

NATO'S POST-COLD WAR EFFECTIVENESS:
HOW NATO PRESERVED STABILITY AND SECURITY IN THE POST-COLD
WAR WORLD THROUGH ITS CONDUCT OF MILITARY OPERATIONS

by
Zachary Marc Silberman

A thesis submitted to Johns Hopkins University in conformity with the requirements for
the degree of Master of Arts in Global Security Studies

Baltimore, Maryland
December 2014

©2014 Zachary Marc Silberman
All Rights Reserved

Abstract:

The main argument of this thesis is that NATO can be an effective post-Cold War alliance in preserving 21st century security and stability through the conduct of its military operations. In order to show NATO's effectiveness in successfully preserving post-Cold War security and stability, this thesis looks at three interrelated aspects of NATO following the fall of communism and how these aspects may have affected NATO's ability to conduct military operations during its involvement in various conflicts. Rather than look at the wider concepts of NATO's security role, I was interested in examining whether the alliance has been effective since the disappearance of the communist threat.

The first chapter looks at the influence of U.S. strategic interests on NATO's decision-making process. However, I argue that the interests of other states and the organization itself within the realm of U.S. strategic interests can motivate NATO decision-making to conduct military operations. The second chapter discusses a tiered system of NATO members—based on their political and military contributions—and whether those tiers impact the conduct of the alliance during specific military operations. I argue that certain tiers contribute more political and military assets to particular military operations than other tiers. Therefore, these contributions can have a decisive impact on the outcome of two conflicts featuring NATO actions. The third chapter investigates whether NATO's adaptation to non-state threats in out-of-area conflicts was successful. I argue that NATO's ability to adapt to changing security challenges outside of its regional borders allowed the alliance to conduct military operations against non-state threats, which resulted in stable and secure environments on the ground.

The various case studies confirm the paper's argument that NATO is effective as a post-Cold War alliance to preserve stability and security through its conduct of military operations. The results of the thesis can serve as a guide for policymakers in favor of NATO's continued role in 21st century security going forward. Lessons learned from this thesis about how NATO has functioned since the end of the Cold War to deal with various security challenges can help guide policymakers as they deal with ongoing global security threats from Islamic terrorism, as well as traditional state aggressors.

Advisor: Dr. Sarah O'Byrne

Readers: Dr. Michael Vlahos, Dr. Kevin Woods

Acknowledgements

This was a long road and I could not have done it without the help of some extraordinary people. First, I want to thank my professors and advisers on these papers, Dr. Rameez Abbas, Dr. Jacob Straus, Dr. Sarah O’Byrne, and Dr. Mark Stout. Your guidance throughout this process has been invaluable to completing my thesis. I also want to thank my parents, Larry and Susan Silberman for continuing to inspire my hard work throughout my time at Johns Hopkins. Your support and guidance has been incredible. Most importantly, I want to thank my wife, Michelle Silberman for her ongoing support throughout my entire time in this program and continuing to serve as my rock. I could not have done this without you. And to my son, Jason, if I can teach you anything from this process, just know that hard work will always pay off in the end.

Table of Contents

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	iv
Table of Contents	v
List of Tables	vii
Introduction	1
Chapter 1: U.S. Strategic Interests and Influence on NATO Decision-Making	6
<i>NATO's Decision-Making: The Factors and Rules that Determine Action</i>	7
<i>Other States' Interests and How They Impact Decision-Making</i>	12
<i>The Role of U.S. Strategic Interests in Decision-Making</i>	17
<i>Methodology and Hypothesis</i>	21
<i>Case Study: NATO's Role in Afghanistan</i>	22
<i>Case Study: NATO's Role in Iraq</i>	31
<i>Analysis: Other States' Interests and NATO Consensus Holds</i>	38
<i>Conclusion</i>	40
Chapter 2: A Tiered NATO Member System's Impact on the Burden for the Alliance's Military Operations	42
<i>The Role of Alliances</i>	44
<i>Alliance Burden-Sharing in NATO</i>	46
<i>The Tiered System Exists</i>	51
<i>Methodology and Hypothesis</i>	54
<i>Case Study: Operation Allied Force (OAF) in Kosovo</i>	55
<i>Case Study: Operation Unified Protector (OUP) in Libya</i>	64
<i>Analysis: Tier 1 Leads Kosovo, Tier 2 Leads Libya</i>	74
<i>Conclusion</i>	76
Chapter 3: Non-State Threats and NATO Military Operations	79

<i>The Nature of Non-State Threats and How to Fight Them</i>	80
<i>NATO's Institutional Survival</i>	81
<i>General Concepts about NATO's Ability to Adapt and Transform</i>	85
<i>Out-of-Area Operations and Strategic Concepts</i>	88
<i>Methodology and Hypothesis</i>	94
<i>Case Study: NATO's First Ever Ground Deployment in Bosnia</i>	96
<i>Case Study: Combatting New Threats in Afghanistan</i>	101
<i>Analysis: Success in Bosnia, but not in Afghanistan</i>	109
<i>Conclusion</i>	111
Conclusion	113
Bibliography	117
Curriculum Vita	129

List of Tables

Table 1.1: Arranging the NATO Tiers

58

Introduction

The world has changed considerably since the fall of the Soviet Union and global communism. Mechanisms created during the Cold War sought to counter the threat from worldwide communist domination, specifically the formation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) in 1949. NATO served as the bulwark in protecting Western Europe from the Warsaw Pact countries in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. However, once the Cold War ended, NATO sought to redefine its purpose in the new global security environment. Several observers believed that NATO was obsolete following the end of the Soviet threat and that it would have little influence on global stability and security.¹ In response to these arguments, other observers argued that NATO needed to become a “global” organization and focus on threats to its security that came from outside Europe.² This also meant that NATO would need to “transform” into a 21st century alliance and rapidly respond to new unconventional threats from non-state actors.³ The alliance would support peacekeeping in the Balkans, counter terrorism in the Middle East, and save innocents from genocide in North Africa, successfully finding a role in the era of globalization and complex threats.

The main argument of this thesis is that NATO can be an effective post-Cold War alliance in preserving 21st century security and stability through the conduct of its military operations. In order to show that effectiveness, this thesis looks at three

¹ John J. Mearsheimer, “The False promise of International Institutions,” *International Security* 19, no. 3 (03, 1994-1995), 7-14. Also, see Gunther Hellmann and Reinhard Wolf, “Neorealism, Neoliberal Institutionalism, and the Future of NATO,” *Security Studies* 3, no. 1 (01, 1993), 3-43.

² W. Bruce Weinrod, “The Future of NATO,” *Mediterranean Quarterly* 23, no. 2 (02, 2012), 1-13; Ivo Daalder and James Goldgeier, “Global NATO,” *Foreign Affairs* 85, no. 5 (05, 2006), 105-113.

³ Kwang Ho Chun, “NATO: Adaptation and Relevance for the 21st Century,” *Journal of International and Area Studies* 20, no. 2 (02, 2013), 67-82; Ivo Daalder, “NATO in the 21st Century: What Purpose, What Missions?” *Brookings Institution*, April 1999, <http://www.brookings.edu/~media/research/files/reports/1999/4/nato%20daalder/reportintro>; “Jones: Transforming NATO Into 21st Century Alliance,” *Sea Power* 47, no. 11 (11, 2004), 28-33.

interrelated aspects of NATO following the fall of communism and how these aspects may have affected NATO's conduct of military operations. I have been a student of the Cold War since my undergraduate work and I have always had a fascination with NATO. Rather than look at the wider concepts of NATO's security role, I want to examine whether the alliance has been effective since the disappearance of the communist threat by focusing exclusively on military actions. The military aspect offers an instructive viewpoint on NATO's 21st century relevance due to the prominent position of armed conflicts in the alliance's post-Cold War history. For that reason, this work presents a meaningful contribution to the current debate on NATO's future place in the world.

The first chapter of the thesis explores NATO's decision-making process and answers the question of whether U.S. strategic interests dominantly influences NATO decisions to conduct military operations. While some could argue that U.S. interests dictate and influence the alliance's decision-making on whether to conduct operations, the chapter's hypothesis states that other factors exist that motivate NATO involvement that reflect the interests of other states and the organization itself. Mainly, this chapter argues that U.S. strategic interests are not absolute in determining whether NATO decides to conduct a military operation.

The chapter examines NATO decision-making structures through the process of consensus-building. The chapter also delves into the influence of U.S. strategic interests based on the U.S. role as the hegemon. However, even with considerable U.S. influence, the literature shows that other states' interests and NATO's interests based on the mechanisms of the organization itself had a role in deciding NATO's actions in a conflict even with a dominant U.S. influence. This chapter identified two case studies where

there was a significant U.S. strategic interest to achieve military victory: Afghanistan and Iraq. Through process tracing, this chapter highlights different NATO actions within the categories of U.S. interests, other members' interests, and NATO's interests to see if these factors influenced the outcome for deciding NATO military action. The case studies confirm the hypothesis that other factors do have a significant impact towards influencing NATO decision-making to determine the alliance's choice to conduct military operations in these two conflicts.

The second chapter answers the question of whether a tiered system of NATO members impacts the conduct of the collective alliance during specific military operations. The hypothesis for this chapter argues that certain tiers contribute more political and military assets to particular operations than other tiers. Therefore, these political or military contributions from NATO tiers can have a decisive impact on the outcome of two conflicts featuring NATO actions. To answer this question, this chapter uses the ongoing argument of burden-sharing and the concept of the "free-rider" problem as guides to explain how specific NATO members—divided into three tiers—contribute to the outcome of specific military operations. This question offers a different perspective on the burden-sharing argument and helps show future implications of a tiered member system in the alliance and its impact on future operations.

The literature review examines the role and structure of alliances and then delves into the concepts of burden-sharing and the "free rider" problem and how they have impacted NATO's functions since its creation. While some observers highlight the existence of a possible tiered system, the analysis ranged in definitions and concepts. However, where this chapter deviates from current analysis is by determining whether

these tiers had an impact on how the operations were conducted, not necessarily focusing on the general concept of burden-sharing and its impact on the alliance. To reinforce this argument, the chapter divides NATO into three tiers based on burden-sharing and shows that these tiers could have a significant impact on the conduct of NATO military operations in Kosovo and Libya. In order to investigate these cases and determine the particular tier's impact on the operation, this chapter employs process tracing. The case studies' results indicate that the top two member tiers contribute more to the operations.

Following the end of the Cold War, NATO would use military force to respond to unconventional threats outside of the Western European borders, specifically threats of armed war between ethnic groups and the rise of Islamic terrorism. The third chapter seeks to answer the question of whether NATO's adaptation to non-state threats in out-of-area conflicts was successful. The third chapter's hypothesis states that NATO's ability to adapt to changing security challenges outside of NATO's regional borders allowed the alliance to conduct military operations against non-state threats, which resulted in stable and secure environments on the ground.

The literature review begins with the nature of non-state threats and then NATO's evolution from its original charter in order to survive. The chapter delves into the concepts of NATO's persistence through institutional theory to explain its adaptation and then looks at how the adaptation occurred throughout the post-Cold War era. While the literature review establishes NATO's adaptation in the general sense, it does not specifically highlight how that adaptation to non-state threats through military operations may have contributed to stability and security on the ground. The two case studies of Bosnia and Afghanistan seek to investigate and confirm the hypothesis of whether

NATO's adaptation to non-state threats contributes to ensuring stability and security on the ground in these conflicts. The methodology uses process tracing to highlight the specific NATO operations to determine whether the alliance successfully counters non-state threats like ethnic conflicts, insurgencies, and terrorism to provide security and stability in these countries. The results of the case studies are mixed as NATO was able to provide stability and security in Bosnia, but was less successful in Afghanistan.

The purpose of this thesis is to show that NATO can be effective in protecting security and stability through military operations in a world that is far different from the one during the Cold War. NATO's value in the 21st century will continue to be an ongoing debate. However, showing the actions of its military operations and the effect that they had towards preserving security can be a good guide for understanding what NATO's role should be as new and complex security threats from a resurgent Russia and the Islamic State will certainly test the alliance and its military capabilities in the future.

Chapter 1: U.S. Strategic Interests and Influence on NATO Decision-Making

At the beginning of the Cold War, the United States and its European allies created a security organization that sought to deter the Soviet Union from further expanding beyond East Berlin. In 1949, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) was formed and it served as the premier world security organization. The United States has been a central member of NATO with its role enhanced since the end of the Cold War. In recent conflicts, the United States has been involved in NATO military operations, particularly in Eastern Europe, South Asia, and North Africa. The break-up of the Soviet Union, globalization, and the rise of Muslim extremism in the last several decades have contributed to an ever-changing world, forcing the United States and European allies to conduct joint military operations to maintain global order.

This chapter will examine the complicated process of NATO decision-making within the scope of U.S. strategic interests, as well as to what extent other states have the autonomy to shape decisions, even in a U.S.-dominated system. Specifically, this chapter will seek to answer the question of whether U.S. strategic interests dominantly influence NATO decisions to conduct military operations. While some could argue that U.S. interests dictate and influence the alliance's decision-making on whether to conduct operations, my hypothesis states that other factors exist that motivate NATO involvement that reflect the interests of other states and the organization itself. This topic is relevant because it can help show whether NATO's decisions to conduct military operations go beyond the United States and its strategic interests and if other members have a voice in the decision-making process outside of U.S. dictation.

The first section of this chapter will look at the basics of NATO decision-making and its functions as a security institution. The next section will examine the role of other states within NATO's structure and how they influence decision-making. Lastly, this chapter will study the influence of the United States and its strategic interests in NATO's decision-making process. This chapter will dissect U.S. interests, other states' interests, and NATO's interests in the alliance's decision-making process and analyze the extent that these factors can influence how NATO decides to conduct military operations, particularly in the post-September 11 world. This chapter looks at military conflicts that demonstrated a heightened American interest and involvement to investigate whether NATO's eventual involvement was influenced solely by U.S. strategic interests or other interests. To understand NATO's military effectiveness in the post-Cold War world, I think it is relevant to investigate whether the alliance shrinks under the pressure of U.S. strategic interests or if it rises to the occasion to take into account the interests of other member states and the alliance itself.

NATO's Decision-Making: The Factors and Rules that Determine Action

To answer the question of how U.S. strategic interests factor into NATO decision-making, one needs to understand NATO's process to determine action. Institutions are created because states have a vested interest in its actions. Robert Keohane noted that international actors that seek to attain their interests will require "systematic and durable cooperation" and institutions will seek "to attain their ends, including increasing their shares of gains from cooperation, through the use of political influence."⁴ To sum up, institutional cooperation allows states to increase their benefits in issues of international

⁴ Robert O. Keohane, "Institutional Theory and the Realist Challenge After the Cold War," in *Neorealism and Neoliberalism: The Contemporary Debate*, ed. David A. Baldwin. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1993), 274.

political importance. As an organization, NATO was created to defend Europe and maintain stability with a significant U.S. footprint. The reason for U.S. involvement can be summed up by John Ikenberry, who argued that following World War II, “the United States saw its goals for Europe expand,” realizing that reorienting and stabilizing Europe was in its interest as the conflict with the Soviet Union expanded.⁵ However, according to scholar Ellen Hallams,

NATO is a formalised alliance whose members meet regularly and work together through institutional structures designed to facilitate agreement and consensus. It acts as a ‘consensus engine,’ whereby decisions are taken only with the agreement of all member states, unlike an ad hoc coalition, where states can opt in and opt out as they choose... Like a coalition, its members have come together for a common purpose and may offer resources and capabilities to that end, but unlike a coalition, there is nothing temporary or transient about the NATO alliance and it is its institutional structures that give NATO its permanence.⁶

In addition to this idea, John Duffield placed importance on NATO’s “denationalization of security policy,” which means that the interests of the alliance have more weight than one nation.⁷ Duffield argues that the denationalization, which includes NATO’s “consultative organs, force planning process, and integrated military structure help forge a common identity among alliance members,” allows members to view operations in the interest of the alliance itself in addition to their own national interests.⁸ Yet there appears to be a discrepancy between the ideal functioning of NATO and the theory of liberal institutionalism as the guide to cooperation in international organizations. NATO may have structures in place to “denationalize” the interests of its

⁵ G. John Ikenberry, “State Power and the Institutional Bargain: America’s Ambivalent Economic and Security Multilateralism,” in *US Hegemony and International Organizations*, ed. Rosemary Foot, S. Neil McFarlane, and Michael Mastanduno (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), 61.

⁶ Ellen Hallams, *The United States and NATO Since 9/11: The Transatlantic Alliance Renewed*, (London: Routledge, 2010), 56.

⁷ John S. Duffield, “NATO’s Functions after the Cold War,” *Political Science Quarterly* 109, no. 5 (05, 1994-1995), 775.

⁸ Ibid.

members, but NATO still functions as a cooperative security institution on the conceptions of its members' own self-interests, which is a key point of the liberal institutionalist theory.⁹ Countries still view their participation in NATO actions through the guise of its own self-interests, which would go against the ideal concept of NATO's functionality according to Duffield.

Particularly, NATO's actions in military conflicts are governed by Article 5 of its charter. Article 5 stipulates the reasons for action.

“The Parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all and consequently they agree that, if such an armed attack occurs, each of them, in exercise of the right of individual or collective self-defence recognised by Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, will assist the Party or Parties so attacked by taking forthwith, individually and in concert with the other Parties, such action as it deems necessary, including the use of armed force, to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area.”¹⁰

However, for NATO to carry out operations, a decision-making process needs to be utilized that allows all the member-states to have a voice in the alliance. The process of decision-making for NATO occurs on the basis of consensus. NATO's functioning capability is divided into military and defensive structures with the Military Committee making proposals for the military decisions, while the North Atlantic Council (NAC) serves as the governing body that makes decisions on action by reaching an agreement.¹¹ The NAC allows for consensus to be reached when “no government states its objection” during the decision-making process, which does not include a formal vote on action.¹²

⁹Keohane, “Institutional Theory and the Realist Challenge After the Cold War,” 271.

¹⁰ “The North Atlantic Treaty,” North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Accessed September 29, 2012, http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_17120.htm

¹¹ U.S. Library of Congress, CRS, *NATO's Decision-Making Procedure*, by Paul Gallis, CRS Report RS21510 (Washington, DC: Office of Congressional Information and Publishing, May 5, 2003), Accessed November 15, 2012, <http://www.fas.org/man/crs/RS21510.pdf>

¹² Ibid.

Like all the nations in the organization, they have an equal voice at the table when deciding whether to take military action, but all decisions require consensus. According to Hallams, there are benefits to this structure because NATO can set expectations for behavior and maintain consensus in a way that is more structured and effective than using “ad-hoc coalitions.”¹³ The interesting thing about this is there is no strict interpretation in the Treaty where unanimity is needed. According to Jack Vincent, Ira Straus, and Richard Biondi, Ambassador Theodore Achilles, an author of the Treaty, noted that “NATO planners deliberately left that point flexible so that the Council (NAC) would be free to act (as it rarely has) without consensus. Nevertheless, the daily practice of NATO decisionmaking has historically emphasized unanimity. As long as there was only one real mission – to plan, prepare, and exercise together for joint resistance to an invasion of Western Europe – the rule of unanimity and the practice of consensus were considered pragmatic and not too damaging constraints.”¹⁴

Over time, there has been a shift in the functions of NATO and the weight that NATO places on certain operations. Charlotte Wagnsson stated that the evolution of NATO’s security structure and its strategic concept has allowed it to define itself based on a broad security understanding that is directed towards new challenges that fall out of the realm of the Article 5 governance.¹⁵ Rather than having a reactionary security structure, NATO has morphed from a strictly defensive organization to a security organization that focuses on maintaining security and stability rather than deterring

¹³ Hallams, “The Transatlantic Alliance Renewed: The United States and NATO Since 9/11,” 53.

¹⁴ Jack E. Vincent, Ira L. Straus, Richard R. Biondi, “Capability Theory and the Future of NATO’s Decisionmaking Rules,” *Journal of Peace Research* 38, no. 1 (01, 2001), 70-71.

¹⁵ Charlotte Wagnsson, “NATO’s Role in the Strategic Concept Debate: Watchdog, Fire-Fighter, Neighbour, or Seminar Leader?” *Cooperation and Conflict* 46, no. 4 (04, 2011), 484.

aggression.¹⁶ When NATO reviewed its strategic concept in 1991, it realized that the threats shifted away from Soviet aggression to matters that could cause instability in the region and greatly cause significant “economic, social, and political” consequences.¹⁷

The post-Cold War thinking of NATO focused more on the rights of the individual rather than the defense of nations.¹⁸ However, the success of this shift did not come without a price that included the failure to effectively build consensus in a swift manner in order to deploy before a situation deteriorated further. This was evident in NATO’s operations in Kosovo when the consensus-building process impeded NATO from quickly agreeing on target packages for bombing runs in Kosovo. According to Hallams, “NATO’s ‘war by committee’ also gave rise to a series of operational and tactical weaknesses with NATO members finding it difficult to agree on a common approach during Operation Allied Force.”¹⁹ As I will discuss later, the other states in NATO had significant influence in preventing a consensus from being reached to conduct bombing runs in Kosovo causing concern on the part of the United States to remain involved in NATO for future operations. However, in the end, this was how NATO was intended to function with all its members working to reach consensus on how to conduct effective military operations in order to have an impact on the conflict.

Following the Prague summit of 2002, NATO’s transformation evolved even further to prevent this indecisive consensus-building from impeding its functions and alienating certain partners. Out of the Prague summit came the creation of the NATO

¹⁶ Ibid., 487

¹⁷ Celeste A. Wallander, “Institutional Assets and Adaptability: NATO After the Cold War.” *International Organization* 54, no. 4 (04, 2000): 718.

