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ABSTRACT

In an increasingly globalized world, threats originating from outside the North Atlantic/European area affect the security of the transatlantic alliance, forcing the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) to develop capabilities to combat a multiplicity of global threats. This thesis will examine the security-development nexus and the changing nature of warfare, which compels the transatlantic alliance to transform itself or risk irrelevance. It will evaluate the recent evolutions in NATO’s missions and advocate the enhancement of its humanitarian assistance capabilities in order to maintain its organizational relevance. By taking a qualitative analytical approach, this thesis will examine, compare, and assess past and present case studies of NATO operations in Bosnia, Kosovo, Afghanistan, and Libya to understand the alliance’s future mission challenges. Documenting and comparing these case histories in their changing contexts will provide a basis for forecasting and evaluating future operational scenarios which NATO might undertake either alone or in cooperation with other regional bodies. This thesis will consider the responsibilities of NATO vis-à-vis other organizations—namely the United Nations, European Union, Organization for Security and Co-Operation in Europe, and African Union—in leading peacekeeping missions. Additionally, this thesis will be interdisciplinary, drawing mainly on political science and international relations,
and also on just war principles and international law to assess humanitarian interventions from an ethical and legal perspective. It will also consider the values-related aspects of NATO interventionism such as the new norm of responsibility to protect, while evaluating the political, operational, ethical, and legal complexities and implications of these missions. This thesis will argue that due to the security-development nexus, NATO must use its resources to support development, peacekeeping, and humanitarian interventions in order to maintain its organizational utility and legitimacy in the international community.
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INTRODUCTION

It was 1989 and the crowds were cheering as TV audiences around the world were watching on with awe. The Berlin Wall was falling and the Soviet Union was slowly collapsing from within. As Central Europe broke free from the grasp of communism, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) needed to reevaluate the purpose of its organization as its primary reason for existence seemed to be crumbling along with the Berlin Wall. NATO was created in 1949 by the United States (U.S.) and Europe to ensure transatlantic security after World War II and to counter the communist Soviet Union. The cornerstone of NATO is Article 5 of its treaty, which states that “an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all.”1 As Europe’s insurance policy in case of attack, NATO has afforded the United States with increased influence within Europe – making it America’s best interest for the organization to be perceived as sustainable and legitimate.

After the fall of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War, NATO transitioned from being only a collective defense organization to being a general security organization. In light of this shift, NATO is forced to reassess its collective goals and purposes within the context of ongoing conflicts in the world, shrinking budgets, and the changing nature of warfare. As seen in recent wars in the Balkans, Afghanistan, and Libya, NATO is only able to secure a sustainable peace through development activities after the combat phase. These development activities include capacity-building, state-

making, implementing good governance projects, building infrastructure, and training local police. This security-development nexus requires NATO to undertake peacekeeping in order to ensure that a region does not re-erupt into conflict.

This thesis will examine the security-development nexus and the changing nature of warfare, which compels the transatlantic alliance to transform itself or risk irrelevance. It will evaluate the recent evolutions in NATO’s missions and advocate the enhancement of its humanitarian assistance capabilities in order to maintain its organizational relevance. By taking a qualitative analytical approach, this thesis will examine, compare, and assess past and present case studies of NATO operations in Bosnia, Kosovo, Afghanistan, and Libya to understand the alliance’s future mission challenges. Documenting and comparing these case histories in their changing contexts will provide a basis for forecasting and evaluating future operational scenarios which NATO might undertake either alone or in cooperation with other regional bodies. This thesis will consider the responsibilities of NATO vis-à-vis other organizations—namely the United Nations, European Union, Organization for Security and Co-Operation in Europe, and African Union—in leading peacekeeping missions. Additionally, this thesis will be interdisciplinary, drawing mainly on political science and international relations, and also on just war principles and international law to assess humanitarian interventions from an ethical and legal perspective. It will also consider the values-related aspects of NATO interventionism such as the new norm of responsibility to protect, while evaluating the political, operational, ethical, and legal complexities and implications of these missions. This thesis will argue that due to the security-development nexus, NATO must use its
resources to support development, peacekeeping, and humanitarian interventions in order to maintain its organizational utility and legitimacy in the international community.

Chapter 1 will assess the importance of NATO to the United States and the necessary transformations that must take place organizationally in light of altered operational environments. Chapter 2 will investigate NATO’s involvement in Kosovo and Bosnia – NATO’s first out-of-area missions. Chapter 3 will focus on the alliance’s current role in Afghanistan and the balance of security and development in the region. Chapter 4 will investigate a new division of labor as seen in NATO’s mission in Libya. Chapter 5 will investigate NATO’s capabilities vis-à-vis the responsibilities and competencies of other international and regional organizations, including the United Nations (UN), the European Union (EU), Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE), and African Union (AU). Chapter 6 will explore the legal and ethical issues associated with interventionism from an American perspective in the context of international law and ethical norms, such as just war criteria. In the conclusion of this thesis, I will provide policy recommendations to facilitate NATO’s transformation and evaluate an alternative strategic framework by which to assess the viability of NATO.

Transatlantic security challenges are becoming increasingly complex with the rise of ethnic strife, a Middle East in flux, and the proliferation of non-state actors yielding power in state politics. The transatlantic alliance must be fluid enough to react to these new situations and issues, while being able to manage new threats effectively in an era of constrained budgets. Not only must the alliance be able to adjust to a changing world, it must do so by retaining its legitimacy within the international community. If it fails to
adjust to an ever-turbulent world, NATO will cease being the alliance of choice for the United States and Europe to combat future threats – thereby diminishing American leadership within Europe. Consequently, the organizational sustainability of NATO is of upmost importance to the United States and is only possible if NATO transforms itself to adapt to the changing nature of warfare – the subject of Chapter 1.
CHAPTER 1: NATO’S TRANSFORMATION

The transatlantic partnership, the key to U.S. leadership in Europe, is solidified by the continuing power and influence of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO).1 NATO was created in 1949 by the United States and Europe to ensure transatlantic peace and security after World War II by acting as a counterweight to the Soviet-controlled Warsaw Pact countries.2 While the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT)—renamed the World Trade Organization in 1995—formalized capitalist trade against a Soviet socialist system beginning in 1948, NATO acted as a balance in the security sector against the Soviet military alliance called Warsaw Pact. After the fall of the Soviet Union, the alliance transitioned from being a strictly defensive organization to a broad-based security organization. With the changing nature of warfare as manifested in Bosnia, Kosovo, and the attacks of September 11th, NATO transformed itself into an alliance with wide-ranging peacekeeping missions, including operating outside of its own territorial area, in order to ensure the security of its members. Especially as the United States sometimes turns to ad-hoc coalitions rather than established collective security alliances and European countries employ European Union (EU) resources, NATO is forced to prove its utility as an organization outside the realm of collective defense.3 In a world in which NATO members may be attacked by terrorists that plan and fund their

2Ibid.
attacks from outside the Euro-Atlantic area, or by long-range missiles launched from the Middle East, the alliance has increasingly undertaken conflict prevention, resolution, and development efforts elsewhere to decrease the likelihood of such events and to ensure its organizational sustainability.

This chapter will first discuss the changing nature of warfare that compels NATO to alter its security strategy. Second, it will delve into the alliance’s transition and transformation from being strictly a traditional security organization. Third, I will argue that the alliance must increase its participation in development and peacekeeping missions in an effort to provide effectively for the future security of its members. Fourth, the chapter will contend that it is in America’s best interest to ensure NATO’s sustainability as a military organization in the twenty-first century because its absence may provide the impetus for another defensive alliance to take its place in Europe⁴ – one in which the U.S. would not be a member and therefore forfeit leadership and burden-sharing provided by NATO. Finally, I will address some geopolitical and economic constraints that limit the kinds of missions that NATO may undertake. Nonetheless, it is in the U.S. interest for the alliance to incorporate more fully peacekeeping functions into its mission to better address the security-development nexus, thereby ensuring the sustainability of the organization.

The Changing Nature of Warfare

The roles of peacekeeping and development have become increasingly important to ensuring security because of a paradigm shift in the way wars are fought in the twenty-first century. The paradigm by which to understand war has shifted from an industrial war to revolutionary war, which is a “war amongst the people.” General Rupert Smith, a former officer in the British army, analyzes this strategic shift and investigates the characteristics of war amongst the people. Likewise, David Galula, a French military officer and scholar in the early twentieth century, evaluates the tactical aspects of a revolutionary war and how this type of conflict is fought differently than a conventional war. In this new type of warfare, both the insurgency, or enemy, and the counterinsurgency, in this case NATO, are fighting for the support and will of the people. For the insurgency, the general population provides the main source of resources, manpower, and equipment, while for the counterinsurgency, the population provides intelligence. Both Smith and Galula present a framework by which governments and counterinsurgencies can fight an insurgency effectively and address the security-development nexus. In order to win this new type of warfare, NATO must continue transforming its weapons, strategies, politics, tactics, and methods from the conventional context its members know and understand.

War Amongst the People

War amongst the people, which can be seen in Afghanistan, Iraq, and Libya, is a construct that sheds light on the security-development nexus by revealing the importance

---

of developing infrastructure, education, and governance of the local population in an effort to strengthen security and stability. This type of war does not rely on conventional arms alone, and decisive victories cannot be achieved. The industrial war paradigm required sheer military force and manpower to win – both of which NATO had and needed during the Cold War. Contrastingly, war amongst the people is a clash between entire populations and value systems. According to Smith, this type of war is no longer fought on a physical battlefield, but instead uses the entire population as its battlefield.\footnote{Ibid., 6.}

An insurgency or terrorist group aims to disconnect the triangular relationship between the government, military, and the population.\footnote{Ibid., 178.} By aiming its efforts at the population, an insurgency tries to separate the people from the government and military, whereas conventional warfare tends to target efforts against the government and military. This type of war is amongst the people because an insurgency depends on the population for its support, materials, and protection. An insurgency aims to erode the government’s ability to govern effectively, which not only decreases the confidence of the people in their government, but also draws support for the insurgency or terrorist group.\footnote{Ibid., 177.} For example, an insurgency focuses on disruption of normal government business rather than a decisive victory as is required in industrial warfare.

In an industrial war, such as World War II, the military takes the lead ahead of diplomatic and political agencies, which results in a “conflict” instead of a
“confrontation.”⁹ On the other hand, in the war amongst the people paradigm, the military and political pieces work simultaneously to achieve a political end. During this process, there are isolated events of conflict over a long period of time, which may be termed as a “confrontation.” Unlike a conflict, a confrontation is won by influencing the population using economic, diplomatic, and political means, rather than by sheer military force alone. An example of an extended confrontation is the Cold War, which the U.S. ultimately won, not by merely exerting force, but by economic stability and prosperity.

Similar to Smith’s new strategic paradigm, Galula presents the major aspects of revolutionary warfare and a tactical framework by which to analyze NATO’s new responsibilities in twenty-first century warfare.

*Revolutionary War*

Revolutionary warfare is an internal conflict that involves specific groups within a population challenging the ruling power that controls the government.¹⁰ The conflict is a result of an insurgency or terrorist group trying to seize power and the response of the counterinsurgency – in this case NATO. Galula explains that the main goal for both the insurgency and counterinsurgency is to control the population, much like war amongst the people. An insurgency’s strategy is to separate the population from the counterinsurgency’s control and to obtain the people’s active support for a specific cause or ideology. An attractive cause is essential for an insurgency’s strategy because it serves

---

⁹Ibid., 185.

as a tool to recruit and sustain supporters.¹¹ Unlike conventional warfare in which the primary instrument is military action, a revolutionary war relies on politics as an active driver of operations and military action is evaluated only in terms of its political effects and implications.

To support this strategy tactically, an insurgency or terrorist organization promotes disorder within the population and causes fear. This disorder is inexpensive to accomplish and easy to sustain because a few isolated events, such as burning a farm or blowing up a bridge, may receive publicity and force the counterinsurgency to expend increased funds for the protection of the population.¹² To mount a successful counterinsurgency, on the other hand, is extremely expensive, because a counterinsurgency must provide for the security of the people, while fighting insurgents that blend in with the general population. Consequently, an insurgency can afford to extend the length of the conflict, but a counterinsurgency cannot. An insurgency has no fixed assets, at least initially, and can afford to wage hit and run operations aimed at the counterinsurgents’ assets.¹³ Insurgents are not limited by national borders and are able to move seamlessly between adjacent countries; however, a counterinsurgency is constrained by its operating directive to the specific country that it is legally fighting. An insurgency has the power of initiation because it chooses when and where to attack the

¹¹Ibid., 12.
¹²Ibid., 6.
¹³Ibid., 8.
enemy. Because it has no permanent bases or targets to defend, it can engage the enemy on its own terms.

According to Smith and Galula, the ultimate goal of a counterinsurgency is to link the people back into triangular relationship with a fully functioning government and military. A counterinsurgency needs to identify the correct enemy, which is plausible only with the intelligence it obtains from the local population; therefore a counterinsurgency must create personal relationships with the local people in order to gain their trust and support. Additionaly, a counterinsurgency must have a counter-cause to help win the trust of the people. Many times, this counter-cause is to reinstitute order, stability, and peace by giving back to the people a normal livelihood free of fear and violence. Development and peacekeeping activities such as building bridges, roads, schools, and implementing good governance and rule of law programs strengthen the people’s trust in the counterinsurgency.

To address the security-development nexus on a tactical level, a counterinsurgency must first convince the people that counterinsurgent forces will have a sustained role in the region. After relying on intelligence from the people to kill or capture members of the insurgency by using a highly mobile and lightly armored infantry, a counterinsurgency must sustain stability and peace. The counterinsurgency must focus its efforts on rebuilding normal life for the people by reinstituting schools, providing food and water, and creating jobs. As the counterinsurgency continues

\[14\] Ibid., ix.

\[15\] Ibid., 54.
conducted these peacekeeping activities, the population will begin to trust the counterinsurgency to a greater extent and provide increased intelligence, eventually leading to the diminished power of the insurgency. Next, political life must be restored by instituting regional councils and organizing parties and elections.\(^\text{16}\) It is important to note that a counterinsurgency’s primary mission is to fight for the people’s support and loyalty by ensuring their safety. Killing the insurgents is not the only goal in this new type of warfare.\(^\text{17}\) Rather, a successful counterinsurgency will win the support of the people based on the fact that the local population does not want to risk losing their livelihoods with the rise of the insurgency, which causes instability and disorder. In this way, the people will enforce the isolation of insurgents within the society.

Both paradigms—war amongst the people and revolutionary war—provide a framework by which to better understand the new nature of war. A counterinsurgency, in this case NATO member states, tends not to train its forces for this type of warfare because it is impossible to accurately simulate the entire population in a military exercise. A counterinsurgency has to learn to adapt during the war, which is advantageous for the insurgents because they are members of the population, giving them natural access to the people and familiarity with the geography. Unlike the counterinsurgency, an insurgency is able to employ propaganda that is not necessarily restricted by the truth because it has no responsibility or accountability to defend its words.\(^\text{18}\) Further, an insurgency has no

\(^{16}\)Ibid., 89.

\(^{17}\)Ibid., viii.

\(^{18}\)Ibid., 9.
obligation to its cause, allowing it the flexibility to change its cause whenever it is convenient.

Understanding the dynamics of the new nature of warfare illustrates the importance of NATO’s evolution to address effectively the security-development nexus. Although NATO must continue defending against traditional threats and be prepared to undertake conventional warfare in-theater within its area of responsibility, it should begin focusing on short-term armed interventions out of its area of responsibility to a greater extent. The alliance’s nuclear posture defends against traditional threats, and resources outside of maintaining this posture should be diverted to highly reactionary troops and targeting precision technology to address the new nature of warfare. Consequently, alliance resources should be increasingly focused on short-term interventions and the peace-building operations that follow an armed conflict. Additionally, conflict mitigation and prevention operations should be the secondary focus dependent on available resources and threat assessments. In order to be a viable security organization in the future, NATO must transform to become an alliance with the capacity to win a war amongst the people.

Alliance in Transition: NATO’s Role as a Security Organization

NATO was founded to counter the communist threat of the Soviet Union and Soviet-bloc nations in Central Europe. The fall of the Soviet Union removed the purpose for which NATO was created – to be an alliance of democratic nations to offset communism in Europe. Democratic values had conquered communism and the transatlantic alliance was no longer content in securing those values only within its area
of responsibility. According to former NATO Secretary General Lord George Robertson, the alliance’s new mission was “to build the Euro-Atlantic security environment of the future – where all states share peace and democracy, and uphold basic human rights.”19 As the alliance was in the midst of broadening its mission, the attacks on September 11, 2001 (9/11) on the World Trade Towers occurred, forcing the alliance to rethink its purpose drastically.

NATO invoked Article 5 for the first time in its history, illustrating its willingness to fight in defense of the United States. Article 5, the cornerstone of the alliance, states that “an armed attack against one or more of them (NATO members) in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all.”20 The decision to invoke this Article carried substantial weight because essentially all NATO members were willing to go to war for the United States or at the very least, to help the war effort financially and politically. The U.S. initially decided not to utilize NATO’s defensive framework in the war against the insurgency in Afghanistan (Operation Enduring Freedom).21 Franz Oswald, an author and expert in European security, asserts that American “unilateralists were happy to reduce NATO to a toolbox for coalitions of the willing.”22 The United States chose to use ad-hoc coalitions rather than this multilateral organization, which


negatively shaped European NATO members’ perceptions of the alliance, especially after the historical invocation of NATO’s main defense clause.

Both the United States and Europe acted non-collaboratively, weakening the alliance in the early 2000s. The U.S. opted to work outside NATO’s security architecture and chose instead to lead a coalition of loyal partners without formal consultations within the NATO framework. In this way, the U.S. had complete command and control of all military actions in the Afghan theater. Although American actions strained the alliance, European allies also manipulated their power in NATO to seek revenge upon the U.S. for starting such an unpopular war. According to Rebecca Moore, an author and expert in NATO, “Perhaps the most devastating development fueling the debate over NATO’s future was the dispute that occurred in early 2003 when France, Belgium, and Germany blocked the initiation of defensive measures aimed at protecting Turkey against potential spillover from the war in Iraq.”

By retracting the cover of Article 5 from Turkey, also a NATO member, Western European states diminished the value of NATO membership in the hopes of making the war effort more difficult for the United States. This vengeful act undermined the primary purpose of NATO – mutual defense.

Although NATO had conducted operations outside its area of responsibility with its mission in Bosnia and Kosovo in the 1990s, the organization had never operated outside of the European theater. 9/11 revealed that attacks that occurred within NATO member states could be carried out and planned by those outside the Euro-Atlantic area. Richard Lugar, a ranking member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations,

---

23 Moore, *NATO’s New Mission*, 3.
explained succinctly that “in a world in which terrorist ‘Article 5’ attacks on our
countries can be planned in Germany, financed in Asia, and carried out in the United
States, old distinctions between ‘in’ and ‘out-of-area’ have become meaningless. NATO
must be able to act beyond Europe […] if it is going to fulfill its classic mission today.”24
9/11 made it increasingly clear to the alliance that it could no longer be strictly defensive
in nature, but must take on an offensive role to provide for the security of its member
states. The strategic implications of an offensive posture meant that NATO members
could no longer look on passively as the United States fought a Global War on Terror.

NATO’s Evolution: Increased Participation in Development

One of NATO’s greatest tools is deterrence based on the perception that NATO
states have the ability to retaliate successfully against an attack, thereby preventing an
armed attack on its territory in the first place.25 The failure to stabilize and keep the
peace of a faraway third world country against non-state actors that have less
technologically advanced weapons and no nuclear capability, will diminish NATO’s
power and damage its image as a collective defensive organization. To keep the peace in
war-torn countries such as Afghanistan, the alliance is forced to ensure that the region
does not slip into a recurring pattern of conflict. However, security threats range from
drug trafficking to lack of infrastructure, compelling NATO to undertake peacekeeping
operations to reach its security goals, stabilize the country, and prevent conflict from re-

24 Richard Lugar, “NATO After 9/11” (Speech, Council on Foreign Relations, Washington, D.C.,
March 4, 2002).

25 David Yost, “Special Issue on NATO and Deterrence,” Strategic Insights 8, no. 4 (September
erupting in the region. Therefore, to be successful, NATO must evolve to accommodate the changing nature of warfare discussed previously and emphasize the importance of both conflict prevention and development in a post-conflict situation.

The New Strategic Concept of NATO that member states agreed upon in mid-November 2010 at the Lisbon Summit indicates the evolution of the alliance. In the lead-up to the Summit, NATO Secretary General Anders Fogh Rasmussen stated that NATO “must be able to do 21st century crisis management. […] We’ve learned that there is often no military solution to crises and conflicts. […] I hope the Strategic Concept will mandate NATO to set up a standing training capacity, so we can help others stand on their feet, rather than leaning on us.” The Secretary General continued in his speech to explain specifically that the alliance must be sure that the Afghan people are able to take responsibility for their own country, so that when NATO leaves the region in the future, it is not leaving a security vacuum behind. If NATO cannot prove itself in Afghanistan and fails at its mission, the alliance would lose legitimacy in the eyes of the Afghan people, the UN, and NATO allies. Additionally, its value and utility as an organization would be questioned by the international community because it would have failed at neutralizing a threat, securing an area, and reconstructing a war-torn country.

---


29 Ibid.
Even in this time of economic decline, NATO must focus on the humanitarian aspects of security in order to increase the sustainability of its missions and provide for the long-term security of the alliance. According to Nicholas Burns, the former Ambassador to NATO, the alliance’s past “was focused inward, on Cold War threats directed at the heart of Europe. NATO’s future is to look outward to the Greater Middle East to expand security in that arc of countries from South and Central Asia to the Middle East and North Africa – where the new challenges to global peace are rooted.”

NATO must continue promoting its democratic values and ideals, which are supported by its military components. As an organization that no longer has a single enemy against which the allies are able to unite, it is necessary to find a mission that unites the allies in a common understanding and purpose. Democratic values continue to be the root of the organization and instead of only spreading these ideals of freedom and liberty across Europe—as was the goal in the Cold War—the goal is to spread these ideals to nations that pose threats to the transatlantic alliance.

In the wake of American war initiatives in Afghanistan and Iraq, the alliance was headed towards disintegration. Henry Kissinger, former U.S. Secretary of State, succinctly stated, “Europe will split into two groups defined by their attitude towards cooperation with America. NATO will change its character and become a vehicle for those continuing to affirm the transatlantic relationship.” Although the situation looked bleak in 2003, the United States drastically shifted its policy to encourage NATO

30Nicholas Burns, “NATO Remains Our Essential Alliance” (Speech, Royal Institute for International Affairs, London, United Kingdom, May 27, 2004).

participation in Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom. As NATO members became involved in reconstruction projects and the U.S. did a better job collaborating with its allies, the transatlantic alliance regained some coherence.

