2015. <http://millercenter.org/president/bush/essays/biography/5>.
- Amar, Akhil Reed. *America's Constitution, A Biography*. New York: Random House Trade Paperbacks, 2006.
- Andreas, Peter and Ethan Nadelmann. *Policing the Globe: Criminalization and Crime in International Relations*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Angell, Norman. *Peace with the Dictators?* New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1938.
- Angell, Norman. *Let the People Know*. New York: The Viking Press, 1943.
- Arango, Tim and Michael S. Schmidt. "Last Convoy of American Troops Leaves Iraq." *The New York Times*, December 18, 2011. http://www.nytimes.com/2011/12/19/world/middleeast/last-convoy-of-american-troops-leaves-iraq.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0.
- Archer, Clive. *The European Union*. New York: Routledge, 2008.
- Art, Robert J., and Kenneth N. Waltz. "Part I: Strategies for the Use of Force." In *The Use of Force: Military Power and International Politics*, edited by Robert J. Art and Kenneth N. Waltz, 1-132. Lanham MA: Rowman and Littlefield

Publishers, Inc., 1999.

- Auerswald, David P., and Stephen M. Saideman. *NATO in Afghanistan: Fighting Together, Fighting Alone*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2014.
- Asmus, Ronald D. *Opening NATO's Door: How the Alliance Remade Itself for a New Era*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2002.
- Baker, Peter, and Jonathan Weisman. "Obama Seeks Approval by Congress for Strike in Syria." *New York Times*, August 31, 2013. Accessed April 21, 2013.
http://www.nytimes.com/2013/09/01/world/middleeast/syria.html?_r=0.
- Barcikowska, Anna. "EU Battlegroups – ready to go?" *European Union Institute for Security Studies* 40 (2013): 1-2. Accessed November 29, 2014. http://www.iss.europa.eu/uploads/media/Brief_40_EU_Battlegroups.pdf.
- Baskin, Mark and Paula Pickering. "Former Yugoslavia and Its Successors." In *Central and East European Politics: From Communism to Democracy*, edited by Sharon L. Wolchik and Jane L. Curry, 277-312. United Kingdom: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 2011.
- BBC. "Sony cyber-attack: North Korea faces new US sanctions." BBC: News US and Canada. Last modified January 2, 2015. Accessed March 14, 2015.
<http://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-30661973>.
- Bendiek, Annegret. "Two-Track Realism: Transatlantic Cooperation in Fighting Terrorism." In *Routledge Handbook on the European Union and International Institutions: Performance, Policy, Power*, edited by Knud E. Jorgensen and Katie V. Laatikainen, 445-452. New York: Routledge, 2013.

Blumenthal, Sidney. *The Clinton Wars*. New York: Macmillan, 2003.

Borger, Julian. "Radovan Karadzic tells war crimes trial there was no ethnic cleansing in Bosnia." *The Guardian*, October 1, 2014. Accessed December 5, 2014. <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2014/oct/01/radovan-karadzic-war-crimes-trial-no-ethnic-cleansing-bosnia>.

Bourne, Mike. "Small arms and light weapons spread and conflict." In *Small Arms, Crime and Conflict: Global governance and the threat of armed violence*, edited by Owen Greene and Nicholas Marsh, 29-42. New York: Routledge, 2012.

Bradley, Matt and Julian E. Barnes. "Iraq Army's Ability to Fight Raises Worries." *The Wall Street Journal*, June 23, 2014. <http://search.proquest.com.mantis.csuchico.edu/docview/1539241971?accountid=10346>.

Carpenter, Ted Galen. "NATO at 60: A Hollow Alliance." *CATO Institute*, no. 635 (March 2009): 1-16. Accessed May 3, 2014. <http://object.cato.org/sites/cato.org/files/pubs/pdf/pa635.pdf>.

Carson, Christopher. "Servicemembers warned anew to scrub social media accounts." *Stars and Strips*, December 1, 2014. <http://www.stripes.com/news/servicemembers-warned-anew-to-scrub-social-media-accounts-1.316754>.

Charlemagne. "NATO versus the European Union." *The Economist*, April 10, 2003. <http://www.economist.com/node/1699200>.

Ching, Jacqueline. *Genocide and the Bosnian War*. New York: The Rosen Publishing

Group, 2009.