¹⁸ Rebecca R. Moore, *NATO’s New Mission: Projecting Stability in a Post-Cold War World* (Westport: Praeger Security International, 2007), 41.

¹⁹ Hallams, “The Transatlantic Alliance Renewed: The United States and NATO Since 9/11,” 43-44.

Response Force (NRF), which “has the overarching purpose of being able to provide a rapid military response to an emerging crisis. The force gives NATO the means to respond swiftly to various types of crises anywhere in the world. It is also a driving engine of NATO’s military transformation.”²⁰ Rebecca Moore stated that this force was developed because the United States rejected NATO after the Kosovo operation, forcing NATO to reevaluate its capabilities and find better methods to become involved in these “high-intensity operations,” not Article 5 operations and actions that were focused on peacekeeping.²¹

All these ideas are important in understanding how U.S. strategic interests can factor into NATO’s decision-making for conducting military operations. Most importantly, cooperation is vital for NATO to be successful in its operations and there is an interest for countries to maintain the cooperation. NATO’s functions and processes have an impact on decision-making in spite of U.S. strategic interests. NATO’s post-Cold War priorities that include the economic, political, and humanitarian principles that are governed by democracies have contributed to NATO’s shifting functions to become more of a proactive security institution rather than a reactive defensive institution. While the United States does have significant influence over these actions, NATO’s governing structure appears to hold more weight when it comes to making military decisions.

Other States’ Interests and How They Impact Decision-Making

While the framework of NATO’s decision-making process allows for a consensus on conducting various operations, other states can still have influence over the process even with the considerable influence of the United States. Following the end of the Cold

²⁰ “The NATO Response Force,” North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Accessed November 9, 2012, http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/topics_49755.htm

²¹ Moore, *NATO’s New Mission: Projecting Stability in a Post-Cold War World*, 88-89

War, NATO foreign ministers, particularly those in Europe, realized that there was a need to build a “new peaceful order in Europe,” and that the “changing European environment now requires of us a broader approach to security based as much on constructive peace-building as on peace-keeping.”²² According to Hallams, after the end of the Cold War, there was a tendency on the part of the Europeans to handle their own issues without any action from the United States. “European leaders were eager to demonstrate that...they were ready and able to deal with European security issues without having to rely on the [United States] for help.”²³ The United States would eventually dismiss this eagerness with regards to the European Union (EU), but more on that later in the chapter.

There can be a benefit for countries to be more involved in NATO than other organizations that may serve the same purposes for European nations. One could immediately argue that EU has a role to play in European security and prosperity, but without the involvement of the United States in the security decisions of Europe like in NATO. However, according to Rebecca Moore, there are more benefits to the power of NATO rather than the EU:

Indeed, the argument that membership in the EU rather than NATO constitutes the ultimate prize ignores the fact that, to the larger task of consolidating a liberal order in Europe, NATO contributes two crucial commodities that the EU cannot provide: military power in defense of shared values and a strong link to the United States, whose military strength continues to be regarded as vital to the defense of the values for which NATO stands.²⁴

Those two benefits place NATO in a league of its own when it comes to the significant impact the alliance has to promote the security interests of European nations. It is also worth noting that NATO’s structures allow the organization to achieve greater success in

²² Fergus Carr and Kostas Ifantis, *NATO in the New European Order*, (London: MacMillan Press LTD, 1996), 63.

²³ Hallams, “The Transatlantic Alliance Renewed: The United States and NATO Since 9/11,” 41.

²⁴ Moore, *NATO’s New Mission: Projecting Stability in a Post-Cold War World*, 67.

certain operations than other international organizations. For instance, the Kosovo operation offered an example where “the EU... would certainly not have been able to accomplish what NATO achieved given their lack of military capabilities. Furthermore, it could be argued that it was only NATO’s institutional structures and combined military capabilities that the alliance was able to achieve its objectives.”²⁵

While the EU may not have been the right actor for specific security missions, the European nations in their NATO capacities saw a need to actively engage in the alliance’s post-Cold war missions. According to David Yost, in conflicts in the Balkans, European allies “were clearly interested in taking vigorous action—in practice, Operation Deliberate Force—to prevent a politically and strategically damaging outcome to the [Bosnian] crisis. Beyond the humanitarian concerns, US and allied leaders wished to contain the risks of the fighting spilling over to other parts of the former Yugoslavia (such as Kosovo) and to other countries, such as Albania, Greece, FYROM [Republic of Macedonia] and Turkey.”²⁶ This could explain the reasoning for European involvement in NATO decision-making, but the Europeans also prevented consensus because of their indecisiveness on the targets for the Kosovo operations in 1999.

While the United States may have significant influence in NATO decision-making, it seems that other states like Great Britain or France also have greater influence in NATO’s decisions than some of the other members.²⁷ According to Tom Lansford, “ideally the interests and opinions of each of the memberstates count equally.”²⁸ The liberal institutionalism theory offers an interesting perspective here because the influence

²⁵ Hallams, *The United States and NATO Since 9/11: The Transatlantic Alliance Renewed*, 43.

²⁶ David S. Yost, “NATO and the anticipatory use of force,” *International Affairs*, 83, no. 1 (01, 2007), 51.

²⁷ Tom Lansford, *All for One: Terrorism, NATO and the United States*, (Burlington: Ashgate, 2002), 60.

²⁸ *Ibid.*

that the other states can provide within the confines of an institution would allow it to achieve greater influence while utilizing the benefits of cooperation to achieve its goals. Steve Weber argued that even though NATO has been “distinctly nonmultilateral” through its history with the United States holding command of the decision-making power and responsibility, the functions of NATO are more aligned with the multilateral principles because it was created to provide security to the other members.²⁹

With this principle, NATO functioned as a method to take the interests of all the states into account, not just the interests of the United States. Sometimes the interests would align, but they could differ at times and the United States would not necessarily hold all the weight. In fact, at times the interests of other states would diverge causing there to be a problem with the consensus-building process. As Galia Press-Barnathan stated, a “divergence” of interests on security could influence decisions that might not necessarily fulfill U.S. interests. When it comes to European security interests, they lie within the realm of Europe and there is a difference in what constitutes a significant security threat for Europe as compared to the United States because Europe focuses its security on whether economic, social, and cultural aspects are affected.³⁰ It is also worth noting that the interests of the EU do not factor into the consensus-building process and NATO decision-making. As the role of the EU has evolved over the years, there was a need for further cooperation between the two entities, considering the common interests. However, according to the 2002 EU-NATO declaration on the European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP), the EU and NATO have an understanding that they “are

²⁹ Steve Weber, “Shaping the Postwar Balance of Power: Multilateralism in NATO,” *International Organization* 46, no. 3 (03, 1992), 633.

³⁰ Galia Press-Barnathan, “Managing the Hegemon: NATO Under Unipolarity,” *Security Studies* 15, no. 2 (02, 2006), 277.

organisations of a different nature” and they have a “due regard for the decision-making autonomy and interests” of each organization.³¹ Regardless of the interests that each organization may have in the other, NATO and the EU respect the independence of each other to make decisions that are in the best interest of the organization.

As Duffield recognized, there was a “persistence of NATO” after the Cold War because it was in the interest of the nations to preserve an institution that continues to “perform a number of valuable security functions,” regardless of the differences they may have had with other nations about NATO’s purposes.³² While NATO continues to be utilized as a method to maintain security throughout Europe, Charles Glaser argued that non-security interests like humanitarian values could factor into NATO decisions because there is an interest by other states to prevent wars and reducing death and destruction to prevent damage to economic interests.³³ Glaser’s argument could not necessarily account for a reason for U.S. involvement, but it could show that other states have interests of their own to maintain order or ensure security. One could argue that this idea causes member-states to think in terms of the collective good when making decisions in NATO. This could potentially explain the issues in the consensus-building process to reach decisions on operations, which caused problems for the United States when NATO took military action previously in Kosovo.

Stephen M. Walt had another way of looking at alliances and institutions, particularly through the perspective of a “unipolar world,” where the global community is dominated by a superpower. Walt noted that “the condition of unipolarity inevitably

³¹ “EU-NATO Declaration on ESDP,” North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Accessed November 27, 2014, http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_19544.htm

³² *Ibid.*, 767.

³³ Charles L. Glaser, “Why NATO is Still Best,” *International Security* 18, no. 1 (01, 1993), 15-16.

shapes the alliance choices that are available to different states.”³⁴ He argued that “today’s medium and lesser powers” would align with the United States, because they want the cover of U.S. power to deal with regional threats.³⁵ He added that a feature of unipolarity is if the unipole chooses to “mold” the political system to its image and play an active role in ensuring order, “it would inevitably be involved in many issues.”³⁶ It could be argued that since the United States helped create NATO and mold it in its image, it sought to utilize cooperation while still maintaining significant influence. Even as NATO has shifted away from the Cold War-era, the United States maintained an interest influencing the institution and sustaining a footprint in Europe, requiring the United States’ involvement.

The Role of the U.S. Strategic Interests in Decision-Making

While NATO’s structures and the influence of its other states have an impact in its overall decisions for military actions, the role of the United States is just as important to determining whether NATO will conduct military operations. According to scholarly opinion, the United States is a key player in maintaining NATO’s relevance within the global order, particularly because it sees a vested interest in European security policy.

John Ikenberry argued that institutions serve as a way to “help create a more favourable and certain political environment in which the leading state pursues its interests.”³⁷

During the Cold War, the United States had sizable influence in NATO’s decisions when deterring Soviet threats. The United States had an interest in Western Europe’s stability and containing the Soviet Union. The reason for NATO’s creation was to deter a Soviet

³⁴ Stephen M. Walt, “Alliances in a Unipolar World,” *World Politics* 61, no.1 (01, 2009), 88.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 88. Also see, Stephen M. Walt, *Taming American Power: The Global Response to U.S. Primacy* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2005), 187-191.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 99.

³⁷ Ikenberry, “State Power and the Institutional Bargain,” 51.

military action and if deterrence failed, NATO would defend Europe against an attack.³⁸

Ted Galen Carpenter argues that the United States viewed maintaining NATO as “crucial” because “the basic American interest in Europe is to prevent any power or combination of hostile powers from achieving a hegemonic position and thereby controlling the major industrial states of Western Europe.”³⁹

The U.S. role in NATO does not appear different from the original concept of NATO. Global events have allowed the United States to maintain its power and influence. Also, it is in America’s interest to maintain a stake in NATO, because of the importance placed on international cooperation. According to Stanley Sloan, “without continuing military cooperation in NATO, the United States and its allies would find it difficult to conduct the kind of coalition military operations that were so key to the success in the [1991] war against Iraq.”⁴⁰ He then argues a point that, “ongoing military cooperation in NATO creates the potential for cooperative military intervention in situations that threaten peace, whether in or beyond Europe.”⁴¹ In the end, Frank R. Douglas emphasized that “NATO is the best institution and mechanism for continued American political and military involvement in the affairs of Europe. It also serves to help amplify American prestige and perceptions about its military power in Europe and around the world.”⁴² As Moore explained earlier in the chapter, European nations saw NATO as “the ultimate prize” over organizations like the EU because it offered those

³⁸ Wallander, “Institutional Assets and Adaptability: NATO After the Cold War,” 712.

³⁹ Ted Galen Carpenter, “Conflicting Agenda and the Future of NATO,” *Journal of Strategic Studies* 17 no. 4 (04, 1994), 154-156.

⁴⁰ Stanley R. Sloan, “NATO and the United States,” in *NATO in the Post-Cold War Era: Does It Have a Future?* ed. S. Victor Papacosma and Mary Ann Heiss. (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1995), 169.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*

⁴² Frank R. Douglas, *The United States, NATO, and a New Multilateral Relationship* (Westport: Praeger Security International, 2008), 145.

nations benefits, such as military power to defend shared interests and the link to the power of the United States.⁴³

The key point of the research question is to investigate how U.S. strategic interests impact NATO's decision-making to conduct military operations. It could be argued that the United States is the "single, strongly dominant actor in international politics" and it forces "collectively desirable outcomes for *all* states in the international system."⁴⁴ Its interests and influence could significantly impact the stability of the international system, particularly within the realm of NATO decision-making. Glaser noted that in the post-Cold War world, NATO could not achieve certain responsibilities without American involvement, because it needs America to be successful.⁴⁵ It seems that without U.S. involvement, NATO cannot be effective, which allows the United States greater ability to exert influence over other countries as the hegemon.

According to Terry Terriff, the substantial military contribution of the United States to NATO continues to give it significant power. Following the Cold War, when the United States "wanted something strongly enough, it could through consultation and persuasion, even including diplomatic arm twisting, convince the European members to agree. There has long been a general sense that where the [United States] led, the rest of NATO usually followed."⁴⁶ This also had an effect when the EU wanted to become more integrated into the security interests of Europe. However, there was considerable disagreement from the United States to have the EU have its own role in preserving

⁴³ Moore, *NATO's New Mission: Projecting Stability in a Post-Cold War World*, 67.

⁴⁴ Duncan Snidal, "The Limits of Hegemonic Stability Theory," *International Organization* 39 no. 4 (04, 1985), 579.

⁴⁵ Glaser, "Why NATO is Still Best," 47.

⁴⁶ Terry Terriff, "Fear and Loathing in NATO: The Atlantic Alliance After the Crisis over Iraq," *Perspectives on European Politics & Society* 5, no. 3 (03, 2004), 426.

security for European nations. According to Richard Rupp, there was “skepticism” by the United States when the “EU wanted to draw on NATO assets in the planning and execution of EU military missions.”⁴⁷ Furthermore, the United States saw the risk of the EU “duplicating assets” that NATO already had, thus potentially hurting the role of NATO in projecting stability and security in Europe.⁴⁸ This is another episode that showed how the United States was able to exert its influence on NATO’s future actions and matters pertaining to European defense.

If there was a moment that began the U.S. apprehension to using the NATO process for military operations, it was the Balkans campaign and the impasse with consensus-building, according to Hallams. She argued that, “NATO’s mission in Kosovo in 1999 proved to be deeply divisive, as the politics of alliance decision-making once again exposed numerous schisms within the alliance. Although ultimately successful, NATO’s operation in Kosovo left the Americans feeling distinctly weary of conducting ‘war by committee.’”⁴⁹ It is plausible to argue that the United States did not want to resort to a consensus decision-making process in order to get approval to conduct a military operation.

While it is in the American interest to be involved in NATO, the United States wants to avoid being bogged down by the delay of consensus-building. Hallams argued that “NATO can only undertake action when all its members are in agreement and...when member states cannot agree on a course of action, NATO becomes a victim

⁴⁷ Richard E. Rupp, *NATO After 9/11: An Alliance in Continuing Decline* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), 91.

⁴⁸ Ibid.

⁴⁹ Ellen Hallams, “The Transatlantic Alliance Renewed: The United States and NATO Since 9/11,” *Journal of Transatlantic Studies* 7, no. 1 (01, 2009), 40.

of its own institutional structures.”⁵⁰ In addition, she argued that because of the “careful scrutiny of targets...it nevertheless created the impression of a divided alliance and gave rise to a determination within the Pentagon that for future operations ‘No one is going to tell us where we can and can’t bomb.’”⁵¹ In other words, the United States was not willing to go through this process again, particularly if the conflict impacted its interests in a more profound way than the peacekeeping missions in Eastern Europe. In order for NATO to be successful, there needs to be U.S. buy-in, as well as from the other parties, because as liberal institutionalism stipulates, there are strategic benefits to cooperation. Most importantly, in conflicts where American interest was the greatest, there could have been a need for the United States to have assistance from its allies, including NATO.

Methodology and Hypothesis

After reviewing the body of literature on NATO decision-making, it seems that United States strategic interests has a significant role in determining whether NATO will conduct a military operation, mainly because the United States is the most powerful member. The body of literature reviewed also indicates that the interests of the alliance as a whole and the strategic interests of the other member-states can influence the organization’s decision-making to conduct an operation. As evidenced in the literature review, while the United States did have significant influence in NATO decisions, the literature does support my claim that the interests of NATO through its consensus building process and other members’ interests motivate NATO’s actions in a conflict. NATO’s structures utilize mechanisms like consensus building and factoring in the

⁵⁰ Ibid., 42.

⁵¹ Ibid., 43. Also, see Gen. Wesley Clark “An Army of One?” *The Washington Monthly* 34, no. 9 (09, 2002).

interests of other members can have an impact, even while U.S. strategic interests may still have dominant influence.

If my claim is true, I would expect to see in my case studies that these other members' interests and NATO's interests would have a significant impact towards NATO decision-making on whether to take military action in particular conflicts. For cases, this chapter will look at the post-September 11th period focusing on conflicts where the United States had the greatest interest. From this criterion and the results of the literature review, the conflicts in Afghanistan and Iraq are relevant because those were the two military operations where the United States was heavily invested. If there is a case where one should expect a large influence of U.S. strategic interests, then these wars are it. Afghanistan is of particular interest because the United States conducted this war to avenge the attacks of September 11, particularly because the Taliban-controlled government provided a safe haven to Al Qaeda for its attack. In addition, the war in Iraq is important for examining American strategic interests, because it manifests the largest U.S. presence in a conflict in the last decade. This chapter will use process tracing to investigate these various conflicts to determine whether NATO or other states' held more influence over decision-making even within the realm of conflicts with major U.S. strategic interests.

Case Study: NATO's Role in Afghanistan

Following the terrorist attacks by Al Qaeda on September 11, 2001, the role of the alliance changed dramatically. The United States focused its attention on avenging the attacks by conducting a military operation against the country that provided a safe haven to Al Qaeda. NATO offered to help and for the first time in its history, NATO invoked

Article 5 of the NATO charter, which stated that an attack on one NATO nation was an attack on all of NATO. While NATO was very involved in conflicts across the Balkans during the Clinton administration, it was the administration of President George W. Bush that did not see much benefit for NATO to have a key role in the U.S. plan to respond to September 11 with a military operation in Afghanistan.⁵² The United States chose a more “unilateralist” approach at the outset of the Afghanistan conflict because the Bush administration was frustrated with NATO’s lack of precision capabilities during the conflicts in the Balkans.⁵³

While this led the European allies in NATO to feel a sense of discouragement, it actually pushed NATO to transform itself to prepare for the looming threat of terrorism; a transformation that Hallams notes was driven by the United States, which still maintained strong commitments to NATO.⁵⁴ However, while the United States was responsible for beginning the conflict in Afghanistan against the Taliban and Al Qaeda, it was NATO that took over management of the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) from the United Nations in 2003. In order to understand what caused this shift, I will examine how the United States advocated for NATO’s involvement following the initial stages of the operation and NATO’s decisions through consensus for involvement in Afghanistan.

U.S. Strategic Interests

Following the September 11 attacks, NATO invoked Article 5 of its charter for the first time in its history. However, while the charter stipulated that NATO would provide any assistance needed following the attack of a member-state, the Bush administration only sought to use NATO as a small component of a much wider coalition

⁵² Hallams, *The United States and NATO Since 9/11: The Transatlantic Alliance Renewed*, 1.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, 2

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*

to avenge the attacks.⁵⁵ According to Hallams, regardless of the invocation of Article 5, the United States did not seek to use any of NATO's structures or utilize NATO collective action against the Taliban and Al Qaeda in Afghanistan, only asking for contributions from member-nations that were "willing to engage in combat operations."⁵⁶ Following the invocation of Article 5 by NATO, it did not take long for the United States to quiet speculation about a substantial role for NATO, particularly with comments made by U.S. Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld about whether NATO would take a role in planning operations to retaliate for the attacks. Rumsfeld stated that, "the mission determines the coalition, the coalition must not be permitted to determine the mission."⁵⁷

Basically, the United States was telling NATO "thanks, but no thanks" to your offer for substantial involvement in Afghanistan. An interesting point that Hallams argued is that the nature of NATO's involvement in Afghanistan was different from past NATO operations, pre-September 11. She stated that, "Unlike in Bosnia and Kosovo, where only NATO had the capabilities to mount a military campaign, following 9/11 NATO was one of many options the United States had at its disposal. Unlike in the Balkans, where Europe depended upon U.S. involvement and indeed, leadership, in Afghanistan the harsh reality was that the U.S. simply was not dependent upon NATO support."⁵⁸ This occurred because the Bush administration was concerned after the Balkans experience that if there was NATO involvement, the decision-making and war-fighting strategy that was "clumsy and constrained" should not be repeated.⁵⁹ Hallams

⁵⁵ Ibid., 58

⁵⁶ Ibid.

⁵⁷ Ibid.

⁵⁸ Ibid., 60

⁵⁹ Ibid., 61. Also, see Robert Kagan, *Of Paradise and Power: America and Europe in the New World Order*, (New York: Vintage Books, 2004)

further noted that the Bush administration had “disdain” for the role of multilateralism, particularly when the administration was determined to pursue its own interests through a unilateral approach, and this tactic initially worked towards America’s advantage.⁶⁰

Following this development, the United States conducted Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF) through an ad hoc coalition, which allowed for a swift defeat of the Taliban through airstrikes and utilized U.S. Special Forces to train Afghani tribal forces to take over the country. Even with its overall command, the Americans did not encounter much difficulty in conducting this operation in a rapid and effective manner. According to Tom Lansford, “the outcome of the military campaign seemed to confirm the utility of the American approach. After the demise of the Taliban, one of the main lessons that emerged was that ‘a military hub-and-spoke command operation has worked far better for Washington than the consensus decision-making on which it had to rely during NATO air campaigns over Kosovo and Serbia in 1999, which left many in the U.S. Defense Department deeply frustrated.’”⁶¹ After the victory against the Taliban in the span of a month, the United Nations authorized the ISAF to serve as an international peacekeeping force to maintain security in Kabul to assist with reconstructing the country.⁶² Due to America’s original inclination not to be dictated how it would fight its own war to avenge attacks on its soil, it was unwilling to use the structures of NATO decision-making to carry out operations. The American ability to serve as a hegemon in the unipolar world allowed it to dictate terms on how NATO would utilize its footprint in Afghanistan and who would be in charge of the operational command in Afghanistan.