Why NATO Still Matters to U.S. National Security

The United States needs NATO to complete successfully its operations in the War on Terror. According to Lugar, restoring stability in chaotic states is extremely complex because “at a minimum, it will require a broad range of military and peacekeeping allies, international legitimacy and more resources than the U.S. can comfortably muster alone. In short, this vital endeavor will require NATO if it is to have the best chance of success.” The United States relies on the international legitimacy of NATO to lend credibility to American-led missions. Additionally, NATO acts within the constructs of United Nations (UN) resolutions, further adding legitimacy to its peacekeeping activities. In support of this evolving role, the alliance created the NATO Response Force (NRF) as well as the NATO Stabilization and Reconstruction Force. These two components lend expertise and military prowess to humanitarian assistance teams, which allow for nation-building to take place effectively. The United States supports both of these efforts; however, it is important to note that some European members believe that these components should be incorporated within the European Security and Defense Policy.


(ESDP) instead and view NATO as a potential competitor.\textsuperscript{35} We will discuss this tension further in Chapter 5.

The United States must continue leading the effort to incorporate development into NATO’s mission in order to increase its capability and legitimacy in providing security. The United States is the leader of NATO in terms of political influence, troop contributions and funding;\textsuperscript{36} therefore, it is in its best interest that NATO continues to be perceived as a legitimate organization with value added by the international community. The U.S. must ensure NATO’s sustainability as an organization as it is the preeminent military organization in which the U.S. wields power and influence among its European allies. The U.S. has the opportunity to champion the transatlantic alliance’s new development role in light of the security-development link and once again prove NATO’s indispensability to the international community.

**Limitations of NATO: What Kinds of Missions are Possible and Desirable**

Although it is evident that the transatlantic alliance must expand its capabilities beyond the realm of security, there are economic and geopolitical limitations to the types of missions NATO has the means to undertake. NATO must continue to remain a security organization first and foremost. The alliance must use its limited resources to undertake development and peacekeeping activities only when they directly affect the security of the allies. On the other hand, a compelling argument can be made about participating in virtually all conflict or post-conflict situations because the world has


\textsuperscript{36}Goldgeier, *Not Whether But When: The U.S. Decision to Enlarge NATO*, 5.
become increasingly globalized and interconnected.\textsuperscript{37} In practical terms, NATO must be careful to become involved only with the development and reconstruction aspects of a post-conflict situation if it has a committed security mission in that region. This development policy must be in line with the UN charter, but must not be subject to the UN Security Council. It remains essential that NATO retain the flexibility to act without the consent of Russia and China, which are both members of the UN Security Council, because priorities between these countries and the U.S. vary significantly at times. This topic will be discussed more fully in Chapters 5 and 6.

Another limitation is that NATO mission priorities must coincide with member states’ national security goals. For example, a broad threat such as terrorism is a mission that the alliance should be able to undertake because not addressing the threat is detrimental to several members of the alliance. Additionally, there must be at least a few countries with military capabilities that are willing to contribute troops and equipment in support of a mission priority. Operation Enduring Freedom in Afghanistan was supported by the United States primarily, but it was also supported by several European partners.\textsuperscript{38} Likewise, in Libya, Britain and France took the lead, but relied on U.S. surveillance aircraft and intelligence to complete the mission. An additional consideration is the desirability of specific missions based on the timeline, possibility of
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success, and the amount of resources necessary to complete the mission. For instance, although cyber security is a looming threat that would affect all members of the NATO alliance and could possibly have detrimental effects if not addressed, there is no cost-effective way to secure all members against a cyber attack due to varying security standards and access controls across computer systems in NATO member states. In a time of increasingly constrained budgets, national resources must be utilized to guard against this threat instead of expending limited alliance resources.

Another limitation is what some claim is a values gap in NATO due to divergent views on the future of NATO that began with the war in Iraq in 2003. Although the organization was founded on democratic principles, some members believed that NATO had a cultural crisis due to different moral perspectives across the Atlantic. These included “long-standing and well-recognized cultural differences between the United States and Europe on issues such as religion, the death penalty, and gun ownership.” Although these cultural differences exist, they may not be as relevant to the gap as diplomatic approaches to world powers, namely Russia. Central and Eastern European states were under Soviet control and are situated geographically much closer to Russia than Western European states. Russia still views former Soviet-bloc states as within its
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sphere of influence and perceives NATO to be a great threat to this influence. Central and Eastern European countries tend to emphasize NATO’s role as a counterweight to Russia on the European continent. On the other hand, Western European states focus on NATO’s role as a potential forum for collaboration between Russia and the transatlantic alliance. It is important to note that some Western European states, specifically France and Germany, have strong bilateral ties to Russia to include political and economic ties, which encompass lucrative oil and gas contracts. This difference in approach to Russia creates a gap within the alliance that manifests itself as a crisis of identity, culture, and morality.

On the other hand, balancing Russia’s perception of the organization proves to be another limitation to the missions NATO can undertake. From its birth to the present day, the transatlantic alliance has forced Russia to rethink its relationship with the West, specifically Western Europe and the United States. NATO was designed to counteract Russia’s power and domination, and in essence, separate Western security from Eastern security. After the fall of the Soviet Union, states once considered part of Eastern Europe joined NATO, which caused the Western security line to shift eastward. The alliance remains a threat to Russia because the central security of Europe is ensured by a structure to which Russia does not have direct access. According to the director of NATO’s information office in Moscow, Rolf Welberts, many Russians still view NATO as “an
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illegitimate, U.S.-dominated remnant of the Cold War, a potentially aggressive military bloc the world would be better off without. Russia possesses a traditional distrust of NATO and continues to believe that other international organizations provide for better global cooperation and security than NATO does, namely the UN. Russia believes that the UN should take the lead in major global operations, rather than NATO, which is understandable since Russia is a permanent member of the UN Security Council and has veto power, which it does not have in NATO.

NATO-Russia relations have evolved and continue to grow in scope and expectations, but NATO still needs to manage the relationship effectively. On May 27, 1997, NATO members and Russia signed the Founding Act on Mutual Relations, Cooperation and Security, the first official framework for a relationship between Russia and the transatlantic alliance. It provided a legal basis for consultation and cooperation between former Cold War enemies and was pushed through by Russian Foreign Minister Yevgeny Primakov, despite severe domestic pushback. This agreement also created the basis for the NATO-Russia Permanent Joint Council (PJC) in 2002, which not only establishes a method for consultation, consensus, and decision-making, but also joint actions that “may include peacekeeping operations under the authority of the UN Security Council or the responsibility of the OSCE [Organization for Security and Co-Operation
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NATO is careful to note that Russia has no power of veto and that NATO’s decision-making bodies and capabilities remain separate from the PJC.\textsuperscript{49} NATO should continue to give Russia a limited voice in international decision-making processes, so Russia does not look to other countries for alliances that may hurt NATO and the West in the future. “Without a continuation of strong, active, and regular engagement from NATO and other important Western institutions, such as the EU, Russia naturally will look for support, security and prosperity from other sources, such as China, India, and even Iran.”\textsuperscript{50} Clearly, NATO must not marginalize Russia, but instead use the NATO-Russia Council to have open consultation. NATO must balance this relationship, while maintaining the flexibility to act independently without Russian reprisal.

Despite these limitations on NATO’s actions, the transatlantic alliance must evolve to retain relevancy in the future. With the increasing importance of the security-development nexus in the new nature of warfare, NATO is in a time of transition and transformation. NATO’s traditional role as a security organization to counter the Soviet communist threat is no longer a viable organizational mission. However, NATO’s increasing participation in development and peacekeeping missions will ensure the organization’s viability in the future, while strengthening its military components in effectively providing and keeping peace. Additionally, it is in the U.S. best interest to
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ensure the sustainability of NATO, thereby maintaining American leadership and influence in Europe. However, it is important to note that budget constraints, a values gap within the alliance, and balancing Russia all prove to be limitations in the types of missions that are possible and desirable for NATO to take. Nonetheless, the alliance must increase its capabilities or risk organizational irrelevance. In the next chapter, we will explore NATO’s first out-of-area operations in Bosnia and Kosovo, which set a precedent for future operations.
CHAPTER 2: NATO’S ROLE IN BOSNIA AND KOSOVO

Conflicts in Bosnia and Kosovo in the 1990s not only challenged the roles and responsibilities of NATO, but had implications for the transatlantic alliance’s core mission. The alliance became involved in conflicts for humanitarian reasons rather than for defensive security reasons based on Article 5. The Bosnian War from 1991 to 1995 combined with mass killings of ethnic Albanians in Kosovo from early 1998 to 1999, embroiled NATO in military actions outside its area of responsibility.\(^1\) Consequently, the transatlantic alliance redefined security based on its democratic values rather than solely collective security, which had important implications for the organization’s future role in the international arena. NATO’s missions in Bosnia and Kosovo set precedents for future out-of-area operations and highlighted necessary organizational areas of improvement in order to remain relevant as the preeminent security provider for the Euro-Atlantic area.

**Bosnia**

During the Cold War, Bosnia and Herzegovina was part of socialist Yugoslavia along with Macedonia, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, and Montenegro. After the Soviet Union fell, Croatia and Slovenia seceded from Yugoslavia to create their own independent states. Bosnia, comprised of ethnic Serbs, Croats, and Bosniaks, who are predominantly Muslim, needed to choose to remain in the Yugoslav Federation or secede. Bosnian Serbs wanted to continue being in the Federation, which was now predominantly Serbian, while Bosniaks and Croats wanted to declare independence. The government
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declared Bosnian independence from the Federation in February 1992, which triggered a violent war between Bosnia and Serbia, the largest nation still in Yugoslavia.

The United Nations (UN) created a UN Protection Force (UNPROFOR) with Bosnian safe zones beginning in 1993 to protect the local population from the brutal Serbian military; however, UNPROFOR had no real military capability and lacked troops to enforce its own mandates. NATO members debated fiercely on whether to become involved in Bosnia because significant resistance existed from some European countries. For example, France and Britain already had contributed resources to UNPROFOR, and did not want the international community to view NATO as competing with the UN. In fact, transatlantic alliance members did not provide assistance in Bosnia until Serbs massacred 8,000 Muslim men and boys in Srebrenica in mid-July 1995 and then attacked a UN safe zone in August 1995. Because the UN lacked military troops and resources to retaliate or even guard against future attacks, NATO intervened by providing the much needed military support for peacekeepers in the form of air strikes, which lasted for 22 days.

NATO’s transition to being able to act out of its area of responsibility was extremely gradual. Its first move in Bosnia to ensure compliance with UN Security Council sanctions was mostly symbolic of political will without any real military capability to support its statements. For instance, the UN initially established a no-fly
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zone over Bosnia in October 1992 with UN Security Council Resolution 781, and NATO air power monitored compliance under Operation Deny Flight.\(^5\) However, the alliance’s role evolved to include monitoring shipping, inspecting cargo, and using force if necessary to implement the UN’s mandates.\(^6\) In 1994, NATO further increased its active responsibilities to include massive air strikes targeted against Bosnian Serbs’ anti-aircraft capabilities, called Operation Joint Endeavor.\(^7\)

After air strikes in Bosnia, NATO created a peacekeeping mission in order to sustain stability called the Implementation Force (IFOR). IFOR had a one-year mandate to implement the military aspects of the Dayton Accords, the treaty officially ending the war in Bosnia. However, it quickly became evident that in order for NATO to stabilize the country and ensure that the military aspects were implemented properly, it needed more than a year to focus on rebuilding the nation and ensuring peace. IFOR culminated with Bosnian elections in September 1996. Over 60,000 troops on the ground supported IFOR, and after IFOR’s mandate ended, NATO created the Stabilisation Force (SFOR) to continue IFOR’s efforts in ensuring that the region did not regress into conflict.\(^8\)

SFOR intended to provide peacekeeping capabilities in support of the UN Security Council Resolution mandating the end of armed conflict in Bosnia. The transatlantic alliance took responsibility to rebuild the nation because of the catastrophic
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infrastructure damage to schools, roads, and buildings caused by the massive air strikes. SFOR not only aided other organizations conducting humanitarian assistance, but also created Civil-Military Cooperation (CIMIC) projects to strengthen infrastructure in Bosnia.⁹ According to NATO official documents, SFOR’s responsibilities included “maintenance and repair of roads and railways in collaboration with the local authorities and other international agencies. This work was critical to providing freedom of movement throughout Bosnia and Herzegovina.”¹⁰ It is important to note that although NATO’s primary purpose became peacekeeping in Bosnia, every NATO member state with armed forces committed troops to both IFOR and SFOR.¹¹ The only NATO country without armed forces, Iceland, supported the war effort by providing medical personnel and assistance.¹² SFOR’s mandate expired in December 2004 with a total of 7,000 troops on the ground still. The EU took over stabilization efforts under Operation Althea, although it does not have the capacity to provide logistical and planning support for the operation.¹³ Consequently, NATO continues providing logistical support under the authority of the Berlin-Plus Agreement, which allows for the EU to utilize NATO’s
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command and control framework. This type of cooperation between NATO and the EU will be discussed more fully in Chapter 5.

The mission in Bosnia was a turning point for the alliance because for the first time in the organization’s history, it acted out of its area of responsibility. NATO could not stand by idly as conflict erupted on its periphery that could potentially spill over into NATO territory. Consequently, the alliance needed to take a preemptive role to ensure security or risk organizational irrelevance. According to Manfred Wörner, NATO Secretary General in the early 1990s, NATO members were forced to question, “Shall we just leave the world to the forces of disorder and limit ourselves to safeguarding our own national borders and security?” NATO grappled with the possibility of looking beyond its boundaries to provide effectively for the security of alliance members.

In so doing, the alliance was slow to take action in Bosnia, raising the question among some member states as to the utility of NATO if it was incapable of taking action against injustice and instability on its periphery. Some believed that NATO’s introspective nature in weighing all risks became a hindrance to taking any action. An inactive organization could be introspective to the point that it could become an island of security surrounded by instability at its borders – eventually failing to repel the mounting threats against the alliance. NATO finally decided to take action in Bosnia; however,
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some members continued to maintain that the alliance’s role in Bosnia was only because it was located in Europe and the conflict could potentially spill over into NATO territory. Further, some members clarified that the organization’s involvement in Bosnia was an exception rather than a precedent for acting outside its area of responsibility.

Nonetheless, NATO’s participation in Bosnia irrevocably changed the internal and external dynamics of the transatlantic alliance. For example, according to James Sperling, an author and professor of political science at the University of Akron, and Mark Webber, professor of international politics at the University of Birmingham, Bosnia was “NATO’s first out-of-area operation (Operation Maritime Monitor), the first authorized use of force to back a UN Security Council resolution (Operation Maritime Guard), NATO’s first combat operation (Operation Deny Flight) and the first time French forces had been involved in NATO military command structures since 1966.”

Bosnia was the first major experience in which NATO had land forces outside of its territory as well as the first major instance that it worked closely with non-NATO members, namely Russia. NATO developed in maturity as an organization by creating new capabilities to address the Bosnian conflict, which would also ensure its sustainability in a post-Cold War era. For example, NATO’s participation in peacekeeping activities was possible because in June 1992, the alliance reached a consensus to assist in stabilization missions under the authority of the Organization of Security and Co-Operation in Europe.
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Further, in 1996, NATO established the MC400/1, which formally explicated that NATO has authority to conduct supportive peacekeeping operations outside its official area of responsibility. Again, in 1997, NATO Heads of State reiterated at the Madrid Summit that, “the new challenges of regional crisis and conflict management now stood alongside the core function of collective defence.” Although official documentation followed NATO’s action in Bosnia, it paved the way for increased peacekeeping responsibilities in the future.

**Kosovo**

As violence was dying down in Bosnia, conflict erupted in Kosovo – providing yet another test for the alliance. Kosovo, an autonomous region within Serbia from 1974 to 1989 comprised of both Kosovar Albanians and Serbians, lost autonomy when Slobodan Milošević became Serbia’s head of state in 1989. Milošević imposed direct rule of Kosovo and replaced most Albanian nationals working in the Kosovar government with ethnic Serbs. In response, Albanians began a peaceful resistance movement that lasted from late 1989 to 1997, at which point Albanians formed the Kosovo Liberation Army (KLA) to fight for Kosovo’s independence. In response,
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Milošević began a violent military campaign to not only kill the KLA, but Albanian civilians as well. As a result, over 800,000 Albanian civilians fled Kosovo, trying to escape Milošević and his Serbian troops.\(^{24}\)

The conflict soon led to allegations of Serbians implementing ethnic cleansing programs against the Albanian majority living in Kosovo.\(^{25}\) Because NATO was already actively engaged in former Yugoslavia, the alliance was able to respond much quicker in Kosovo than in Bosnia when conflict erupted. Beginning in 1998, NATO played a supportive role to the OSCE, which was involved actively in Kosovo. In 1999, the OSCE was forced to leave the region because it could no longer contain the increased violence. Although the international community tried to resolve the conflict peacefully by mediating a resolution, the Serbian government refused to sign any peace treaties.\(^{26}\) As conflict and violence continued escalating in Kosovo, thousands of civilians fled from their homes to surrounding countries, primarily Albania and Macedonia. NATO provided for the safety and security of the refugees in and around Kosovo, and prevented the increase of refugees from flooding Europe. Facing this immediate humanitarian need at the periphery of NATO’s territory, the organization authorized air strikes against Serbian forces in Kosovo in 1999, called Operation Allied Force (OAF).\(^{27}\) Subsequently,
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the Serbian government signed an agreement in June 1999 to withdraw its forces from Kosovo and to allow for the presence of international peacekeeping forces.\textsuperscript{28}

It is important to note that NATO’s intervention in Kosovo was not nearly as contentious or slow-moving as its intervention in Bosnia. NATO members seemed to understand to a greater extent than in the early 1990s immediately following the collapse of the Soviet Union, the organization’s evolving role and responsibilities to address dynamic challenges. On June 10, 1999, after the Kosovo air strikes, NATO Secretary General Javier Solana stated that the alliance “was ready to undertake its new mission to bring the people back to their homes and to build a lasting and just peace in Kosovo.”\textsuperscript{29}

The United Nations passed Resolution 1244 in support of these statements, ensuring that a civil and military presence set-up an interim administration in Kosovo.\textsuperscript{30} In support of Resolution 1244, NATO initiated Operation Joint Guardian, which established Kosovo Force (KFOR) – NATO’s enduring military presence in the region. By the end of June 1999, 50,000 NATO personnel were on the ground in Kosovo as part of the KFOR mission.

KFOR is a multinational force charged with not only security missions, but development ones as well. For instance, in addition to deterring against new hostilities and demilitarizing the conflict region, KFOR’s responsibilities included ensuring the safe
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return of refugees and displaced persons and supporting the international civil presence.\textsuperscript{31} NATO troops under KFOR built emergency feeding stations, refugee camps, and refugee reception centers as well as transported and distributed humanitarian aid.\textsuperscript{32} It is important to note that NATO worked closely with the UN High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR), but undertook missions on its own such as flying hundreds of tons of food and equipment into Kosovo and its surrounding countries. Refugees refused to return to their homeland without some form of security; however, because security threats ranged from starvation to lack of infrastructure, NATO was forced to undertake peacekeeping operations to reach its security goals, stabilize the country, and prevent conflict from re-erupting in the region.

NATO has led several peacekeeping projects in an effort to win the hearts and minds of the local population and ensure security. An example of the development activities that KFOR engages in can be seen by a bridge-building project by the Hungarian contingent. The bridge allows for 300 local families to cross a river safely in the Gjakove/Dakovica municipality, thereby providing easier access to schools and places of employment.\textsuperscript{33} The project was extremely successful and there are plans for KFOR to build another bridge. This bridge-building project is just one of several


development activities led by KFOR to improve infrastructure and stabilize the region. Other projects include distributing the H1N1 vaccine in 2009, hosting a medical seminar to facilitate doctors learning from one another, and training firemen.\textsuperscript{34} NATO cooperated with other international organizations and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) to implement some of these development projects.

The transatlantic alliance led the peacekeeping efforts in Kosovo although the UN and EU participated as well. The alliance had the capability to conduct humanitarian assistance in Kosovo to a better extent than other international organizations because it had military components and resources to support its mission. For example, NATO created the Euro-Atlantic Disaster Response Coordination Centre (EADRCC), which provided air power in support of humanitarian assistance programs implemented by the UNHCR.\textsuperscript{35} EADRCC had the capability to respond to both man-made and natural disasters and incorporated both military and civilian components to provide humanitarian relief.\textsuperscript{36} Although EADRCC’s capabilities draw from national resources, it is able to coordinate national and international humanitarian relief efforts.

Over time, as the country has transitioned to become a stable, democratic nation, NATO has drawn down the number of troops in support of KFOR. Currently, there are approximately 5,500 troops from 30 different countries on the ground even though
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Kosovo declared independence on February 17, 2008. Since Kosovo’s independence, the roles and responsibilities of KFOR have expanded to include the training and standing up of a Kosovo Security Force (KSF). To sustain peace, NATO recruited for KSF across all different ethnic groups and regions within Kosovo to ensure that security responsibility was not concentrated to one ethnic group. The alliance was careful to recruit in both the Albanian and Serbian languages from every level of society. NATO’s training for KSF incorporated crisis response and peacekeeping aspects in the hope that the alliance may eventually transfer those mission priorities to this national, multi-ethnic group to sustain the peace. Training for KSF started in 2009, but the security force does not expect to reach full performance capability until the 2012-2013 timeframe.

Kosovo provides an example of why NATO’s military capabilities are important to ensure lasting peace. In 2004, conflict re-erupted in Kosovo between Albanians and Serbs, forcing the alliance to take military action. It deployed an additional 2,500 troops to the region to support KFOR’s offensive strategy. In so doing, NATO reestablished peace and stability in the region. In 2009, it withdrew some of its forces
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and left a “deterrent posture” to prevent against future outbursts of violence, while providing for the flexibility to react quickly to a conflict if it does erupt. In 2010, it drew down its troops to 10,200 and in 2011, NATO drew down to 5,500 troops in Kosovo. Although NATO continues having a presence in the region, it plans on continuing this gradual decrease of forces until there is a residual troop presence for strictly deterrence purposes. This residual presence, even if symbolic, is important to show the local population that the international community continues to monitor events in Kosovo and has a stake in its future success. Additionally, once NATO has fully trained the KSF, it may transition to an oversight and monitoring role to allow Kosovars to provide for their own security and transform into a fully functioning independent state.