Clements, Ben. "Public Opinion and Military Intervention: Afghanistan, Iraq and Libya."

The Political Quarterly 84, no. 1 (January – March 2013): 119-131. Accessed March 18, 2015. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-923X.2013.02427.x.

Coniglio, Rob. "Piracy and the Law of Nations." *The Cornell Daily Sun*, April 21, 2009.

<http://cornellsun.com/blog/2009/04/21/piracy-and-the-law-of-nations/>.

Dandurand, Yvon and Vivienne Chin. "Human security objectives and the fight against transnational organized crime and terrorism." In *Human Security,*

Transnational Crime and Human Trafficking: Asian and Western

perspectives, edited by Shiro Okubo and Louise Shelley, 36-56. New York:

Routledge, 2011.

Dent, Nicholas. *Rousseau*. New York: Routledge, 2005.

Drasner, Stephen D. "Problematic Sovereignty." In *Problematic Sovereignty: Contested*

Rules and Political Possibilities, edited by Stephen D. Drasner, 1-31. New

York Chichester, West Sussex: Columbia University Press, 2001.

DTIC. "Joint Publication 1-02; Department of Defense Dictionary of Military and

Associated Terms." Defense Technical Information Center (DTIC). Last

modified January 2015. Accessed March 17, 2015. [http://](http://www.dtic.mil/doctrine/new_pubs/jp1_02.pdf)

www.dtic.mil/doctrine/new_pubs/jp1_02.pdf.

Dull, James. *The Politics of American Foreign Policy*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc.,

1985.

Embassy of The United States. "Secretary Kerry at NATO Headquarters in Brussels."

- Embassy of The United States – Brussels, Belgium. Last modified December 3, 2013. Accessed March 18, 2015. <http://www.uspolicy.be/headline/secretary-kerry-nato-headquarters-brussels>.
- Europa; Summaries of EU Legislation. “Common Security and Defence Policy.” Last modified July 5, 2010. http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/institutional_affairs/treaties/lisbon_treaty/ai0026_en.htm.
- Fine, John V. A. *The Ancient Greeks: A Critical History*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1983.
- Fitzpatrick, Mark. “How Europeans View Tactical Nuclear Weapons on Their Continent.” *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* 67, no. 2 (March – April 2011): 57-65. Accessed March 18, 2015. doi: 10.1177/0096340211399405.
- Foyle, Douglas C. *Counting the Public In: Presidents, Public Opinion, and Foreign Policy*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1999.
- Gabay, Jonathan. *Brand Psychology: Consumer Perceptions, Corporate Reputations*. Philadelphia PA: Kogan Page Limited, 2015.
- Gallup. “Afghanistan.” Gallup. Accessed May 13, 2014. <http://www.gallup.com/poll/116233/afghanistan.aspx>.
- Garber, Lee, ed. “Hackers Hit Sony with Devastating Attack.” *Computer* 48, no. 1 (January 2015): 22-29. Accessed March 14, 2015. <http://ieeexplore.ieee.org.mantis.csuchico.edu/stamp/stamp.jsp?tp=&arnumber=7030214>.
- Glynn, Patrick. “See No Evil: Clinton-Bush, and the truth about Bosnia.” *The New Republic*. 209, no. 17 (1993), <http://web.b.ebscohost.com.mantis.csuchico>.

edu/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=1&sid=eb665490-3c2e-4981-8c6d-6447ccd6efd7 %40sessionmgr198&hid=105.

Goldgeier, James M. *The Future of NATO: Council on Foreign Relations, International Institutions and Global Governance Program*. New York: Council on Foreign Relations, 2010. Kindle.

Goldin, Ian. *Divided Nations: Why global governance is failing, and what we can do about it*. Oxford UK: Oxford University Press, 2013.

Goldsmith, Benjamin E., Yusaku Horiuchi, Takashi Inoguchi. "American Foreign Policy and Global Opinion: Who Supported the War in Afghanistan?" *The Journal of Conflict Resolution* 49, no. 3 (June 2005): 408-429. Accessed March 18, 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/30045121>.

Gorenberg, Gershom. "Danger Signals." *The American Prospect* 25, no. 5 (2014). <http://search.proquest.com.mantis.csuchico.edu/docview/1614143079?accountid=10346>.

Griffiths, Martin, ed. *International Relations Theory for the Twenty-First Century: An Introduction*. New York: Routledge, 2007.