⁶⁰ Ibid., 60

⁶¹ Lansford, *All for One: Terrorism, NATO and the United States*, 110-111. Also, see David M. Malone, “When America Banged the Table and the Others Fell Silent,” *New York Times*, December 11, 2001, Accessed November 15, 2012 http://www.nytimes.com/2001/12/11/opinion/11iht-edmalone_ed3_.html

⁶² Hallams, *The United States and NATO Since 9/11: The Transatlantic Alliance Renewed*, 67.

However, this go-it-alone strategy would come back to cause a negative impact on the American mission and push the United States into allowing for a greater NATO role.

The United States maintained the lead in operations in Afghanistan, but the it encountered problems in its ability to effectively carry out strategy in the post-war environment of Afghanistan. According to Hallams, “the greatest flaw in US strategy was that in their eagerness to commence a decisive and overwhelming military campaign, the Bush administration failed to adequately develop a post-war strategy for the stabilization and reconstruction of Afghanistan.”⁶³ The inability of American leadership to understand the challenges in Afghanistan contributed to this failure, which may have caused a greater need for NATO. However, Hallams pointed out that “only after the end of OEF and the setting of ISAF that the value of coalition and NATO contributions became apparent.”⁶⁴ The United States recognized that using an ad hoc coalition from the beginning may have allowed “greater operational freedom and flexibility.”⁶⁵ According to Hallams, “only when combat operations were over and reconstruction began did the [United States] realize the utility of an organization such as NATO.”⁶⁶

After analyzing the process of American interests in Afghanistan, it is evident that the United States was valid in its reasoning to sideline NATO during the beginning of OEF. The consensus-building process caused problems for the United States in the past, particularly during the Kosovo campaign and it proved to be a hindrance on America’s ability to exert its capabilities as the hegemon in order to conduct military operations. The need for a structured coalition that had the abilities and the resources provided by

⁶³ Ibid., 74

⁶⁴ Ibid.

⁶⁵ Ibid., 77

⁶⁶ Ibid., 79

NATO would have made sense to have initially if the United States understood the challenges that came with reconstruction. NATO's eventual involvement may have come with an American request to take on a greater role, but other interests did factor into NATO's decision-making to take on the lead role for the ISAF.

Other States' Interests

According to Press-Barnathan, "immediately after the United States began its operation in Afghanistan, there was a real eagerness on part of the European allies to offer military burden sharing to the operation."⁶⁷ In addition, the European states believed there was a mutual perception of the inherent threats by Islamic terrorists, not only to the United States, but also to the Western world, and Europe was "eager to cooperate with the United States."⁶⁸ While NATO did not take a major role initially in the conflict, NATO member-states did offer bilateral assistance to the United States in its efforts to respond to the attacks, particularly assistance from Great Britain, France, and Germany.⁶⁹ Press-Barnathan argued that the reason for European involvement was that these countries wanted the United States to remain an active part of the NATO alliance, not only as a way to keep the alliance relevant, but also to restrain and influence the United States on its policies in Afghanistan.⁷⁰

However, as seen in the previous section, the United States was not willing to repeat the problems it encountered during the Balkan campaigns and since this was an attack on the United States, there was a desire for the United States to handle this campaign on its own. Nevertheless, Press-Barnathan argues that the creation of ISAF

⁶⁷ Press-Barnathan, "Managing the Hegemon: NATO Under Unipolarity," 298.

⁶⁸ Ibid.

⁶⁹ Ibid.

⁷⁰ Ibid., 299

was a way for Europe to maintain involvement in Afghanistan operations and show that there was a positive “division-of-labor” strategy on their part, considering that the ISAF is a creation of the Europeans.⁷¹ Initially, major NATO allies had “rotating national commands” of the ISAF, such as Great Britain, Turkey, Germany, and the Netherlands.⁷² However, the United States still had operational command of stabilization efforts and the ISAF only served to complement U.S. involvement in Afghanistan

Following the swift victory that led to the defeat of the Taliban in Afghanistan, there was a role that the other states needed to play in the reconstruction of Afghanistan and prevent the country from becoming a terrorist safe haven again. As the United States began focusing its attention on the looming war in Iraq, the role of the United States in Afghanistan began to lessen. The interesting thing about the looming Iraq war was that there was tension between European allies in NATO and the United States, particularly over the request by NATO ally Turkey for the organization to invoke Article 4 in order to protect Turkey with deterrence aid if a war with Iraq was conducted.⁷³ Article 4 states that, “The Parties will consult together whenever, in the opinion of any of them, the territorial integrity, political independence or security of any of the Parties is threatened.”⁷⁴ There was a schism in NATO due to the sensitive nature of discussing the potential Iraq war, but it allowed the allies to move beyond the heated discussion to tackle common issues like Afghanistan.⁷⁵ It is fascinating to observe how the arguments

⁷¹ Ibid., 300

⁷² Mark Webber, “NATO: The United States, Transformation and the War in Afghanistan,” *British Journal of Politics and International Relations* 11, no. 1 (01, 2009), 55.

⁷³ Sten Rynning, *NATO in Afghanistan: The Liberal Disconnect*, (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2012), 87-88.

⁷⁴ “The North Atlantic Treaty,” North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Accessed September 29, 2012, http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_17120.htm

⁷⁵ Rynning, *NATO in Afghanistan: The Liberal Disconnect*, 88.

over one conflict did not serve all the states' interests and galvanized the states to see the importance in cooperating on ISAF operations in Afghanistan to ensure stability.

NATO's Interests

NATO's invocation of Article 5 called for its members to act in concert to maintain security of its member countries. This involved NATO sending assistance to the United States by patrolling the North American airspace, as well as patrolling Mediterranean Sea lanes to prevent potential threats from impacting American strategic interests.⁷⁶ While NATO was not given a substantial role in OEF during its initial phase, the United States did utilize NATO for several small contributions, such as intelligence sharing and cooperating.

In 2003, NATO took over operational command of the ISAF from the United Nations. According to NATO's deputy Secretary General Alessandro Minuto Rizzo at the time, assuming leadership of the command in Afghanistan made sense, since the ISAF had already included several NATO members from their involvement in the UN-mandated force and it also allowed NATO to have direct management over the conflict rather than its prior diminished role.⁷⁷ However, according to Rynning, the substantial role for NATO began before it took operational command of the ISAF. In spite of being sidelined by the United States for initial involvement in the operations in Afghanistan, it took on the role of "architect" of peacekeeping operations to maintain its relevance as a security organization following being shut out by the United States.⁷⁸ In addition, according to Rynning, NATO's ability to shift its strategy to utilize concepts like the NATO Response Force (NRF), that were developed during the Prague summit of 2002,

⁷⁶ Press-Barnathan, "Managing the Hegemon: NATO Under Unipolarity," 297.

⁷⁷ Rynning, *NATO in Afghanistan: The Liberal Disconnect*, 44-45.

⁷⁸ Rynning, *NATO in Afghanistan: The Liberal Disconnect*, 47.

also “laid the groundwork” for its role as the architect of ISAF operations when they were able to take over command.⁷⁹

Specifically, NATO made the decision for itself to take command of the ISAF because it believed it now had “the ability to address new security challenges and take on new missions.”⁸⁰ Most importantly, with the situation on the ground changing in 2003 and the looming presidential and parliamentary elections in 2004 in various NATO member countries, “the allies knew that an additional effort on their part was required because the security situation remained unsettled and tense.”⁸¹ There was a need for NATO to ensure that the provisions in the Bonn Agreement of 2001 (the agreement that created the current government in Afghanistan and set up the ISAF) were carried out effectively and a force like ISAF was utilized to counter the Taliban.⁸² As evidenced in the earlier information, NATO became involved because it was in its interest to provide stability and take over the lead, particularly with the United States focusing its attention on Iraq. If the situation spiraled out of control, it would have negatively impacted NATO and it was in the organization’s strategic interest to ensure that the country was able to achieve stability and continue to counter the Taliban.

While the United States prevented NATO’s significant involvement in initial Afghanistan operations, it eventually advocated for NATO to take a role in the stabilization efforts in Afghanistan following 2003. In addition, with the eventual shift to a different kind of mission, NATO as an institution understood that it needed to assist

⁷⁹ Ibid.

⁸⁰ Hallams, *The United States and NATO Since 9/11: The Transatlantic Alliance Renewed*, 76.

⁸¹ Rynning, *NATO in Afghanistan: The Liberal Disconnect*, 89.

⁸² Ibid., 84-85

with the stabilization efforts, because it was in their interests to prevent Afghanistan from becoming a terrorist safe haven in the future.

Case Study: NATO's Role in Iraq

When studying the recent war in Iraq, one tends to remember that the United States had a unilateral approach of becoming embroiled in a military operation alone while dictating the terms for involvement by other nations in a “coalition of the willing.” However, while the United States did push for the war, other allies (not including Great Britain), and NATO itself did not want to get involved in the conflict because it was not in their collective interests to do so. According to Hallams, “Between December 2002 and March 2003, the transatlantic community became locked in a titanic diplomatic struggle, not only with Saddam Hussein, but also within itself, as the [United States] sought to lead the charge to war only to find itself facing significant opposition from many of its traditional NATO allies.”⁸³ This battle between the allies could have destroyed the alliance.⁸⁴ The fascinating thing about this case is that while NATO eventually became involved in the conflict in Iraq with a light footprint, other states’ interests prevented NATO from becoming entrenched in Iraq.

U.S. Strategic Interests

As the United States was responding to the global war on terror, it began to re-engage on the issue of Iraq’s intransigence. The United States and Iraq were in a constant war of words and some infrequent airstrikes following Iraq’s withdrawal from Kuwait after the 1991 Gulf War. The attacks on September 11 changed the thinking of American policy makers because the global war on terror gave the United States an

⁸³ Ibid., 85

⁸⁴ Ibid.

opportunity to finally oust the regime of Saddam Hussein by connecting his regime to Al Qaeda.⁸⁵ As the United States took its case to the global stage, including the United Nations, it was met with opposition from fellow allies, particularly those in NATO. According to Hallams, the push for military action and bickering between the parties caused a “fundamental schism within the transatlantic alliance” because there were different perceptions by the countries on what constituted major threats to their interests.⁸⁶ The United States focused on preventing Saddam Hussein from acquiring weapons of mass destruction that he could use on American citizens and with the wounds of September 11 a year old, this potential threat was even more important for the Bush administration. This caused global opinion to be mixed with some arguing that the Bush administration was using September 11 as a “smokescreen for putting in place long-held objectives” to finish the job from 1991.⁸⁷

Specifically, the United States had asked NATO to provide assistance to Turkey, a member-nation, under Article 4 of the NATO charter to deter any attack from Iraq if a conflict was to occur and U.S. troops would enter Northern Iraq from Turkey.⁸⁸ The United States used this route to enable a role for NATO, because it believed that it was better equipped to provide support for Turkey in the event of an attack by Iraq as a result of an American invasion. According to Terriff, “NATO was a perfect vehicle to provide the equipment and military personnel to improve Turkey’s security from the American point of view. Alliance involvement would have no direct impact on the US military’s capacity to mount and conduct a large invasion of Iraq while sustaining a multitude of

⁸⁵ Ibid., 86

⁸⁶ Ibid., 87

⁸⁷ Ibid., 88

⁸⁸ Press-Barnathan, “Managing the Hegemon: NATO Under Unipolarity,” 303.

other overseas commitments.”⁸⁹ While the United States would go it alone, the future would still hold a need for alliance assistance.

Following another swift victory by United States Armed Forces against another opponent in the region, America was faced with reconstruction efforts that were difficult to accomplish on its own and with its small coalition of allies. According to Hallams,

In the weeks and months following the end of combat operations, CENTCOM Commander General John Abizaid was forced to admit that the [United States] simply did not have sufficient numbers of troops on the ground to establish security and quell the mounting disorder. Abizaid’s admission not only undermined any notion US troop levels could begin to decrease, it also reinforced the inherent weaknesses of operating outside of an organization such as NATO with its existing pool of troops and experience in peacebuilding operations.”⁹⁰

The lack of post-war planning contributed to this eventual admission and that certainly showed that NATO still had relevance with its functions as a security and peacekeeping organization. The United States eventually saw the advantages of utilizing NATO’s role in this process and according to Philip H. Gordon, NATO had “experience with peacekeeping and disarmament, an available pool of troops, existing command arrangements and a proven track record of promoting defense reform and civil-military relations in former authoritarian states,” which would assist greatly with combating the insurgency, enhancing post-war construction, and easing the burden off the United States.⁹¹ While NATO did not provide military operational capacity to assist the United States in its efforts, it did support the training of Iraqi Security Forces. At the time, training the Iraqi Security Forces, along with the U.S. counterinsurgency strategy, assisted with bringing more stability to the country and tamping down the insurgency.

⁸⁹ Terriff, “Fear and Loathing in NATO: The Atlantic Alliance After the Crisis over Iraq,” 425.

⁹⁰ Hallams, “The Transatlantic Alliance Renewed: The United States and NATO Since 9/11,” 51.

⁹¹ Philip H. Gordon, “An alliance for Iraq : A NATO role would heal many hurts,” *New York Times*, April 15, 2003, Accessed November 18, 2012 http://www.nytimes.com/2003/04/15/opinion/15iht-edgordon_ed3_.html

However, while the future of the Iraqi Security Forces is certainly questionable after its failure to stop the rise of the Islamic State, one cannot discount the success of NATO's role at the time to help ensure stability in the country.

Other States' Interests

Even as the drumbeat for war in Iraq grew louder with American overtures to the United Nations and its allies, there was significant opposition by other states to conduct military action against Iraq, including leaders of France and Germany, also two premier NATO members. Most of the debate occurred in the United Nations as the United States sought a resolution that would authorize the use of military force to take out Iraq's weapons of mass destruction.⁹² According to Press-Barnathan, there was a difference in the threat perceptions of the United States and its European allies. "On Iraq itself, it is clear that countries such as France, Germany, and Russia simply did not buy into the argument linking Saddam's dark regime with the 'war on terror.' American genuinely perceived a threat from Iraq, but Europeans genuinely did not."⁹³ While the United States and the other states differed on the threat perception, they also differed on which methods would work best for stopping Iraq's WMD program. France and Germany both argued in favor of "renewed [weapons] inspections," which were a better way to limit any threat posed by Iraq if it were found in possession of WMD.⁹⁴ As the United States made efforts to use NATO for protection over Turkey under Article 4, Belgium, France, and Germany resisted pressure to meet Turkey's requests and blocked multilateral action

⁹² Hallams, *The United States and NATO Since 9/11: The Transatlantic Alliance Renewed*, 86.

⁹³ Press-Barnathan, "Managing the Hegemon: NATO Under Unipolarity," 302. Also, see Phillip Gordon and Jeremy Shapiro, *Allies At War: America, Europe and the Crisis Over Iraq*, (New York: McGraw-Hill, 2004).

⁹⁴ Terriff, "Fear and Loathing in NATO: The Atlantic Alliance After the Crisis over Iraq," 423.

by NATO.⁹⁵ The assistance allowed Turkey to resist any attack from Iraq and while NATO was not the vehicle for providing these assets, the deterrence was provided on a bilateral basis, which the Treaty does offer as an option.⁹⁶ In addition, several of these countries had more to lose if America continued its aggression in the region, particularly France, because of its economic ties to the region.⁹⁷ Most importantly, the other states did not want the United States to use NATO “as a rubber stamp for American policy.”⁹⁸

Regardless of the position of the other states and the push to include NATO in the initial operations, Great Britain was heavily involved in Iraq military actions from the beginning, since the importance their leaders placed on the “special relationship” with the United States.⁹⁹ Terriff argued that in addition to Great Britain, there were other NATO members that supported the United States in its efforts, such as the “new” NATO allies and “those states recently invited to join the alliance” because they saw the United States as the “main provider of their security in Europe.”¹⁰⁰ While there is no clear distinction by Terriff of these other nations, it is evident from the list of coalition members released by the Bush administration in 2003 that the NATO member-nations in the coalition included, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Spain, and Turkey.¹⁰¹ While these countries provided assistance during combat

⁹⁵ Christian Tuschoff, “NATO Cohesion from Afghanistan to Iraq,” in *European Security and Transatlantic Relations after 9/11 and the Iraq War*, ed. Heinz Gartner and Ian M. Cuthbertson. (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2005), 157.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, 158

⁹⁷ Press-Barnathan, “Managing the Hegemon: NATO Under Unipolarity,” 302.

⁹⁸ Gabriel Kolko, “Iraq, the United States and the End of the European Coalition,” *Journal of Contemporary Asia* 33, no. 3 (03, 2003), 296.

⁹⁹ Terriff, “Fear and Loathing in NATO: The Atlantic Alliance After the Crisis over Iraq,” 428.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*

¹⁰¹ “Operation Iraqi Freedom: Coalition Members,” The White House, Accessed November 18, 2012 <http://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2003/03/20030327-10.html>

operations, the role of the other states in determining NATO action did not reach a point of contention again until 2004.

As the war continued into 2004, there was an admission by President Bush that the United States needed NATO involvement to end the insurgency in Iraq caused by the end of Saddam Hussein's regime. However, as President Bush made the request, there was still opposition for an increased role for NATO by France and Germany, particularly during the G8 summit in June 2004.¹⁰² These countries eventually pushed NATO's agreement to provide assistance to training the Iraqi Security Forces. However, there still was opposition from French President Jacques Chirac who argued that, "I do not believe it is NATO's mission to intervene in Iraq."¹⁰³ It may not have been an ideal situation for the United States while it continued to be bogged down by the insurgency, but it did allow for NATO to provide help with stability by training Iraqi forces that could eventually take responsibility over protection of Iraq's infrastructure. This mission did not need to operate under consensus from the NAC and it seems that the opposition within the NAC was successful in blocking opposition to operational involvement in Iraq.¹⁰⁴ The differing opinions on the threat assessments by Germany and France caused an impasse in NATO's consensus-building. However, as I have examined, the interests of these other states and their apprehension for becoming embroiled in another Middle East conflict prevented NATO deploying combat forces to Iraq.

¹⁰² Hallams, "The Transatlantic Alliance Renewed: The United States and NATO Since 9/11," 51.

¹⁰³ Hallams, *The United States and NATO Since 9/11: The Transatlantic Alliance Renewed*, 101.

¹⁰⁴ David Capezza, "Iraq Training Mission Shows NATO's Future," *The New Atlanticist*, October 28, 2008, Accessed November 18, 2012 http://www.acus.org/new_atlanticist/iraq-training-mission-shows-natos-future

NATO's Interests

The interests of NATO member-states had a greater impact to decide NATO's course of action in Iraq than NATO's own mechanisms did. As I stated earlier, while the NAC sought to allow for an implementation of Article 4 to protect Turkey from potential retribution by Iraq for an American invasion, Belgium, France, and Germany blocked any action within the NAC for NATO to become involved. Regardless of the action to try to assist Turkey, these three countries were vocal in their opposition to the war. However, the opposition did not stand in the way of NATO eventually becoming involved.

As a collective organization, NATO agreed to offer assistance to train Iraqi Security Forces. Yet there was difficulty for NATO to join the conflict, due to its prior commitments in Afghanistan.¹⁰⁵ Because of these commitments, NATO did become involved, but with a lighter footprint because there were calls of opposition from France and Germany, and also Spain to send additional troops to Iraq.¹⁰⁶ NATO agreed at its 2004 Istanbul Summit to offer training to the Iraqi security forces after the transfer of power to the interim governmental authority.¹⁰⁷ In December 2004, the NATO Training Implementation Mission was succeeded by the NATO Training Mission – Iraq, which expanded NATO's mission in Iraq by “providing training and advice” and established training centers for Iraqi forces.¹⁰⁸ The training mission was under the “political” control of the NAC, but it did not involve any need for NATO to reach a consensus for action.¹⁰⁹ The ability to provide for this training mission and the mechanism that allowed for this mission to be initiated without NATO consensus was a positive development in NATO's

¹⁰⁵ Hallams, *The United States and NATO Since 9/11: The Transatlantic Alliance Renewed*, 100.

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁷ Hallams, “The Transatlantic Alliance Renewed: The United States and NATO Since 9/11,” 52.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁹ Capezza, “Iraq Training Mission Shows NATO's Future.”

light footprint in Iraq. Nevertheless, it shows how consensus can still hinder NATO's involvement in conflicts when it may be required that NATO provides a more substantial presence rather than training.

For Iraq, the interests of other states and NATO's functionality prevented it from having a larger footprint in the Iraq war. However, even while the other states utilized the consensus-building process to impede any NATO involvement, NATO still had a presence in Iraq with the training mission, which did not need a consensus in order to be approved. The interesting thing about this case was that the failure of the United States to understand the situation on the ground caused it to seek greater involvement from the alliance. However, its unilateral approach in the initial stages of the Iraq War may have contributed to the animosity between all the parties involved, perhaps causing the unwillingness of certain members to sign off on any combat operations.