In some respects, Kosovo was the ultimate opportunity for NATO to reinvent itself and prove its utility in the twenty-first century. NATO was forced to expand its view of security with the onset of a humanitarian crisis in Kosovo. As studies began to show the correlation between a lack of development in post-conflict regions and the likelihood of recurring armed conflict, NATO could not simply conduct air strikes and then leave the region to its own devices. The alliance became involved with refugee assistance followed by peacekeeping and conflict prevention operations, in order to decrease the likelihood of having to conduct further armed interventions in the same area. The alternative would have been to leave after a completed air strike and then when the
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region slipped back into conflict, NATO’s mission would have been labeled as a failure by the allies and the international community. NATO’s entire reputation and greatest weapon—deterrence—would have been compromised and its members may even have questioned the necessity of having such an alliance if it had been unable to secure the peace of a small region in Serbia. Hence, NATO was forced to take on a development role in Kosovo in order to prevent further conflict and prove its organizational utility post-Cold War.

Further, similar to the Bosnian conflict, official NATO documentation and tactical strategies needed to catch up to the organization’s actions. NATO’s new Strategic Concept of 1999 revealed the changing tide among members to support a robust peacekeeping capability to provide security comprehensively. Consequently, the organization reorganized the structure of its battle groups to become more effective in military and civilian aspects of peacekeeping. The alliance originally structured its mission using brigades and transitioned to multinational task forces (MTFs) in 2006. Task forces allowed for increased flexibility and mobility because they were comprised of fewer, lightly armored troops. MTFs differed significantly from brigades because it “placed more emphasis on intelligence-led operations, with MTFs working closely with both the local police and the local population to gather information.” This evolution highlighted the importance of intelligence gathered from the local population—an example of NATO altering its strategies to address the new nature of warfare.
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the MTFs transitioned to multinational battle groups (MNBGs), which became increasingly mission-specific because they tailored every group according to mission priorities and intelligence gaps in a specific region.\footnote{Ibid.}

NATO’s mission in Kosovo was also significant because the organization chose to act initially without a UN Security Council Resolution. In Bosnia, NATO acted with a clear mandate from the UN Security Council. On the other hand, in Kosovo, two permanent members of the UN Security Council, China and Russia, were sure to veto a resolution advocating that NATO conduct a humanitarian intervention. Consequently, NATO chose to act without a resolution, which will be discussed further in Chapter 6. Actions NATO would take in the future greatly depended on lessons learned from Bosnia and Kosovo.

Lessons Learned

Although NATO was eventually successful in Bosnia and Kosovo, and both countries are now relatively peaceful and democratic, there were several lessons learned from those missions that are applicable to present conflicts. For example, in Kosovo, the allies displayed a lack of resolve, which did not help win over the local population or build confidence for the people to provide intelligence. Not only did the allies adamantly refuse even to entertain the idea of putting NATO troops on the ground, but they also limited the precision of NATO air strikes by enforcing a minimum altitude of only 15,000 feet.\footnote{Human Rights Watch, “Kosovo: Civilian Deaths in the NATO Air Campaign,” Human Rights Watch, February 1, 2000, www.unhcr.org/refworld/docid/3ae6a866b0.html (accessed December 21, 2011).} This stringent restriction, while contributing to force protection of NATO,
resulted in increased civilian casualties in Kosovo. This adversity to risk also resulted in increased refugees, which raised ethical questions in the international community as to the differing values placed on human life based on nationality.\textsuperscript{48} Further, the greater likelihood of miscalculating target locations led to the loss and destruction of important infrastructure that the alliance was later forced to rebuild. Some claim that NATO never intended to nation-build in Kosovo and only aimed to bring the Serbian government back into diplomatic talks for a negotiated peace.\textsuperscript{49} However, once it was clear that the loss of lives and infrastructure as well as the presence of thousands of refugees needed international guidance and monitoring, NATO was the alliance of choice due to its military capabilities. Nonetheless, it was evident that NATO needed to remove some restrictions in order to address and manage conflict effectively in the future.

One issue that the wars in Bosnia and Kosovo revealed was that because NATO is a consensus-based body, decision-making was slow and maintaining consensus was difficult. In Kosovo, NATO states could not agree on specific targets and varying philosophies on civilian casualties limited the number and location of air strikes. Because consensus even to participate in mitigating the conflict was so fragile, military commanders did not have the flexibility to create contingency plans or discuss worst-case scenarios for fear of scaring away some allies.\textsuperscript{50} According to David Fulghum, Editor of \textit{Aviation Week & Space Technology}, “NATO troops had too many political masters. The
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system was so cumbersome that it limited the effectiveness of some of the best technology. Joint STARS [Joint Surveillance Target Attack Radar System], for example, couldn’t be used to direct aircraft to the targets it saw because it took too long to get approval for a strike.”

Collective force proved to be cumbersome and too slow to fight an asymmetric war. NATO realized that it needed to streamline its process in order to increase efficiency and reaction times in the future.

Burden-sharing was another area of contention because there was a capability and resource gap among allies – an issue that exists today. Although European member states contributed the majority of troops in Albania and Macedonia and also provided most of the personnel for the extraction force located in Macedonia, the U.S. provided much of the military equipment, communications systems, and arsenal for both the Bosnia and Kosovo missions. This dependence on the United States created resentment on both sides of the Atlantic and caused tension regarding command and control of the operations. For example, the U.S. launched an independent operation called Joint Task Force Noble Anvil, which was solely an air strike mission that was exclusive of NATO’s OAF in Kosovo. In part, this independent move was due to NATO’s slow action and inability to reach consensus quickly. Alternatively, the U.S. claimed that the joint task force was set-up to synchronize and support both NATO and U.S. operations in the
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region.\textsuperscript{54} Some in NATO believed that the U.S. was not sharing all of its intelligence with allies and prioritizing support for Noble Anvil over the NATO mission. In response, the U.S. claimed that this secrecy was due to a possible security breach in OAF because Serbian forces were aware of attacks before they occurred.\textsuperscript{55} Some in the U.S. alleged that France leaked target information to the Serbs in order to decrease the number of civilian casualties.\textsuperscript{56}

Command and control structures also contributed to the lack of cohesion and slow consensus among allies because national troops had their own organizational structures that needed to be integrated within an alliance hierarchy.\textsuperscript{57} For example, the U.S. had sub-missions in place such as Noble Anvil with different chains of command and authorities than OAF. Integration was confusing and varied greatly among member states, further contributing to the need to streamline structures for increased efficiency. Because of varying levels of operational security and the slow process of consensus, the powers and authorities of the NATO Secretary General grew to fill the role of mediator between member states. In fact, the Secretary General’s authority increased to an unprecedented level – to the point that he was even able to authorize air strikes.\textsuperscript{58}

Another lesson that NATO learned is the need for contingency planning not only for its military responsibilities, but also for its civilian responsibilities, which includes
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learning from experts in the field of humanitarian assistance. For instance, UNHCR and NATO should have had a contingency plan addressing the influx of refugees after the air strikes in Kosovo. Instead, UNHCR did not have anyone inside Kosovo and was merely trying to piece information together based on interviews with refugees.\textsuperscript{59} However, even in the border countries of Macedonia and Albania, where humanitarian aid workers from both UNHCR and the World Health Organization (WHO) with substantive experience in aiding refugees were willing to help, NATO chose to build refugee camps independently without consulting either international aid organization.\textsuperscript{60} Competition developed because NATO contingents wanted to turn over control of refugee camps to their respective national NGOs. Although NATO did not have the expertise or structures in place to play a mediating role, it did not allow international aid organizations to screen national groups for necessary experience or to integrate efforts among the various national aid efforts.\textsuperscript{61} According to Peter Morris from Doctors Without Borders, “Many governments made bilateral funding agreements with NGOs, greatly undermining UNHCR’s ability to prioritize programs or monitor efficiency.”\textsuperscript{62} Although UNHCR has the necessary expertise to coordinate and prioritize these programs effectively, it does not have the resources, military capabilities, or equipment that the alliance has to enforce its
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decisions. NATO needs to conduct joint training with international aid organizations and learn from the experts in order to mitigate duplication of efforts and delegate responsibilities. NATO also must act as a cohesive organization to prioritize requirements irrespective of national NGOs.

Another important lesson that NATO learned in Bosnia and Kosovo is the necessity of managing public relations – a vital aspect of the new nature of warfare. Managing NATO’s image during the conflict and post-conflict periods is essential to continue receiving intelligence and support from the local population and local police. According to NATO’s Official Lessons Learned from Kosovo publication, “The use of radio communication can be particularly important in securing the successful outcome of a peacekeeping operation […] It does not depend on electricity supplies, it cannot be censored, and it is immediate and precise.” Further, radios are able to reach a wider audience than other forms of media and are not dependent on computer systems. The use of radio and other forms of mass media was essential to defeat the Serbian government and to publicize its crimes against humanity, which helped create consensus among NATO member states on the importance of intervention. The need to bolster NATO’s image and to publicize the Serbs’ ethnic cleansing campaign was also important for neighboring countries so that their populations were supportive of NATO forces and receptive to providing resources and basing rights on their territories.


Bosnia and Kosovo also served to set correct expectations of what the new nature of warfare entailed as far as resources and time commitments. By participating in these missions, NATO recognized that its expectation to conduct air strikes and leave a nation was flawed and that undertaking these types of missions were multi-year efforts with a number of troops. Resetting expectations was a slow-moving process during the 1990s, but prepared NATO member states to reach a consensus more speedily in the future. The transition of power from NATO to the EU in Bosnia also revealed what a realistic exit strategy entailed and the necessary commitments still required of NATO, such as command and control resources. Transitioning power also gave NATO experience to work with the EU successfully, establishing a precedent for the handling and turnover of a mission.

The importance of both the Bosnia and Kosovo missions cannot be overstated. At the end of the Cold War, both missions tested the alliance’s resolve and ability to sustain organizational relevance after its primary mission vanished with the collapse of the Soviet Union. Bosnia was NATO’s first out-of-area mission and solidified its offensive capability. Kosovo was NATO’s first humanitarian intervention and tested the alliance’s resolve to reach consensus and ability to do peacekeeping in a war-torn nation. Lessons learned from both Bosnia and Kosovo revealed issues within NATO’s internal structure to address in order to combat future threats as well as tensions with NGOs and international aid organizations. These lessons proved crucial when the next test of the alliance came in the form of 9/11 and the Global War on Terror. The alliance’s
experiences in Bosnia and Kosovo also set the framework for NATO’s capacity to sustain peace and ensure order and stability in Afghanistan – the subject of Chapter 3.
CHAPTER 3: NATO’S ROLE IN AFGHANISTAN

As the world’s foremost military organization comes head to head with a rapidly globalized security environment, NATO is forced to reassess its role and organizational utility once again. Although the war in Afghanistan has tested the political will and commitment of NATO member states, it serves as an example of NATO’s organizational capacity to conduct large-scale development and peacekeeping operations. After 9/11, NATO not only chose to act outside of its area of responsibility, but outside of the European continent for the first time. With 45,000 NATO forces deployed in Afghanistan, the alliance is charged with enhancing security by integrating peacekeeping activities into its combat operations in order to counter terrorism successfully and suppress an insurgency.¹ Consequently, the war in Afghanistan has solidified the peacekeeping authorities of NATO vis-à-vis other international and regional organizations. By integrating the civil and military components of the alliance to address the security-development nexus in Afghanistan, NATO has continued on its trajectory of transformation from the Bosnia and Kosovo conflicts.

This chapter will provide a deeper understanding of NATO’s roles and responsibilities vis-à-vis the United States in Afghanistan. First, it will give a brief historical overview of NATO’s involvement in the war in Afghanistan and its current status. Second, the chapter will shed light on NATO’s International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) and its major goals and challenges. Third, we will delve into the roles and

challenges associated with provincial reconstruction teams (PRTs) – the method that NATO employs to integrate security and development. Fourth, we will explore the tensions of burden-sharing and national troop restrictions among allies that have been highlighted by the alliance’s mission in Afghanistan – the subject of the next part of the chapter. Fifth, this chapter will investigate counterarguments of NATO’s sustainability in Afghanistan and recommendations for the way ahead to overcome these challenges. This chapter will contend that the war in Afghanistan has increased NATO’s capacity to conduct development activities in order to secure and maintain peace, while highlighting areas of improvement for the future.

**Background and Current Status**

The war in Afghanistan is unlike any conflict that the alliance has faced before because it was a defensive response to an attack against a NATO member state. Although the alliance had invoked Article 5 in response to the September 11th terrorist attacks on the United States, the U.S. initiated a war against the Taliban in Afghanistan independent of NATO. The United Nations passed Resolution 1386 on December 20, 2001, authorizing ISAF, which was led by the U.S. and comprised of mostly American troops. Two years later, on August 11, 2003, NATO took over leadership of ISAF and established a permanent base of operations in Afghanistan. NATO’s mission statement in Afghanistan reflects the new nature of warfare because it explicates that NATO should address “the essential elements of the task of stabilizing and rebuilding the country: train
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the Afghan army, police, and judiciary; support the government in counter-narcotics efforts; develop a market infrastructure; and suppress the Taliban.\footnote{Vincent Morelli and Paul Belkin, “NATO in Afghanistan: A Test of the Transatlantic Alliance,” Congressional Research Service, December 3, 2009, \url{http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RL33627.pdf} (accessed November 1, 2011).} ISAF employs a combination of military and civilian tools for NATO to ensure stability in Afghanistan—a country in which NATO forces did not lead the initial military offensive, but nonetheless are leading post-conflict reconstruction efforts.

Unlike in Bosnia and Kosovo, NATO chose to send ground troops to Afghanistan, making it NATO’s first out-of-area ground operation.\footnote{Ibid.} The transatlantic alliance’s primary mission in Afghanistan is to protect the Afghan people and conduct counterinsurgency warfare. According to Daniel Hamilton, Executive Director of the Center for Transatlantic Relations and Executive Director of the American Consortium on European Union (EU) Studies, if NATO fails in its mission in Afghanistan, “terrorist networks will be able to operate there again with relative impunity, posing a direct threat to the European and North American homelands and to neighboring Pakistan. Instability in nuclear-armed Pakistan, in turn, would pose a severe threat to regional and global stability.”\footnote{Daniel Hamilton, \textit{Alliance Reborn: An Atlantic Compact for the 21st Century} (Washington, D.C.: Atlantic Council of the United States, Center for Strategic and International Studies, Center for Technology and National Security Policy, NDU Center for Transatlantic Relations, Johns Hopkins University SAIS, February 2009), 25.} Securing peace and stability in Afghanistan and the Afghan-Pakistan tribal areas remains NATO’s top priority because of the terrorist networks based in the region that have the potential to attack alliance members. The alliance wishes to create an
atmosphere in Afghanistan in which the democratically-elected national government is able to exercise its authority and power, while maintaining peace within its borders.

When NATO first assumed leadership of ISAF, its responsibility was to secure areas only inside Kabul and on its immediate periphery. In October 2003, ISAF’s mandate extended to establish and maintain security across all of Afghanistan. NATO’s strategy to extend ISAF’s reach was to assume leadership of PRTs which had been established by European allies that had participated in the U.S. coalition of the willing at the onset of the war in Afghanistan. The roles and challenges associated with PRTs will be discussed further later in this chapter. By 2004, ISAF’s expansion process had been completed and ISAF not only controlled existing PRTs, but also began establishing additional PRTs in areas of Afghanistan that the security force did not have firm control over yet. As the alliance’s mission expanded, so did its resource and troops commitments. When U.S. President Barack Obama came to power in 2009, NATO escalated the number of its troops in Afghanistan. ISAF started with 5,000 NATO troops in Afghanistan in 2003 and by 2011 it had over 130,000 troops from 48 countries—including from all 28 NATO member states.

As al-Qaeda was becoming increasingly resurgent and crossing the porous border into Pakistan—a predominantly Muslim state with nuclear weapons—it became clear that the Obama administration and NATO allies needed to increase their efforts, funding, and
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troops in Afghanistan. According to President Obama, the U.S. and its NATO allies must be successful in Afghanistan because “if the Afghan government falls to the Taliban—or allows al-Qaeda to go unchallenged—that country will again be a base for terrorists who want to kill as many of our people as they possibly can.”\(^9\) In an environment of resource constraints, the U.S. and NATO were forced to choose the most strategic country in which to wage the War on Terror because it could not afford to fight terrorist networks in every country. Recognizing the dire threat of al-Qaeda gaining access across the uncontrolled border to Pakistan’s nuclear capabilities, the Obama administration reallocated U.S. troops and resources from Iraq to Afghanistan, while NATO increased ISAF’s commitment to Afghanistan.\(^10\)

The U.S. and NATO have gradually escalated the war in Afghanistan to continue dismantling the al-Qaeda network and to resist the Taliban’s reconsolidation of power. With the death of Osama bin Laden in May 2011, the alliance has an unprecedented opportunity to decidedly dissolve the hub of al-Qaeda’s operations in Afghanistan and Pakistan.\(^11\) Although the radical militant group is not hierarchically organized and has several independent actors, the killing of its leader has had an immediate and perceptible
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\(^10\)Ibid.

Leveraging this momentum, NATO has the opportunity to end combat operations in Afghanistan. NATO hopes to transfer its responsibilities to the Afghan Security Force, which is being trained by the alliance to handle the nation’s security after the completion of NATO’s mandate.\textsuperscript{13}

Similar to Bosnia and Kosovo, the transfer of power from NATO to local authorities is crucial in preventing conflict from recurring in the long-term and maintaining peace. Aggressively training and strengthening the Afghan military and police infrastructures are intended to ensure that the Afghan people are able to provide for their own nation’s security, establish the rule of law, and create order. NATO has accepted responsibility for training in Afghanistan, while partnering with U.S. troops in clearing and securing territory free of Taliban and al-Qaeda control. This allied effort has had some success toward accomplishing the short-term goal of transitioning security responsibility to the Afghan military in the hopes of ultimately drawing down troops. The alliance plans to transition out of the country by the end of 2014, leaving a deterrence capability to oversee the Afghan government’s exercise of power.\textsuperscript{14}

**International Security Assistance Force (ISAF)**

NATO-led ISAF has three major goals: security, governance, and development. Security is within the traditional realm of NATO’s mission, but governance and development diverge from NATO’s created purposes, revealing a new direction in which


\textsuperscript{13} Ibid.
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the organization is heading. Alexandra Gheciu, the Director at the Centre for International Policy Studies in the University of Ottawa, describes ISAF’s strategy as implementing “the norms of human rights, the rule of law and democracy, and simultaneously, helping and training the other Afghans, teaching them to build good institutions of governance and, more broadly, to build a modern, reliable polity.” As such, ISAF’s offensive strategy seeks to minimize casualties in order to protect its image within the country and international community. For example, ISAF established the Post-Operations Emergency Relief Fund (POERF) in 2006 to provide immediate humanitarian assistance in places that it had attacked. According to ISAF official documents, “Assistance includes the provision of food, shelter and medicines, as well as the repair of buildings or key infrastructure. Such assistance is provided on a short-term basis, and responsibility is handed over to civilian actors as soon as circumstances permit.” Based on lessons learned in Kosovo, the alliance developed an interim capability to provide humanitarian assistance in Afghanistan until it established a secure environment to transfer power to civilian subject matter experts.

The key to transferring power successfully is training Afghan forces to have the skill and capacity to ensure their own country’s security. NATO’s ISAF has been the


18 Ibid.
primary trainer of security forces and local police – an important factor in preventing conflict from re-erupting in the region. NATO’s Training Mission-Afghanistan (NTM-A) develops the capacity of both the Afghan National Army and the Afghan National Police. In addition to providing skills and training, NATO provides equipment and resources for these troops to guard against insurgencies in the future. Because of the insurgency’s reliance on narcotics for funding, the transatlantic alliance has also trained Afghan security forces in counter-narcotics operations. Providing training enhances sustainable governance, which links military and civilian aspects of peacekeeping and ensures stability even after NATO troops have departed from Afghanistan.

ISAF’s success depends on separating itself nominally from the U.S.-led invasion of Afghanistan. American forces that are part of Operation Enduring Freedom have a priority to defeat terrorism and as President Obama articulated in March 2009, the U.S. mission is to “disrupt, dismantle and defeat al-Qaeda in Pakistan and Afghanistan, and to prevent their return in either country in the future.” NATO’s purpose, on the other hand, is to reconstruct and stabilize Afghanistan, maintain the peace, and prevent further conflict from breaking out in the region. Because terrorists cannot be separated from the general population, NATO must gain the trust of the Afghan people to inform the alliance of those associated with the Taliban so that NATO can identify them and take the
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appropriate actions to provide security for the general population. In providing security, NATO increases its legitimacy in the eyes of the local population, which is necessary to implement governance and development programs successfully. Moreover, when these nation-building and institution-building projects are implemented, NATO has the military capability to ensure order and stability for the Afghan people to feel safe enough to use the new infrastructure, send their children to schools, and allow their women to participate in the democratic process.

Given this reality, ISAF has given a high priority to those projects that win hearts and minds and create trust and mutual friendship between NATO forces and the Afghan people. For instance, ISAF women troops play soccer games with Afghan women, helping to form a bond among members of the local population and NATO.\(^{24}\) By playing soccer, these women not only help advance women’s rights in a conservative Muslim culture, but also fight against the Taliban in their small way. They demonstrate that not all Afghan people will submit to the Taliban’s rules or disassociate themselves from Western culture and civilization. ISAF’s prioritization of women’s issues is also seen in its military training programs, in which both women and men are encouraged to participate.\(^{25}\) From gender issues to building kindergartens for Afghan children, ISAF’s mission is heavily focused on the development angle of the security-development nexus.


Further, NATO’s ISAF is focusing on governance and rule of law with a long-term perspective of training local Afghan leaders and eventually ending the Taliban insurgency. For instance, ISAF implemented a reintegration and reconciliation program for insurgents to be able to turn in their weapons, become educated, and contribute to the development of their country.\textsuperscript{26} By implementing programs that bring insurgents into the system, NATO has been able to decrease the likelihood of conflict from re-erupting in the future and resentment among mid-level Taliban fighters. Further, this option gives insurgents an alternative to participating in the insurgency. This long-term outlook and focus on sustainability is also seen in economic programs that open up the Afghani farmers’ products to international markets.