Hammes, Thomas X. *The Sling and The Stone: On War in the 21st Century*. St. Paul MN: Zenith Press, 2004.

Harsch, Michael F. *The Power of Dependence, NATO-UN Cooperation in Crisis Management*. United Kingdom: Oxford University Press, 2015.

Henehan, Marie T. *Foreign Policy and Congress: An International Relations Perspective*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 2000.

Hendrickson, David C. *Peace Pact: The Lost World of the American Founding*.

Lawrence KS: University of Press Kansas, 2003.

Hengari, Alfredo Tjiurimo. "EU-UN partnership in military conflict management:

Whither the African Union security infrastructure?" *African Journal on*

Conflict Resolution 11, no. 1 (2011): 153-171. Accessed March 19, 2015.

<http://www.ajol.info/index.php/ajcr/article/view/68158/56248>.

Henriksen, Thomas H. *Clinton's Foreign Policy in Somalia, Bosnia, Haiti, and North*

Korea. New Jersey: Hoover Press, 1996.

Hitler, Adolf. *Nazi-Soviet Relations 1939-1941, Documents from the Archives of The*

German Foreign Office. Edited by Raymond J. Sontag and James S. Beddie.

Washington D.C.: Department of State, 1948.

Husbands, Jo L. "Conventional Weapons." In *Arms Control: Cooperative Security in A*

Changing Environment, edited by Jeffrey A. Larsen, 163-180. Colorado:

Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2002.

ISAF. "About ISAF." International Security Assistance Force (ISAF). Accessed April 21,

2014. <http://www.isaf.nato.int/history.html>.

ISAF. "Leadership, About ISAF." *International Security Assistance Force (ISAF)*.

Accessed March 19, 2015. <http://www.isaf.nato.int/leadership.html>.

Jackson, Robert, and Georg Sorensen. *Introduction to International Relations*. New York

NY: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Jansson, Bruce S. *The Sixteen-Trillion-Dollar Mistake: How the U.S. Bungled Its*

National Priorities from the New Deal to the Present. New York: Columbia

University Press, 2001.

Joint Congressional Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies. "Swearing-In Ceremony for President William J. Clinton: Fifty-Second Inaugural Ceremonies, January 20, 1993." Accessed December 5, 2014. <http://www.inaugural.senate.gov/swearing-in/event/bill-clinton-1993>.

Kelley, Donald R. ed. *Divided Power: The Presidency, Congress, and the Formation of American Foreign Policy*. Fayetteville: The University of Arkansas Press, 2005.

Keohane, Robert O. "Realism, Neorealism and the Study of World Politics: Theory of World Politics, Structural Realism and Beyond." *Neorealism and Its Critics*, edited by Robert O. Keohane, 1-26, 158-203. New York: Columbia University Press, 1986.

Keohane, Robert O., and Helen V. Milner. "Internationalization and Domestic Politics: An Introduction." In *Internationalization and Domestic Politics*, edited by Robert O. Keohane and Helen V. Milner, 3-24. New York NY: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Los Angeles Times. "Guns Speak Louder Than Words: U.N., Vance, and Owen Keep talking, Serbs keep fighting." *Los Angeles Times*, January 20, 1993. Accessed December 5, 2014. http://articles.latimes.com/1993-01-20/local/me-1406_1_vance-owen-plan.

MacArthur, Douglas. "Value of Press in Wartime." *The Examiner*, March 25, 1942. Accessed March 2, 2015, <http://trove.nla.gov.au/ndp/del/article/91505914>.

- Madison, James. "Fourty-Six (No. 45 in Newspapers), The Subject of the Last Paper Resumed; with an Examination of the Comparative Means of Influence of the Federal and State Governments." In *The Federalist: Alexander Hamilton, James Madison, John Jay*, edited by J.R. Pole, 255-260. Indianapolis IN: Hackett Publishing Company, Inc., 2005.
- Madsen, Frank G. *Transnational Organized Crime*. New York: Routledge, 2009.
- Marcus, Jonathan. "Factors behind the precipitate collapse of Iraq's army." *BBC News*, June 13, 2014. <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-middle-east-27838435>.
- Marquand, David. *The End of the West: The Once and Future Europe*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2011.
- Marsh, Nicholas. 2012. "The tools of insurgency: a review of the role of small arms and light weapons in warfare." *Small Arms, Crime, and Conflict*, edited by Owen Greene and Nicholas Marsh, 13-28. New York NY: Routledge Taylor and Francis Group.
- Marsh, Nicholas and Owen Greene, ed. *Small Arms, Crime, and Conflict*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- Marten, Kimberly Z. *Enforcing the Peace: Learning from the Imperial Past*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2004.
- Mearsheimer, John J. *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 2001.
- Merriam-Webster. "Treaty." Merriam-Webster. Accessed on March 17, 2015, <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/treaty>.