Analysis: Other States' Interests and NATO Consensus Holds

The case studies above confirm the earlier hypothesis that other factors can have a significant impact towards influencing NATO decision-making even within the realm of dominant U.S. strategic interests. In fact, as expected, these two different factors have held even more weight in determining NATO's eventual actions in these two conflicts. As discussed in the earlier literature review, the American role as the lead state in creating NATO allowed it to achieve significant influence in NATO's structure, particularly during the Cold War. However, the literature review showed the role of the decision-making process and NATO's need for a consensus among the member-states in order to conduct military action. As NATO evolved, other states were able to exert more influence in response to the United States while the structures held in determining

NATO's eventual actions. During the Kosovo campaign of 1999, in order to conduct airstrikes on potential Serbian targets, there needed to be a consensus by all the nations involved before airstrikes were carried out on specific targets. Notwithstanding its successes, the consensus-building caused problems, particularly for the United States as there was concern that this antiquated process would hinder the United States if a military conflict ever directly impacted its own interests. The interesting point about this choice was that the eventual consequences unilateral U.S. action caused it to eventually identify a need for NATO's role in military operations going forward.

As mentioned earlier, the case studies were chosen as part of a specific time period and keeping in mind that these conflicts had the greatest level of American strategic interests post-September 11. Afghanistan and Iraq confirmed that for decision-making to occur for NATO, there needed to be other factors to determine action even if the United States tried to dictate the decisions. In Afghanistan, the American interest provided for the United States to take the lead on military action and sidelined NATO from any substantial action. However, NATO's interests allowed the organization to invoke Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty, which showed the level of importance that the alliance placed on offering support to an eventual mission. Obviously, when the ISAF took over command of the conflict in Afghanistan, the United States realized the importance of using NATO to improve the strategic situation in the country. ISAF eventually became involved as the need for NATO's role changed, but also it was in the other states' interests to reach consensus for action due to the strategic importance of preventing future terror.

The other states' role in preventing NATO military action was fascinating in the Iraq case study. During the lead-up to the war in Iraq, France and Germany played a significant role in blocking any NATO consensus for military action to support the U.S. invasion of Iraq. That showed that other states' interests still played a vital role in NATO's eventual actions. In addition, when the United States realized that it had committed an error by not planning for post-war reconstruction and tried to enlist the help of NATO, France and Germany blocked action again. While NATO sidestepped the process by taking on a small role in Iraq, the organization never used military action in Iraq and that was prevented by the blocking of consensus.

NATO would eventually provide training and assistance to Iraqi security forces, but did so without using consensus-building and without utilizing political control by the NAC to take action. The United States could take a significant share of the blame because of its go-it-alone, unilateralist strategy, but in the end, the United States did not use NATO the way it was intended because of the U.S. aversion to the consensus-building process. Nevertheless, in terms of NATO's role, it showed it could still be effective with other states' interests impacting decisions and then utilizing the mechanisms it created to decide on actions. The decision then allowed NATO to deploy forces strictly for training purposes and not for combat operations in Iraq and it still found a way to be effective in a military conflict through the decisions it made to conduct particular operations.

Conclusion:

In the end, while some could argue that U.S. interests dictate and influence the alliance's decision-making on whether to conduct operations, these case studies support

my hypothesis that the interests of other states and the alliance itself motivate NATO involvement in particular military operations. The United States' changing attitude towards NATO represents an interesting point in these case studies. The evolution of the U.S. calculus moved from viewing NATO as irrelevant to its military interests after Kosovo to eventually seeing a need for NATO after getting bogged down in Afghanistan and Iraq. The United States needed NATO to be successful in these conflicts, which is interesting because history clearly showed that NATO would need the United States to be successful in the Cold War and the immediate European conflicts following the Cold War. I would say that this is more a testament to the importance of NATO's effectiveness as a security institution rather than the decline of U.S. power. In fact, NATO's eventual actions to assist in these missions may have served to provide a better outcome towards security and stabilizing the situations on the ground. Whether there are flaws in reaching consensus, all interested parties realized the need to utilize NATO to achieve military strategic aims in a rapidly changing world.

Chapter 2: A Tiered NATO Member System's Impact on the Burden for the Alliance's Military Operations

As stated in chapter 1, one thing about NATO remains constant: the United States brings considerable power and resources to the alliance given its size, economic and military strength, and “global policeman” role. The United States, however, is not the only member that is influential in NATO decision-making. France and Great Britain also provide power and resources to many NATO missions. These contributions, however, are not considered to be equal to American contributions. Since the Cold War ended, NATO expanded to include former Warsaw Pact states. Generally, these states have fewer economic, military, and other resources available than the founding members of NATO. NATO burden-sharing has been a subject of contention ever since the alliance was created. With that, there has been the “free-rider” problem where some nations shouldered more of the burden of NATO than others, while nations that did not contribute as much still received the benefits that come with being a NATO member. Subsequently, the disparity in capability between the United States and the other members appears to have expanded, exacerbating the claim that the United States shoulders the largest burden in the alliance.¹

The gap between America and other NATO members' resources has created a tiered participation system based on economic and military power. Most observers agree that a tiered system exists. Exactly which members constitute each tier, however, has been debated. Some studies have argued that NATO's tiers are based on level of

¹ John R. Oneal and Mark A. Elrod, “NATO Burden Sharing and the Forces of Changes,” *International Studies Quarterly* 33, no. 4 (04, 1989), 436.

commitment to defense as part of a state's gross national product.² Other studies consider how states have publically articulated the future of NATO's strategic directions to group members.³ Since burden-sharing is seen as the primary organizational tool of modern NATO, understanding how the alliance functions during missions, when one state is contributing more than another, is a central point for analysis.

This chapter seeks to answer the question of whether a tiered system of NATO members—based on their political and military contributions—impacts the conduct of the alliance during specific military operations. The hypothesis for this chapter argues that certain tiers contribute more political and military assets to particular military operations than other tiers. Therefore, these contributions can have a decisive impact on the outcome of two conflicts featuring NATO actions. As NATO's role in the post-Cold War world continues to be debated, a study of how the alliance functioned in recent conflicts and how the disparity between military resources is dispersed among the tiers of NATO members is important to determine if NATO's system of member involvement needs to be reformed. This chapter begins by examining how alliances function and how NATO fits into that mold. It then discusses the arguments of burden-sharing in NATO for recent operations. Also, this chapter investigates how the tiered system fits into these elements and whether the existence of the tiered system significantly impacted the conduct of operations. The impact of the tiered system offers an interesting perspective

² Klaus Knorr, "Burden-Sharing in NATO: Aspects of U.S. Policy," *Orbis* 29, no. 3, (03, 1985), 517-536. Also, see Mancur Olson, Jr. and Richard Zeckhauser, "An Economic Theory of Alliances," *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 48, no. 3, (03, 1966), 266-279.

³ Timo Noetzel and Benjamin Schreer, "Does a Multi-Tier NATO Matter? The Atlantic Alliance and the Process of Strategic Change," *International Affairs*, 85, no. 2 (02, 2009), 211-226. Also, see Jim Gramone, "Gates: NATO Has Become Two-tiered Alliance," *American Forces Press Service*, June 10, 2011, Accessed January 30, 2014 <http://www.defense.gov/news/newsarticle.aspx?id=64268>

on whether the tiered system has future implications to NATO's military effectiveness, as well as its relevance as a global security actor.

The Role of Alliances

Global alliances—whether they are political or economic—are important to international politics. Many prominent scholars have written about international cooperation and the role of alliances. For example, Robert Keohane believed that international cooperation “requires that the actions of separate individuals or organizations—which are not in pre-existent harmony—be brought into conformity with one another through a process of negotiation, which is often referred to as ‘policy coordination.’”⁴ Keohane argued that this cooperation occurs after nations realize that their objectives mirror one another's and there are benefits to working together on policy coordination.⁵ In essence, these actors then come together to form common institutions because they see their value to achieve successful ends for security, economics, or other issues.⁶

Countries can benefit when they cooperate together to achieve common objectives. Yet as Brian Rathbun pointed out, there are often caveats to achieve cooperation. “State leaders will commit to qualitative multilateralism only if they believe that states will not abandon their obligations by either refusing to abide by procedures for dispute resolution or not coming to the aid of others in case of attack. In other words, states expect reciprocity.”⁷ It seems that international cooperation cannot function

⁴ Robert O. Keohane, *After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984), 51.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 63.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 244-251.

⁷ Brian C. Rathbun, “Before Hegemony: Generalized Trust and the Creation and Design of International Security Organizations,” *International Organization* 65, no.2 (02, 2011), 247.

successfully unless there is a mutual understanding of trust and willingness to act to achieve the stated goals. The obvious function of an alliance is to influence global geopolitics. K.J. Holsti believes that, “all diplomatic coalitions and alliances have one common characteristic – they attempt to increase diplomatic influence on some issue or problem or create a deterrent effect by combining capabilities.”⁸ Some alliances like the United Nations are for peacebuilding, while alliances like the World Trade Organization are used for promoting global economic prosperity.

When defining an alliance, there are two accurate portrayals. First, Stephen Walt argued that, “An alliance is a formal or informal commitment for security cooperation between two or more states. Although the precise arrangements embodied in different alliances vary enormously, the defining feature of any alliance is a commitment for mutual military support against some external actor(s) in some specified set of circumstances.”⁹ While Walt pointed out the textbook definition, he acknowledges that modern alliances have evolved into “social institutions that may involve extensive interactions between the member-states,” which is a little more detailed than the traditional World War I military alliance. Robert E. Osgood stated that “alliances are an integral part of international politics. They are one of the primary means by which states seek the co-operation of other states in order to enhance their power to protect and advance their interests.”¹⁰ Osgood and Walt’s definitions are most applicable based on NATO’s functions as a security organization.

⁸ K.J. Holsti, “Diplomatic Coalitions and Military Alliances,” in *Alliance in International Politics*, ed. Julian Friedman, Christopher Bladen, and Steven Rosen (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1970), 95.

⁹ Stephen Walt, “Why Alliances Endure or Collapse,” *Survival*, 39, no.1 (01, 1997), 157 and Stephen Walt, *The Origins of Alliances*, (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1987), 1.

¹⁰ Robert Osgood, *Alliances and American Foreign Policy*, (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1968), 17.

Others echo similar sentiments. Julian Friedman emphasized that alliances consist of the “pursuit of national interests jointly or by parallel sources of action” and the “probability that assistance will be rendered by members to one another.”¹¹ Another reason for alliance cooperation can be the desire to efficiently obtain interests. Hans Morgenthau noted, “an alliance adds precision, especially in the form of limitation to an existing community of interests and to the general policies and concrete measures serving them.”¹² However, Glenn Snyder stated countries align because they want to “maximize its share of the alliance’s net benefits.”¹³ It seems that countries form alliances because they see the benefits of cooperation, but also do so to enhance their own interests abroad, for security, political, economic purposes. For the purposes of this study, I focus on security and political issues. The functioning of alliances represents a good starting point to examine at how members function within an organization and contribute to the overall mission. The next section captures the concept of NATO burden-sharing and its purposes, but most importantly it considers the argument of how it has significantly impacted NATO members since the alliance’s creation in the late 1940s.

Alliance Burden-Sharing in NATO

Burden-sharing can be defined as “the distribution of costs and risks among members of a group in the process of accomplishing a common goal.”¹⁴ When determining how countries share the burden in NATO, it depends on the members’

¹¹ Julian R. Friedman, “Alliance in International Politics,” in *Alliance in International Politics*, ed. Julian Friedman, Christopher Bladen, and Steven Rosen (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1970), 5.

¹² Hans Morgenthau, “Alliances,” in *Alliance in International Politics*, ed. Julian Friedman, Christopher Bladen, and Steven Rosen (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1970), 81. Also, see Hans Morgenthau, “Alliances in Theory and Practice,” in *Alliance Policy in the Cold War*, ed. Arnold Wolfers (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1963), 186

¹³ Glenn Snyder, “The Security Dilemma in Alliance Politics,” *World Politics*, 36, no. 4 (04, 1984), 463.

¹⁴ Ida M. Oma, “Explaining states’ burdensharing behaviour within NATO,” *Cooperation and Conflict*, 47, no. 4, (04, 2012), 562. Also, see Stephen J. Cimbala and Peter Forster, *The US, NATO and Military Burden-Sharing*. (London: Routledge, 2005), 1.

contributions in terms of military forces and monetary assistance to NATO's common budget.¹⁵ From America's perspective, three areas contribute to its views on burden-sharing: "the adequacy of NATO forces, the equity of the distribution of costs among the allies, and the nature of each country's contribution to collective security."¹⁶ When it comes to burden-sharing theory in alliances, Mancur Olson, Jr. and Richard Zeckhauser's seminal study *An Economic Theory on Alliances*—which discussed the collective goods theory of alliances—has many valid points on the concept of burden-sharing and how it impacts alliances like NATO. Olson and Zeckhauser measured that a country's gross national product (GNP) was a good indicator "of the benefits it derives from collective security and its ability to provide for it."¹⁷ It seems that looking at NATO states' proportion of GNP, specifically on defense is a frequent way to measure each nation's burden-sharing for the alliance.¹⁸ According to Olson, "member states independently make decisions about how much military force to provide. That is, each ally decides on its own how much military force it will raise and thus contribute to the strength of the alliance."¹⁹ While each nation can choose how much it contributes, it seems counterproductive to the effectiveness of the alliance if nations provide little in terms of military force in order to successfully complete a mission.

Others argue that while NATO is a voluntary organization that provides the public good of collective defense, "nations will join the club and remain members so long as

¹⁵ Keith Hartley and Todd Sandler, "NATO Burden-Sharing: Past and Future," *Journal of Peace Research*, 36, no.6, (06, 1999), 668.

¹⁶ ONeal and Elrod, "NATO Burden Sharing and the Forces of Changes," 436.

¹⁷ John R. ONeal, "The Theory of collective action and burden sharing in NATO," *International Organization*, 44, no.3, (03,1990), 381.

¹⁸ U.S. Government Accountability Office, *U.S.-NATO Burden Sharing: Allies Contributions to Common Defense During the 1980's*, GAO/NSIAD-91-32 (Washington, DC: United States General Accounting Office, October 23, 1990), Accessed March 15, 2014, <http://www.gao.gov/assets/150/149781.pdf>, 3.

¹⁹ Mancur Olson, "Increasing the Incentives for International Cooperation," *International Organization*, 25, no. 4, (04, 1971), 868.

membership is expected to worthwhile (benefits exceed costs).”²⁰ The United States tends to be the one nation it is bearing more of the costs than its fellow members and not receiving any benefits. This could be plausible since it provides the most significant contribution to NATO. This has occurred since the creation of the alliance due to the fact that larger members, most notably the United States, “are bearing a disproportionate share of the burden of the common defense of the NATO countries,” while smaller members are devoting a minor amount of their GNP to defense than some of its bigger allies.²¹ As Olson and Zeckhauser argue, NATO’s purpose is to achieve a collective good for its members by defending against a common enemy, even though one nation may be taking on more of a burden for NATO.²²

In explaining why some nations contribute more to NATO than others, it depends on a number of factors. Olson and Zeckhauser argued a nation’s assessment of its military force depends on its national income, but also on the proximity of that nation to an enemy, as well as the nature of the threat and the attitudes that country has towards the necessity of defense.²³ They argue that smaller nations will see themselves as incapable of having a significant impact on global crises and they will be skeptical of making larger sacrifices than other nations.²⁴ Olson and Zeckhauser stated there is disproportionate burden sharing for the larger countries in NATO that see value in its own public good by devoting resources to their defense versus a smaller nation that does not have the available resources, but also does not believe it can make a difference in the world.²⁵

²⁰ Hartley and Sandler, “NATO Burden-Sharing: Past and Future,” 666.

²¹ Olson and Zeckhauser, “An Economic Theory of Alliances,” 266.

²² *Ibid.*, 267

²³ *Ibid.*, 271

²⁴ *Ibid.*

²⁵ Hartley and Sandler, “NATO Burden-Sharing: Past and Future,” 667.

The main cause of friction results from the “free-rider” problem. According to Keith Hartley and Todd Sandler, the free-rider problem “arises when smaller allies rely on larger allies for defence protection, allowing the free-riders to ‘consume’ more civil goods and services.”²⁶ The free rider problem can easily be identified when examining NATO resource allocation in the 1950s and 1960s. At that time, the larger allies in the alliance, such as the United States, France, Germany, and the United Kingdom, were “bearing a disproportionate share of the burden of collective defence, so allowing the smaller nations to free-ride.”²⁷ For the United States, the disproportionate burden sharing provides a problematic situation. This echoes Gates’ concern that some NATO members have turned into consumers, not contributors. The United States joined modern military alliances because they “save costs and multiply benefits through the division of responsibilities, the sharing of common assets, or simply the protection provided by having a stronger country as an ally.”²⁸ If the United States is expected to provide more resources than its European allies, the economic benefit of the alliance is unrealized. Economics, however, are not the sole reason why the United States enters into the alliance. Its involvement in defending Europe offsets some of the greater burden-sharing. Thus, while free-riders could be a problem, the United States is still involved in NATO because it sees the greater benefit of sharing assets.²⁹ This gives the United States the opportunity to be further involved in Europe’s affairs, which may add to the U.S. role as the global hegemon, which was mentioned in chapter 1.

²⁶ Ibid.

²⁷ Ibid. Also, see Bruce Russett, *What Price Vigilance? The Burden of National Defense*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1970). Also, see Todd Sandler and John F. Forbes, “Burden Sharing, Strategy, and the Design of NATO,” *Economic Inquiry*, 18, no.3, (03, 1980), 425-444.

²⁸ Bruno Tertrais, “The Changing Nature of Military Alliances,” *Washington Quarterly*, 27, no. 2, (02, 2004), 136.

²⁹ Jens Ringsmose, “NATO Burden-Sharing Redux: Continuity and Change after the Cold War,” *Contemporary Security Policy*, 31, no. 2, (02, 2010), 322.

However, some have pointed out that because there are “political, economic, and cultural ties that link the NATO allies,” cooperation might be more likely to occur than free riding by particular alliance members.³⁰ James Golden’s definition of the elements of burden-sharing in NATO is applicable here. According to Golden, “the idea of sharing the burdens of collective defense normally applies primarily to costs in money and manpower,” which could include where to measure contributions based on the location of bases and the size of militaries on those bases, force contributions to NATO’s commands, and contributions to NATO’s infrastructure programs.³¹

When looking at studies by Binyam Solomon and John Oneal, which include tabulations of the United States defense burden, there seems to be no challenge to the the United States from other NATO members.³² This begs the question of whether the costs are outweighing the benefits for the United States because other nations are not able to contribute. Some believe that the United States “was practically a prisoner of its size during the Cold War” because it had the abilities to provide more to the effort to defend against the Soviet Union.³³ In addition, according to the Olson and Zeckhauser theory, the United States’ size and wealth provide it with more to lose if the alliance is unsuccessful in its mandate and causes the United States to contribute more to the effort.³⁴ Yet even while there was a need to contribute more because of its size, there was not as much reciprocity on the part of the Europeans following the Cold War.

³⁰ Oneal, “The Theory of collective action and burden sharing in NATO,” 386.

³¹ James R. Golden, *NATO burden-sharing: Risks and opportunities*, (New York: Praeger, 1983), v.

³² Binyam Solomon, “NATO Burden Sharing Revisited,” *Defence and Peace Economics*, 15, no. 3, (03, 2004), 254-255. Also, see Oneal, “The Theory of Collective Action and Burden Sharing in NATO,” 388.

³³ Ringsmose, “NATO Burden-Sharing Redux: Continuity and Change after the Cold War,” 324

³⁴ *Ibid.* Also, see Olson and Zeckhauser, “An Economic Theory of Alliances,” 266-279.

Since the end of the Cold War, defense spending by the Europeans has dropped significantly. They have consolidated their major industries, downsized their land forces, and cut spending.³⁵ As a result, “European armies continue to lack funds for major initiatives aimed at reducing the technological and strategic transport and logistics disparities with the United States,” according to Brian Finlay and Michael O’Hanlon.³⁶ Finlay and O’Hanlon argue that even if these middling European powers wanted to deploy their own armies, they do not have the skills necessary to conduct operations in today’s environment.³⁷ Because of the lack of capability, they are not even able to keep up with the demand of the alliance and the conflicts that require a response, leaving the larger allies to take more of a burden in the fight. These burden-sharing theories are helpful in determining why certain nations contribute the amounts they do to NATO’s mission and provide a good focal point for my research as I look at whether these tiers of member states impact the conduct of operations in specific NATO military conflicts.

The Tiered System Exists

The existing literature shows how NATO functions as an alliance and the role of burden-sharing in NATO’s conduct. Also, this literature is helpful as a guide to understanding the impact of specific NATO members on the functions of the alliance. Based on the concepts of the role of alliances and alliance burden-sharing, it seems that a tiered system of members exists in NATO. Some studies have looked at NATO tiers based on how certain members view the role of the alliance. Timo Noetzel and Benjamin Schreer stated that NATO is a “multi-tier alliance,” but one that looks at the various

³⁵ Brian Finlay and Michael O’Hanlon, “NATO’s Underachieving Middle Powers: From Burdenshedding to Burdensharing,” *International Peacekeeping*, 7, no. 4, (04, 2000), 146.