For example, in April 2010, NATO Foreign Ministers established the “Afghan First” policy, which gives preference to local vendors, local contractors for bids, and even local civilians for available jobs.\textsuperscript{27} By increasing the capacity of Afghanistan’s private sector, NATO develops the potential of the country to become a functioning member of the international community. Additionally, the “Afghan First” policy acts as an economic stimulus for Afghans to develop competitive products and increase their skills. This policy is a reflection of the security-development nexus because security forces prevent conflict from recurring by promoting “sustainable economic development by creating jobs, building economic capacities, developing the private and banking sectors,

\textsuperscript{26}Amin Tarzi, “Recalibrating the Afghan Reconciliation Program,” \textit{PRISM} 1, no. 4 (September 2010), \url{http://www.ndu.edu/press/recalibrating-the-afghan-reconciliation-program.html} (accessed January 3, 2012).

encouraging the development of infrastructure and generating tax revenue to support the delivery of services to the people of Afghanistan." Tax revenue provides an additional method for the Afghan government to sustain its authority and deliver goods and services to its people – making it difficult for terrorist networks to gain strongholds in the region because the population is less inclined to assist terrorists for fear of losing the stability and order afforded by their government. These seemingly disconnected programs that range from women’s issues to economic programs are slowly winning hearts and minds of the Afghan people and making the region increasingly stable, while simultaneously making NATO indispensable to the international community for the future.

**Provincial Reconstruction Teams (PRTs)**

NATO conducts and integrates these security and development tasks primarily through the use of PRTs, which are comprised of multi-national military and civilian personnel. The military forces are to provide security and help defend against resurgent Taliban members, while the civilian personnel train teachers and doctors as well as build infrastructure like hospitals, schools, and roads – projects that tend to be associated with nation-building. NATO currently has 27 PRTs – six belonging to Regional Command North, four belonging to Regional Command West, four belonging to Regional Command South, and thirteen belonging to Regional Command East. These PRTs are led by different NATO member states and vary in the amount of security and

---

28 Ibid.


development each team conducts according to the part of the country in which it is located. For example, the PRTs located in the north are led by Germany (2 PRTs), Sweden, Hungary, Norway, and Turkey. Although there are six in that regional command, Northern Afghanistan is considered to be one of the safest regions in Afghanistan. Consequently, these PRTs focus more heavily on development activities such as building good governance, training the local police, and implementing rule of law programs instead of killing insurgents. It is also important to note that communication with the Afghan population in northern provinces is easier because they speak Persian, which is easier to learn than Pashto, which is spoken in the southern provinces. 31 This ease of communication facilitates trust and open dialogue with the people.

On the other hand, the eastern region of Afghanistan is considered the most dangerous and has thirteen PRTs – ten of which are led by the United States. 32 These teams focus heavily on establishing security by clearing an area of insurgents and retaining order. This region is not stable enough to create sustainable development programs yet; however, after the counterinsurgency has weakened the capacity of the insurgency, other NATO member states may take the lead of PRTs in the eastern region to implement peacekeeping activities. After an area is secure, NATO must shift the balance of development versus security functions within a PRT. It is important to note that PRTs must have some level of both development and security capabilities to ensure


that conflict does not recur in a region and to address the security-development nexus effectively. This balance changes over time as a region becomes increasingly stable and varies from region to region.

For example, the PRT in Bamiyan province in Regional Command North led by New Zealand has very different roles and responsibilities from the PRT in Kandahar province led by Canada in Regional Command South. Bamiyan is already quite well-developed and “is geographically encapsulated, relatively ethnically homogeneous, and well run by a local administration where Afghanistan’s only female governor enjoys strong community support.”33 These conditions allow the PRT to focus on building schools and strengthening infrastructure, while allowing local Afghan authorities to provide for the vast majority of security needs in this low-threat province. On the other hand, Kandahar province is located near Afghanistan’s border with Pakistan and is much more dangerous because Taliban insurgents are able to attack NATO troops from their bases in Pakistan. Additionally, there is intense infighting among rival groups in the region, which causes further disorder and instability. These conditions force the Canadian-led PRT to focus most of its efforts on providing security. A PRT’s roles not only differ according to region, but also according to various caveats placed on national troops, which restrict the types of operations that a PRT may conduct—the subject of the next section.

33William Maley, “Provincial Reconstruction Teams in Afghanistan – How They Arrived and Where They Are Going,” NATO Review.
National Caveats and Divergent Perspectives

Despite the alliance’s relative success in incorporating development into its mission, NATO partners have divergent views on the balance of development and security and how the alliance should allocate its scarce resources. For instance, German troops within ISAF have a priority of reconstruction and stabilization over security.\textsuperscript{34} In fact, they are strictly prohibited from conducting counterinsurgency operations and may only actively engage in combat for defensive purposes.\textsuperscript{35} Other NATO members have criticized Germany for imposing these restrictions because they believe that German troops are less effective. Although German troops lead two PRTs in northern Afghanistan, they do not leave the secured area and at times do not respond to security incidents for fear that they will have to engage insurgents, thereby breaking their restrictions.

In response to this criticism, Germany has stated that its troops are in the region to help rebuild the country and demonstrate its commitment to the local Afghan population by first gaining their trust.\textsuperscript{36} These caveats also make German troops less effective in training Afghan security forces because “ISAF advisory teams that are unable to accompany ANSF [Afghan National Security Force] counterparts on offensive operations quickly lose both the Afghans’ respect, and their own ability to shape and mentor the
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Afghan forces.” ANSF is much more receptive to learning from troops that fight alongside them and “drink from the same canteen.” Likewise, over half of the nations that have contributed to ISAF’s forces have placed caveats on their troop deployments, choosing to emphasize reconstruction of infrastructure over security. For instance, Italy, Spain, and other NATO states have several restrictions, which include a “ban on nighttime operations, consultation with national governments, exclusion of specific operations (notably, counterinsurgency) and even [a] ban on fighting after a snowfall.” Although these NATO allies focus heavily on only conducting peacekeeping and reconstruction activities, there are other member states with differing views, such as France.

French troops are trained in combat and reconstruction, although they are especially focused on governance and capacity-building. French officials believe ISAF efforts in security and counterinsurgency operations must be “accompanied by increased capacity by the Afghan police and judicial system.” France has recognized the necessity of offensive combat operations in the past, but due to an increasing push from the French electorate recently, France’s government has imposed more stringent
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restrictions on its troops.\textsuperscript{42} Now, troops have been explicitly instructed to have visual observation of a target before bombing and to avoid targeting civilian infrastructure under all circumstances.\textsuperscript{43} Additionally, France prefers enabling the Afghan government to stabilize its own country by training police forces, judges, and soldiers, rather than using the PRT framework. Although France supports ISAF’s mission in Afghanistan and has embraced both the stabilization and security aspects of that mission, France believes that, in general, the UN or the World Bank should lead development projects, and that NATO’s role should be restricted to collective defense.\textsuperscript{44}

On the other hand, the U.S., Britain, and Canada support ISAF’s development activities that aid in the reconstruction and stability of Afghanistan, but also believe that NATO forces should take on a more offensive approach in its combat operations.\textsuperscript{45} In their view, by clearing out the Taliban from a specific area and securing it, ISAF’s reconstruction projects will be more successful. Britain, for instance, began taking an “inkblot” approach, in which British troops would secure a small area, then begin building roads, strengthening infrastructure, and implementing development projects just
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in the secured area. However, with the resurgence of the Taliban in the last couple years, Britain has expanded its role in taking a more offensive stance in counterinsurgency operations across the most violent areas of Afghanistan. To be successful in Afghanistan and future peacekeeping operations, NATO must have the capacity to conduct both security and development missions effectively, while considering budget constraints and its other challenges.

**Challenges**

Some critics have called into question the viability of NATO’s success in Afghanistan with a planned withdrawal by 2014. Because the alliance’s major mission is to train Afghan security forces, its success relies heavily on the performance capabilities of those forces. According to Anthony Cordesman, a national security advisor to ABC News and a researcher in the Center for Strategic and International Studies, there is a significant risk to broader stability and security when NATO forces plan to withdraw because Afghan forces will not be prepared to assume the responsibility for the country’s security.

Although the transfer of security responsibility to Afghanistan will be difficult, it is important to note that only NATO’s combat operations will be completed; NATO support forces, including those dealing with development and peacekeeping, will remain. In fact, the NATO Training Mission in Afghanistan (NTM-A), which includes
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pledges from allies for trainers, soldiers, and personnel, does not fall under the combat
capability and will not be withdrawn by 2014.\textsuperscript{49} 

Another issue that NATO faces in Afghanistan, as it did in Kosovo, is the lack of
integration between the alliance and the United States. For example, the U.S. mission in
Afghanistan, Operation Enduring Freedom, has developed training for Afghan security
forces called Combined Security Transition Command-Afghanistan (CSTC-A) that is
independent of the NATO framework.\textsuperscript{50} By having a comprehensive, integrated
approach, a duplication of efforts may be avoided and a single chain of command may
allocate resources more effectively. NTM-A and CSTC-A have the same commander,
but each force is comprised of different troops. Because of caveats placed on some
NATO troops that American troops do not operate under, CSTC-A has more flexibility.
By integrating efforts, the training process may be streamlined and be made more
effective.

Another example of an area in which NATO may improve is the PRT structure.
Because PRTs are comprised of differing mixes of military and civilian components, it is
difficult to have a single policy that is applicable to all PRTs. The end result is that PRTs
that have more civilian expertise focus on development to a greater extent than PRTs that
have more military components. An additional challenge is the military components are
able to deploy and react to a situation much quicker than development components,
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creating a lag of development efforts. According to Christa Meindersma, a scholar in the Hague Center for Strategic Studies, “The experience in Afghanistan reinforces the need to integrate civilian and military efforts from the very beginning and to develop expeditionary rapidly deployable non-military capabilities.” Increased interoperability of NATO with its development counterparts will allow for PRTs to be more productive. Continuing to integrate NATO’s processes among allies and developing standards of operating in war zones will increase the alliance’s capacity to conduct peacekeeping successfully.

Another unforeseen challenge is that NATO’s participation in the war in Afghanistan has forced it to become global in its geostrategic considerations. For example, a recent development in the Afghanistan-Pakistan border has altered ties between the transatlantic alliance and Russia. After a NATO air strike accidentally killed 24 Pakistani officials on a border post, Pakistan closed one of two main transit routes that NATO used to transport heavy equipment, resources, and arms into Afghanistan. Now, NATO is forced to rely on Russia to supply a transit route for NATO troops and equipment through Russian territory. This northern transit route being their only option, the U.S. and NATO are completely dependent on Russia, allowing Russia to gain power in other arenas. For instance, NATO has plans to build a ballistic missile defense (BMD)


system in parts of Europe to hedge against a growing Iranian threat. However, Russia believes that the BMD system is to keep Russian power in check and prevent it from exerting its power in its area of influence in Central and Eastern Europe. Russia is leveraging the northern transit route to gain political advantages in its discussions on the BMD system with NATO. Although this issue is ongoing, NATO must continue managing its relationship with Russia effectively in order to move ISAF equipment out of Afghanistan and transition out of the country successfully.

**Recommendations**

The war in Afghanistan has highlighted areas in which NATO may improve. Because NATO troops are contributed by individual countries, the alliance must explicate clearly a standard on the balance of security and development implemented by all NATO member states. This balance is essential to create unity in the alliance and to solidify the role of development within the organization. Perceptions of the alliance’s roles and responsibilities in a post-conflict region to ensure peace and to break the cycle of recurring conflict vary drastically among NATO allies. According to The Brookings Institution, “To stem growing atrophy, the alliance needs a clearly defined, realistic and attainable purpose to focus efforts and avoid inevitable mission failure.”

A practical application of this policy could be to prohibit caveats on NATO troops. By creating a
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comprehensive development policy in NATO, ISAF can increase cohesion among its troops and efficiency in allocating resources. In light of ongoing operations and budget constraints, the alliance can include in this policy “enhanced multinational cooperation, pooling arrangements, common procurement programs, and role specialization.” The United States is in a unique position to lead this effort for cohesion as it possesses command and control of NATO troop activity and military infrastructure within Afghanistan. Although implementation of the policy across all member states will be years out, it is worth pursuing to foster cooperation within NATO and increase its sustainability in being able to carry out development work.

In addition to creating a collective development policy that explicates the balance of security and development missions within the alliance, NATO must also have some level of success in Afghanistan. As NATO’s major out-of-area operation, it cannot fail or leave the region in more chaos and insecurity than when it started. It is important to remind NATO allies why the alliance is engaged in Afghanistan. Initially, Afghanistan was a threat to the alliance because it represented “extreme belief systems [...] unstable and intolerant societies, strategic crime and the globalization of commodities and communications combine[d] to create a multi-dimensional threat transcending geography, function, and capability.” Further, the transatlantic alliance became involved in Afghanistan as an Article 5 response to 9/11, which the organization must keep stressing for its member states. If NATO cannot prove itself in this war and fails at


its mission, the alliance will lose legitimacy in the eyes of the Afghan people, the UN, and the allies.

One way to sustain the alliance’s legitimacy is to strengthen its information programs, highlighting NATO’s humanitarian assistance and peacekeeping activities in Afghanistan. Because the Taliban uses propaganda and provocation which indoctrinates and evokes fear within the population, NATO must increase publicity of its successes to counter the insurgency’s propaganda. For instance, NATO currently has a SILK-Afghanistan program in place that provides over 9,000 Afghan university students with free high-speed internet access, which will likely enhance the quality of education and access to information.\(^{58}\) Capacity-building, reconstructing infrastructure, and providing technological access in Afghanistan are development activities on which ISAF must focus military resources in order to prevent further conflict from erupting in the region. The U.S. can help foster information programs that publicize these types of activities, not only within NATO member states, but also within Afghanistan. As the Afghan people learn of NATO’s activities to further their security and stability, they will eventually begin trusting ISAF to a greater degree and will be unwilling to protect terrorists in the region. This topic will be discussed further in the conclusion of this thesis.

The war in Afghanistan continues to be the greatest test for the alliance since the end of the Cold War. As NATO’s first out-of-area ground operation, Afghanistan has highlighted both the alliance’s strong and weak points. On the one hand, ISAF has

created an environment in parts of Afghanistan in which democracy, order, and stability may be sustained through the PRT structure. On the other hand, NATO member states’ caveats on their respective national troops restrict offensive operations that NATO may undertake and undermine training of Afghan security forces. Although the alliance must continue in its pursuit of winning hearts and minds in Afghanistan to dismantle the insurgency effectively, it is important to note that NATO has already reached some level of success in creating stability in parts of the country. These successes in Afghanistan and lessons learned from previous conflicts gave the alliance confidence to become involved in its next conflict—the war in Libya—the subject of Chapter 4.
CHAPTER 4: NATO’S ROLE IN LIBYA

NATO’s most recent mission, Operation Unified Protector in Libya, is a testament to how far the alliance has transitioned to integrate humanitarian assistance and peacekeeping into its mission. The alliance fought on behalf of democratic principles and provided support and protection for Libyan nationals fighting for independence from an autocratic ruler. Although the Libyan intervention illustrated the will of European allies to take a leadership role, it also emphasized a capabilities gap between the United States and its NATO allies that must be addressed for the alliance to be sustainable. On the other hand, the mission in Libya divided labor effectively, allowing the U.S. to support the operation, while European partners took the lead. However, the operation highlighted a lack of unity among European allies, raising the challenge of NATO being diminished to various coalitions of the willing. Nevertheless, the alliance’s resolve and success in Libya has shown the international community and the United States the continuing relevance of NATO and may serve as a model of collective action and peacekeeping in the future.

Background and Current Status

The Arab Spring, a movement that began in December 2010 across North African and Middle Eastern states to remove autocratic governments from power, was the ideal opportunity for the alliance to exert its new role in the international community. Being an alliance founded on democratic principles allowed NATO to respond to these events consistent with its core values. As the movement spread from Tunisia to Egypt to other states, Libyan rebels also took to the streets protesting against their despotic ruler,
Colonel Muammar Qadhafi. In February 2011, Libyan nationals peacefully protested in the second largest city in Libya, Benghazi, demanding regime change.¹ Qadhafi, who had been in power for 42 years, chose not to relinquish his power and instead resorted to violence against his own people to repress the protests. He threatened to “cleanse Libya house by house”² and reiterated that “the moment of truth has come. There will be no mercy. Our troops will be coming to Benghazi tonight.”³ The international community demanded that the United Nations intervene to prevent what would surely become a massacre of innocent civilians.

In response to the international outcry, the United Nations Security Council passed Resolutions 1970 and 1973, which demanded a ceasefire between rebels and Qadhafi’s loyalists.⁴ These resolutions also authorized the use of an arms embargo and all other measures necessary to protect Libyan civilians, who were being violently repressed. In response, NATO invoked the “doctrine of the Responsibility to Protect (R2P), which holds that the international community has a responsibility to prevent large-scale loss of life, or large-scale ‘ethnic cleansing,’ when the government of a country


proves either unable or unwilling to do so.”

We will discuss this ethical norm further in Chapter 6. On March 8, 2011, NATO increased its surveillance of Libyan airspace, and on March 10 transferred its ships to the Mediterranean to fortify these surveillance efforts. On March 19, the United States launched Operation Odyssey Dawn, an air strike campaign against Libya, which was led by U.S. Africa Command (AFRICOM). The U.S. transferred power to NATO to take the lead in Libya on March 24. NATO initiated Operation Unified Protector and authorized its air and sea assets to take military action to protect Libyan civilians. As such, NATO searched ships to cut off the transfer of arms and mercenaries to the Libyan government and enforced a no-fly zone over Libyan airspace, in an effort to guard civilians against air attacks launched by their own government.

NATO’s goals in Libya were threefold: 1) to end attacks aimed at killing Libyan nationals, 2) to force Qadhafi to withdraw military equipment, mercenaries, and troops to designated military bases, and 3) to ensure the safe passage of humanitarian aid to civilians. To these ends, NATO had 20 ships off the coast of Tripoli, Libya’s capital,
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and employed over 250 aircraft at its peak. Additionally, the alliance took a global leadership role in the humanitarian intervention and coordinated efforts among international and regional organizations including the European Union, African Union, League of Arab States, and the United Nations to plan long-term conflict prevention in Libya. On August 22, NATO Secretary General Anders Fogh Rasmussen along with U.S. President Barack Obama recommitted NATO’s involvement in Libya and declared the liberation of Tripoli. Both Rasmussen and Obama called for Qadhafi to step down from power in order to end the suffering of the Libyan people. In their struggle for freedom, Libyan nationals formed the Transitional National Council (TNC), recognized by NATO and the U.S. as the legitimate governing authority of Libya. TNC intended to hold democratic elections after the overthrow of Qadhafi’s government. Rasmussen, the head of the foremost military alliance in the world, invoked the alliance’s commonly held values as it related to Libya by saying, “Now is the time to create a new Libya – a state based on freedom, not fear; democracy, not dictatorship; the will of the many, not the whims of a few.” In accordance with these statements, on September 19, the United Nations
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Nations passed Resolution 2009, which extended NATO’s mandate to protect Libyan civilians and established a UN Mission in Libya.\(^\text{17}\)

Further, NATO Defense Ministers met on October 6 and resolved to offer long-term security assistance to TNC.\(^\text{18}\) They pledged that, if asked by TNC, they would provide security sector reform and training.\(^\text{19}\) However, NATO Defense Ministers also committed to leave Libya as soon as the government became stable and civilians were out of harm’s way. Fulfilling NATO’s commitment, on October 28, the North Atlantic Council reached a consensus to end NATO’s operation in Libya, but to retain a deterrence force as it had done in Kosovo.\(^\text{20}\) This deterrence force would be able to monitor events on the ground and be able to respond quickly if conflict re-erupted in the region. Rasmussen stated that Operation Unified Protector was “one of the most successful in NATO history […]. Libyans have now liberated their country and they have transformed the region. This is their victory.”\(^\text{21}\) By the end of October 2011, NATO ships had left the ports of Tripoli and had returned to their home ports, while alliance aircraft had stopped continual monitoring of Libyan airspace.\(^\text{22}\) The mission in
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Libya was deemed a success by the international community and has become an exemplar of NATO’s new modus operandi to accomplish its mission effectively.

**U.S. Role in Libya**

Although the United States initially led the intervention in Libya, it transitioned leadership to NATO five days after the onset of the war. The U.S. became involved in Libya in order to prevent a potential genocide. According to President Obama, the U.S intervened militarily because he “refused to wait for the images of slaughter and mass graves before taking action.”^{23} Failing to stop Qadhafi would not only have been detrimental to civilians in Benghazi, but also would have quelled the resistance movements across the greater Middle East as part of the Arab Spring. These human values of democracy and self-determination compelled the U.S. and NATO to take action and protect civilians in Libya. However, President Obama was careful to note that the intervention did not entail a forced regime change of the Libyan government. He specifically stated that “we went down that road in Iraq [and…] regime change there took eight years, thousands of American and Iraqi lives, and nearly a trillion dollars. That is not something we can afford to repeat in Libya.”^{24} The President differentiated between going to Libya with the aim of removing Qadhafi from power and American air power assisting Libyan rebels, whose aim was to depose their government.

The war in Libya serves as an example of American leadership of the transatlantic alliance in an environment of increased economic constraints. For example, President
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Obama explained that American leadership of NATO is not “going it alone and bearing all of the burden ourselves. Real leadership creates the conditions and coalitions for others to step up as well; to work with allies and partners so that they bear their share of the burden and pay their share of the costs.” Obama stressed the importance of American unilateral actions when national security and U.S. core interests are at stake, but when humanitarian assistance, economic and regional interests are at stake, to take a multilateral approach and depend more on alliances. This burden-sharing was evident when European partners took the lead, but continued relying on American support.

After NATO assumed leadership of the air strikes, they still needed American resources and technology. For instance, the U.S. continued supporting NATO aircraft by providing refueling and air surveillance for war planes. Additionally, the United States retained control of drones used in Libya after the alliance had taken control of enforcing the no-fly zone. By sharing intelligence and geospatial imaging, the United States took a collaborative approach towards NATO, which fortified existing partnerships. American leadership and support to allies in Libya may be used as a model of the U.S. role in NATO’s peacekeeping operations because it provides a multilateral, collaborative, and shared framework by which to operate, increasing the legitimacy of both U.S. and NATO actions.