Meyer, John G. Jr. *Company Command: The Bottom Line*. Alexandria, VA: Byrrd Enterprises, Inc., 1996.

Meyers, Steven L., and Ellen Barry. "Putin Reclaims Crimea for Russia and Bitterly Denounces the West." *New York Times*, March 18, 2014. Accessed May 3, 2014. <http://www.nytimes.com/2014/03/19/world/europe/ukraine.html?action=click&contentCollection=Europe&module=RelatedCoverage®ion=Marginalia&pgtype=article>.

Mojzes, Paul. "From Genocide to Dialogue: Christian-Muslim Relations in the Former Yugoslavia." *Occasional Papers on Religion in Eastern Europe*. 34, no. 3 (2014): 14-34. Accessed December 5, 2014. <http://eds.b.ebscohost.com.mantis.csuchico.edu/eds/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=ea1cc5f1-da54-41eb-bb2f-5e36528f9d88%40sessionmgr198&vid=36&hid=120>.

Moodie, Michael. "Tragedy in the Balkins: A Conflict Ended – Or Interrupted?" In *Toward Responsibility in the New World Disorder: Challenges and Lessons of Peace Operations*, edited by Max G. Manwaring and John T. Fishel, 12-31. Portland: Frank Cass, 1998.

Moon, Younghoon. "The Future of NATO, The Purpose of the Alliance after the Cold War." *Harvard International Review* 34, no. 3 (December 2013): 19-21. Accessed May 10, 2014. <http://eds.a.ebscohost.com.mantis.csuchico.edu/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=e13481f0-6173-4ab8-8f2e-d99faf956fe2%40sessionmgr4001&vid=1&hid=4205>.

Morgenthau, Hans J. *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*. New

York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1961.

Munoz, Arturo. *U.S. Military Information Operations in Afghanistan: Effectiveness of Psychological Operations 2001-2010*. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation, 2012.

NATO. "A Short History of NATO." *North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)*.

Accessed May 3, 2014. <http://www.nato.int/history/nato-history.html>.

NATO. "Basic Points: What is NATO?." *North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)*.

Accessed on March 17, 2015. <http://www.nato.int/nato-welcome/index.html>.

NATO. "Consensus decision-making at NATO." *North Atlantic Treaty Organization*

(*NATO*). Last modified August 22, 2014. Accessed October 5, 2014. [http://](http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/topics_49178.htm)

www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/topics_49178.htm.

NATO. "Counter-piracy operations." North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Last modified

June 17, 2014. Accessed March 19, 2015. [http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/](http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/topics_48815.htm)
[topics_48815.htm](http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/topics_48815.htm).

NATO. "Defence Ministers agree to strengthen NATO's defences, establish Spearhead

Force." *North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)*. Last modified February

6, 2015. Accessed March 19, 2015. [http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/news_](http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/news_117188.htm)
[117188.htm](http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/news_117188.htm).

NATO. "Membership Action Plan." *North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)*. Last

modified June 10, 2014. Accessed March 19, 2015, [http://www.nato.int/](http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/topics_37356.htm)

[cps/en/natolive/topics_37356.htm](http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/topics_37356.htm).

NATO. "NATO Member Countries." North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Last modified

March 27, 2014. Accessed March 19, 2015. http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/nato_countries.htm.

NATO. "NATO Operations and Missions." North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). Last updated January 14, 2015. http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_52060.htm.

NATO. "NATO's relations with Georgia." *North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)*. Last modified November 18, 2014. Accessed March 19, 2014. http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/topics_38988.htm.

NATO. "The North Atlantic Treaty." *North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)*. Last modified December 9, 2008. Accessed May 6, 2014. http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_17120.htm.

Nazemroaya, Mahdi D. *The Globalization of NATO*. Atlanta GA: Clarity Press Inc., 2012.