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ Ibid.

interests of its members for how NATO should function.³⁸ According to Noetzel and Schreer, the first tier consists of the “Anglo-Saxon allies,” who are “driven by ‘reformist’ ambitions and wants NATO to take on a broader set of challenges that include combating the proliferation of nuclear, biological and chemical weapons (NBC), tackling the threat of nuclear terrorism and providing energy security,” while also playing a broader role in global security.³⁹ The second tier consists specifically of France and Germany; the tier that Noetzel and Schreer define as the “‘status-quo’ oriented and skeptical about a ‘globalized alliance’” members.⁴⁰ Lastly, they view the third tier as a “‘reversal’-oriented tier,” which includes Central European countries that place importance on collective defense and fear the resurgence of the Russian threat to Europe.⁴¹ Noetzel and Schreer’s analysis is a helpful framework to show how NATO members view the alliance’s functions in the post-Cold War world.

Some observers have actually used burden-sharing to identify specific member tiers. In 1985, Klaus Knorr articulated that NATO consisted of a tiered system of members containing three classes based on member nations’ commitment to defense as a proportion of their gross national product.⁴² Knorr argues that “the smaller countries contribute least” to NATO’s missions, while the “second class is composed of “Britain France, and West Germany – nations that were great military powers not long ago” and of course, “the United States can be said to be in a class by itself.”⁴³ NATO membership can be divided into two or three tiers based on various aspects of the alliance, particularly

³⁸ Noetzel and Schreer, “Does a Multi-Tier NATO Matter? The Atlantic Alliance and the Process of Strategic Change,” 211-226.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 215.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 216.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*

⁴² Knorr, “Burden-Sharing in NATO: Aspects of U.S. Policy,” 525-526.

⁴³ *Ibid.*

the contributions made to member countries' defense, their level of influence in the alliance, attitudes on the functioning of the alliance in the changing global landscape, and how the other nations measure up their contributions against those of the United States.

David Auerswald has divided NATO into two tiers: the five most influential members (Great Britain, France, Germany, Italy, and the United States) versus every other member.⁴⁴ Auerswald uses many similar burden-sharing studies as parameters for his work to determine these five influential members of NATO. While Auerswald does create a NATO tier of the "five most influential members," it seems it is for the purpose of his own work to determine why the five nations contributed to NATO's Kosovo response. The Auerswald study is useful because it uses burden-sharing as a guide for determining five influential NATO members and how they conduct themselves in a war of choice.

The categorization of NATO members by tiers is not a uniquely scholarly activity. Former U.S. Secretary of Defense Robert M. Gates identified NATO as a "two-tiered alliance" consisting of

members who specialize in 'soft' humanitarian, development, peacekeeping and talking tasks and those conducting the 'hard' combat missions -- between those willing and able to pay the price and bear the burdens of alliance commitments, and those who enjoy the benefits of NATO membership, be they security guarantees or headquarters billets, but don't want to share the risks and the costs."⁴⁵

Gates' comments seem to echo the free-rider problem and its impact on U.S. thinking. While this does not clarify which NATO nations fall into a respective tier, this is a thought-provoking premise and one that requires a little more investigation.

⁴⁴ David Auerswald, "Explaining Wars of Choice: An Integrated Decision Model of NATO Policy in Kosovo," *International Studies Quarterly* 48, no. 3, (03, 2004), 632.

⁴⁵ Gramone, "Gates: NATO Has Become Two-tiered Alliance."

Methodology and Hypothesis

The two concepts mentioned above of members' views of the role of the alliance and burden-sharing together form the tiers of NATO members. In addition, the categorization of members by tier is a useful organization and practical tool to understand NATO actions. The literature review and the concept of burden-sharing confirm my earlier claim that a tiered system exists where certain members bear more of a burden than others in terms of NATO military operations. With this in mind, I expect the case studies to show how certain tiers may have impacted NATO's military operations and influenced that operation's outcome. For the case studies, this chapter will investigate the 1999 Kosovo operation and the 2011 Libya operation using process tracing to determine if one tier or another has a greater impact on the conduct of operations.

Since no single study has, to date, compiled NATO countries by tier for the purposes of evaluating activity within a particular mission, I have created Table 1.1 to better understand the tiers of NATO membership. Table 1.1 is based on analysis previously conducted by Knorr, Noetzel, and Schreer.⁴⁶ In distinguishing the tiers, the literature clearly indicates that the United States is in a tier by itself, because it brings the economic and military power to NATO that no other member matches. The second tier consists of Great Britain, France, Italy, and Germany because of their political heft, economic size, and military strength. These four countries may not have as much power as the United States, but they still bring considerable clout. The third tier includes many of the new members of NATO, such as Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic, as

⁴⁶ Noetzel and Schreer, "Does a Multi-Tier NATO Matter? The Atlantic Alliance and the Process of Strategic Change." Also, see Knorr, "Burden-Sharing in NATO: Aspects of U.S. Policy."

well as other smaller European nations that do not offer as much in terms of political and military influence.

Table 1.1: Arranging the NATO Tiers

Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 3
United States	France, Germany, Italy, United Kingdom	Albania, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Turkey

This chapter seeks to use the burden-sharing element as a way to distinguish which members offered political and military contributions to a specific operation. Thinking about resources by tier, is useful to determine whether certain members offer significant contributions to the alliance’s function and the impact on a particular operation. Based on the structure of NATO and the placement of the members in terms of tiers, I expect that the top two tiers will have the largest impact on the alliance’s actions in these two operations.

Case Study: Operation Allied Force (OAF) in Kosovo

Following the end of the Cold War, NATO’s role began shifting from being strictly a defensive organization to a proactive security organization that maintained peace in Europe. The break-up of the Soviet Union created conflict across the continent and NATO found itself quickly involved in the former Yugoslavia. In 1995, NATO conducted its first action during the Bosnian War, when Operation Deliberate Force was launched to degrade the capabilities of the Bosnian Serbs.⁴⁷ This operation proved that airpower could have a critical role in achieving political objectives, forcing the parties in

⁴⁷ Ryan C. Hendrickson, “Crossing the Rubicon,” *NATO Review*, September 1, 2005, Accessed March 1, 2014 <http://www.nato.int/docu/review/2005/issue3/english/history.html>

Yugoslavia to find a diplomatic solution to end the war.⁴⁸ The Dayton Accords may have ended the Bosnian War, but it did not solve the ongoing ethnic tensions in the region. Following the Bosnian War, NATO's attention quickly turned to Kosovo, a small territory seeking its independence from Serbia. In response to Kosovo's bid for independence, Serbian President Slobodan Milosevic used force to oppress Kosovars and ethnic Albanians, which resulted in armed conflict against the Serbians.⁴⁹ Since thousands of ethnic Serbians lived in the territory Milosevic did not seem willing to give up the territory. Once the conflict intensified, the international community attempted to find a peaceful solution to the crisis, hoping to avoid a repeat of the humanitarian crises that occurred in Bosnia four years earlier.⁵⁰

NATO wanted to avoid being slow to take action against Serbian forces killing civilians and causing a humanitarian crisis.⁵¹ While a military response to Kosovo was necessary to reach a successful and peaceful conclusion, bombing was used as a way to force the Serbians to the diplomatic table.⁵² However, according to Ivo Daalder and Michael O'Hanlon, there was disagreement among the allies for even threatening the use of forces against Serbia to stop the bloodshed in Kosovo.⁵³ The disagreement arose because of the risk level that some countries were willing to take to be involved in a conflict that may not have directly affected their geopolitical situation.⁵⁴ NATO decision-making on whether to conduct military action can be a long and arduous process. In

⁴⁸ Ibid. Also, see "Operation Deliberate Force," GlobalSecurity.org, Accessed February 28, 2014 http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/ops/deliberate_force.htm

⁴⁹ Ivo Daalder and Michael O'Hanlon, *Winning Ugly: NATO's War to Save Kosovo*, (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 2000), 6.

⁵⁰ Ibid., 12

⁵¹ Ibid., 31

⁵² Ibid., 105

⁵³ Ibid., 35

⁵⁴ Ibid.

order to reach a decision, a consensus needed to be reached by all the NATO members to take action for NATO's involvement.⁵⁵ This has often caused problems because the long process can have a negative impact on NATO's abilities to conduct operations. Looking at the countries that advocated strongly for action is a good indicator for identifying the tiers' impact on operations.

Tier 1

On March 24, 1999, Operation Allied Force (OAF) began to stop the Serbian onslaught on Kosovo. Initially, the operation included military assets mostly from the United States and Great Britain, or as Daalder and O'Hanlon explain, "an air armada that closely resembled that used for Operation Desert Fox, the four-day U.S.-British bombing of Iraq in December 1998."⁵⁶ The first wave of 350 NATO aircraft included 220 American aircraft, which was a good indicator of the burden that the United States would bring to this operation, since U.S. aircraft and personnel eventually comprised one-third of the total aircraft used for the operation.⁵⁷ Ultimately, the United States contributed 62 percent of the bombing sorties for the air strikes in OAF, which was about 60 percent ahead of the second biggest contributor, France.⁵⁸

According to David Auerswald, the U.S. ability to contribute comes back to this idea of burden-sharing by countries based on the level they contribute to their national defense. Auerswald explains that, "the U.S. was by far the most powerful nation in terms of both GDP and military spending before the conflict. Indeed, American GDP was

⁵⁵ "Consensus decision-making at NATO," North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Accessed March 2, 2014 http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/topics_49178.htm

⁵⁶ Daalder and O'Hanlon, *Winning Ugly*, 101-103

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 117.

⁵⁸ Auerswald, "Explaining Wars of Choice: An Integrated Decision Model of NATO Policy in Kosovo," 646.

significantly larger than the combined total for the other four [influential] nations.”⁵⁹

Because it had the capabilities to do so, the United States provided the greatest amount of military support to the alliance for the operation. In terms of economic support, Patricia Weitsman says that the United States provided \$3.1 billion in funds for the operation, given all of its military material contributions.⁶⁰ Additionally, the command structure was led by the Americans with Army General Wesley Clark as Supreme Allied Commander of NATO and Air Force Lt. General Michael Short leading air operations.⁶¹

However, while it did provide the material support and considerable financial support to NATO overall, American political support was lower than other nations involved in the operation. According to Auerswald, “U.S. public support for the NATO campaign remained at or above 60 percent until a few days after the NATO summit, at which point support declined into the 50s for the remainder of the conflict.”⁶² Yet the U.S. government still strongly supported the air campaign, particularly to continue the air strikes without any interruptions for negotiations.⁶³ However, there was hesitancy to get further involved, particularly with the use of ground forces. According to the Congressional Research Service (CRS), the United States did not share the long-term risks with other allies and was not willing to provide ground forces to achieve victory.⁶⁴ Also, the Clinton administration had to deal with political opposition from Congress. At

⁵⁹ Ibid., 637.

⁶⁰ Patricia Weitsman, *Waging War: Alliances, Coalitions, and Institutions of Interstate Violence*, (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2013), 85.

⁶¹ Department of Defense, *Kosovo/Operation Allied Force After-Action Report*, (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Defense, January 31, 2000), Accessed March 14, 2014
<http://www.dod.mil/pubs/kaar02072000.pdf>, 20

⁶² Auerswald, “Explaining Wars of Choice: An Integrated Decision Model of NATO Policy in Kosovo,” 641.

⁶³ Ibid., 653

⁶⁴ U.S. Library of Congress, CRS, *Kosovo: Lessons Learned from Operation Allied Force*, by Paul Gallis, CRS Report RL30374 (Washington, DC: Office of Congressional Information and Publishing, November 19, 1999), 20.

the time, Congress voted to refuse any funding to send U.S. ground troops to the region, while also reaching a stalemate with a tied vote on a resolution that expressed support for the overall campaign.⁶⁵

Given all these factors and its large share of the burden, the United States was able to influence NATO to not use ground forces throughout the entire campaign. Auerswald points out that of the five most influential members of NATO involved in the conflict, the United States provided the second least amount of public support for the operation, just ahead of Italy.⁶⁶ Yet even with these factors, the United States still took on a large share of the burden in the operation and had a significant impact on the outcome.

Tier 2

Great Britain was the strongest advocate for using force in Kosovo. At the time, Great Britain believed that the only way to change Milosevic's calculus on Kosovo was through armed intervention, which went as far as suggesting the use of ground forces to stop Milosevic; a tactic that many NATO members – including the United States – were not willing to sign off on.⁶⁷ Another way to look at Great Britain's involvement would be that they took on the burden of the political involvement in NATO to move the alliance to take military action. In fact, a CRS report agrees with this assessment, arguing that Prime Minister Tony Blair's government "provided the key political leadership" for the operation, particularly through its calls for ground forces when the air campaign was not

⁶⁵ Charles A. Kupchan, "Kosovo and the Future of U.S. Engagement in Europe: Continued Hegemony or Impending Retrenchment?" in *Alliance politics, Kosovo, and NATO's war: allied force or forced allies?* ed. Pierre Martin and Mark R. Brawley. (New York: Palgrave, 2001), 77.

⁶⁶ Auerswald, "Explaining Wars of Choice: An Integrated Decision Model of NATO Policy in Kosovo," 640.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 35-36 and 52

as successful.⁶⁸ At the time, the Blair government viewed Kosovo as a threat to its national interests because the conflict could potentially spread to other areas in the Balkans.⁶⁹ Great Britain provided the second largest number of planes to the effort (behind the United States), but they also flew the third most sorties with 1,008 missions.⁷⁰ For the nation that was the most vocal for action, they did not contribute as much militarily as France and the United States.

France provided significant material support to the air campaign, as it was the second largest contributor to the air strikes behind the United States, flying 2,414 sorties.⁷¹ This is interesting because France had not been heavily involved in the military command structure of NATO since President Charles De Gaulle ended their involvement in 1966.⁷² France's support for the air campaign started well before the operation began, as they were publicly "in favor of an uninterrupted and escalating air campaign."⁷³ This could be attributed to the threat that France saw from the crisis to its national interests, mainly because of the proximity of the Balkans to France's borders.⁷⁴ France contributed over 100 aircraft to the operation and they contributed the most in terms of sophisticated munitions.⁷⁵

⁶⁸ U.S. Library of Congress, CRS, *Kosovo: Lessons Learned from Operation Allied Force*, 20.

⁶⁹ Jason W. Davidson, *America's Allies at War: Kosovo, Afghanistan, and Iraq*, (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2011), 78.

⁷⁰ Nora Bensahel, Stuart Johnson, Timothy Liston, John E. Peters, and Traci Williams, *European Contributions to Operation Allied Force: Implications for Transatlantic Cooperation*, (Santa Monica, RAND Corporation, 2001), 20

⁷¹ Bensahel, Johnson, Liston, Peters, and Williams, *European Contributions to Operation Allied Force*, 18.

⁷² Steven Erlanger, "France Will Take Full NATO Membership Again, With Greater Military Role," *New York Times*, March 11, 2009, Accessed March 25, 2014
http://www.nytimes.com/2009/03/12/world/europe/12france.html?_r=0

⁷³ Auerswald, "Explaining Wars of Choice: An Integrated Decision Model of NATO Policy in Kosovo," 649.

⁷⁴ Davidson, *America's Allies at War*, 87.

⁷⁵ Bensahel, Johnson, Liston, Peters, and Williams, *European Contributions to Operation Allied Force*, 18-20.

While Great Britain very actively pushed for NATO to become involved in the conflict, other members of the second tier expressed their reservations with the use of force by NATO. Germany and Italy expressed concern at one point on if NATO had any legal authority to respond to the violence in Kosovo.⁷⁶ In fact, Italy and Germany faced considerable public pressure from its citizens to avoid involvement in the conflict.⁷⁷ Germany wanted to end the conflict as soon as possible and it strongly advocated for ceasefires to find a diplomatic solution to the crisis.⁷⁸ However, despite the public pressure, Germany still contributed to the air campaign, flying 636 sorties throughout OAF.⁷⁹ Italy may have expressed opposition to the mission, because of the economic costs it could impose on the country.⁸⁰ Yet, most of the missions were actually flown out of Italian bases, while some aircraft did originate from U.S. and British bases, but half of the aircraft used for the entire operation were actually based at Italian bases.⁸¹ Also, the Italian Air Force flew the fourth largest number of sorties during the campaign.⁸² In the end, it seems that Great Britain and France together shouldered the second biggest burden after the United States. While not as powerful as the United States, France and Great Britain had the political and military capabilities to impact the conduct of the operation.

Tier 3

In terms of the other members of NATO, at the time there were not as many countries that were members of the organization. However, a new group of former

⁷⁶ Ryan C. Hendrickson, *Diplomacy and War at NATO: The Secretary General and Military Action after the Cold War*, (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2006), 100-101.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 106.

⁷⁸ Auerswald, "Explaining Wars of Choice: An Integrated Decision Model of NATO Policy in Kosovo," 651.

⁷⁹ Bensahel, Johnson, Liston, Peters, and Williams, *European Contributions to Operation Allied Force*, 21.

⁸⁰ Davidson, *America's Allies at War*, 96.

⁸¹ Daalder and O'Hanlon, *Winning Ugly*, 35-36, 52, 149.

⁸² Bensahel, Johnson, Liston, Peters, and Williams, *European Contributions to Operation Allied Force*, 21.

Warsaw Pact countries had just become members of the alliance and took on a role – albeit a small one – in OAF. The Czech Republic, Poland, and Hungary (also known as the Visegrad countries) became NATO members just days before OAF began.⁸³ As they were still getting their bearings, OAF became an immediate test of their commitment to the alliance. Ryan Hendrickson argues that “most analysts recognized that the Visegrad states would be unable to contribute militarily to the alliance in a meaningful way for some years, but there was little doubt in most analysts’ minds about these states’ commitment to the alliance.”⁸⁴ Poland provided the most diplomatic and military support to the operation of the Visegrad countries. Polish public opinion favored airstrikes against Serbia with 63 percent of the public supporting the operation, resulting in stronger political support.⁸⁵ Militarily, Poland contributed a contingency of infantry to protect NATO forces and leaders operating in Albania.⁸⁶ According to Hendrickson, Poland’s minor contributions soon after it became a member left no doubt about its commitment to the alliance.⁸⁷

While the Czech Republic expressed political support for the NATO air strikes and opposed Milosevic’s actions, public opinion was against participation. At the time, “50 percent of the public stated that they opposed the bombings, while only 30 percent backed the operation,” which then followed with public protests throughout the course of the operation.⁸⁸ The Czech Republic did not provide any military assistance and it did

⁸³ Ryan C. Hendrickson, “NATO's Visegrad allies: The first test in Kosovo,” *The Journal of Slavic Military Studies*, 13, no. 2, (02, 2000), 27

⁸⁴ Ibid.

⁸⁵ Ibid.

⁸⁶ Ibid.

⁸⁷ Ibid., 30

⁸⁸ Ibid.

not formally approve the use of its country for NATO to launch air strikes.⁸⁹ There is really no clear reasoning to the Czech Republic's opposition, as stated by Milada A. Vachudova. She argues that, "the war did not have any repercussions for the Czech Republic, such as economic loss, regional instability, or the risk of the influx of refugees, which might explain such a hostile political reaction."⁹⁰

On the other hand, Hungary encountered the difficulty of its proximity to Serbia, as well as the complexity of a population of ethnic Hungarians residing there and its people were unwilling to fight under a NATO flag against fellow Hungarians in Serbia.⁹¹ In addition, public opinion contributed to the lack of political support as 45 percent of the population opposed OAF prior to its start.⁹² Yet even with its reservations for direct involvement, Hungary provided strategic military support to the alliance by allowing plans to use its airspace to fly through for the air strikes. This action was critical in allowing NATO to take out key Serbian targets. As the operation progressed, Hungarian public support began to shift as 65 percent of the public supported the air strikes.⁹³

The other smaller allies contributed in a varying degree ranging from providing aircraft to assisting in peacemaking efforts. For example, the Netherlands contributed 18 aircraft to the operation, while Canada contributed 18 CF-18 fighter bombers to the mission.⁹⁴ Other smaller aspiring NATO countries at the time, like Bulgaria and Romania

⁸⁹ Ibid., 31

⁹⁰ Milada A. Vachudova, "The Atlantic Alliance and the Kosovo Crisis," in *Alliance politics, Kosovo, and NATO's war: allied force or forced allies?* ed. Pierre Martin and Mark R. Brawley. (New York: Palgrave, 2001), 211.

⁹¹ Ibid., 209.

⁹² Ibid.

⁹³ Hendrickson, "NATO's Visegrad allies: The first test in Kosovo," 34.

⁹⁴ Bensahel, Johnson, Liston, Peters, and Williams, *European Contributions to Operation Allied Force*, 22. Also, see and Canada and the Kosovo War, 181

approved airspace usage for NATO to conduct operations.⁹⁵ Greece had significant public opposition to the operation – close to 90 percent.⁹⁶ Yet while Greece withheld participation in OAF, it contributed to the peacemaking effort and the Kosovo Force (KFOR) following OAF.⁹⁷ “Tier 3” seems less involved than the first two tiers; however, even with small contributions, “tier 3” had a positive impact on the operation.

Case Study: Operation Unified Protector (OUP) in Libya

Ten years had passed since NATO last used air power to impact a civil war in another country. In 2011, NATO went even further out of its area of operations to prevent Muammar Qaddafi’s forces from slaughtering the Libyan rebels in Benghazi. Operation Unified Protector (OUP) in Libya shows how NATO collaborated to topple Qaddafi and free Libya. This operation was the first appearance of the “leading from behind” concept for the United States as it took a minimal role in the operation compared to Great Britain and France.⁹⁸ In addition, NATO expanded since OAF as many new allies joined the organization and many non-NATO members provided assistance to the operation. Yet as said best by Ellen Hallams and Benjamin Schreer, “the United States, the most powerful military actor within NATO, decided to play only a supporting role, forcing some European allies, predominantly France and Britain, to take the lead.”⁹⁹

⁹⁵ Vachudova, “The Atlantic Alliance and the Kosovo Crisis,” 213.