A New Division of Labor

Many Americans viewed NATO’s role in Libya as a discouraging sign of alliance decay and unsustainability, because European partners could not have been successful without American resources and support. Two months after NATO assumed leadership of the operation, former U.S. Secretary of Defense Robert Gates stated, “The mightiest military alliance in history is only 11 weeks into an operation against a poorly armed regime in a sparsely populated country – yet many allies are beginning to run short of munitions.” 28 Because the U.S. continued providing surveillance, intelligence, and reconnaissance support to European allies, some perceived the alliance’s mission in Libya to be a failure because of continued dependence on American military equipment and infrastructure. Additionally, some believed that the alliance’s mission could not be deemed a true military success because the humanitarian intervention did not involve the deployment of ground troops.29 This pessimistic view of the Libyan intervention is unwarranted because it does not take into account the alliance’s ultimate success in preventing genocide without relying solely on the United States for leadership.

For the first time in NATO history, European partners proved that if provided with the appropriate military equipment, resources, and intelligence support, they are willing to fight for their values abroad and share the burden of leadership with the United


This new division of labor will allow the alliance to take on increased responsibilities in the peacekeeping and humanitarian assistance arenas because the U.S. is no longer forced to assume the majority of the risks, costs, and burdens associated with foreign interventions. American presidents have complained for years that European partners need to begin taking greater risk and responsibility to preserve global security, without relying solely on the U.S. to be the world’s policeman. Especially with America’s economic decline and the drawn-out wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, the United States must depend on European partners to assume increased security obligations, while America takes a supportive role. Although the U.S. ensured the success of NATO allies by resupplying them with weapons and munitions and by providing cutting edge drone technology, European air forces assumed the majority of the responsibility of daily bomb runs.  

This division of labor proved to be the complete opposite of NATO’s first wars in Bosnia and Kosovo, in which the U.S. was responsible for 90% of all daily bomb runs. It is important to note that France—a NATO member state that is usually reluctant to engage militarily—was not only the first nation to demand a humanitarian intervention in Libya, but also along with the United Kingdom, Denmark and other Western European allies provided over two-thirds of the attack aircraft used in Operation Unified.
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Further, of the 18 ships safeguarding Libya’s port, only one was American. In addition to taking the military lead, French President Nicolas Sarkozy and British Prime Minister David Cameron took the political lead in winning support from other NATO member states as well as from other international and regional organizations. The U.S. must acknowledge the leadership and resources European allies contributed instead of focusing on their lack of resources.

It is important to note that this type of supporting American role cannot be expected of all future NATO missions. Rather, in wars of mutual defense, if a NATO member state is attacked, the United States should continue its leadership role and provide the necessary military equipment, troops, and resources to defend the alliance. However, in wars of choice, such as the war in Libya and other wars based on the need for humanitarian assistance, the U.S. can take a supportive role by providing resources, refueling, and munitions to European allies that have the will to lead those missions. By differentiating between wars of necessity that directly affect American national security and wars of choice that compel American values and ideals to act, the U.S. along with European partners may set a precedent for burden-sharing of security and peacekeeping missions. By dividing labor, as it did in the Libyan intervention, the alliance increases its organizational sustainability, while increasing the likelihood of successful peacekeeping missions.
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The Libyan Model: Lessons Learned

Successes in Libya provide NATO with a framework for future humanitarian interventions. The most important lesson learned is that NATO decided to take a “boots off the ground” approach, relying solely on air strikes, drone technology, intelligence and reconnaissance to defeat the enemy, which decreased costs and casualties. Because peacekeeping and humanitarian interventions usually occur in nations with less technologically advanced equipment, NATO allies should leverage their advanced military technology to increase their precision in targeting the enemy. This approach saves vital infrastructure and local civilians from the line of fire, ameliorating the process of winning hearts and minds. This “boots off the ground”35 approach ensures that regime change is conducted by nationals that want a change in their government and not imposed by Western powers.

An added benefit to this approach is that NATO forces are removed from local nationals – giving them assistance remotely. This distance does not alienate the population as ground troops do because the people do not have a sense of being invaded by foreigners in their land.36 Although they appreciate NATO’s efforts in helping them fight for their freedom, Libyans, Afghans, and other peoples in the Middle East are still “troubled both by U.S. combat methods (which they see as yielding too many civilian casualties) and by what they deem freewheeling personal conduct (including the presence of female soldiers). Above all, they consider foreign troops a violation of their
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sovereignty and a sign of their underlying weakness.”\textsuperscript{37} Given these perceptions, Libyan rebels made it extremely clear that they appreciated NATO’s assistance as long as it did not involve alliance ground troops.\textsuperscript{38} The “boots off the ground” approach fortified Libyan nationals’ efforts for regime change without encroaching on their state’s sovereignty.\textsuperscript{39}

Additionally, exiting a combat arena when employing the “boots off the ground” approach provides increased flexibility to respond to events on the ground and changes in the political scene. It is easier to redirect aircraft or ships than to move ground troops and equipment out of a war zone. Additionally, exiting the country is quicker when troops do not have to deal with unforeseen obstacles to moving equipment out of the country, as seen in the example of Afghanistan’s transit routes and NATO’s dependence on Russia discussed in Chapter 3. Disengagement without ground troops also deflects any political questions on leaving the country due to domestic and foreign pressure and war fatigue. This new approach would avoid political challenges and perceptions regarding the alliance’s will to fight or appearance of weakness when disengaging from a nation. It is important to note, however, that this approach cannot be applied to all nations in need of humanitarian assistance. Libya is not a landlocked nation, like Afghanistan, and therefore had close air support and refueling available to allies by sea – removing the
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need to rely on ground equipment and troops. Additionally, the U.S. has several bases close to Libya in Italy, Spain, and Turkey, which made moving aircraft and collecting intelligence much easier and faster, allowing for a seamless exit strategy.

The second lesson learned from NATO’s operation in Libya is to avoid mission creep. Although some mission creep occurred in Libya, the alliance learned from its mistakes in Afghanistan and Kosovo. By stating a narrow goal or purpose to the international community and then achieving that goal, NATO’s mission in Libya was deemed a success and allowed for a clean exit strategy. In Libya, the mission was to protect the Libyan national rebels from the use of force by Qadhafi and his mercenaries. Later, the alliance’s mission expanded to include the removal of Qadhafi from power, as seen in a joint statement by Heads of State Obama, Sarkozy, and Cameron in April 2011, which explicated, “So long as Qadhafi is in power, NATO must maintain its operations so that civilians remain protected and the pressure on the regime builds.” Although NATO did not demand regime change, it was implied that NATO’s mission would not be completed until Qadhafi no longer held power.
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In May 2011, the alliance was forced to choose how far it would go in ensuring regime change, when Qadhafi offered a ceasefire with the rebels, but refused to give up his power. NATO did not accept the ceasefire and continued bombing not only Libyan military bases and strongholds, but Qadhafi’s private residences as well in the hopes of forcing regime change. By October 2011, Qadhafi’s regime had been destroyed and genocide had been averted. NATO’s goal was accomplished, allowing air and sea forces to return to their home bases without opposing voices claiming that it was due to the alliance’s weaknesses or lack of will. However, it is too early to assess if the added mission requirement of regime change is a success or not because the type of government that emerges to fill the void left by Qadhafi and his regime is yet to be seen.

Some argue that a negative lesson learned is that NATO should have accepted the ceasefire and not have forced regime change because the rebels, on whose behalf the alliance waged war, have exhibited acts of unjust violence. Both Human Rights Watch (HRW) and Amnesty International have highlighted the violent behavior of the rebels after the death of Qadhafi, which has ranged from torture and rape to theft. HRW noted that rebels had “burned some homes, looted from hospitals, homes and shops, and beaten some individuals alleged to have supported government forces.” The report suggests


that the rebels also had conducted targeted racism campaigns and assassinated those belonging to Qadhafi’s regime.\textsuperscript{49} Some journalists even alluded to the fact that rebel militias stole munitions from Qadhafi’s warehouses and sent those arms to terrorists with possible ties to al-Qaeda on the borders of Libya.\textsuperscript{50} If these allegations were true, NATO’s mission creep in Libya to incorporate regime change would be deemed a failure instead of a success. It is important to note that this mission creep of a humanitarian assistance mission becoming one of regime change is an anomaly and not the method NATO can use in the future. If the international community believed that NATO uses humanitarian intervention as an excuse to force regime change, similar NATO missions would fail. Winning hearts and minds of the local population would be next to impossible if the people believed that NATO came to their country under false pretenses.

Another lesson learned is that the United States has the capacity to “lead from behind” and should continue approaching military operations collaboratively. According to David Rothkopf, a former national security official under U.S. President William Clinton, “We need to give the Obama administration credit for finding a way, taking the long view, resisting the pressure to do too much too soon, resisting the old approaches which would have had the U.S. far more involved than it could have or should have.”\textsuperscript{51}

This approach allows the United States to rebuild its public image within the international community and fortify NATO’s capabilities to conduct humanitarian assistance. In
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Libya, this collaborative approach allowed NATO to reach out to the Arab League and other international partners, which increased not only the legitimacy of the mission, but also the credibility of the alliance. Due to this increased legitimacy, individual states partnered with NATO to provide training and peacekeeping assistance. For example, Qatar and the United Arab Emirates provided weapons, financial assistance, and training to the Libyan rebels covertly. This legitimacy was, in part, because the United States did not lead another campaign for regime change in the Middle East. Although the Libyan intervention may be used as a model, challenges exist in making this approach an official policy.

**Challenges and Recommendations**

While there are positive lessons learned in Libya, several critics point to the flaws revealed by Operation Unified Protector. A natural criticism that stems from the new division of labor discussed is that if the United States is not vital for operations, then NATO may eventually evolve to be a strictly European security capability. Especially, new NATO members in Central and Eastern Europe are concerned that a lack of U.S. leadership would entail relying on Western European states – many of which have close economic and energy-related ties to Russia. This prospect is disconcerting for Central and Eastern European states because they still view Russia as the highest threat to their security and do not believe that Western European states would be as inclined as the U.S. to defend their interests against Russia. These fears of the alliance evolving into a
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European capability are unwarranted, however, because although European states have the will to lead NATO missions, they do not have the capacity to do so independently without the United States. Additionally, NATO provides a mechanism for the American nuclear umbrella to be extended to the European continent in order to deter against nuclear attacks. Nuclear deterrence is a costly capability that only Britain and France have, which would cause division and possible competition in Europe if the U.S. were to retract that protection. Further, the trend suggests that the U.S. is forging closer ties with the transatlantic alliance instead of drifting apart from it.

The Obama administration has made it clear that the United States is a key player in NATO and intends to participate in collective defense of the transatlantic alliance for years to come. For example, President George W. Bush had planned to withdraw two of the four American combat brigades in Europe, but the Obama administration decided to only withdraw one – retaining three brigades if the need arose to defend Europe against an attack. Additionally, the United States deployed several Aegis ships to European waters to protect against potential missile attacks from Iran in the future. These actions reaffirm to European allies the American commitment of mutual defense and illustrate to the international community that the United States is far from finished with the transatlantic alliance, which “discourages possible challengers from testing the existing
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order in Europe.” Simultaneously, these actions show that the U.S. is only willing to fight wars of necessity for Europe, implying that other NATO allies must now assume leadership of wars of choice with the U.S. providing support and resources.

Another challenge raised by the Libyan intervention is the lack of unity among European member states. Less than one third of European partners—only eight out of a total of 28 NATO allies—participated in Libyan air strikes. For instance, “Italy pulled their aircraft carrier Garibaldi out of the Libyan theater to save $114 million, allies ran out of munitions and were only able to fly about half of the planned sorties, and one of the traditional NATO pillars, Germany, opted out from the start.” Europe’s largest state, Germany, did not become involved in Libya in any way and abstained from voting for the UN Security Council Resolution authorizing air strikes. In fact, Germany chose not to allow NATO to use commonly-owned Airborne Warning and Control System (AWACS) aircraft based in Berlin because several of the aircraft’s crewmembers were German. The Libyan intervention was nominally a “joint operation,” but several NATO partners refrained from participating. Some allies like Spain, Netherlands, and Turkey, specified that they would not participate in armed attacks, but would be involved
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with post-attack peacekeeping efforts and brokering a ceasefire. Likewise, Poland, usually an enthusiastic participant in NATO missions, not only refused to send troops or resources in support of the Libyan campaign, but also undermined NATO’s efforts and public image. Polish Prime Minister Donald Tusk stated, “One of the reasons for our restraint [is] if we want to defend people against dictators, reprisals, torture and prison, that principle must be universal and not invoked only when it is convenient, profitable or safe.” Tusk’s comments implied that NATO only intervened in Libya because of oil, which damaged NATO’s credibility and image in the international community.

Although this disunity may be alarming, it is important to assess the European response to Libya as compared to its response to Afghanistan or Kosovo in order to fully appreciate how far the alliance has come. For example, in Afghanistan, six NATO allies have had 90% of all casualties, while some allies chose to send only a symbolic presence and others chose not to participate at all. In Kosovo too, Greece refrained its participation and even protested against peacekeepers passing through Greek territory.

Given these past experiences of disunity, the Libyan intervention must not be discredited
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as a joint operation just because some allies chose not to participate. On the contrary, NATO’s mission in Libya must serve as an example of European action to defend common values and ideals that define the transatlantic alliance.

However, with NATO operations being diminished to various coalitions of the willing, some argue that increased allied lives are lost as a result of less troops and resources at NATO’s disposal and the alliance’s public image is damaged irreparably. Because nations bear the burden when their national troops are deployed, some countries choose not to participate in a mission to save money and soldiers, yet continue having the protection of Article 5 at their disposal. For example, in the lead up to the war in Afghanistan, some European states refrained from participating, while others did not, which caused a rift within Europe. This division damaged the unity and image of NATO as a collective security organization based on mutual defense and shared values.\textsuperscript{68} One way for allies to retain this option of not participating in an operation while preserving NATO’s image is for member states to agree that even if they abstain from an operation, they will not discredit the alliance or its operations. This management of NATO’s public image has proven to be increasingly important in Afghanistan and Libya because winning the support of the local population is an ongoing aspect of ensuring that conflict does not re-erupt. Especially as NATO transitions out of countries and leaves only a deterrent force behind, it is vital that the alliance appears to be unified in its will to respond quickly to signs of conflict. Additionally, when member states refrain from participating in a
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mission, NATO should publicize that state’s support in other NATO missions to preserve allies’ perceptions of each other and goodwill among member states.

Operation Unified Protector is an example of the extent to which the alliance has transformed to embrace its new peacekeeping and development missions. Unlike in Bosnia, Kosovo, and Afghanistan, NATO took immediate action in Libya to prevent a massacre of civilians in Benghazi. Instead of criticizing European partners’ capability gaps, the United States must seize this opportunity to publicize the transatlantic alliance’s successes and the new division of labor for NATO operations. This publicity campaign would benefit not only European partners that feel under-appreciated after carrying the weight of daily fighting in Libya, but also the American public. Americans must realize that the alliance is still important for their security and European partners are willing to fight for shared values. Tying American and European security is vital to ensure the sustainability of the transatlantic alliance.

An important byproduct of Operation Unified Protector is that it undermined the role of the European Union’s security arm, Common Security and Defense Policy (CSDP). Being much closer to Europe in proximity, Libya posed a greater threat to the European Union than it did to the transatlantic alliance. Further, France and the United Kingdom—key players in the EU—chose to leverage NATO’s infrastructure instead of fortifying an independent European military capability. According to French newspaper, Le Monde, the EU failed because it could not reach a consensus on how to act or on “whether to recognise the Libyan opposition and most, of all, on the legitimacy of the use
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of force. The disunity is total and particularly striking when it is a question of deciding on war – that is to say when history becomes tragedy and it is necessary to move from frothy rhetoric about the rights of man.” CSDP not only failed to lead the mission, it also failed to lend its support to NATO’s mission of humanitarian assistance until April 1, 2011.  The mission in Libya served to remind Europeans that NATO is still necessary to provide for their security because the CSDP lacks capabilities and coherence.  The transatlantic alliance’s value added in the realm of humanitarian assistance and peacekeeping became irrefutable because there was no clear alternative organization that could complete the mission successfully.

On the other hand, to continue taking on increased responsibility in future missions as it did in Libya, European governments must begin investing more in their national defense programs. The United States has been accepting increased alliance costs because “fifteen years ago, the U.S. footed 50 percent of NATO costs; last year the figure was 75 percent, and European spending on defense is going down.”  NATO Secretary General Rasmussen warned that if Europe continues on its trend, that in five to ten years, European militaries would have shrunk to a size that would be meaningless in a war. According to a European Parliament study on the effect of the financial crisis on
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European defense, Germany has decided to cut its defense spending by 2.5% over the next five years, France by 10% over three years, and the United Kingdom (UK) by 7.5% over five years.\textsuperscript{75} Although the UK and France had aircraft and weapons to fight in Libya, they are not investing in research and development of weapons systems like the United States.\textsuperscript{76} Consequently, in a decade or so, their weapons will have become almost obsolete. They will not have the military equipment and infrastructure to lead another mission like Libya, forcing them to rely solely on the U.S. to lead these wars of choice. However, given the decline in the American economy, there is a high likelihood that the U.S. would no longer be able to be independent financial backers of NATO operations of choice outside the realm of collective defense. Libya serves as an example of a new division of labor, but also serves as a warning that increased European investments are necessary to make burden-sharing sustainable.

NATO’s mission in Libya, Operation Unified Protector, clearly demonstrates the alliance’s transformation since Bosnia and Kosovo. NATO took a “boots off the ground” approach by launching an air and sea operation to protect and assist Libyan citizens fighting for shared democratic values. European allies took the lead, relying on the U.S. only for increased munitions and technological support, which illustrated their willingness to fight if provided with the appropriate resources. Although European allies need to continue strengthening their military capabilities, the Libyan intervention may be used as a model of a new division of labor within the alliance that may be applied to other
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humanitarian interventions. Above all, this mission proved NATO’s continued relevance because other international and regional organizations did not have the capabilities or cohesiveness to end a humanitarian crisis successfully. This interplay, competition, and collaboration between NATO and other international and regional organizations is the subject of the next chapter.
CHAPTER 5: NATO VIS-À-VIS OTHER INTERNATIONAL AND REGIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

As NATO expands its mission to include peacekeeping and development activities, it must work effectively with other international and regional organizations to share the burden. In response to the new global security environment, NATO expanded its area of responsibility from the Euro-Atlantic zone to anywhere in the world there is a potential threat to allies. A global mandate comes with unlimited costs, however, so the alliance cannot hope to fulfill its new role independently. NATO is in the process of creating a comprehensive approach to crisis prevention, mitigation, and resolution working with not only the United Nations (UN) and European Union (EU), but also with other appropriate regional organizations, such as the Organization for Security and Co-Operation in Europe (OSCE) and the African Union (AU). NATO has the military resources and manpower to implement successful, sustainable development programs that these organizations do not have the capacity to implement autonomously when there are security threats in a region. On the other hand, in a post-conflict situation, the alliance tends to transfer authority to other organizations, while leaving only a deterrent force behind. Challenges exist, however, that must be addressed to strengthen a comprehensive approach to sustainable peace-building. This chapter will consider the operational and political dynamics of NATO vis-à-vis other organizations in leading conflict prevention, management, and resolution missions.
Comprehensive Approach

NATO must provide support and expand the capacity of regional organizations, thereby fortifying existing political alliances’ peacekeeping capabilities while strengthening global partnerships. In this way, NATO does not directly have to be involved in every region of the world. Instead, it supports ongoing efforts, and in turn, these organizations support NATO efforts – adding legitimacy to NATO’s missions. It is important to note that NATO has only provided support on a limited basis to regional organizations that specifically request NATO’s assistance. The North Atlantic Council deliberates and must come to a consensus before supporting ongoing peacekeeping efforts by other regional organizations. In an environment of increasingly constrained budgets, NATO cannot afford to become involved in all regions of the world, and must instead leverage and support existing peacekeeping efforts – creating a comprehensive approach to international peacekeeping.

In November 2010 at NATO’s Lisbon summit, member states agreed that the international community as a whole must be prepared to undertake crisis management.\textsuperscript{1} In order to mitigate, prevent, and resolve crises, a comprehensive approach involving military, political, and civilian components are necessary. As such, several international and regional organizations, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and local actors must be able to work together effectively and share the burden of crisis management. According to NATO Secretary General Anders Fogh Rasmussen, “The comprehensive

approach not only makes sense—it is necessary. NATO needs to work more closely with our civilian partners on the ground, and at a political level—especially the European Union and the United Nations.”

Being able to burden-share with international and regional organizations will increase the likelihood of sustainable peace-building by the transatlantic alliance and the international community. A comprehensive approach would need to take into account respective authorities, allow for open dialogue, and ensure that all actors take responsibility for crisis management. A civilian-military task force has been set-up to review and delegate responsibilities to various actors. NATO must take the lead to implement peacekeeping capabilities into its mission, so that other organizations have a model to follow and may be able to participate effectively in the comprehensive approach. This comprehensive approach that leverages capabilities of regional and international actors is straightforward in theory, but is very difficult to implement on the ground, as seen in NATO’s relations with the UN.

NATO-UN Relations

From its inception, NATO has been viewed by many UN members as a competing organization. Relations between the two organizations have never been smooth despite their cooperation in Kosovo and Afghanistan as well as NATO’s assistance in protecting UN food shipments from piracy in Somalia. Many UN member states view NATO as a tool of the United States, while NATO allies themselves have
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varying views toward the UN. Powerful NATO members, namely the United States and its Central European partners, are wary of having the very organization created to counter communism and the Soviet Union submit to the UN Security Council in which China and Russia have veto power.\(^5\) On the other hand, several UN member states believe that NATO’s primary mission of collective security and the method it uses to achieve this security are fundamentally against the international peace for which the UN is striving.

UN members do not want to increase dependence on NATO because they believe that it would reduce UN operational independence and autonomous decision-making capability.\(^6\) For instance, the UN’s top troop-contributing countries such as “Pakistan, Bangladesh, India and Nigeria are especially concerned about possible NATO influence on UN command-and-control structures.”\(^7\) Additionally, the humanitarian bodies of the UN are concerned that increased interaction with NATO could result in the international community perceiving a UN bias towards the West, which may jeopardize the UN’s objectivity in conflict mitigation. In turn, UN peacekeepers could be at greater risk in some areas.\(^8\) Because of these concerns, institutional cooperation between NATO and the UN has primarily been through informal desk to desk contacts and through one military liaison officer.\(^9\)


\(^7\)Ibid., 7.

\(^8\)Ibid.