Ninkovich, Frank. "The United States, NATO, and the Lessons of History." In *The European Union: From Jean Monnet to the Euro*, edited by Dean J. Kotlowski, 203-216 Athens: Ohio University Press, 2000.

Oye, Kenneth A. ed. *Cooperation Under Anarchy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1986.

Page, Benjamin I., and Robert Y. Shapiro. *The Rational Public*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1992.

Parrish, Karen. "Link Grows Between Terrorism, Organized Crime, Officials Say." *Department of Defense News*, March 28, 2012. <http://www.defense.gov/>

news/newsarticle.aspx?id=67721.

Paul, T.V., James J. Wirtz, and Michel Fortmann ed. *Balance of Power, Theory and Practice in the 21st Century*. Stanford CA: Stanford University Press, 2004.

Pew Research Center. "Few in NATO Support Call For Additional Forces in Afghanistan." Pew Research Center: Global Attitudes and Trends. Last modified August 31, 2009. Accessed March 5, 2015.

<http://www.pewglobal.org/2009/08/31/few-in-nato-want-more-troops-in-afghanistan/>.

Pinder, John. *The European Union: A Very Short Introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Raddatz, Martha. "Obama Plans to Send 1,500 More Troops to Iraq." ABC News. World News. November 7, 2014. <http://abcnews.go.com/International/president-obama-plans-send-1500-troops-iraq/story?id=26765896>.

Rahkonen, Juho. "Public Opinion, Journalism and the Question of Finland's Membership of NATO." *Nordicom Review* 28, no. 2 (November 2007): 81-92. Accessed March 18, 2015. <http://eds.a.ebscohost.com/mantis.csuchico.edu/eds/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=6&sid=395ef5e0-b3f7-4d28-87e3-bfca41c21b43%40sessionmgr4002&hid=4205>.

Rasmussen, Anders Fogh. "Joint press point with NATO Secretary General Anders Fogh Rasmussen with the President of Romania, Traian Basescu." North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Last modified May 19, 2014. http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/opinions_109865.htm.

- Rasmussen, Anders Fogh. "NATO: A long blue line for security, Speech by NATO Secretary General Anders Fogh Rasmussen at the United States Military Academy at West Point." Last modified October 8, 2014, http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/opinions_113265.htm?selectedLocale=en.
- Reagan, Ronald. "Remarks on East-West Relations at the Brandenburg Gate, Delivered in West Berlin, Germany, June 12, 1987." In *Classic American Speeches*, 759-764. New York: Barnes and Nobels, 2014.
- Reardon, Terry. *Winston Churchill and Mackenzie King: So Similar, So Different*. New York: Dundurn, 2012.
- Renner, Michael. *Small Arms, Big Impact: The Next challenge of Disarmament*. Washington D.C.: World Watch Institute, 1997.
- Reydams, Luc and Jan Wouters. "The Politics of Establishing International Criminal Tribunals." In *International Prosecutors*, edited by Luc Reydams, Jan Wouters, and Cedric Ryngaert, 6-80. United Kingdom: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Ringsmose, Jens and Sten Rynning, ed. *NATO's New Strategic Concept: A Comprehensive Assessment, DIIS Report*. Copenhagen: Danish Institute for International Studies, 2011.
- Roberg, Jeffery L. "The Importance of International Treaties; Is Ratification Necessary?," *World Affairs* 169 (2007): 181-186. Accessed November 21, 2014. <http://eds.b.ebscohost.com/mantis.csuchico.edu/eds/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=9e85ec30-e900-4650-9159-6182c40be069%40session>

mgr111&vid=4&hid=114.

- Rohde, David. "The Fall of Sebrenica." In *War and Change in the Balkans: Nationalism, Conflict and Cooperation*, edited by Brad K. Blitz, 132-142. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. *The Social Contract or Principles of Political Right*. Translated and edited by Fredrick M. Watkins. New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd., 1953.
- Rudesill, Dakota S. "Foreign Public Opinion and National Security." *William Mitchell Law Review* 36, no. 1 (March 2010): 1-22. Accessed March 18, 2015. <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2111595>.
- Sandler, Todd and Keith Hartley. *The Political Economy of NATO; Past, present, and into the 21st century*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Sciolino, Elaine. "Abuses by Serbs the Worst Since Nazi Era, Report Says." *New York Times*, January 20, 1993. Accessed December 5, 2014. <http://www.nytimes.com/1993/01/20/world/abuses-by-serbs-the-worst-since-nazi-era-report-says.html>.
- Shahzad, Syed Saleem. *Inside Al-Qaeda and the Taliban: Beyond Bin Laden and 9/11*. London: Pluto Press, 2011.
- Shanker, Thomas and Eric Schmitt. "Seeing Limits to 'New' Kind of War in Libya." *New York Times*, October 21, 2011. Accessed March 5, 2015. http://www.nytimes.com/2011/10/22/world/africa/nato-war-in-libya-shows-united-states-was-vital-to-toppling-qaddafi.html?_r=0.