⁹⁶ Hendrickson, *Diplomacy and War at NATO*, 106. Also, see Linda D. Kozaryn, “Cohen Thanks Greek Allies for Support to NATO,” *American Forces Press Service*, July 15, 1999, Accessed February 18, 2014 <http://www.defense.gov/news/newsarticle.aspx?id=42112>

⁹⁷ Kozaryn, “Cohen Thanks Greek Allies for Support to NATO” <http://www.defense.gov/news/newsarticle.aspx?id=42112>

⁹⁸ Ryan Lizza, “The Consequentialist,” *New Yorker*, May 2, 2011, 44-55.

⁹⁹ Ellen Hallams and Benjamin Schreer, “Towards a ‘post-American’ alliance? NATO burden-sharing after Libya,” *International Affairs*, 88, no. 2. (02, 2012), 313.

They further argued that this action by the United States showcased the burden-sharing concept in NATO, as well as a NATO without the United States as the lead actor.¹⁰⁰

After Qaddafi used violence to respond to the rebel uprising, the United Nations Security Council responded with sanctions and arms embargoes to prevent Qaddafi's forces from gaining further materials to kill civilians.¹⁰¹ Those measures led to the passing of UN Security Council Resolution 1973, which called for all measures to be taken to protect civilians and included the provision of a no-fly zone against Qaddafi's forces.¹⁰² UN Security Council Resolution 1973 codified NATO military actions against Libya. Following passage of the resolution, the United States and two members of "tier 2" (Great Britain and France) conducted the initial air strikes against Qaddafi's force to prevent them from reaching Benghazi in Operation Odyssey Dawn (OOD). Given the success of the initial operation and the desire for the United States to minimize its involvement, President Barack Obama sought NATO's support to command enforcement of the UN Security Council Resolution and imposing the no-fly zone in Libya.¹⁰³ According to Ivo Daalder and Admiral James Stavridis, NATO was the right choice to assume command given the countries that were involved in the operation because "with many NATO countries, including Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Spain, the United Kingdom, and the United States, already contributing to the intervention, NATO was the logical choice to assume command, and it agreed to do so on March 27."¹⁰⁴

¹⁰⁰ Ibid.

¹⁰¹ Ivo Daalder and James Stavridis, "NATO's Victory in Libya: The Right Way to Run an Intervention," *Foreign Affairs*, 91, no. 2, (02, 2012), 2.

¹⁰² Ibid.

¹⁰³ Ibid., 3.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid.

However, according to Jeffrey Michaels, there were reservations from certain NATO members to even take control of the campaign, as well as concerns if NATO was not involved.

Initially, France did not want NATO participation on the grounds that this would undermine Arab support[,but they eventually agreed to it]. Additionally, German officials suggested non-military options such as target sanctions and other forms of diplomatic pressure. Turkish leaders cast doubt on the motives behind Western intervention, suggesting that action was driven by oil and mineral wealth rather than a desire to protect the Libyan people...Conversely, there were also problems with *not* having NATO in charge. For instance, the Norwegians were reluctant to participate in a non-NATO mission, and Italy issued a veiled threat to withdraw the use of its bases unless the Alliance was put in charge.¹⁰⁵

A smaller number of NATO countries actually took part in OUP than OAF. While some “tier 2” members shouldered a greater burden and the United States scaled back its involvement, many of the “tier 3” members did not contribute any military, financial, or political support to the operation. OUP included “only 14 out of 28 members [that] contributed military assets and only six European nations (Britain, France, Belgium, Italy, Norway and Denmark) contributed to the strike mission—and one of those (Norway) pulled out of the air strikes.”¹⁰⁶ NATO relied on “tier 2” more, as well as non-NATO members to contribute to the overall air campaign.

Tier 1

Even though the United States had an early role with support for the UN Security Council resolution and its initial involvement in OOD, it sought to step back and enable NATO to lead the air campaign. However, even with its commitment declining, “Washington would continue to participate in military operations but would do so mainly

¹⁰⁵ Jeffrey H. Michaels, “Able but not Willing: A Critical Assessment of NATO’s Libya Intervention,” in *The NATO Intervention in Libya*. ed. Kjell Engelbrekt, Marcus Mohlin, and Charlotte Wagnsson, (New York: Routledge, 2013), 23-24.

¹⁰⁶ Hallams and Schreer, “Towards a ‘post-American’ alliance? NATO burden-sharing after Libya,” 322.

by gathering and analyzing intelligence, refueling NATO and partner aircraft, and contributing other high-end military capabilities, such as electronic jamming.”¹⁰⁷

President Obama argued that scaling back American involvement would ensure “the risk and cost of this operation—to our military and to American taxpayers—will be reduced significantly.”¹⁰⁸ According to Hallams and Schreer, this action reflected a change in America’s position on NATO burden-sharing, meaning that the “limited nature of U.S. interests’ dictated a constrained response.”¹⁰⁹ As part of this new strategy, the United States withheld certain military materials from NATO for the operation. That included A-10 Thunderbolt II and AC-130 Spectre gunships, which have a critical role in providing air cover to ground troops conducting precision operations.¹¹⁰

In terms of the raw numbers, the United States contributed 75 percent of all aerial refueling sorties, 70 percent of intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR), 24 percent of the total aircraft, and 27 percent of the total sorties flown for the actual operation, which does include the refueling sorties.¹¹¹ Even though the United States did not partake in the bombing runs for OUP, it still had a substantial role to enable the other members to carry out the strikes. One could make the argument that the United States may not have contributed much to the actual war-fighting effort, but that the European allies could not necessarily complete some of the missions without the refueling aircraft and the ISR for the targets. In the end, it seems that the United States withheld

¹⁰⁷ Daalder and Stavridis, “NATO’s Victory in Libya,” 3.

¹⁰⁸ Hallams and Schreer, “Towards a ‘post-American’ alliance? NATO burden-sharing after Libya,” 321.

¹⁰⁹ Ibid.

¹¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹¹ “Libya: Operation Unified Protector,” U.S. Mission to NATO, April 28, 2011, Accessed March 4, 2014 http://nato.usmission.gov/issues/our_issues/libya/libya-fact-sheet2/libya-fact-sheet.html

substantial military support because of domestic politics, but it allowed other NATO members to take on the necessary burden.

Tier 2

Of all the “tier 2” members, Great Britain and France pushed for the air campaign in Libya the most, while countries like Germany publicly criticized the operation and did not contribute to the air campaign.¹¹² It is important to note that this was the first NATO operation that France was reintegrated back into the NATO command structure after a 43-year absence.¹¹³ Great Britain and France’s two leaders began lobbying for intervention, taking a more hawkish stance than other NATO members.¹¹⁴ Great Britain and France then joined the United States in leading the passing of the Security Council resolution while Germany abstained.¹¹⁵

France’s initial involvement could be explained by the political ramifications from conflict so close to its borders, which contributed to the strength of its political support and its involvement in the air campaign.¹¹⁶ Even when there was public opposition to France’s involvement, it did not impact President Nicolas Sarkozy’s hawkish views. Initially, the French people did not want NATO to become involved in the operation for fear of alienating the Arab nations.¹¹⁷ Despite the French people’s initial opposition to NATO’s command of the operation, the country still took a lead in

¹¹² Hallams and Schreer, “Towards a ‘post-American’ alliance? NATO burden-sharing after Libya,” 322.

¹¹³ Edward Cody, “After 43 years, France to rejoin NATO as full member,” *Washington Post*, March 12, 2009, Accessed March 28, 2014 <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/03/11/AR2009031100547.html>

¹¹⁴ Jason W. Davidson, “France, Britain and the intervention in Libya: an integrated analysis,” *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* 26, no. 2 (02, 2013), 315. Also, see Michaels, “Able but not Willing,” 20.

¹¹⁵ Mark Laity, “The Latest Test for NATO,” *Journal of the Royal United Services Institute for Defence Studies* 157, no. 1 (01, 2012), 53.

¹¹⁶ Davidson, “France, Britain and the intervention in Libya,” 316.

¹¹⁷ Kim Willsher, “Sarkozy opposes NATO taking control of Libya operation,” *The Guardian*, March 22, 2011, Accessed March 18, 2014 <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2011/mar/22/sarkozy-nato-libya-france>

the operation. France's involvement in the operation included the deploying of 3,100 sorties, which accounted for 32 percent of the overall sorties during the operation.¹¹⁸ The French contributed the largest amount of "tier 2" military support in what became known as "Sarkozy's War," due to his intense lobbying for intervention.¹¹⁹

The initial political support from Great Britain included the push for UN Security Council resolution to respond to the humanitarian crisis. Reports from British journalists argue that Prime Minister David Cameron was influenced by the West's failure to respond to Srebrenica in 1995 that saw 8,000 civilians slaughtered.¹²⁰ The historical influence on Britain's leaders contributed to the vocal political response for intervention. However, while the British public opposed involvement, it did not seem to impact Cameron's drive to intervene. Other than the United States pushing for NATO involvement after OOD, "the British were the lone outliers, wanting the operation to take place under NATO auspices and utilizing NATO command and control systems."¹²¹ In terms of military support for OUP, Great Britain contributed 3,000 air sorties, which would place it as the second largest contributor behind France.¹²² They also sent in special forces to liaise with the Libyan rebels, exhibiting their commitment to impact the ground situation.¹²³ In the end, Great Britain believed it was in its national interest to intervene and it showed from Cameron's actions to publicly push for an operation. A key

¹¹⁸ "Opération Harmattan," French Ministry of Defense, November 8, 2011, Accessed March 28, 2014 <http://www.webcitation.org/63rgPazcA>

¹¹⁹ David Auerswald and Stephen Saideman, *NATO in Afghanistan: Fighting Together, Fighting Alone* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2014), 197. Also, see Ben Smith, "Nicolas Sarkozy's War," *Politico*, March 22, 2011, Accessed March 28, 2014 <http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0311/51708.html>

¹²⁰ Davidson, "France, Britain and the intervention in Libya," 321. Also, see Auerswald and Saideman, *NATO in Afghanistan: Fighting Together, Fighting Alone*, 207.

¹²¹ Auerswald and Saideman, *NATO in Afghanistan: Fighting Together, Fighting Alone*, 197.

¹²² Davidson, "France, Britain and the intervention in Libya," 320.

¹²³ Auerswald and Saideman, *NATO in Afghanistan: Fighting Together, Fighting Alone*, 208

conclusion is that “tier 2” countries like France and Great Britain “were willing to ‘step up’ and take on a greater share of the burden.”¹²⁴ Hallams and Schreer argue that this represented a shift in the European members’ thinking and those members “can and will use force when they have the political will to do so.”¹²⁵

Germany was not as willing to support the operation as some of its fellow “tier 2” allies. Some have explained that Germany’s unwillingness to even participate in campaigns like these is due to its post-World War II culture of restraint, particularly on military matters.¹²⁶ One could argue that this factored into Germany’s minimal involvement in Kosovo. Chancellor Angela Merkel argued that “the no fly-zone idea was potentially dangerous.”¹²⁷ The initial anxiety behind the Germany’s lack of political support stemmed from a concern that the military action supporting OUP would not be supported by the German public.¹²⁸ Also, there was suspicion from Germany towards the motives of the key allies pushing for military intervention: France and Great Britain.¹²⁹ Merkel believed Sarkozy was motivated by his upcoming election to show strength, which caused him to favor intervention.¹³⁰ Nevertheless, Germany followed a similar pattern as in Kosovo and withheld any action for this operation.

Another “tier 2” country that did not get as involved was Italy. The Italians offered mild support for the operation and gave limited contributions to the air campaign. Most of its contributions were through enforcement of the arms embargo on Qaddafi and

¹²⁴ Hallams and Schreer, “Towards a ‘post-American’ alliance? NATO burden-sharing after Libya,” 322.

¹²⁵ Ibid.

¹²⁶ Sarah Brockmeier, “Germany and the Intervention in Libya,” *Survival* 55, no. 6, (06, 2013), 63-64.

¹²⁷ Daniel F. Baltusaitis and Mark E. Duckenfield, “Operation Unified Protector: Triumph or Warning Sign?” *Baltic Security and Defence Review* 14, no. 2 (02, 2012), 26.

¹²⁸ Ibid., 33

¹²⁹ Brockmeier, “Germany and the Intervention in Libya,” 67-68.

¹³⁰ Ibid.

giving NATO access to seven air bases for launching strikes.¹³¹ The reasons for their hesitancy to participate in the operation directly appear to result from their economic ties with Libya.¹³² According to Bloomberg, prior to the intervention, Italy's trade with Libya was over 12 billion Euros; so it would be difficult for any country to go to war against a country with this type of trade partnership.¹³³ Public opinion factored into their decision-making as well because only 40 percent of Italians polled in April 2011 favored intervention in Libya.¹³⁴ However, Christian Anrig noted that, Italy offered some small level of support through "reportedly enforcing the no-fly zone" with eight combat aircraft.¹³⁵ And even with the lack of political support for the operation, Italy still utilized drones and other combat materials for ISR through a joint venture with the United States.¹³⁶ A month after that April poll, public opinion shifted to 52 percent of Italians supporting intervention, which could explain the change in Italy's thinking.¹³⁷

In the end, the "tier 2" countries contributed to the operation based on a variety of public, political, and military support. The political support mostly came from Great Britain and France, while Germany expressed opposition to the operation. Great Britain and France contributed about two-thirds of the strike sorties, while Italy contributed one-third, due to its contribution of eight aircraft to the operation.¹³⁸ Based on the

¹³¹ Ben Lombardi, "The Berlusconi Government and Intervention in Libya," *The International Spectator* 46, no. 4, (04, 2012), 31.

¹³² Christian F. Anrig, "Allied Air Power over Libya," *Air & Space Power Journal* 25, no. 4 (04, 2011), 93.

¹³³ Flavia Krause-Jackson and Giovanni Salzano, "Italy Most Exposed to Libya as Top Trading Partner," *Bloomberg*, February 22, 2011, Accessed March 29, 2014 <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2011-02-22/italy-most-exposed-to-libya-as-top-trading-partner-chart-of-the-day.html>

¹³⁴ Lombardi, "The Berlusconi Government and Intervention in Libya," 33.

¹³⁵ Anrig, "Allied Air Power over Libya," 93.

¹³⁶ *Ibid.*

¹³⁷ Lombardi, "The Berlusconi Government and Intervention in Libya," 33.

¹³⁸ Florence Gaub, *The North Atlantic Treaty Organization and Libya: Reviewing Operation Unified Protector* (Carlisle Barracks: The Strategic Studies Institute, 2013), 7.

contributions, the “tier 2” countries stepped up as the major players to conduct the operation in Libya.

Tier 3

Mark Laity attributes the lesser involvement of the third tier members to the fact that “only the richest nations of the Alliance...can afford the full spectrum of military capabilities.”¹³⁹ Only six alliance members contributed to the NATO air campaign and Denmark, Canada, and Norway were the involved “tier 3” nations. Canada contributed six CF-18 planes and two tanker aircraft, while engaging targets in Misrata early in the campaign.¹⁴⁰ Yet it is interesting to see how that some smaller countries took on a greater burden while others did not. Some of the stronger military countries in the alliance like Turkey, the Netherlands, Poland, and Spain were reluctant to offer any military or political support to the mission.¹⁴¹ In particular, Poland and the Netherlands may have been active during OAF in Kosovo, but did not offer as much support for OUP. In terms of the Netherlands, Anrig argues Dutch policy shifted from being proactive in NATO operations.¹⁴² Poland did not participate at all in the campaign, which can be attributed to the close diplomatic ties it had with Qaddafi following the destruction of his nuclear weapons and willingness to become a member of the international community.¹⁴³ Poland’s actions starkly contrasted to its involvement in Kosovo to save civilians. On the other hand, Hungary did not have a role in OUP consistent with its earlier policy of refusing to participate in Kosovo. Hungary’s non-participation can be attributed to its

¹³⁹ Laity, “The Latest Test for NATO,” 58.

¹⁴⁰ Anrig, “Allied Air Power over Libya,” 93.

¹⁴¹ Michaels, “Able but not Willing,” 33-34.

¹⁴² Anrig, “Allied Air Power over Libya,” 93.

¹⁴³ Joseph P. Bell and Ryan C. Hendrickson, “NATO’s Visegrad Allies and the Bombing of Qaddafi: The Consequence of Alliance Free-Riders,” *Journal of Slavic Military Studies* 25, no. 2 (02, 2012), 154.

past diplomatic and trade relationships with Libya; however, even without actual involvement, Hungary offered public support for the intervention to protect civilians, but not for regime change.¹⁴⁴

The Czech Republic followed a variation of the same playbook from Kosovo, as it did not participate in the operation, but it did offer public support for the air strikes against Qaddafi. This could be attributed to the public support for an intervention, but also the fact that the Czech Republic did not have the military assets to participate.¹⁴⁵ This comes back to this idea that Olson and Zeckhauser discussed about how smaller nations see themselves as incapable of impacting the situation in the alliance. While the Czech public did not support participation in the air strikes, there was significant support for NATO's intervention with close to 48 percent believing the strikes were warranted.¹⁴⁶ In the end, it seems that Czechs were in favor of the prevention of killing civilians, but for their country not to partake in the operation is indicative of the problem with burden-sharing.

Even though some countries support action, they are not willing to participate in the action themselves, leaving other countries to shoulder a greater portion of the burden. Additionally, it becomes harder when militarily superior allies like Turkey, Germany, the Netherlands, and Poland do not offer support and Belgium, Denmark, and Norway – countries that had significantly smaller military assets – “provided a disproportionately high level of support.”¹⁴⁷ Also of interest is the number of non-NATO countries that contributed assets to the air campaign. This includes Qatar, Jordan, the United Arab

¹⁴⁴ Ibid., 152-153.

¹⁴⁵ Ibid., 158.

¹⁴⁶ Ibid.

¹⁴⁷ Michaels, “Able but not Willing,” 33-34.

Emirates, and Sweden, which all contributed some form of military assistance.¹⁴⁸ It seems that many of these “tier 3” countries were not willing to offer assistance to the operation, forcing other allies to shoulder more of the burden.

Analysis: Tier 1 Leads Kosovo, Tier 2 Leads Libya

The takeaways from the case studies support the hypothesis that the top two tiers (singling out Great Britain, France, and the United States) have the greatest impact in the conduct of NATO operations. OAF clearly showcased the significant role of the United States in the results of the operation. While other tiers like 2 and 3 did offer contributions to the operation and flew a significant amount of sorties, Great Britain and France were not able to effectively conduct the operations without U.S. logistical support, which included intelligence, surveillance, reconnaissance, as well as a significant amount of refueling support for aircraft. Great Britain may have pushed the most for airstrikes with its political advocacy, but the United States was instrumental to the overall success of the operation. This falls under the free-rider problem because the United States was still called on to shoulder a significant burden to support the “tier 2” allies in their strike sorties. Obviously, the disparity in capabilities factors in, but it does not change the fact that Great Britain and France still needed a significant U.S. contribution even when the United States wanted to scale back involvement. To add to this free rider idea, it seems perplexing that Greece was adamantly against the intervention, but then decided to offer ground troops for KFOR. In addition, it appears that some nations offered political support, but did not give enough in terms of military support

In the end, OAF was a prime example of the burden-sharing problem in NATO. According to Daalder and O’Hanlon, “Operation Allied Force certainly revealed what

¹⁴⁸ Anrig, “Allied Air Power over Libya,” 94.

many already realized or suspected before: that European NATO members are not, on balance, contributing their share of the transatlantic security bargain.”¹⁴⁹ Furthermore, German General Klaus Naumann, a top NATO military official, argued that this could be a harbinger for future NATO burden-sharing arguments, stating that,

There is a totally unacceptable imbalance of military capabilities between the U.S. and its allies, notably the Europeans. With no corrective action taken as a matter of urgency, there will be increasing difficulties to ensure interoperability of allied forces, and operational security could be compromised. Moreover, it cannot be tolerated that one ally has to carry on average some 70%, in some areas up to 95%, of the burden.¹⁵⁰

However, in Libya, “tier 2” countries like Great Britain and France took the lead while the United States took a step back from the operation. The interesting aspect of the overall Libya campaign was that the Europeans now had more capabilities to shoulder their fair share of the burden for NATO operations. According to Anrig, the military gap between the European allies and the United States “ha[d] narrowed, not only in terms of equipment but also in terms of willingness to intervene.”¹⁵¹ Yet in the end, the allies needed military logistical support to carry out the airstrikes, utilizing U.S. capabilities. As the strongest power in the alliance, the United States can have a significant impact on the results of a campaign; however, they decided it was best to scale back involvement in this specific operation. This could be a win for the burden-sharing argument that the United States complains about and the success of France and Great Britain’s involvement to lead the NATO campaign only adds to that argument. Yet even when the United States scaled back its involvement, some in “tier 3” still refused to share the burden. This may occur because they do not have the military capabilities to partake in certain

¹⁴⁹ Daalder and O’Hanlon, *Winning Ugly*, 150.

¹⁵⁰ *Ibid.*

¹⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 105

operations. It seems that while “tier 2” did take on more of the burden, “tier 3’s” lack of involvement does not put to rest the burden-sharing issue. This operation had a far smaller number of NATO members offering their political and military contributions with only six members carrying out the strike operations and more than half not participating in the campaign at all. It may be necessary in the future to push the smaller countries to offer more in support to operations and carry their burden so they can be upstanding members of the alliance.