\(^9\)Ibid., 6.
Despite opposition from some UN member states, the UN needed NATO’s naval and airlift capabilities in Africa, forcing the organizations to work together.\textsuperscript{10} Partnership was institutionalized formally in September 2008 when UN Secretary General Ban Ki Moon and former NATO Secretary General Jaap de Hoop Scheffer signed the UN-NATO Cooperation Declaration.\textsuperscript{11} Although the organizations worked together already, this agreement created a framework to expand strategic dialogue for regular working-level and senior-level meetings. Additionally, it included the following areas to focus on for deeper collaboration and consultation: “communication and information-sharing, including issues pertaining to the protection of civilians; capacity-building, training and exercises; lessons learned; planning and support for contingencies; and operational coordination and support.”\textsuperscript{12} The declaration signified to the international community the political will in both organizations to form a deeper bond.

Despite existing impediments and limitations to UN-NATO relations, NATO’s role may continue to expand based on the UN’s lack of military capacity to address security-development challenges successfully and to provide for the protection of its peacekeepers. Although, the agreement does not specify support or technical capabilities that will be shared, its importance lies in forming a basis of cooperation for the future. Russian Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov asserted that the secret agreement was made
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without consultation within the UN, and therefore it was illegal.\textsuperscript{13} The declaration, however, did not need the approval of the UN General Council because it was between both organizations’ Secretaries General.\textsuperscript{14}

Notwithstanding Russian opposition, the agreement is mutually beneficial to both organizations. For NATO, the agreement provides a conduit to tap into UN expertise in humanitarian assistance, refugee issues, and development work. Because peacekeeping is part of NATO’s emerging role globally, it is important for the alliance to have access to subject matter experts that have the know-how to develop sustainable programs in areas such as rule of law, education, and gender equality. On the other hand, the agreement is also beneficial to the UN because NATO has military capabilities that are necessary for the UN to operate in increasingly complex environments. For example, in the Democratic Republic of Congo and Sudan, the UN has humanitarian assistance programs that need aerial reconnaissance as well as air and sea power to ensure the safety of UN workers and safe passage of aid to the people.\textsuperscript{15} However, it is important to note that NATO will not provide resources in areas that are strategically unimportant for the alliance because of its restricted budget.\textsuperscript{16} Nonetheless, in strategic areas of mutual interest, increased cooperation and coordination of activities between NATO and the UN can have benefits for burden-sharing and sustainable development, as seen in the case of
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Afghanistan. Cooperation in Afghanistan is an example of NATO’s expanded role despite limitations in the existing state of affairs in UN-NATO relations.

The UN created and controlled the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) in Afghanistan from December 2001 to August 2003, before transferring command of operations to NATO at the request of both the Afghan government and the UN.\(^{17}\) During the transition phase, the UN Security Council noted, “that increased involvement of NATO would be within the context of the UN mandate of ISAF and that the alliance would operate according to current and future Security Council resolutions.”\(^{18}\) This statement signified the UN’s belief that even though NATO was implementing development programs in Afghanistan, it was only at the behest of the UN. Further, this assertion revealed the UN’s acknowledgement that NATO possessed the capacity to carry out parts of the UN mission better than the UN itself. Although the UN also has a mission in Afghanistan, it depends on NATO to implement development on the ground because the UN does not have the military capacity to protect its peacekeepers in a war zone.

The percentage that each organization contributes to development versus security is unclear because NATO’s ISAF mission does not have a centralized budget. Additionally, several members contributing to ISAF also contribute to the UN mission. When a specific NATO member state contributes troops to ISAF, that nation bears the complete burden of financially equipping, training, and supporting those troops as it does

\(^{17}\)Ibid., 207.

when contributing to a UN mission.\textsuperscript{19} Lacking a centralized budget to support troop deployments, ISAF’s mission is heavily funded by a few member states, namely the U.S., as seen by the chart below.\textsuperscript{20} It is important to note that although it is impossible to speculate the percentage of ISAF money or efforts being spent on development versus security projects, the number of troops that are being associated with ISAF’s Provincial Reconstruction Teams (PRTs) has been increasing over time. This increase is seen in the below chart, which shows a growing ISAF presence, and therefore implies an expansion of NATO roles and responsibilities in both security and development, over time.

Figure 1. ISAF Troops in Afghanistan
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Because ISAF’s budget is convoluted and there exists significant overlap between securing and keeping the peace in Afghanistan, the amount of money being spent on reconstruction or peacekeeping as opposed to solely security missions is unknown.

By comparing the presence of NATO’s ISAF and the UN in Afghanistan, we may gain a more meaningful sense of each organization’s respective scope and focus in the region. The UN continues having a heavy presence in the region, but is focused on everything from culture and health to children and refugees. The UN would be unable to implement any of these projects without working closely with ISAF’s PRTs, which provide the security and order necessary to create sustainable development. On the next page, there is a map of the UN presence in Afghanistan as of June 2009 and a map of the locations of ISAF as of November 2010. These maps depict the much heavier presence of NATO in Afghanistan than the UN. Almost all the UN offices are co-located alongside a PRT because NATO’s security forces are necessary to keep the peace and ensure conflict does not re-erupt so that real development may take place.
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Figure 2. UN Presence in Afghanistan as of June 2009


Figure 3. NATO Presence in Afghanistan as of November 2010

While NATO continues to expand its area of operations and responsibilities, its collaboration with the UN and other regional organizations remains vital, but is at times quite difficult.

For example, in Afghanistan, there are three main organizations on the ground – NATO, UN, and EU. However, one UN Security Council mandate created both the UN Assistance Mission in Afghanistan and ISAF, but did not specify the roles and responsibilities of each.\textsuperscript{22} Further, the UN, NATO, and EU have separate civilian points of contact that facilitate peacekeeping and development activities – the UN’s Special Representative of the Secretary General, NATO’s Senior Civilian Representative, and the EU’s Special Representative.\textsuperscript{23} All three representatives have the same mandate for peacekeeping in Afghanistan with no clear division of labor or responsibility.\textsuperscript{24} One defense advisor from the Netherlands stated, “We contribute to NATO, the budgets of the EU and the UN, as well as substantially to many of the NGOs on the ground in Afghanistan. Yet none of them can manage to coordinate with each other. Instead, it seems like they are working against each other. It is absurd.”\textsuperscript{25} Although the UN, NATO, and EU are comprised of many of the same members, these organizations

\textsuperscript{22}Michael J. Williams, \textit{(Un)Sustainable Peace-Building: NATO’s Suitability for Post-Conflict Reconstruction in Multi-Actor Environments} (Ottawa: Centre for International Policy Studies, November 2009): 123.


\textsuperscript{24}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{25}Williams, \textit{(Un)Sustainable Peace-Building: NATO’s Suitability for Post-Conflict Reconstruction in Multi-Actor Environments}, 123.
oftentimes are more worried about organizational “turf” than in burden-sharing or collaborating to accomplish a mission.26

Further, organizations do not have the same priorities, and therefore do not devote the same amount of energy, resources, or time towards the same regions. For example, when the UN conducted a recent internal review of its top ten priorities, Afghanistan—the top priority for NATO—was not on the list.27 Likewise, no EU political delegation had visited Afghanistan until 2008 at which time Javier Solana, former Secretary General of the Council of the European Union, was the first EU senior leader to visit.28 This example shows that although the comprehensive approach is NATO’s solution to incorporate peacekeeping capabilities within the international community writ large in a time of economic constraints, implementing this approach will require sustained cooperation from several regional and international actors.

**NATO-EU Relations**

Increased cooperation and burden-sharing is needed with the EU. Collaboration with the EU tends to differ in various stages of conflict management. For example, NATO rarely conducts conflict prevention activities in a region without an existing security-related mission in the area. The EU, on the other hand, has conflict prevention programs in regions that are conflict-ridden and even has a Conflict Prevention
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Partnership (CPP) within the European Commission.\textsuperscript{29} The EU does not have a standing army or military command structure, however, and relies on NATO resources to implement these projects.\textsuperscript{30} Under the 2002 Berlin Plus agreement between NATO and the EU, the EU has access to NATO planning resources, communication structure, and headquarters for crisis prevention and management operations.\textsuperscript{31} These crisis management operations (CMOs) are EU-led, but must have the unanimous support of all NATO members. Additionally, within the Berlin Plus agreements, there is a statement of “right to first refusal,” which means that the EU cannot lead a CMO without NATO having first refused to lead the mission.\textsuperscript{32} NATO’s new Strategic Concept reiterates this idea that “where conflict prevention proves unsuccessful, NATO will be prepared and capable to manage ongoing hostilities. NATO has unique conflict-management capacities, including the unparalleled capability to deploy and sustain robust military forces in the field.”\textsuperscript{33} In conflict prevention operations, NATO tends to allow the EU to lead, while the transatlantic alliance takes a supportive role.

During conflict and post-conflict stages, however, the roles between NATO and the EU shift. NATO tends to take the lead in an area with a committed security mission
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or with NATO equities, while the EU provides economic and diplomatic support to these efforts. At the end of the conflict, NATO tends to conduct development activities and peacekeeping missions only until the local government is set-up and able to create order independently. After this point, NATO transfers authority to the EU. This pattern of the EU taking over peacekeeping activities from NATO after the local government is set-up is seen in two main operations. The first is in Macedonia, where the EU took over from NATO’s Allied Harmony Operation.\textsuperscript{34} The second is in Bosnia and Herzegovina where EUFOR Althea took over from NATO’s Stabilization Force (SFOR) in 2004.\textsuperscript{35} With Kosovo and Afghanistan, there was a shift in this trend because NATO continued to run peacekeeping activities after the local government had been set-up. This varying interaction with the EU suggests that there is no standard formula for cooperation between both organizations, but that such modalities will be determined case-by-case.

In part, this standard does not exist because there are two very distinct views towards EU and NATO defense cooperation – one based on increased collaboration and one based on competition. The first view holds that with the changing nature of warfare, NATO must work to integrate the EU more fully into its operational planning in order to address the security-development nexus effectively. Because the EU has increased experience conducting peacekeeping in war-torn areas, the transatlantic alliance must leverage the EU’s expertise. According to this view, the EU’s security arm, the European Security and Defense Policy (ESDP), must strengthen its capabilities in order to
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contribute increased resources to NATO operations. An issue with this type of cooperation is that the EU does not have one political will or agenda and is instead comprised of individual member states with separate national security strategies and differing priorities. Although it is important to include the EU in the planning stages of a NATO operation in order to facilitate the alliance’s transition out of a country, it is unlikely that the EU will participate in operational planning because it cannot contribute militarily due to a lack of solidarity. Because several EU states are also NATO member states, this collaboration between both organizations relies on bilateral ties among states, instead of an organizational mandate.

The second view holds that because the EU and NATO share several member states, NATO may fail to exist if the EU strengthens its military power. The EU has been making very slow progress in building its military capacity, but has proven its will in ensuring an independent defense capability outside the NATO security architecture. If European states develop a defense capability and no longer need to rely on the United States for security, the EU and NATO will be competing organizations with duplicate responsibilities. Further, European governments would have no incentive to continue relying on U.S. leadership within NATO when they have the option of conducting operations autonomously. As a unified political entity, the European Union also may be able to advance political goals in the international community to a greater extent with
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a unified defense policy that is separate from the United States. However, establishing one political agenda remains difficult because European governments are split in their views on the future of EU-NATO relations. Britain along with Central European states believes that the EU should have support capabilities to NATO’s existing architecture and that each organization can complement the other effectively. Other states, such as France, believe that the EU should have independent military and political clout from NATO.\textsuperscript{39}

As discussed in the previous chapter on Libya, if the EU were to strengthen its defense and security policy, it would not necessarily compete with NATO. Instead, it would be in a better position of sharing the responsibility for peacekeeping and development missions with the United States. Because NATO tends to transfer power to the EU, leaving only a deterrent force behind, it would be in NATO’s best interest if the EU strengthens its military capacity and is able to prevent conflict from recurring in a region. However, the EU must be careful not to duplicate NATO’s functions and areas of responsibility. Even with the political will to support NATO operations to a greater extent, the EU currently does not have the capacity or unity to share NATO’s burden of addressing the security-development nexus.

The EU has failed in its limited peacekeeping responsibilities in Afghanistan, which illustrates a lack of capacity. In 2007, the EU established its mission in Afghanistan called European Union Police Mission (EUPOL) to train and strengthen the
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Afghan police force. According to its mandate, the EU was to create a force that upheld human rights and the rule of law. At its inception, EUPOL planned to have 160 to 190 officers from 15 EU states to conduct the training of local police, while NATO conducted training of Afghan military and security forces. NATO specifically delegated this task to the EU in order to share the burden of responsibility and the EU accepted the task.

However, Turkey blocked NATO from making an organizational agreement with the EU, which would have allowed police officers from EU countries to come into the active war zone of Afghanistan. Consequently, NATO was forced to create separate bilateral treaties with all 15 EU states that volunteered to provide police trainers. This unnecessary step wasted time and money in both organizations. Additionally, once the bilateral treaties were in place, the EU did not staff EUPOL adequately, relying instead on U.S. resources and funding. In part, this reliance was because Turkey did not allow NATO to share intelligence with EUPOL or provide for its force protection. Because 15 different bilateral treaties existed, EUPOL failed to have a comprehensive strategy to train Afghan police. Instead, each state had its own best practices for training that was implemented in an ad-hoc fashion and did not interconnect with NATO’s larger training
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mission.\textsuperscript{45} The main reason for this disconnect between NATO and the EU is that Turkey is not a member of the EU, but is a strong player in NATO, making cooperation between both bodies increasingly difficult.

Turkey tends to block cooperation between NATO and the EU because it has a historical claim on Cyprus, which is partitioned between Turkish Cypriots and Greek Cypriots. Turkey, not a member of the EU, occupies Northern Cyprus where the majority of Turkish Cypriots are located, while the Republic of Cyprus, an EU member, has effective control over the rest of the island.\textsuperscript{46} Although Cyprus joined the EU in 2004, it remains divided. Turkey refuses to approve EU-NATO cooperation when Cyprus attends meetings because it is not a NATO Partnership for Peace member.\textsuperscript{47} M. J. Williams, an author and expert in transatlantic relations, explains that Turkey has a legal right to disapprove of Cyprus’ participation because “According to a December 2002 EU-NATO agreement, all EU members that are not NATO allies must be a member of the Partnership for Peace program to attend the joint EU-NATO meetings. This arrangement worked well until the EU enlarged to include Malta and Cyprus.”\textsuperscript{48} Once Cyprus joined, Turkey began blocking Cyprus’ participation in EU-NATO cooperation talks.

This issue is one of the major reasons that cooperation between the EU and NATO is difficult and will most likely continue being a challenge in the future because it
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has proven to be an impediment for NATO-EU relations across the board and not just where Cyprus is involved. One reason for this continuing impediment is because Turkey applied to be a member of the EU in April 1987, but still has not ascended into the Union mostly due to economic reasons.\textsuperscript{49} Further, although Cyprus is an EU member, EU provisions and rights do not extend to Northern Cyprus or the Turkish Cypriots who live there because the government of Cyprus does not exercise control in that region. Due to the Cyprus issue, a cooling of relations with Israel over the killing of Turks onboard a flotilla that carried aid, and a gradual distancing from Washington over the war in Iraq, Turkey seems to be an impediment in allowing NATO to take a more global role. In fact, Turkey canceled its annual military exercises with Israel in 2010, and instead participated in exercises with China – the first time a NATO member state has ever had joint military exercises with China.\textsuperscript{50} Turkey’s separation from the transatlantic alliance and difference in opinion from many EU states on foreign relations hampers organizational cooperation between the EU and NATO.

The other major issue hampering EU-NATO relations is the role of France in each institution. France is a key player in both NATO and the EU, however, in 1966, French President Charles de Gaulle withdrew France from the military structure of NATO.\textsuperscript{51} Although France remained engaged politically, it did not want to compromise its autonomy in decision-making to the United States or other NATO member states.
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Additionally, France did not want to integrate its nuclear capabilities with other European and North American states. However, since the collapse of the Soviet Union, France has taken a more active role in NATO’s military structure – becoming the fourth largest contributing country to the alliance’s budget and among the top contributors of troops to NATO missions.\footnote{North Atlantic Treaty Organization, “Member Countries,” North Atlantic Treaty Organization, September 1, 2011, \url{http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/topics_52044.htm} (accessed January 31, 2012).} In 2009, France officially reintegrated itself into NATO’s military structure, but remained wary of close ties between the EU and NATO because it preferred that the EU have a greater role in defense.\footnote{Kaplan, \textit{NATO Divided, NATO United: The Evolution of an Alliance}, 125.} A reason for this bias is that France wields greater power and influence in the EU than in NATO. Despite these challenges, the EU must continue strengthening its capabilities in order to be a productive partner in peacekeeping with NATO, much as other regional organization must continue doing.

**NATO-OSCE Relations**

The OSCE is a regional security organization comprised of 56 European, Central Asian, and North American states, including the United States. It is an organization that addresses political, military, economic, and even environmental threats to its member states and has a broad range of activities including arms control, anti-human trafficking, education, and conflict prevention.\footnote{Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, “What We Do,” Organization for Security and Co-Operation in Europe, \url{http://www.osce.org/what} (accessed February 13, 2012).} The OSCE was created during the height of the Cold War in the 1970s to serve as a forum for consultation and negotiation between the
Soviet Union and the West.\textsuperscript{55} Like NATO, the OSCE is funded by member states. However, OSCE’s budget is approximately 200 million dollars, while NATO’s FY2010 budget was over 1 billion dollars.\textsuperscript{56} Another important differentiation is that OSCE is not a collective defense organization.

NATO has political and operational cooperation with the OSCE. Politically, each organization consults the other on security issues in the region. Additionally, OSCE launched the “Platform for Co-operative Security,” which provides the framework for NATO and the OSCE to cooperate politically.\textsuperscript{57} This platform was originally established in 1999 “to draw upon the resources of the international community in order to restore democracy, prosperity and stability in Europe and beyond.”\textsuperscript{58} NATO discusses conflict prevention, mitigation, and resolution with the OSCE, as well as post-conflict peace-building that needs to take place in a region. For example, NATO and OSCE have cooperated closely in combating security threats in the Mediterranean.

Operationally, the OSCE has complemented NATO’s missions in Bosnia and Kosovo extensively. For example, in Bosnia, the OSCE worked with NATO in providing
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arms control and confidence-building security training. Additionally, NATO provided for the protection of OSCE peacekeepers ensuring free and fair elections in Bosnia. In Kosovo, too, the OSCE “mounted a Kosovo Verification Mission to monitor compliance on the ground with the Holbrooke-Milošević cease-fire agreement,”59 for which NATO provided aerial-surveillance. OSCE complements the work NATO began in Kosovo by initiating projects on human rights, democratization, and institution-building, while NATO ensures for OSCE workers’ protection and provides an environment of order and stability for OSCE to implement sustainable development. Further, OSCE secured the borders and conducted other border control operations in support of NATO’s Kosovo mission.

With three OSCE member states on the border of Afghanistan—Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan—OSCE became a partner of cooperation in Afghanistan in 2003 and has strengthened its collaboration with NATO’s ISAF.60 OSCE has supported all four of Afghanistan’s elections, worked to strengthen Afghan law enforcement agencies, and conducted border control activities at the request of the Afghan government.61 Compared to the EU and UN, the OSCE has much smaller available resources, and is therefore limited in capacity. However, the OSCE has development expertise that NATO leverages in the post-conflict reconstruction phase and in conflict
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mitigation. Collaboration between OSCE and NATO is difficult in the operational planning phase because OSCE encompasses several member states that are not in NATO, including Russia and Central Asian states. The OSCE is an important partner for peacekeeping, much as other regional organizations, such as the African Union, and adds legitimacy to NATO’s missions precisely because it does not only include European states.

**NATO-AU Relations**

Because NATO cannot have a presence in all regions across the world, it partners with regional organizations to provide humanitarian assistance to some areas that NATO does not have a military presence. For example, NATO provides assistance to the African Union, which includes all states in the African continent except Morocco.62 The AU has long-term peace-building projects in Sudan and Somalia, but does not have the military capabilities to support its activities. NATO began assisting the AU in 2005 with its mission in Sudan by providing airlift and training for AU peacekeepers.63 NATO assisted the AU from June 2005 to December 2007, then transferred authority to the UN to continue partnering with the AU. However, NATO was careful to note that it would provide support capabilities to the joint UN-AU mission in Sudan if requested.

After the Sudan mission, the AU requested assistance from NATO in capacity-building of the AU’s Standing Force (ASF), which is an agile force, used for long-term
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peace-building and crisis response operations in Africa.\footnote{North Atlantic Treaty Organization, “NATO Assistance to the African Union,” North Atlantic Treaty Organization, October 4, 2011, \url{http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/topics_8191.htm} (accessed February 13, 2012).} NATO has also supported the AU’s mission in Somalia (AMISOM) by providing air and sea support to transport aid.\footnote{Ibid.} Further, NATO is assisting the AU to strengthen its peacekeeping capabilities by helping with the logistics of development missions such as “maritime planning, strategic planning, financial planning and monitoring, air movement coordination, logistics, military manpower management and contingency planning.”\footnote{Ibid.} This type of support expands the AU’s capability to provide crisis management in the future. In response to this capacity-building support from NATO, the AU supported Operation Unified Protector in Libya and recognized the rebels’ group, Transitional National Council, for which NATO was fighting.\footnote{BBC News, “Libya War: African Union Recognizes NTC as Leaders,” \textit{BBC News}, September 20, 2011, \url{http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-africa-14986442} (accessed February 14, 2012).} Thus, NATO’s training of other regional organizations is mutually beneficial and will allow for increased burden-sharing of crisis management missions.