Simons-Morton, Bruce, Kenneth Riley McLeroy, and Monica Wendel. *Behavior Theory in Health Promotion Practice and Research*. Burlington, MA: Jones and Bartlett Learning, 2012.

Sloan, Stanley R. *NATO, the European Union and the Atlantic Community, The Transatlantic Bargain Challenged*. Lanham MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers Inc., 2005.

Spiegel Online. "First Military Medal for Bravery Since WWII: Germany Awards Military Cross of Courage." *Spiegel Online, International*, July 6, 2009. Accessed March 5, 2015. <http://www.spiegel.de/international/germany/first-military-medal-for-bravery-since-wwii-germany-awards-military-cross-of-courage-a-634601.html>

Stackelberg, Roderick, and Sally A. Winkle, ed. *The Nazi Germany Sourcebook: An Anthology of Texts*. New York: Routledge, 2002.

The Charters. "Constitution of the United States." *The Charters of Freedom*. Accessed May 13, 2014. http://www.archives.gov/exhibits/charters/constitution_transcript.html.

The Charters. "Declaration of Independence." *The Charters of Freedom*. Accessed May 13, 2014. http://www.archives.gov/exhibits/charters/declaration_transcript.html.

The European Parliament. "NATO's role in Afghanistan." The European Parliament. Last modified January 20, 2010. Accessed February 6, 2015, http://www.europarl.europa.eu/meetdocs/2009_2014/documents/sede/dv/sede25011

Onatoroleafghanistan_/sede250110natoroleafghanistan_en.pdf.

The Future of NATO. "NATO flexes its muscle memory." *The Economist*, August 30, 2014. Accessed March 5, 2015. <http://www.economist.com/news/international/21614166-russias-aggression-ukraine-has-made-natos-summit-wales-most-important>.

United Nations. "Sanctions List." Last modified March 13, 2015. Accessed March 14, 2015. <http://www.un.org/sc/committees/1267/1267.pdf>.

United Nations Programme of Action. "Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects." Last modified June 20, 2014. Accessed March 16, 2015. <http://www.poa-iss.org/PoA/pohtml.aspx>.

U.S. Department of State. "Treaties and Agreements." Accessed November 24, 2014. <http://www.state.gov/t/isn/c18882.htm>.

U.S. Department of State. "Foreign Terrorist Organizations." Accessed March 14, 2015. <http://www.state.gov/j/ct/rls/other/des/123085.htm>.

Walker, Portia. "Ukraine Open to Peace Talks with Militants." *USA Today*, May 12, 2014. Accessed May 13, 2014. <http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/world/2014/05/11/ukraine-referendums/8964471/>.

Walsh, Declan. "2 Haqqani Militant Leaders Are Captured, Afghan Officials Say." *The New York Times*, October 16, 2014. http://www.nytimes.com/2014/10/17/world/asia/haqqani-leaders-arrested-afghanistan-khost.html?_r=0.

Waltz, Kenneth N. *Theory of International Politics*. Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press,

Inc., 1979.

Wendt, Alexander. *Social Theory of International Politics*. Cambridge UK: Cambridge

University Press, 1999.

Williams, Michael C. "Perception of the War in Bosnia." *International Affairs (Royal*

Institute of International Affairs 1944-). 75, no. 2 (1999): 377-381. Accessed

December 8, 2014. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2623350>.

Wintz, Mark. *Transatlantic Diplomacy and the Use of Military Force in the Post-Cold*

War Era. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2010.

Zucconi, Mario. "Reconciliation of Western Security Institutions." In *NATO and*

Collective Security, edited by Michael Brenner, 278-287. New York: St.

Martin's Press, 1998.