Looking at both operations through the prism of these tiers, I think that they are indicative of NATO’s problems with burden-sharing. Both operations showed a small number of NATO members are shouldering the burden with the United States in Kosovo and Great Britain and France in Libya. Libya may have shown the success of “tier 2” to conduct an operation without significant U.S. support, but it still showed the lack of determination by the rest of NATO to take on their fair share as well. Regardless of the military success of the Libya operation and the fact that some smaller nations shared the burden of the operation, it does not quell the argument that many NATO members are free-riders in the alliance.

Conclusion:

This chapter shows the effect of NATO member tiers on the conduct of the alliance’s operations, using burden-sharing to determine each tier’s impact on the outcome of the operation. In the end, OAF showed how American involvement (or “tier 1”) significantly contributed to a swift operation and achieving the stated goals. Milosevic surrendered after three months of bombing raids and it could have taken longer without the United States. OUP proved that “tier 2” could take on a greater burden and

achieve a successful mission, but the seven-month operation was a little longer without America's involvement in conducting the actual airstrikes. Could America's involvement have impacted the outcome more positively? It is plausible to believe that assertion, but only history will judge as the operation gets further and further away and Libya continues to evolve following the end of Qaddafi's rule. In terms of NATO functioning without certain countries shouldering the burden or not, the operations achieved the intended outcomes: protecting civilians and ending the rules of dictators.

Regardless of the successes, the current NATO model of certain tiers shoulder more of the burden than other members is not sustainable for the alliance in the future. There continues to be a problem with some nations contributing more political and materiel resources to operations than others. Tomas Valasek has an interesting perspective on this whole issue. Even though countries may decide to stay out of an operation, "the alliance continues to do its work."¹⁵² He adds that "since the end of the Cold War, NATO has been acting more like a shifting coalition of the willing than a true alliance."¹⁵³ In addition, Francois Heisbourg points out that "NATO has become a service provider, with different allies turning to it for different services."¹⁵⁴ These interpretations are indicative of NATO's role in the 21st century. It has shifted from its role as a traditional alliance where every member contributes to the operation to an alliance where members pick and choose their commitments.

So far, NATO has still been effective in carrying out its missions to preserve peace and security. However, the future of NATO may depend on how certain "tier 3"

¹⁵² Tomas Valasek, "What Libya says about the future of the transatlantic alliance," *Centre for European Reform*, July 2011, Accessed March 11, 2014
http://www.cer.org.uk/sites/default/files/publications/attachments/pdf/2011/essay_libya_july11-146.pdf

¹⁵³ Ibid.

¹⁵⁴ Ibid.

countries choose to contribute to NATO's missions in this age of non-state threats. In an ideal world, each NATO member should shoulder an equal burden for operations. With global conflicts moving from state-based war to asymmetric fighting, NATO will need better methods for ensuring that every member contributes to its efforts. Only time will tell if NATO can rise above the burden-sharing debate and actually function successfully to combat global security challenges.

Chapter 3: Non-State Threats and NATO Military Operations

Once the Cold War ended, NATO's main threat – Soviet aggression – disappeared and observers asked whether the alliance could survive in the post-Cold War world. Yet, even without the Soviet threat, NATO still found a reason to have a role in global security matters, particularly with the emergence of non-state threats. NATO found a way to provide stability and security even if it shifted slightly from its original design of a collective defense organization with its humanitarian interventions and conflict stabilization efforts. This process of adaptation allowed NATO to evolve from its original design as a collective defense organization concerned with the direct Soviet threat and state-on-state conflict to a collective security organization focused on rapid deployments in order to counter indirect non-state threats.

In the new strategic environment post-Cold War, NATO has adapted and transformed to respond out-of-area to non-state threats, such as terrorism, insurgencies, ethnic cleansing, and state failures. This chapter will answer the question of whether NATO's adaptation to non-state threats in out-of-area conflicts was successful. My hypothesis for this chapter is that NATO's ability to adapt to changing security challenges outside of NATO's regional borders allowed the alliance to conduct military operations against non-state threats, which resulted in stable and secure environments on the ground.

This chapter begins by examining the nature of non-state threats and then NATO's evolution from its original charter in order to survive. The chapter looks at the concepts of NATO's persistence through institutional theory in order to explain its adaptation. The next section discusses the general concepts of NATO's transformation

and adaptation after major events in global history. This chapter then focuses on what NATO's strategic concepts indicate about how it may have adapted to conduct successful post-Cold War military operations that featured non-state threats. The chapter focuses on two case studies that involved non-state threats, such as ethnic conflicts, insurgencies, and terrorism to illustrate that NATO's adaptation was successful, resulting in successful military operations. Emphasizing these concepts and the alliance's capacity to adapt to new threats will support the argument for NATO's indispensable role in the 21st century.

The Nature of Non-States Threats and How to Fight Them

When defining non-state threats, one could immediately think of threats that did not feature a conventional military vs. military battle. Some have specifically defined non-state threats to include terrorism, cyber warfare, and insurgencies.¹ According to Lt. General Teodor Frunzeti, non-state threats “have been identified [as] new risks, dangers and threats of global scale and high intensity, such as terrorism, proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, organized crime, and other processes and phenomena which...can have a negative impact such as globalization that intensifies those listed above.”² Elinor Sloan noted that irregular warfare is not conventional warfare between two countries with standing militaries, but would also involve a non-state actor.³ This type of threat might have seemed more prevalent now, but it has been around for quite some time and discussed in different ways, according to Lt. Colonel John Nagl (Ret.).⁴

¹ Teodor Frunzeti, “Asymmetric, Unconventional and Hybrid Actions in 21st Century Warfare,” *Strategic Impact* 46, no.1 (01, 2013), 6.

² Ibid.

³ Elinor C. Sloan, *Modern Military Strategy*, (New York: Routledge, 2012), 65.

⁴ John A. Nagl, *Learning to Eat Soup with a Knife: Counterinsurgency Lessons from Malaya and Vietnam*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002), 15.

Yet it is the 21st century where these threats would dominate, because of other factors due to the end of the Cold War, such as globalization.⁵ Frunzeti's studies emphasized the theory that the Cold War served as the catalyst for these threats to impact the strategic environment for NATO and the rest of the world and allowed for globalization to dominate the political environment.⁶ Because of the evolution of the threats that contribute to globalization, some observers have argued that conflict cannot be focused primarily on state-on-state conflicts, but more on asymmetric threats that arise throughout the world.⁷ Due to this "paradigm shift," the unconventional threats that Frunzeti discussed in previous studies have a significant impact on international security.⁸ While non-state threats may be more common in the 21st century, it was not NATO's original intent to deal with these types of threats because the alliance acted as a deterrent to Soviet aggression to defend the collective alliance of Western European nations against the Warsaw Pact and communism.

NATO's Institutional Survival

According to Stephen Walt, "An alliance is a formal or informal commitment for security cooperation between two or more states. Although the precise arrangements embodied in different alliances vary enormously, the defining feature of any alliance is a commitment for mutual military support against some external actor(s) in some specified set of circumstances."⁹ In addition, NATO was created as a political alliance between

⁵ Frunzeti, "Asymmetric, Unconventional and Hybrid Actions in 21st Century Warfare," 7.

⁶ Teodor Frunzeti, "Conventional and Unconventional in Military Actions," *Strategic Impact* 45, no. 4 (04, 2012), 6.

⁷ Rebecca R. Moore, *NATO's New Mission: Projecting Stability in a Post-Cold War World* (Westport: Praeger Security International, 2007), 43; Muhidin Dzambic, "NATO's Strategic Concept: Non-Traditional Threats and Bridging Military Capability Gaps," *Connections* 10, no. 3 (03, 2011), 16.

⁸ Frunzeti, "Conventional and Unconventional in Military Actions," 6.

⁹ Stephen Walt, "Why Alliances Endure or Collapse," *Survival* 39, no.1 (01, 1997), 157; Stephen Walt, *The Origins of Alliances*, (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1987), 1.

members where each had common interests and utilized NATO as a vehicle to achieve those interests.¹⁰ When formed, the allies hoped NATO would serve as a counterweight to the growing Soviet rise in Eastern Europe and “to defend beleaguered Western European nations against the threat of communism, either from within through national Communist parties, or from without through such military actions as the Soviet Union might mount against them,” which came with a large conventional military deployment – mainly by the United States – to defend against Soviet aggression.¹¹ In essence, the NATO treaty was used as a vehicle to rebuild Western Europe into a community that shared the same political and economic values.¹² In addition, NATO was used as a forum to help negotiate arms reduction treaties with the Communists and prevent nuclear confrontation, especially during the periods of détente.¹³ While it was not considered an organization at the time of its founding, the North Atlantic Treaty bound the parties together in the traditional sense of an alliance. However, NATO evolved from a collection of allies guided by the treaty to a more structured global security organization that was guided by governing principles in order to conduct operations.¹⁴

The end of the Cold War presented the first challenge to NATO’s survival. Some observers believed NATO would lose its purpose without the Communist threat. John Mearsheimer and other “realists” believed that following the end of the Cold War, international institutions like NATO would have “minimal influence on state behavior,

¹⁰ Steven L. Rearden, “NATO’s Strategy: Past, Present, and Future,” in *NATO in the Post-Cold War Era: Does It Have a Future?* ed. S. Victor Papacosma and Mary Ann Heiss. (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1995), 72.

¹¹ Lawrence S. Kaplan, *The Long Entanglement* (Westport: Praeger, 1999), 29. Also, see Anthony Forster and William Wallace, “What is NATO For?” *Survival* 43, no. 4 (04, 2001-2002), 111-112.

¹² Forster and Wallace, “What is NATO For?” 112.

¹³ Kaplan, *The Long Entanglement*, 116-117.

¹⁴ Gareth Winrow, “NATO and Out-of-Area: A Post Cold War Challenge,” *European Security* 3, no.4 (04, 1994), 617.

and thus hold little promise for promoting stability in the post-cold War world,” meaning there was no role for it at all.¹⁵ However, others believed that given NATO’s structure and organization, it did have the capabilities to adapt to the changing strategic environment that came with the fall of the Soviet Union. John Duffield and Robert McCalla have emphasized NATO’s “persistence,” while Celeste Wallander points out NATO’s “adaptability” following the end of the Cold War.¹⁶ In fact, Wallander argued that alliances can also be viewed as security institutions, which may explain why NATO was able to evolve the way that it did.¹⁷ Wallander stated that institutions like NATO “persist because they are costly to create and less costly to maintain, so they may remain useful despite changed circumstances.”¹⁸ Wallander’s argument seemed to add to what McCalla focused on when discussing various organizational theories to explore why NATO has survived past the Cold War.

Robert McCalla focused a study on NATO’s persistence after the Cold War, which highlights this same issue. McCalla argued that scholars have not studied in-depth why alliances have persisted when the threat has disappeared, mainly focusing on the realist and neorealist theories of why alliances are actually created.¹⁹ He uses three theories within the scope of alliance theory – neorealist, organizational, and institutional

¹⁵ John J. Mearsheimer, “The False promise of International Institutions,” *International Security* 19, no. 3 (03, 1994-1995), 7-14. Also, see Gunther Hellmann and Reinhard Wolf, “Neorealism, Neoliberal Institutionalism, and the Future of NATO,” *Security Studies* 3, no. 1 (01, 1993), 3-43.

¹⁶ John S. Duffield, “NATO’s Functions after the Cold War,” *Political Science Quarterly* 109, no. 5 (05, 1994-1995), 763-787; Robert B. McCalla, “NATO’s Persistence after the Cold War,” *International Organization* 50, no.3 (03, 1996), 445-475; Celeste A. Wallander, “Institutional Assets and Adaptability: NATO After the Cold War,” *International Organization* 54, no. 4 (04, 2000), 705.

¹⁷ Wallander, “Institutional Assets and Adaptability: NATO After the Cold War”, 705. Also, see Forster and Wallace, “What is NATO For?” 111.

¹⁸ Wallander, “Institutional Assets and Adaptability: NATO After the Cold War,” 705 and 711. Also, see Robert O. Keohane, *After Hegemony* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984).

¹⁹ McCalla, “NATO’s Persistence after the Cold War,” 446.

– to highlight why NATO was successful in its survival.²⁰ To define these theories, McCalla notes that neorealists believe that NATO would “falter absent its threat,” while he points out that organizational theory discusses that the interests of NATO itself drive its behavior to persist; whereas the institutional theory argues in favor of NATO’s persistence due the shared norms and values of the members.²¹ His arguments of NATO’s uses of organizational and institutional theories highlight components that seem to explain the persistence better than neorealist theory, which is more focused on NATO’s disappearance after a threat is gone. While McCalla emphasized that organizations do not have uniform goals, he explained that there is willingness for the organization to modify and change its goals to survive regardless of what some members may believe is the best course of action for moving forward.²² NATO adapted to the strategic environment, but maintained its core values. This indicated that the alliance remained more concerned with its survival and took the actions to repurpose its role for the post-Cold War world.²³

International institutional theory also provided good arguments for explaining NATO’s survival. McCalla pointed out that institutions have a formal structure in place and because of this structure there are benefits to members that may go beyond the the institution’s original intent.²⁴ In addition, with a formalized structure in place, members realize that it is better to maintain the institution and adapt it rather than creating a new one.²⁵ McCalla argued that this theory best explains NATO’s persistence, because it

²⁰ Ibid., 450.

²¹ Ibid., 447, 456, and 461.

²² Ibid., 456.

²³ Ibid., 458-460.

²⁴ Ibid., 462.

²⁵ Ibid. Also, see Wallander, Institutional Assets and Adaptability: NATO After the Cold War,” 712-714.

shows adapting to a new environment and using existing structures as a better way to maintain an institution, which has lasted for four decades rather than folding it and creating a new organization.²⁶ It seems that using existing structures and repurposing the mechanisms of the alliance tends to be easier for adapting in the post-Cold War world. Taking this a step further, Wallander focused on NATO as an institution and argued that NATO began by developing general assets for action, but then evolved during the Cold War to use specific resources to counter the Soviet threat.²⁷ However, by shedding the specific assets NATO became able to adapt to the changing security environment when the Soviet Union was no longer a threat.²⁸ I think the arguments that McCalla and Wallander laid out have important relevance for showing NATO's survival and serve as a guide for understanding why non-state threats may have led to this adaptation. The end of the Soviet threat and the rise of unconventional and non-state threats pushed NATO to change its calculus. However, with NATO's mechanisms and assets already in place, it was able to recalibrate the alliance rather than ending it.

General Concepts about NATO's Ability to Adapt and Transform

Much has been written about NATO's transformation from its original design as a Cold War defensive security alliance. Several observers focus on issues of NATO's transformation in a number of interconnected areas, such as new missions, new capabilities, and NATO enlargement, which all contributed to the Alliance's core Article 2 goal of friendly international relations and stability around the world.²⁹ Scholars all

²⁶ Ibid., 464.

²⁷ Wallander "Institutional Assets and Adaptability: NATO After the Cold War," 731.

²⁸ Ibid., 731-732.

²⁹ Ivan Dinev Ivanov, *Transforming NATO: New Allies, Missions, and Capabilities*. (Lanham: Lexington Books, 2011), xiv; Andrew T. Wolff, "The Structural and Political Crisis of NATO Transformation," *Journal of Transatlantic Studies* 7, no. 4, (04, 2009), 476-492; David S. Yost, *NATO Transformed*

seem to agree that transformation happened, but they prove it in a number of different ways. Ivan Dinev Ivanov examined these issues and further extrapolated them by using club goods theory and complementarities to show NATO's transformation through three interrelated actions: enlargement, new missions, and new capabilities.³⁰ Ivanov believed that the fusion of these actions best explained NATO's transformation. Kwang Ho Chun focused on enlargement, but looked at NATO's adaptation by investigating the "institutions, capabilities, and political will" that transformed the alliance to its current form; however, he believed that enlargement caused internal conflict between members, which may have had ramifications for NATO's ability to successful adapt.³¹ Those studies seemed to focus more on the expansion issue.

Others like Andrew T. Wolff are more interested in the instabilities and friction that NATO's transformation has caused within the alliance to redefine its role in the world, since there does not seem to be a clear definition of what NATO's role should be.³² He talked about security reforms and highlighted particular actions through the guise of how these actions have hurt cooperation between the alliance.³³ Wolff offered some relevant points to this study, specifically that NATO's transformation was defined by expanding the meaning of security for the post-Cold War world. Wolff indicated that this new security meant the alliance needed to be more agile in responding to threats, promoting democracy, and collective defense.³⁴ This is a good point that shows the need to respond to new challenges, particularly unconventional threats that so far define the

(Washington, DC: U.S. Institute for Peace, 1998); Kwang Ho Chun, "NATO: Adaptation and Relevance for the 21st Century," *Journal of International and Area Studies* 20, no. 2 (02, 2013), 67-82.

³⁰ Ivanov, *Transforming NATO: New Allies, Missions, and Capabilities*, 77.

³¹ Chun, "NATO: Adaptation and Relevance for the 21st Century," 67-82.

³² *Ibid.*, 476.

³³ *Ibid.*

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 477-482.

21st century. Gareth Winrow offered a similar argument that the transformation occurred because NATO understood the need to shift from the collective defensive nature of the alliance towards projecting stability and managing crises to have an impact.³⁵ This uncertain and complex world may have caused transformation and adaptability.³⁶ While scholars examined the concept of transformation differently most seemed to agree on the existence of adaptation and transformation. Winrow and Wolff both highlight the shifting nature of the challenges NATO would face in the Cold War world, which supports the argument about how non-state threats caused NATO to adapt. In addition, they seemed to imply that these challenges would be indirect in nature and would focus more on threats that did not fall within the realm of traditional state-on-state Cold war conflict.

It appears that adaptability and transformation are similar concepts when it comes to NATO's post-Cold War functions because they both highlight the need for NATO to change with the times in order to survive. Wolff offers a definition of what transformation is for NATO; specifically that it is a wide-ranging term to describe all of NATO's changes post-Cold War to keep the alliance relevant.³⁷ Adaptability can also be defined in the same way as transformation, because as McCalla showed, adaptability kept several NATO mechanisms and structures in place to survive after the Soviet threat. It seemed that transformation and adaptability occurred in order for NATO to stay relevant following the end of the Cold War. Without finding a way to survive, NATO would have just disappeared once the Soviet Union fell. These are the general concepts for

³⁵ Winrow, 'NATO and Out-of-Area: A Post Cold War Challenge,' 622.

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ Ibid.

understanding NATO's evolution, but they do not really discuss non-state threats and why these threats may have caused this change in NATO's strategic worldview.

Out-of-Area Operations and Strategic Concepts

The previous section focused on the general concept of transformation/adaptation in NATO. One of the main examples of this concept was NATO's focus towards out-of-area operations. Following the end of the Cold War, Senator Richard Lugar famously said that for NATO to have a role in the new world it would need to "go out-of-area or out-of-business."³⁸ Lugar adequately describes the next period in NATO's history, since out-of-area operations would become the new normal for NATO in the 21st century. NATO's shift away from Cold War defense to focus on out-of-area operations meant that the alliance moved away from nuclear deterrence and massing troops on the border of the Warsaw Pact countries, which were commonplace during the Cold War. Out-of-area operations would consist of smaller and rapidly deployed forces that could conduct peacekeeping, humanitarian relief, and peace enforcement operations, which demonstrated to be the most effective way to combat the different conflicts.³⁹ In essence, these operations would concentrate on "military, political social, economic, etc. developments in territory which is out-of-area" because these conflicts would offer new risks and challenges for NATO to deal with.⁴⁰ More than anything, out-of-area operations also would provide NATO with an ability to stay relevant in the post-Cold War world. Veronica Kitchen stated that NATO understood the necessity to become

³⁸ Richard Lugar, "NATO: Out of Area or Out of Business: A Call for U.S. Leadership to Revive and Redefine the Alliance." (August 2, 1993) in Mats Berdal and David Ucko. "NATO at 60," *Survival* 51, no.2 (02, 2009), 59.

³⁹ Wallander, "Institutional Assets and Adaptability: NATO After the Cold War," 726.

⁴⁰ Winrow, "NATO and Out-of-Area: A Post Cold War Challenge," 620. Also, see Richard L. Kugler, *NATO Military Strategy for the Post-Cold War Era: Issues and Options*, (Santa Monica: Rand Corporation, 1992), xi.

involved in peacemaking and peacekeeping, since it recognized the responsibility to shape stability in the regions with proximity to the allies.⁴¹ NATO viewed the common interest for participating in these out-of-area operations to prevent genocide and to ensure global stability.⁴² If anything was apparent from the out-of-area focus, it was that NATO moved from collective defense against a common enemy to collective security in order to ensure a stable international order post-Cold War.

NATO adapted and moved towards out-of-area conflicts through the definition of its overall strategy, otherwise known as the drafting and release of three “strategic concepts.” Andreas Behnke offered a useful definition of a strategic concept, which “defines the political and military purpose of NATO, thereby providing a ‘world picture’ containing a spatialization of the Alliance’s security political environment, designations of agency, and an enumeration of available and legitimate means and strategies through which to mediate the re-presented entities.”⁴³ Before the end of the Cold War, NATO’s strategic concepts were kept classified from the public, but following 1991 NATO saw a need to make its strategy public.⁴⁴ The 1991 Strategic Concept may offer more understanding for NATO’s changing calculus, mainly because it was the first concept

⁴¹ Veronica M. Kitchen, “NATO’s Out-of-Area Norm from Suez to Afghanistan,” *Journal of Transatlantic Studies* 8, no.2 (02, 2010), 110.

⁴² Ibid.