After examining the collaboration and challenges that exist between NATO and other regional and international organizations, it is clear that it would be beneficial for NATO to leverage and integrate other organizations’ capacities to contribute to humanitarian assistance and peacekeeping missions. A comprehensive approach involving regional and international actors is necessary despite challenges of limited capacity and a lack of unity. Further, a comprehensive approach is essential because the
UN does not have the military capabilities to support its development functions in order to create a sustainable peace and must rely on NATO for protection. Likewise, the EU has the will to conduct peacekeeping operations, but is weighed down with bureaucratic and political infighting. Other regional organizations, such as the OSCE and AU, may be leveraged to add legitimacy to NATO’s operations, and allow for NATO to have a global reach in humanitarian assistance missions by building the capacities of existing institutions. A comprehensive approach is possible only within the context of understanding NATO’s ethical obligations and legal authorities in conducting peacekeeping – the subject of the next chapter.
CHAPTER 6: ETHICAL AND LEGAL IMPLICATIONS OF NATO’S NEW ROLE

Approaching security holistically entails considering the ethical and legal parameters of NATO’s humanitarian interventions in order to assess the legitimacy of the organization’s new role. NATO’s missions in Kosovo and Libya are considered to be humanitarian interventions – generally understood to be “the transboundary use of military force for the purpose of protecting people whose government is egregiously abusing them, either directly, or by aiding and permitting extreme mistreatment.”\(^1\) NATO’s out-of-area missions in Kosovo and Libya stem from an ethical obligation to protect civilians even at the expense of violating a state’s sovereignty. The principles of just war create a framework by which to assess the moral justifiability of humanitarian interventions. However, as missions evolve, as in the case of Libya, complexities and nuances of ethical judgments become evident. It is clear that if NATO undertakes a responsibility to protect civilians elsewhere, it must overcome legal limitations and other burdens – both operational costs and burdens of proof.

From a legal perspective, international law, much of which was established with the creation of the United Nations (UN) in 1945, is based on the power of state actors and is, in principle, universally accepted. As such, use of force generally requires authorization from the UN Security Council in order to be deemed as legal by the international community. Consequently, NATO’s intervention in Kosovo, although widely accepted as ethically legitimate, was illegal. This moral defensibility must be

reconciled with international law in order to increase legitimacy of NATO’s future humanitarian interventions. This chapter will consider the ethical and legal responsibilities of NATO to conduct humanitarian interventions and will evaluate NATO’s missions in Libya and Kosovo as case studies.

**Ethical Aspects of Interventionism**

When investigating NATO’s role in conflict management and the ethical considerations that govern its decision to intervene, it is necessary to consider the new international norm of responsibility to protect. The responsibility to protect is a demand on the international community to intervene in places where entire communities and peoples are threatened by genocide, where women are threatened by mass rape, and where death and starvation threaten to destroy an entire generation.² In such cases, the international community, in the form of international and regional organizations, may make a commitment to protect civilians when their own state does not have the will or resources to do so.³ The UN incorporated this norm in the 2005 World Summit and then passed UN Security Council Resolution 1674 in April 2006.⁴ Paragraph 139 of the World Summit document explicitly states, “We are prepared to take collective action, in a timely and decisive manner, through the Security Council […] should peaceful means be inadequate and national authorities manifestly fail to protect populations from genocide,
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war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity and its implications.”5 In practice, this commitment is limited by the capacity of those who might be inclined to intervene militarily, particularly in cases where the state is the perpetrator of these crimes against humanity and is uncooperative or actively opposes such intervention.

While the UN Security Council is the primary international framework by which to invoke the authority of responsibility to protect, the Council includes two permanent members—Russia and China—with values that are very different from American and NATO ideals of freedom and democracy.6 Additionally, Russia and China have differing geostrategic goals and allies from the United States, which at times, hinders consensus within the Security Council. Only if Russia and China also perceive a threat to international security, as in the case of Libya, will the UN Security Council authorize the use of force to protect civilians. However, in the case of Kosovo, Russia threatened to veto a UN Security Council resolution authorizing the use of force because Russia supported the Serbian government which was conducting ethnic cleansing programs.7 Consequently, some believe that the UN’s legitimacy in establishing and implementing liberal norms is not on par with NATO. Hence, from the standpoint of Western


democracies, NATO’s actions do not necessarily gain ethical legitimacy simply by having UN approval.8

A tension between NATO’s emphasis on human values and the UN’s emphasis on state sovereignty exists due to differing interpretations of the UN Charter. Article 2.7 of Section 1 of the Charter emphasizes that “a sovereign state is empowered by international law to exercise exclusive and total jurisdiction within its territorial borders, and other states have the corresponding duty not to intervene in its internal affairs.”9 This limited statement of sovereignty must be reconciled with the international community’s responsibility to protect in instances where a state fails in its duty toward its citizens. However, if state sovereignty is interpreted to entail a state’s responsibility to protect one’s own people from rebel groups causing unrest within the state, then a state’s sovereignty and its responsibility to protect coincide.

Although this responsibility to protect innocent civilians from their autocratic leaders is accepted by Western states, it is not fully accepted by Eastern states with differing cultures, which tend to emphasize a state’s power, glory, and sovereignty over the will of their people. Western democracies believe that sovereignty stems from the people of a nation and is not concentrated with the head of state alone.10 Ivo Daalder, U.S. representative to NATO, and Robert Kagan, senior fellow with The Brookings Institution, explain that “real sovereignty, like real legitimacy, resides with the people

---


9Ibid.

10Derek Chollet, Bridging the Foreign Policy Divide (New York: The Stanley Foundation, 2008), 16.
rather than with the states. That is why the decision of states to intervene in the affairs of another state can be legitimate only if it is rendered by the people’s democratically chosen representatives rather than the personal whims of autocrats or oligarchs.”¹¹  

NATO reconciles this tension between sovereignty and responsibility to protect adhering to this logic that the people hold true sovereignty and legitimacy. In order to fully weigh ethical problems of war, NATO relies on just war principles, by which specific missions may be assessed to be either morally defensible or not. Although this thesis will not attempt to discuss all ethical issues related to humanitarian interventions—torture, assassination, blackmail, and human rights being a few—it will provide the framework by which NATO considers these issues and then discuss the Libyan case in particular to illustrate the complexities involved in assessing the ethical dynamics of humanitarian interventions.

NATO relies on the just war criteria to provide a framework of whether and how to intervene, at times without UN Security Council authorization. This ethical framework has six main components—a just cause, four precautionary principles, and a right authority requirement—all of which must be satisfied to invoke the ethical obligation of responsibility to protect and rightfully be able to infringe on a state’s sovereignty.¹²  

The first prerequisite for intervention is to have a just cause. A just cause necessitates an intervention in order to prevent large-scale loss of life within a state that occurs due to genocide, ethnic cleansing, or other means, including environmental and natural

¹¹Ibid.

disasters. The state must be either conducting large-scale destruction to life or does not have the ability to stop this destruction from occurring due to its own failure or neglect.

In addition to just cause, there are four precautionary criteria that contribute to the framework by which states can judge if an intervention is both warranted and legitimate. First, states must have the right intention, that is, only be motivated to prevent large-scale loss of life from occurring. States must not be motivated by political or financial gains that may occur due to intervening in a state. Second, armed intervention may occur only as a last resort, when all other reasonable options have been exhausted. Gareth Evans, former Australian Foreign Minister, and Mahmoud Sahnoun, UN representative and Algerian diplomat, explain that “the responsibility to react with military coercion can be justified only when the responsibility to prevent has been fully discharged.” Only when diplomatic solutions and non-military, peaceful efforts in resolving a crisis fail, is military intervention legitimate. Third, the intervention must be proportionate to the intensity and scale of the humanitarian crisis and the stated purpose of intervention. The intervention must end when the intended, specific purpose is accomplished or it will risk losing legitimacy in the eyes of the international community. Fourth, there must be
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reasonable prospects of successfully preventing large-scale loss of life.\(^{19}\) Although it is impossible to know the ultimate costs of intervention beforehand, there must be reasonable belief that international inaction would be worse than military action. Further to considering the consequences that occur within the state, it is necessary to weigh international ramifications as well. For example, if intervening in a state is judged to raise substantial risk of a wider conflict, then intervention cannot be justifiable if large-scale loss of life is expected.

In addition to these four precautionary criteria, the requirement of right authority must also be fulfilled to legitimize an intervention. As the legitimate authorizer of force, the UN Security Council is able to pass resolutions to allow and oversee interventions. Article 54 of Chapter 8 of the UN Charter states, “The Security Council shall at all times be kept fully informed of activities undertaken or in contemplation under regional arrangements or by regional agencies for the maintenance of international peace and security.”\(^{20}\) According to this Article, all of NATO’s activities must be coordinated with the UN. However, as seen in previous chapters, NATO has intervened even without UN authorization in humanitarian crises that affected the NATO alliance and fulfilled the above criteria for just war. For example, in the Balkans conflict, although NATO had the support of the UN Security Council in Bosnia from 1992 to 1995, it did not have a UN Security Council mandate in Kosovo, which will be discussed further later in this
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chapter. Ideally, when there is a humanitarian crisis, the UN Security Council and NATO will work together to address the situation, as was the case with Libya.

**Case Study: Ethics of NATO’s Intervention in Libya**

In applying the criteria of just war to the Libyan intervention, the complexities of assessing military force from an ethical standpoint become evident. The first criterion of just cause is subjective and is based on the definition one uses for “just.” For instance, Michael Walzer, author of *Just and Unjust Wars*, claims that a just war is only constituted if actions within the state, “shock the moral conscience of mankind.” On the other hand, what shocks humanity is also subjective, so the more defensible criteria for just cause is if there is large-scale destruction of life or ethnic genocide. Using this definition, it is evident that Qadhafi’s threats of wiping out Benghazi and his proven willingness to harm civilians, fulfills this criteria of just cause. Additionally, the “subsequent indiscriminate shelling of Misrata provides further evidence of the regime’s willingness to use force against its people.” Although NATO arguably fulfilled the just cause criterion initially, this criterion was not necessarily met as NATO’s mission in Libya evolved.

NATO’s humanitarian intervention with the intention of protecting citizens was ethically permissible; however, there are certain aspects of the mission that proved to be
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increasingly problematic. As discussed in chapter 4, NATO’s intention when it first decided to go into Libya was to protect Libyan civilians from Qadhafi, not to remove Qadhafi from power. Only after Qadhafi threatened to harm civilians as long as he could, NATO’s objectives shifted to include regime change. Regime change is much more difficult to morally defend because it may result in greater loss of life than in retaining the regime in power. Further, forcible regime change must consider that “the potential for instability in neighboring regions is greater.” With regime change being the primary objective, criteria for just war may not be as clearly fulfilled as the case for intervention.

Regime change had several negative consequences both within Libya and regionally. For example, after the removal of Qadhafi from power, mercenaries and weapons flowed out of Libya to neighboring states, which has since caused increased regional instability and conflict that may have not occurred if Qadhafi’s regime retained power. Although it is difficult to predict how much regional instability would have occurred even if Qadhafi was allowed to stay in power, it is clear that Qadhafi’s mercenaries would have most likely remained in Libya with no clear motivation to return home. With regime change, however, many of Qadhafi’s mercenaries who were Tuareg tribesmen from Mali returned to their homes. This influx into Mali of highly-trained mercenaries with weapons “has re-energized the long-simmering Tuareg insurgency against the Malian government. These Tuareg insurgents have formed a new group, the
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National Movement for the Liberation of Azawad (MNLA).” The MNLA has started violent protests against the current Malian government in an effort to take control of three northern regions. In mid-January, the MNLA attacked military facilities, which spurred a conflict between the Malian government and the MNLA across the country including several armed attacks and an unknown number of casualties. Further, there are claims that the MNLA has ties to al-Qaeda and other extremist groups. It is important to note that the Malian government has instigated these claims linking the MNLA to terrorists, most likely with the hope of attracting American and European support in their fight against the tribesmen. It is impossible to know the extent of MNLA’s relationship with al-Qaeda; however, there does appear to be at least limited cooperation in utilizing Malian smuggling routes to fund their activities. These negative consequences illustrate the complexities involved when assessing regime change in Libya because the repercussions of that decision have led to regional instability and a loss of life in neighboring states.

In addition to the possibility of not fulfilling the criteria of preventing large-scale loss of life, there are other criteria that would arguably not be met when assessing the ethics of regime change in Libya. For instance, military force was not the option of last resort because diplomatic and economic pressure had not been aimed to remove Qadhafi from power before the intervention. Long-term sanctions against Libya or collaboration with the Arab League in applying regional pressure were not tried in achieving regime
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change. Further, regime change would unlikely have fulfilled the criterion for reasonable prospects of success, especially with no alternative government or leader to take over with a much better record of human rights than Qadhafi.\textsuperscript{30} As discussed in chapter 4, the rebel leaders also had incidents of human rights abuses and violence toward civilians.

In the case of Libya, the limits of international actors’ willingness to observe just war criteria are revealed. Although the Libyan intervention seems to fulfill these ethical criteria at the onset of the war, as mission creep set in and NATO’s objective expanded, the intervention became ethically questionable, yet NATO remained in Libya. In order to take mission creep into account, every action and operation during the course of a mission should be weighed against just war principles to ensure that all aspects of the intervention are morally defensible. Because NATO’s actions should reflect shared human values and would risk losing legitimacy in the eyes of the population and the international community if considered unethical, the transatlantic alliance should assess every action during a humanitarian intervention before it is taken.\textsuperscript{31} Just war criteria should not only be applied at one point during the war, but instead “just war principles should be temporalized […]. For example, a war that initially had a just cause might at some critical juncture while it is being waged cease to have a just cause.”\textsuperscript{32} As such, NATO should assess specific operations and decisions against just war principles throughout the duration of the conflict and post-conflict stages to ensure it has a just
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cause, right intentions, legitimate authority, prospects for success, a specific purpose, and has exhausted all other non-military options.

Another ethical issue that was raised during NATO’s humanitarian intervention in Libya was the use of drones in targeting specific people and buildings during combat. For example, when NATO attacked dual-use facilities—manufacturing plants that produced both peaceful and military products—some argued that the transatlantic alliance was destroying infrastructure and taking away a form of livelihood from the civilians that worked there. Further, when NATO employed drones, some questioned if restraint had been removed because there were no boots on the ground and no way for the enemy to fight back effectively or even surrender.33 Although there is some truth in these criticisms, they fail to take into account the precision of drone technology, allowing the U.S. and NATO to avoid civilian targets to a greater extent than with troops.34 For example, in Pakistan, a place where the U.S. heavily relies on drone technology, the Pakistani government has confirmed that 95% of the people killed by American drones have been militants.35 While drones have increased precision in targeting and thus have led to fewer civilian casualties, this technology also makes it easier to resort to military
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action. However, because this technology does save an increased number of civilian lives, it may be seen as morally defensible.

Another moral issue that was raised by the Libyan intervention is the universal application of just war principles. In other words, does NATO’s intervention in Libya imply necessary interventions in other states with similar dynamics, such as Syria, Yemen, or Bahrain? Critics claim that because there have been no similar interventions in these countries, NATO’s mission in Libya was motivated by self-interests instead of an objective responsibility to protect civilians. Furthermore, some argue that NATO’s intervention in Libya served to embolden rebel groups in other states that would not have been compelled to resort to violence because they now had the hope of Western intervention. According to Thomas Weiss, Director of the UN Intellectual History Project, “International mumbling has perhaps affected calculations by local militias and elites, even causing them to take action that perhaps has had the effect, intended and unintended, of prolonging the violence.” This effect may be seen in other regional states, such as Syria, where rebel groups may have assumed that NATO would intervene in their country much as it had intervened in Libya.
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It is important to note that this argument does not discount the justifiability of NATO’s actions in Libya, but rather demands increased action in other parts of the world.\textsuperscript{41} That said, if there was a viable option to act in another country that had the potential to save more lives than in Libya, then some may categorically judge NATO’s actions to not be morally justifiable. For example, some critics point to the fact that instead of intervening in Libya, NATO could have used “the same resources to save a greater number of lives in Cote d’Ivoire (given the potential for the crisis in Cote d’Ivoire to lead to more deaths than in Libya) by, for instance, strengthening the French and UN operations there.”\textsuperscript{42} However, in an environment of limited budgets, NATO’s actions may be perceived as being morally defensible if the organization was faced with a decision to intervene in Libya—thereby saving some lives—or by not taking action at all.

After deciding to take action, the alliance continued having a limited scope, had reasonable prospects of success, exhausted diplomatic solutions, and did not gain financially from intervening according to its initial mission. Additionally, NATO had the right authority to act because it intervened after the UN Security Council had passed Resolution 1973, authorizing the use of force.\textsuperscript{43} In addition to fulfilling the criteria of just war, NATO’s intervention in Libya had wide support from the international community, including the Arab League, of which Libya was a member state. NATO’s intervention in Libya based on the criteria above was morally defensible. However,
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applying the ethical principles of just war to the case of Libya reveals the complexities involved when assessing humanitarian interventions from an ethical standpoint.

**Legal Aspects of Interventionism**

Similar complexities exist when assessing NATO’s humanitarian interventions from a legal perspective. It is important to keep in mind that justifications for force under international law are not necessarily coextensive with the moral justifications provided above. Thus, this tension must be reconciled to increase the legitimacy of NATO’s humanitarian interventions. For instance, according to the UN charter, the UN Security Council is generally the only legal authority able to use and authorize force in the international community.\(^{44}\) The legal status of humanitarian intervention must be evaluated, in part, in the context of Article 2 (4) of the UN Charter, which prohibits “the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state.”\(^{45}\) This Article assumes that the very use of force to intervene in another state is the greatest threat to civilians and human rights.\(^{46}\) The exception to that rule is provided in Article 51 of the UN Charter, which notes that individual and collective self-defense are legitimate uses of force.\(^{47}\) This authorization of force only applies to self-defense and responsibility to protect missions that have been sanctioned specifically by the UN Security Council, such as the case with Libya. The UN Security Council only formally
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endorsed responsibility to protect missions in 2005; however, this norm is not within a treaty or the body of formalized international law.  

The UN Charter prohibits intervening in another country unless specifically given permission by the UN Security Council. The main body of law from which NATO derives the authority to intervene and still remain legitimate is the Genocide Convention, because humanitarian intervention aims to prevent large-scale loss of life, similar to but not limited to genocide. The Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide was passed by the UN in 1948. It defines genocide and delineates the punishment for a breach of this convention, but is vague about allowing the use of force. As the only universally-recognized source of legitimacy, the UN may authorize use of force, but in the case of Kosovo, NATO took action without UN authorization. However, the complexities and nuances of this legal framework are far from simple.

The question arises if NATO’s action in Kosovo should be a precedent for future humanitarian interventions or an anomaly. Ryan Goodman, international law scholar and professor in New York University Law School, poses the question, “Should international law permit states to intervene militarily to stop genocide or comparable atrocity without
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Security Council authorization?"\(^{52}\) Many states are opposed to this notion because they believe that other states will be inclined to take unilateral actions for their own self-interests, but will defend their actions by claiming it was a humanitarian intervention.\(^{53}\) A law permitting interventions will be reduced to a pretext for war and will cost the lives of innocent civilians. As such, over 133 states have rejected the formalization of such a law that would undermine the primacy of the UN Security Council to authorize intervention on a case by case basis.\(^{54}\)

Some scholars point to the idea that although humanitarian interventions are prohibited under international treaty law in the Articles discussed above in the UN Charter, international customary law may allow for these types of armed interventions. However, the United States unilaterally intervened in Nicaragua in the early 1980s and defended its actions by explaining an intervention was necessary to ensure the respect of human rights in the country. The case went to the International Court of Justice in 1986, and the court ruled that “the argument derived from the preservation of human rights in Nicaragua cannot afford a legal justification for the conduct of the United States.”\(^{55}\) As seen in this ruling, humanitarian intervention is prohibited both under treaty and customary international law. As such, the UN has a monopoly over the legal use of force because under international law, unilateral humanitarian intervention is indefensible.
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One reason the UN has this monopoly over force is because the Charter was written in 1945 after World War II. Adolf Hitler, founder of the Nazi Party, used humanitarian intervention as a pretext for expanding his power into Austria and Czechoslovakia. He claimed that Germans were being terribly mistreated in both Austria and Czechoslovakia and were forced to flee to neighboring countries. In response to this perceived German refugee issue, Hitler wrote a letter to Arthur Chamberlain, Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, claiming that the “security of more than 3,000,000 human beings were at stake.”

Hitler, of course, had an ulterior motive in expanding Germany’s power, but used the pretense of humanitarian intervention. The writers of the UN Charter aimed to enshrine in international law the prevention of anything similar from recurring in the world.

Despite claims that including the possibility of unilateral humanitarian intervention into international law will increase conflict and violence, I contend that reconciling moral justifications with international law will decrease violence. Having a mechanism within the UN to weigh a situation against just war criteria would prevent states from intervening in another state only on the basis of self-interests. Because having a limited scope and reasonable chances of success are prerequisites for such interventions, drawn-out wars for financial or political gains would be reduced as well because there would be accountability within the international system. Further, if states committing crimes against their own people knew that the UN had a mechanism to
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consider moral justifications for intervention, they would be less inclined to create a just cause for others to infringe on their state’s sovereignty. Reconciling just war criteria with international law would allow for international monitoring and reporting of an intervention, thereby increasing transparency and accountability in the international system. A notifications system and an international structure for states to detect a humanitarian crisis will facilitate political and diplomatic opportunities to prevent an intervention before war is necessary. 58 This pre-war mechanism combined with post-war feedback structures may serve to limit wars in the future with the reconciliation of just war principles and international law.

It is important to note, however, that just war principles are not universally accepted. Further, the UN has no enforcement mechanism to prevent states from expanding their mission after the initial intervention. The limits of states in observing just war criteria as mission creep sets in was seen in Libya, and would not be preventable even if just war principles were reconciled with international law. Given these complexities, incorporating just war criteria into international law would be extremely difficult, but would greatly benefit the United States and NATO. The UN has already recognized the international norm of responsibility to protect, and the next step would be to recognize just war criteria as a legitimate framework by which to assess the moral permissibility of humanitarian interventions. That said, this reconciliation of just war principles with international law is most likely a long-term ideal.

Reconciling the just war framework with international law presents several other issues that will be discussed in this thesis only summarily. For example, international law does not fully consider the role of non-state actors, and instead relies on the supremacy and power of the state. According to international law, a state “must possess a permanent population, a defined territory, a government, and the capacity to enter into relations with other states.”59 In this new nature of warfare, however, it is impossible to discuss the legal basis of humanitarian interventions without considering the role of non-state actors. Being outside the accepted global political community, non-state actors have no legal authority to initiate a war.60 Negotiating with non-state actors is discussed briefly in Article 3 of the Geneva Conventions and in the Additional Protocol II of Article 1, but is omitted from the vast body of international law.61 That said, only in cases of anti-colonialism, established international law allows for non-state actors to initiate war as seen in the 1977 Additional Protocols.62 However, in these cases, the non-state actors aspire to statehood or resemble statehood already.63 It is unclear if this law would extend to rebel groups waging war outside the context of fighting colonialism. As such, it may be argued that NATO broke international law by assisting non-state actors in an illegal war that they started against the power of the state.


60Ibid., 10.


62Ibid.

63Ibid.
Another complexity is that the United Nations is the only legitimate authorizer of force, deriving its power from limited sovereignty ceded by its member states, but is not judged on moral grounds. Legitimacy of the Security Council stems from consensus reached by its five permanent members – France, United Kingdom, China, Russia, and the United States. A lack of consensus in the Security Council then means that any action taken by other states and regional organizations is illegitimate and illegal. Achieving a consensus, however, does not imply that “efforts will be taken to restrain belligerents, punish evildoers or halt aggression.”64 For example, inaction to halt aggression may be seen in July 1995 during the Bosnian War. At this time, over 5,000 civilians tried to seek refuge in the UN peacekeeper camp as Bosnian Serbs approached them. The UN peacekeepers, however, refused to shelter the civilians and turned them away. This inaction led to over 8,000 men and boys being slaughtered and several thousands of women being raped. Additionally, the UN peacekeepers failed in their duty to protect Srebrenica, the civilian center.65 UN peacekeepers were not held liable for these deaths or the destruction of Srebrenica because their presence was sanctioned by a UN resolution, giving them immunity.66 This example illustrates that international law does not have to consider just war principles for preventing large-scale loss of life. An action sanctioned by the UN may then be legal, but immoral if it fails to meet the just war criteria. On the other hand, an action may be moral, but illegal, as in the case of NATO’s
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humanitarian intervention in Kosovo. As such, just war principles must be reconciled with international law to rectify the divergence.

**Case Study: (Il)Legality of NATO’s Intervention in Kosovo**

As discussed in Chapter 2, the UN Security Council issued several warnings to the former Yugoslavia before NATO intervened in Kosovo in 1999. The UN had been observing the events occurring in Yugoslavia closely and had deemed that there was a violation of human rights, but could not take action due to systemic shortcomings. Russia threatened to veto a UN Security Council Resolution authorizing force, so NATO tried exhausting diplomatic solutions first. It attempted to broker a ceasefire between Serbia and Kosovo; however, peace negotiations disintegrated and violence resumed. Despite pressure from Western powers, Russia still continued to threaten vetoing a resolution authorizing force in Kosovo. Sustained claims of ethnic cleansing prompted NATO to initiate a bombing campaign against the Serbs, which was considered illegal by many because it lacked UN authorization to use force. In addition to lacking UN authority, NATO’s intervention also involved other legal quagmires that highlight the complexities of humanitarian intervention.

For example, some critics point to the NATO Treaty as preventing the use of force except in cases of collective defense. The NATO Treaty does not consider humanitarian intervention to be part of the transatlantic alliance’s mandate and does not
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specify that intervention is considered to be an act of self-defense. However, defenders of NATO’s actions argue that since the organization “arrives at decisions by unanimous vote or a consensual method, transformations of the treaty are considered to be possible without a formal revision of the founding treaty.” Further, NATO defends its intervention in Kosovo by claiming that it was defending common values and interests, which constitutes a form of collective self-defense. Despite, these claims, most legal scholars agree that NATO’s actions in Kosovo were unauthorized and therefore illegal, as assessed within the framework of both the UN Charter and the NATO Treaty.

As the conflict in Kosovo was raging, other states deemed NATO’s intervention as illegal because the organization was becoming involved in an internal dispute. An Indian politician stated during the war that “this arbitrary, unauthorized, and illegal military action should be stopped immediately. Domestic political problems have to be settled peacefully by the parties concerned through consultation and dialogue. Foreign military action can only worsen matters.” Other members of the international community viewed NATO’s intervention itself as being the true humanitarian crisis because of the transatlantic alliance’s flagrant disregard for a state’s sovereignty in order to solve a perceived crisis that several other states felt did not exist. Several non-NATO states also believed that as a regional organization, NATO is subject to the authority of
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the UN Charter as are all other regional organizations.\textsuperscript{73} They believed that NATO’s intervention set a precedent that undermined the primacy of the UN Charter, weakening the international system as a whole.

It is clear that from many legal perspectives, NATO’s intervention in Kosovo was unauthorized and therefore illegal.\textsuperscript{74} International law does not allow for the use of force without approval from the UN Security Council in such cases. From an ethical perspective, NATO acted within the framework established by the just war criteria – principles that are not universally accepted like the UN Charter. According to the UK House of Commons, “While legal questions in international relations are important, law cannot become a means by which universally acknowledged principles of human rights are undermined […]. We conclude that NATO’s military action, if on dubious legality in the current state of international law, was justified on moral grounds.”\textsuperscript{75} Despite this illegality, NATO’s actions may be considered ethically just because it fulfilled the criteria of the just war framework. This divergence implies that international law must be reconciled with the possibility of military force outside of self-defense. From a Western perspective, the alliance acted justly in Kosovo, but would have preferred to have UN authorization, as it had in Libya. As states and regional organizations strive towards implementing a comprehensive approach to address humanitarian crises, the body of
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international law must be reformed to reflect the limits of state sovereignty in light of moral justifications.

As NATO evolves to address the security-development nexus, its actions must be assessed within the context of ethical and legal norms in order to continue being perceived as legitimate within the international community. Just war principles provide an ethical framework by which to evaluate the justifiability of a humanitarian intervention. However, as seen in the case of Libya, there are complexities when applying the framework because of the subjective nature of ethical obligations. It is also important to keep in mind that just war principles are not universally accepted as is international law. Legally, the UN Charter provides the foundation of international law and the UN Security Council is the only authorizer of the use of force. NATO’s intervention in Kosovo, while illegal because it lacked UN Security Council authorization, may be deemed ethically permissible. The disparity between ethical norms and international law must be reconciled in order for NATO’s humanitarian interventions and peacekeeping activities to continue being perceived as morally defensible and legitimate. Recommendations for focusing NATO’s new mission and sustaining legitimacy follow in the conclusion of this thesis.
CONCLUSION

After the Soviet Union collapsed in 1991, NATO transformed itself from being strictly a defensive organization to being a comprehensive security organization. In an increasingly globalized world, threats originating from outside the Euro-Atlantic area of responsibility affect the security of the transatlantic alliance, forcing NATO to develop capabilities to combat a multiplicity of global threats. This thesis has evaluated the recent evolutions in NATO’s missions and has advocated for the enhancement of its humanitarian assistance capabilities in order to maintain its organizational relevance.

NATO has evolved from conducting its first out-of-area operation in Bosnia, to its first humanitarian intervention in Kosovo, to its first out-of-area ground operation in Afghanistan, and finally, to its first European-led mission in Libya. This thesis has explored the issues associated with NATO interventionism from an American perspective by investigating the responsibilities and competencies of other international and regional organizations, including the United Nations (UN), the European Union (EU), Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), and African Union (AU).

Additionally, this thesis has been interdisciplinary because it drew on just war principles and international law to assess humanitarian interventions from an ethical and legal perspective. It also considered the values-related aspects of NATO interventionism such as the Western norm of responsibility to protect, while evaluating the political, operational, ethical, and legal complexities and implications of these missions. This chapter summarizes the principal conclusions and assessments presented herein and provides policy recommendations to continue integrating peacekeeping responsibilities
into NATO’s core mission. Additionally, an alternate strategic framework will be considered. This thesis has argued that due to the security-development nexus, NATO must use its resources to promote human values by undertaking peacekeeping missions in order to continue its organizational viability and legitimacy.

**Overview of NATO’s Evolving Role**

Chapter 1 discussed the changing nature of warfare which compels the transatlantic alliance to conduct peacekeeping in an effort to win hearts and minds and prevent conflict from recurring in a region. This transformation is in America’s best interest so that it may sustain its leadership and influence in Europe. NATO’s increased participation in development and peacekeeping missions will ensure its organizational relevance in the future, although there are limitations to missions it may undertake due to budget constraints, a values gap within the alliance, and the need to balance Russia. Chapter 2 delved into NATO’s missions in Bosnia and Kosovo, which were the alliance’s first tests of relevance after the Cold War. While Bosnia solidified NATO’s offensive capability, Kosovo was the transatlantic alliance’s first humanitarian intervention that entailed peacekeeping responsibilities. These missions highlighted flaws in NATO’s organizational consensus-building architecture and in its post-conflict collaboration capacity with NGOs and international aid organizations.

Despite important lessons learned from the Balkans, NATO faced another challenge with its first out-of-area ground operation in Afghanistan – the subject of Chapter 3. In Afghanistan, NATO fully integrated its military and development components with the creation of provincial reconstruction teams (PRTs). Although the
International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) has had some level of success in creating order and stability in parts of Afghanistan, NATO member states’ caveats on their respective national troops continue to undermine offensive operations and training of Afghan security forces. On the other hand, NATO’s mission in Libya, as discussed in Chapter 4, illustrates a new division of labor within the alliance that may be applied to other humanitarian interventions. European allies took the lead to protect Libyan citizens, which illustrated European partners’ willingness to fight for such a cause if provided with the appropriate resources. NATO’s mission in Libya proved its organizational viability because other international and regional organizations did not have the capabilities or cohesiveness to end a humanitarian crisis successfully.

Chapter 5 examined NATO’s operational and political capacity to conduct humanitarian interventions vis-à-vis the UN, EU, OSCE and AU. In order for NATO to sustain its development capacities in an environment of limited funding, a comprehensive approach incorporating the expertise and responsibilities of other regional organizations is crucial. Chapter 6 was interdisciplinary in nature because it assessed NATO’s humanitarian interventions from an ethical perspective within the context of the just war theory and from a legal perspective within the context of international law. The transatlantic alliance has accepted the responsibility to protect, even at the expense of state sovereignty and at times, without authorization from the UN Security Council if the criteria of just war have been met. International law must be reconciled with just war principles so tension between actions being deemed as either morally legitimate or legally authorized no longer exist. As NATO looks ahead, policies should be implemented that
will strengthen the transatlantic alliance’s ability to address the security-development nexus, thereby ensuring its organizational sustainability in the future.

**Policy Recommendations**

1) *The U.S. must lead efforts to conclude a memorandum of understanding (MOU) between NATO and the EU, elucidating the purview of each organization’s mission in the role of development, which will ultimately add legitimacy to NATO’s activities.*

As the majority of NATO members are also members of the EU, there are divergent views on how the transatlantic alliance interacts with the EU in development activities.¹ The U.S. must facilitate an understanding between the two organizations to avoid tension and redundant development efforts, thereby increasing the efficiency and legitimacy of NATO’s activities. As discussed in Chapter 5, the EU’s training mission for Afghan police (EUPOL) does not have the necessary resources or cohesiveness to implement adequate training programs.² Further, NATO is unable to assist the EU because Turkey has blocked the alliance from providing protection to EU police conducting training and has not allowed intelligence-sharing between NATO and the EU.³ To avoid friction between NATO and the EU in the future, the U.S. must initiate negotiations on an MOU between both organizations explicating the role of development
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in NATO’s mission and how that role may be complemented by the EU’s role in peacekeeping. ⁴

The U.S. is in a unique position to facilitate this MOU because of its close relationship with Turkey. The U.S. has given Turkey over $300 million in economic and military aid since 2002, facilitating increased American influence in Turkey. ⁵ Further, as of mid-2011, U.S.–Turkey bilateral trade had increased since 2010 by 50%, going from $6.9 billion to $10.4 billion and U.S. exports to Turkey had increased by 58%, going from $4.9 billion to $7.8 billion. ⁶ Additionally, Turkish exports to the United States increased by 32%, going from $2.0 billion to $2.6 billion, making Turkey one of the top exporters to the United States. ⁷ The American administration must leverage this influence and garner Turkey’s support for an EU-NATO MOU to ease tensions between both organizations. Increased EU-NATO cooperation will strengthen peacekeeping capabilities and allow for burden-sharing of sustainable peace programs in conflict-ridden areas.

The U.S. must be careful to clarify within the MOU that NATO is the lead organization in peacekeeping missions in areas in which the alliance has a committed
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security mission.\textsuperscript{8} For example, NATO has taken the lead in Afghanistan and is in a position to delegate development projects to various regional organizations, such as the EU, because it has the necessary clout and political capital to do so.\textsuperscript{9} NATO’s relevance and utility as an organization depends on the fact that other regional organizations cannot be as effective as NATO in implementing successful reconstruction projects that stabilize a region and bring enduring peace and security.\textsuperscript{10} However, the MOU must specify that NATO may transfer peacekeeping responsibility to the EU after the conflict has been mitigated. NATO may continue supporting the EU’s efforts by providing a deterrent force to prevent conflict from re-igniting in the region.

\textit{2) The United States must strengthen NATO’s public diplomacy efforts to fortify the organization’s legitimacy in the development arena.}

The use of public opinion and diplomacy has become increasingly essential to NATO’s capability to provide security effectively, as seen in the case of Afghanistan.\textsuperscript{11} Because terrorist organizations rely on propaganda against the U.S. and its allies to gain support from the local population, NATO must work to actively counter that propaganda with its own.\textsuperscript{12} The transatlantic alliance must publicize the enemy’s failures while highlighting NATO’s successes. For example, according to the Combating Terrorism

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{9}Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{10}House of Representatives, “Congressional Record,” United States Congress, May 13, 2003, 11221, first column.
\item \textsuperscript{11}Stefanie Babst, “Explaining NATO’s Public Diplomacy” (Speech, NATO Headquarters, Mons, Belgium, September 18, 2006), \texttt{http://www.nato.int/docu/speech/2006/s060918a.htm} (accessed February 14, 2012).
\item \textsuperscript{12}Ibid.
\end{itemize}
Center in West Point Military Academy, just between 2004 and 2008 “al-Qaida claimed responsibility for 313 attacks, resulting in the deaths of 3,010 people. And even though these attacks include terrorist incidents in the West—in Madrid in 2004 and in London in 2005—only 12 percent of those killed (371 deaths) were Westerners.”\(^\text{13}\) NATO must continue sharing this information in Afghanistan in an effort to win hearts and minds of the local population, or at the very least, to discredit insurgent groups. Further, NATO’s public diplomacy efforts are essential to spread information in member states on the changing roles and responsibilities of the alliance in peacekeeping.\(^\text{14}\) NATO is not traditionally considered a diplomatic organization, but rather a collective defense alliance. Diplomacy entails using soft power versus hard power, which is typically uncharacteristic of a security alliance dependent on military forces, but an essential aspect to the organization’s changing role.\(^\text{15}\)

Soft power, as coined in 1990 by Joseph Nye, former Assistant Secretary of Defense, depends on the power of attraction rather than troops and weapons to obtain desired results.\(^\text{16}\) Soft power relies on influencing a local population by spreading one’s values, policies, and culture. NATO created a Public Diplomacy Division (PDD) in 2003


based on its values of freedom and democracy, which the U.S. must continue empowering.\textsuperscript{17} NATO’s development activities are currently directed by PDD, which in itself reveals the transformation of the alliance to address the new nature of warfare.\textsuperscript{18} The U.S. must continue solidifying NATO’s preeminent role in security-development missions and garner support globally for them, which will ultimately bolster NATO’s image as an irreplaceable organization.

3) The U.S. must initiate joint development exercises in order to ensure the eventual cohesiveness and efficiency of the transatlantic alliance in peacekeeping missions.

The alliance will be increasingly effective in implementing development projects if troops are not only trained in military interoperability, but development interoperability as well.\textsuperscript{19} NATO troops donated by individual member states have training to ensure interoperability with other members in military and equipment, but are not trained to participate in reconstruction or peacekeeping projects with other troops.\textsuperscript{20} According to Ivo Daalder, the U.S. Ambassador to NATO and former fellow of The Brookings Institution, “It is precisely NATO’s interoperability—the result of joint planning, training, and fighting—that allows its members to interact smoothly and efficiently when a crisis erupts. […] The potential of U.S. troops is maximized when they are involved in

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{17}Stefanie Babst, \textit{NATO’s New Public Diplomacy: The Art of Engaging and Influencing} (Berlin: Atlantic Community Organization, February 2009).
\item \textsuperscript{18}Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{20}Ibid.
\end{itemize}
operations with other troops with whom they have trained on a regular basis.” 21 This interoperability is increasingly important in post-conflict situations to create sustainable development projects and to ensure that the region does not erupt into conflict again. 22 As seen in Kosovo, troops must also be interoperable with non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and other regional organizations providing humanitarian assistance on the ground.

NATO must establish priorities for peacekeeping that each state’s national troops respect and implement. Troops working together efficiently will directly impact the resources and timeframe needed to be successful in securing the peace and stability of an area after the enemy has been defeated. 23 According to the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS), “In today’s complex and uncertain global security environment, NATO needs more flexible and agile armed forces both for collective defense and for operations beyond the North Atlantic region to safeguard members’ interests.” 24 These flexible forces must be able to work together during a humanitarian intervention and conduct peacekeeping operations according to commonly-established priorities during the post-conflict phase. The U.S. must take the lead in implementing interoperability beyond the realm of joint military exercises to prevent a duplication of  
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efforts and to ensure resources are used effectively by the alliance, regional organizations, international institutions, and NGOs.

4) The U.S. must exploit the division of labor used in Operation Unified Protector in Libya as necessary for the transatlantic alliance to be sustainable in conducting humanitarian interventions.

The United States cannot and should not bear a disproportionate burden of NATO’s defensive and peacekeeping missions. Instead, a new division of labor that shares the burden of NATO missions among both European and American partners must be implemented. As seen in Libya, European partners have the will to lead missions and accept responsibility to protect operations if the United States plays a supportive role. As such, when NATO deems a peacekeeping mission to be strategic, European partners must take the lead and garner multi-national and multi-organizational support. In turn, the United States must lend its support both politically and tactically to provide munitions, fuel, and intelligence in these wars of choice. In this way, both sides of the Atlantic will have a role in peacekeeping, but the burden of responsibility will be better distributed among them.

However, in Article 5 wars of necessity that are in response to direct attacks against NATO allies, the United States must continue taking the lead. This insurance policy for Europeans will allow the U.S. to sustain its influence and leadership within the transatlantic alliance. Further, it will reduce or obviate European incentives to develop an independent capability that competes with NATO. This division of labor will ensure NATO’s viability to respond effectively to both wars of choice and wars of necessity in
an environment of increased budget constraints. Additionally, this division will ensure NATO’s organizational relevance vis-à-vis other international and regional institutions.

**An Alternate Strategic Framework?**

This thesis has argued that in order for NATO to continue being sustainable, it cannot limit itself geographically to only the Euro-Atlantic area or categorically to defense missions. Threats originating from outside the transatlantic region remain detrimental to the security of NATO allies, thereby forcing the alliance to address the security-development nexus globally and not just at home. Several alternate frameworks exist, however, that point to the irrelevance of NATO if it were to fight security threats globally. Some feel that if NATO continues conducting out-of-area operations, the organization will become cumbersome and unfocused – making it inept to provide collective self-defense if there were an attack.²⁵ Within this framework, there are two major perspectives on NATO’s core mission. The first holds that NATO must return to being a strictly defensive organization that serves as an insurance policy in case of attack.²⁶ According to this view, NATO must not conduct out-of-area operations because if it were to be unsuccessful, it would damage NATO’s image and deterrence capability. Instead, as in the Cold War, the transatlantic alliance should only be used to defend against a direct attack on the soil of a NATO member state.

The second perspective holds that NATO must incorporate all aspects of security into its mission and not just focus on hard security threats such as terrorism. According to James Goldgeier, *The Future of NATO: Special Report Number 51* (New York: Council on Foreign Relations, February 2010), 4.

According to Christopher Chivvis, *Recasting NATO’s Strategic Concept: Possible Directions for the United States* (Santa Monica: RAND Corporation, 2009), xi.
to this view, NATO must work to combat all threats to NATO allies, including cyber, economic, and environmental threats.\textsuperscript{27} Combating these threats would strengthen the overall security of NATO member states, especially in an age when security is intertwined with a state’s dependence on technology. For instance, some member states argue that a cyber attack on their power grid would be as detrimental to their security as a terror attack.\textsuperscript{28} Therefore, the alliance should evolve to incorporate capabilities to protect against these non-traditional threats. Both of these perspectives hold that out-of-area operations are unsustainable and that the alliance must redirect its focus solely on the Euro-Atlantic area.

This alternate strategic framework fails to consider the new nature of warfare and its impact on traditional security alliances. Threats that originate from the opposite side of the world can now have a direct impact on the alliance’s security.\textsuperscript{29} If NATO does not conduct out-of-area operations, it will eventually become irrelevant because it will not be able to secure NATO member states proactively, and instead only remain a reactive organization. As discussed in Chapter 1, due to the security-development nexus, the alliance must conduct peacekeeping and development in order to prevent a region from becoming a breeding ground for transnational crime and terrorism – a direct threat to Europe and North America.\textsuperscript{30} Additionally, although cyber and economic threats have the potential to harm NATO, the organization does not have the resources or funding to

\textsuperscript{27}Goldgeier, \textit{The Future of NATO: Special Report Number 51}, 21.
\textsuperscript{28}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{29}Ibid., 8.
\textsuperscript{30}Ibid., 4.
address every single threat. The alliance must focus on the most important priorities, which today, is preventing terrorist attacks from occurring on NATO soil. Although several other strategic frameworks exist, most fail to take into account the security-development nexus and budgetary constraints.31

As the world’s foremost military organization comes head to head with a rapidly globalized security environment, NATO is forced to reassess its role and organizational utility.32 The transatlantic alliance continues to be of utmost importance to the United States and it is in America’s best interest for NATO to include development projects as part of its mission. The alliance has faced unprecedented challenges in Bosnia, Kosovo, Afghanistan, and Libya – all out-of-area operations where the lines between security and development blurred.33 As NATO continues negotiating new challenges, the policy recommendations presented here will bolster NATO’s sustained role in development and alleviate tensions between NATO and other regional organizations. In light of the security-development nexus and the changing nature of warfare, the U.S. must continue shaping NATO’s shifting roles and responsibilities within the international arena to ensure the indispensability of the transatlantic alliance.

31For more information on alternate strategic frameworks beyond the scope of this thesis, please refer to Coming in from the Cold War: Changes in U.S.-European Interactions Since 1980 by Sabrina Ramet and Christine Ingebritsen; Recasting NATO’s Strategic Concept: Possible Directions for the United States by Christopher Chivvis; NATO and European Security: Alliance Politics from the End of the Cold War to the Age of Terrorism by Alexander Moens, Lenard Cohen, and Allen Sens; NATO 2.0: Reboot or Delete? by Sarwar Kashmeri; and NATO Divided, NATO United: the Evolution of an Alliance by Lawrence Kaplan.
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