⁴³ Andreas Behnke, *NATO’s Security Discourse After the Cold War: Representing the West* (London; New York: Routledge, 2013), 79; Dzambic, “NATO’s Strategic Concept: Non-Traditional Threats and Bridging Military Capability Gaps,” 14-15; Jens Ringsmose and Sten Rynning, “Come Home, NATO? The Atlantic Alliance’s New Strategic Concept,” *Danish Institute for International Studies*, 2009, http://www.post322.org/www.Post322.org/NATO_News_files/2009%2003%2010%20-%20DIIS%20Report%20-%20NATOs%20New%20Strategic%20Concept.pdf Accessed August 28, 2014, 6.

⁴⁴ Gulnur Aybet, “The NATO Strategic Concept Revisited: Grand Strategy and Emerging Issues,” in *NATO in Search of a Vision*. ed. Gulnur Aybet and Rebecca R. Moore. (Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2010), 38.

that discussed the need for NATO to look at threats outside of former conventional military engagements with communist powers.⁴⁵

While the 1991 Strategic Concept argued that collective defense remained a core principle of the alliance, the document mentioned indirect threats to NATO that came from instabilities caused by economic, social, and political tensions.⁴⁶ Specific passages focus on the security risks and challenges to NATO in 1991. In the following passage, NATO specifically argued that the environment changed with the end of the Soviet Union, but other threats emerged to challenge NATO.

The security challenges and risks which NATO faces are different in nature from what they were in the past. The threat of a simultaneous, full-scale attack on all of NATO's European fronts has effectively been removed and thus no longer provides the focus for Allied strategy... Two conclusions can be drawn from this analysis of the strategic context. The first is that the new environment does not change the purpose or the security functions of the Alliance, but rather underlines their enduring validity. The second, on the other hand, is that the changed environment offers new opportunities for the Alliance to frame its strategy within a broad approach to security.⁴⁷

These threats identified in the strategic concept were viewed outside the realm of traditional state-on-state conflicts between the Soviet aggressors and the Western allies. With the end of the Cold War, NATO immediately saw the need to adapt to the new strategic environment. This passage explicitly states that NATO was not concerned with direct threats from Soviet aggressors anymore, but foresaw a different type of threat that might impact stability. By recognizing this threat to stability, NATO noticed an opportunity to use its existing mechanisms and adapt them to the changing environment

⁴⁵ Wallander, "Institutional Assets and Adaptability: NATO After the Cold War," 717; McCalla, "NATO's Persistence after the Cold War," 449; Ivanov, *Transforming NATO: New Allies, Missions, and Capabilities*, 241; Wolff, "The Structural and Political Crisis of NATO Transformation," 477.

⁴⁶ Wallander, "Institutional Assets and Adaptability: NATO After the Cold War," 718; "NATO's New Strategic Concept," North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Accessed September 12, 2014 http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_23847.htm; Winrow, "NATO and Out-of-Area: A Post Cold War Challenge," 622-623.

⁴⁷ NATO's New Strategic Concept," http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_23847.htm.

to have a broader role in the global security context. The fundamental tasks of NATO laid out in the strategic concept add to the idea that NATO viewed the environment differently and was ready to adapt. However, this particular strategic concept did not specifically highlight out-of-area operations for NATO to survive. The focus for NATO would be more on rebuilding Eastern Europe following the fall of the Warsaw Pact and ensuring Western European security by pushing for stability in those countries. It appears that the out-of-area focus for NATO would happen towards the end of the decade. The first strategic concept offered a useful guide for NATO's posture in the post-Cold War world, but as evidenced by later strategic concepts in the decade, the constantly changing environment would cause NATO to recalibrate its efforts when new threats emerged, which would require out-of-area operations.

The 1999 Strategic Concept seemed to focus on the same issues, but the conflict in the Balkans would cause NATO to realize that out-of-area operations offered greater opportunities for its survival. The 1999 Strategic Concept indicated that alliance security would still need to look at indirect, non-state threats that were "multi-dimensional and often difficult to predict," which could potentially cause instability and uncertainty.⁴⁸ The 1999 Strategic Concept highlights the same ideas of non-military risks that could be multi-dimensional and hard to predict, but it also highlighted the rise of ethnic conflicts and territorial disputes that have created instability in non-NATO countries and could affect security of NATO members.⁴⁹ The most important component of this passage was

⁴⁸ Behnke, *NATO's Security Discourse After the Cold War*, 159; Richard E. Rupp, *NATO After 9/11: An Alliance in Continuing Decline* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), 62.

⁴⁹ "The Alliance's Strategic Concept," North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Accessed September 12, 2014 http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_27433.htm.

the mention of these conflicts and threats occurring on the “periphery” of NATO.⁵⁰ This appeared to be the first mention of NATO’s understanding of non-state threats and that they could occur in the out-of-area regions, which would require responses outside the realm of Cold War defense.⁵¹ According to the strategic concept, this would require partnerships across NATO and other non-NATO countries, as well as focusing on crisis management. Crisis management seemed to define the nature of the threats NATO would face and the out-of-area operations it would need to utilize:

Crisis Management: To stand ready, case-by-case and by consensus, in conformity with Article 7 of the Washington Treaty, to contribute to effective conflict prevention and to engage actively in crisis management, including crisis response operations.⁵²

Behnke argued that a lack of clarity existed regarding the particular direct threats NATO would face. Since the location of the threats remained unknown, the alliance looked more generally at the shifting strategic environment.⁵³ Again, it appeared that these were indirect threats that NATO viewed around the world and that a response would be necessary to survive the post-Cold War world. Perhaps this vague mention of the direct threats and the lack of specificity was a helpful example of NATO’s organizational adaptation. It is plausible to believe that by using this vague interpretation, NATO was finding a means to survive by preparing itself for any emerging threat and be ready to adapt as needed.

The 2010 Strategic Concept provided an example of why NATO placed high importance on a non-state threat like terrorism. NATO was eager to draft a new strategic

⁵⁰ Behnke, *NATO’s Security Discourse After the Cold War*, 159.

⁵¹ Alessandro Marrone, “The Equilibrium of the 2010 NATO Strategic Concept,” *The International Spectator* 46, no. 3 (03, 2011), 98.

⁵² “The Alliance’s Strategic Concept,” http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_27433.htm

⁵³ Behnke, *NATO’s Security Discourse After the Cold War: Representing the West*, 162.

concept, which seemed different from the past two, because its leaders understood that it needed to be more capable and effective to deal with the different challenges it faced.⁵⁴

The 2010 Strategic Concept specifically showed the wide variety of threats to NATO members that focused on the proliferation of ballistic missiles and WMDs, terrorism, and cyber attacks, which would dominate global security in the 21st century.⁵⁵ It recognized other non-state threats, but it is important to note that this was the first time that terrorism was mentioned in a NATO strategic concept as a specific “direct threat” to the alliance.

In fact, it appeared that this was the first time that a direct threat was mentioned since the Cold War. The 2010 Strategic Concept stated that,

Terrorism poses a direct threat to the security of the citizens of NATO countries, and to international stability and prosperity more broadly. Extremist groups continue to spread to, and in, areas of strategic importance to the Alliance, and modern technology increases the threat and potential impact of terrorist attacks, in particular if terrorists were to acquire nuclear, chemical, biological or radiological capabilities.⁵⁶

More importantly, the strategic concept showed two components of NATO’s strategy going forward in the 21st century to add to collective defense: crisis management and cooperative security.⁵⁷ These components guided how NATO would respond to security and stability concerns going forward. Some have argued that the 2010 Strategic Concept defined how NATO should respond to security issues outside of Europe.⁵⁸ There was another passage in the strategic concept that may explain NATO’s reasoning for focusing

⁵⁴ Dzambic, “NATO’s Strategic Concept: Non-Traditional Threats and Bridging Military Capability Gaps,” 15-16.

⁵⁵ Behnke, *NATO’s Security Discourse After the Cold War: Representing the West*, 163. Also, see Dzambic, “NATO’s Strategic Concept: Non-Traditional Threats and Bridging Military Capability Gaps,” 16

⁵⁶ “Strategic Concept,” North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Accessed September 1, 2014 http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_82705.htm

⁵⁷ Marrone, “The Equilibrium of the 2010 NATO Strategic Concept,” 102-103; David S. Yost, “NATO’s Evolving Purposes and the Next Strategic Concept,” *International Affairs* 86, no. 2 (02, 2010), 490-494; Timo Noetzel and Benjamin Schreer, “More Flexible, Less Coherent: NATO after Lisbon,” *Australian Journal of International Affairs* 66, no. 1 (01, 2012), 26.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 101.

more on non-state threats, according to Alessandro Marrone. The passage argued that, “instability or conflict beyond NATO borders can directly threaten Alliance security.”⁵⁹ While the purpose of this concept was to determine NATO’s role in the new century following the terrorist attacks of September 11, it may have created a NATO that would be a hybrid. This meant that while NATO wanted to be involved in security issues completely outside of its sphere of responsibility so that it could survive, the direct threat of terrorism also gave the alliance a new component to its mission and another reason to adapt.

To briefly summarize the findings in the strategic concepts, the 1991 and 1999 Strategic Concepts show the changing nature of the threats and NATO’s role in promoting stability, as well as out-of-area operations. However, the out-of-area and stability components do not seem to focus on direct threats to the alliance, but more on indirect threats such as ethnic conflicts and instability on NATO’s periphery. More than anything, the strategic concepts show that NATO identified a variety of new threats and sought to find ways to counter them to ensure its survival.

Methodology and Hypothesis

The literature review discussed several concepts, particularly where NATO’s adaptation came from and how the strategic concepts guided the strategy for NATO in the post-Cold War world. In addition, the strategic concepts and the corresponding literature highlighted NATO’s adaptation to indirect, non-state threats following the end of the Cold War and that NATO found a role for itself in this new strategic environment through adapting past mechanisms to survive and stay relevant. The existing literature

⁵⁹ Strategic Concept,” North Atlantic Treaty Organization, http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_82705.htm. Also, see Marrone, “The Equilibrium of the 2010 NATO Strategic Concept,” 101.

may have explained NATO's adaptation to the non-state threats it faced; however, it did not specifically highlight whether this adaptation helped the alliance conduct military operations against these threats in specific conflicts.

Given the discussion about NATO's ability to adapt to the changing strategic environment and establishing mechanisms to conduct operations against non-state threats, it seems plausible that the adaptation would allow NATO to successfully conduct military operations in environments different from the Cold War. I use the two specific conflicts of Bosnia and Afghanistan as cases to argue that NATO's evolution to non-state threats in these environments produced successful military operations. I chose Bosnia for the purposes of exploring the first operation that NATO participated in following the end of the Cold War. I also chose it because it fell into the non-state threat category due to the ethnic conflict that was being perpetrated by non-state actors, as well as displacement and genocide. I chose the Afghanistan case because it was the first conflict where NATO had to respond to non-state threats like terrorism, insurgencies, and post-conflict reconstruction.

Given the findings of the literature review regarding NATO's willingness to adapt and survive, I expect that the alliance's adaptation towards non-state threats allows NATO to conduct military operations against non-state threats in these two different campaigns and deliver successful results that ensure stability and security. To support my claim that NATO's concept of adaptation to non-state threats produced military operations that created stability and security in these conflicts, this chapter will use process tracing to examine the various NATO military actions in Bosnia and Afghanistan.

Case Study: NATO's First-Ever Ground Deployment in Bosnia

The ethnic conflict in Bosnia represented NATO's first ever deployment of ground forces to stabilize a conflict outside its regional area of responsibility: Western Europe.⁶⁰ In addition, the Bosnia conflict appeared to be the first moment when NATO's transformation came into play. This was the first instance where NATO's common-held belief of territorial defense was not applied to the outcome of a conflict that NATO was involved in because it occurred outside Western Europe.⁶¹ Also, this was the first unconventional war that NATO would participate in following the end of the Cold War, outside the normal operations that NATO was accustomed to.⁶²

In the conflict, NATO employed airpower to turn back aggressors and eventually established a peacekeeping mission to maintain stability. More importantly, conducting out-of-area missions became necessary for the alliance's survival, resulting in NATO moving away from its Western European focus to respond to the violence in Bosnia.⁶³ It is worth noting that observers have commented on the lack of literature about the Bosnia peacekeeping mission following the Dayton Accords, which served as the bulk of NATO's involvement.⁶⁴ I use the existing literature to explain the conflict and show the conduct of the operations. The case study examines NATO's role in the Bosnia conflict and discerns if NATO's adaptation to this non-state threat allows the alliance to conduct effective military operations that achieve successful results.

⁶⁰ Yost, *NATO Transformed*, 195.

⁶¹ Mark Webber, "NATO's Post-Cold War Operations in Europe," in *NATO After Sixty Years: A Stable Crisis*, ed. James Sperling and S. Victor Papacosma. (Kent, Ohio: The Kent State University Press, 2012), 59.

⁶² Roberto Corsini, "The Balkan War: What Role for Airpower?" *Airpower Journal* 9, no. 4 (04, 1995), 57-58.

⁶³ Behnke, *NATO's Security Discourse After the Cold War: Representing the West*, 139-141

⁶⁴ Patrice C. McMahon, "Rebuilding Bosnia: A Model to Emulate or to Avoid?" *Political Science Quarterly* 119, no. 4 (04, 2004-2005), 570.

NATO's Use of Conventional Airpower

A number of factors prompted NATO involvement to stop genocide in Bosnia. In fact, the situation in Yugoslavia deteriorated since the fall of the Soviet Union in 1991. As the 1991 Strategic Concept stated, NATO would be faced with indirect threats to its borders following the fall of communism and the Bosnia conflict applied to this challenge. At first, while the threats may have been confined to the region, the inability of the United Nations (UN) and other entities to address the violence prompted NATO's eventual involvement.⁶⁵ Collectively, NATO could have more of an impact than the UN, mainly because of its structure and military capabilities. Furthermore, the political factors contributed to NATO's involvement in Bosnia. NATO members believed that their democratic values and model for ensuring regional stability could not be confined to just the member states.⁶⁶ This also meant, as Behnke noted, a resurgence of violence in the European continent could jeopardize the "resurgence of democracy" and stability in the region and could cause the region to relive the horrors of the Cold War.⁶⁷

NATO had minimal involvement in the Bosnian conflict before 1995. The alliance assisted the United Nations with establishing command and control centers for the UN Protection Force, enforcing a no-fly zone (Operation Deny Flight), maritime security (Operation Sharp Guard), and contingency planning if the conflict would spill into Western European borders.⁶⁸ Interestingly, many believed that only NATO could pull together the necessary resources to stop the ethnic cleansing and violence.⁶⁹

⁶⁵ Ibid.

⁶⁶ Behnke, *NATO's Security Discourse After the Cold War*, 142.

⁶⁷ Ibid., 141.

⁶⁸ Dick A. Leurdijk, "Before and after Dayton: the UN and NATO in the former Yugoslavia," *Third World Quarterly* 18, no. 3 (03, 1997), 460.

⁶⁹ Behnke, *NATO's Security Discourse After the Cold War*, 138.

NATO's "aggressive" air operations began after the horrific massacre in Srebrenica in 1995.⁷⁰ Operation Deliberate Force began soon thereafter, which included 3,400 bombing sorties against Bosnian Serb positions, which had the goal of forcing an end to attacks on innocents and ethnic cleansing.⁷¹ The operations also included the policing of a no-fly zone and intercepting unauthorized enemy aircraft.⁷² Some argued that the operations to enforce a no-fly zone actually achieved political goals by easing the pressure on Sarajevo, preventing the fall of Gorazde, and giving the foundation for the Dayton Peace Accords.⁷³ The Dayton Peace Accords resulted in NATO's involvement as the primary actor in an international peacekeeping force to maintain stability and prevent future hostilities.⁷⁴ Airpower may have served to end the violence between the warring parties, but NATO's subsequent peacekeeping mission would test its ability to deliver military operations to ensure stability.

NATO and Peacekeeping in Bosnia

Following hostilities, NATO began Operation Joint Endeavor that sought to implement the Dayton Peace Accords. NATO participated in the Implementation Force (IFOR) to ensure that the warring parties withdrew their militaries and complied with ceasefires.⁷⁵ The UN gave the mandate for these forces to ensure compliance with the Dayton Peace Accords.⁷⁶ In addition to providing stability on the ground and ensuring

⁷⁰ Ivanov, *Transforming NATO: New Allies, Missions, and Capabilities*, 84; Behnke, *NATO's Security Discourse After the Cold War*, 137. Also, see Joyce P. Kaufman, "A Challenge to European Security and Alliance Unity," *World Affairs* 161, no. 1 (01, 1998), 26.

⁷¹ Ivanov, *Transforming NATO: New Allies, Missions, and Capabilities*, 84.

⁷² Corsini, "The Balkan War: What Role for Airpower?" 57-60.

⁷³ Ibid. Also, see Ivanov, *Transforming NATO: New Allies, Missions, and Capabilities*, 84.

⁷⁴ Ivanov, *Transforming NATO: New Allies, Missions, and Capabilities*, 84.

⁷⁵ Ibid.

⁷⁶ Pascale Combelles Siegel, "Target Bosnia: Integrating Information Activities in Peace Operations," *Department of Defense Command and Control Program*, January 1998, http://www.dodccrp.org/files/Siegel_Bosnia.pdf, 24.

the continued cessation of hostilities, IFOR also had the task of creating boundaries between the warring participants and the return of the political process to the region.⁷⁷

IFOR consisted of 60,000 troops from NATO and non-NATO countries and was far more effective in peacekeeping than the UN Force previously tasked with “humanitarian aid and safe-haven mandates” earlier in the conflict.⁷⁸

IFOR’s mandate was only supposed to last a year, but the international community and the alliance recognized a need for an ongoing presence in the region to assist the countries with ongoing implementation of the Dayton Accords. The extension occurred to ensure further reconstruction and stability, as well as securing conditions for peace to allow for an eventual end to NATO’s military presence.⁷⁹ Stabilization Force (SFOR) was created following this decision with a broader mandate to focus on economic development, reconstruction, and political development.⁸⁰ SFOR’s role would evolve over time to support activities of the International Criminal Tribunal (ICT), international policing efforts, security sector assistance, and providing a “secure environment for internal development.”⁸¹ In addition, NATO’s participation in the Bosnian peacekeeping missions focused on ground security and regulation of the borders to ensure a cessation of future violence and ethnic cleansing.⁸² Moreover, SFOR’s mandate extended beyond peacekeeping, since it was responsible – along with a

⁷⁷ David Carment and Frank Harvey, *Using Force to Prevent Ethnic Violence: An Evaluation of Theory and Evidence*. (Westport: Praeger, 2001), 111.

⁷⁸ Elinor C. Sloan, *Bosnia and the New Collective Security*. (Westport: Praeger, 1998), 86.

⁷⁹ McMahon, “Rebuilding Bosnia: A Model to Emulate or to Avoid?” 573; Sloan, *Bosnia and the New Collective Security*, 90; Carment and Harvey, *Using Force to Prevent Ethnic Violence: An Evaluation of Theory and Evidence* 112.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 573.

⁸¹ Webber, “NATO’s Post-Cold War Operations in Europe,” 63.

⁸² Rebecca Johnson and Micah Zenko, “All Dressed Up and No Place to Go: Why NATO Should be on the Front Lines in the War on Terror, *Parameters: U.S. Army War College* 32, no. 4 (04, 2002), 56. Also, see Webber, “NATO’s Post-Cold War Operations in Europe,” 63.

significant NATO role – to provide security for elections and to ensure that Bosnia and its neighbors handled security matters on their own.⁸³

The NATO intervention in Bosnia resulted in a stronger sense of citizen security, because IFOR and SFOR stabilized the situation on the ground and held the warring parties to task.⁸⁴ Yet NATO's response to Bosnia did not come without criticism, which focused on NATO cautiousness in several of its peacekeeping responsibilities, including protecting refugees, going after suspected war criminals, and managing community policing.⁸⁵ However, even with the criticisms, NATO provided stability through its military operations in Bosnia. NATO improved its operations and nearly 723,000 refugees returned, oversaw open elections, captured and indicted 21 war criminals, and successfully removed 120,000 mines and 11,000 small arms.⁸⁶ Admiral Leighton Smith, the IFOR commander at the time, acknowledged that IFOR "successfully met the military provisions of the Dayton Accords because of its robust force, its rules of engagement, and its resolve to use force when necessary."⁸⁷ The stability mission's success still produced significant results with the return of refugees, apprehension of war criminals, and a reduction in violence. This allowed NATO to conclude the mission in 2004, as well as and move towards consultations on defense reforms and continued coordination with the country to detain war criminals.⁸⁸

⁸³ McMahon, "Rebuilding Bosnia: A Model to Emulate or to Avoid?" 573.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 578

⁸⁵ Webber, "NATO's Post-Cold War Operations in Europe," 63. Also, see McMahon, "Rebuilding Bosnia: A Model to Emulate or to Avoid?" 578.

⁸⁶ Lansford, *All for One: Terrorism, NATO and the United States*, 48.

⁸⁷ Leighton W. Smith, *NATO's IFOR in Action: Lessons from the Bosnian Peace Support Operations* (Washington, DC: National Defense University Institute for National Strategic Studies, 1999), 1.

⁸⁸ "NATO ends SFOR mission," North Atlantic Treaty Organization, December 2, 2004, Accessed October 5, 2014 <http://www.nato.int/DOCU/update/2004/12-december/e1202a.htm>

According to some observers, the operations sufficiently showed NATO's ability to adapt and deliver military operations against non-state threats, particularly because it could participate in an out-of-area operation and coordinate across the membership to provide stability on the ground.⁸⁹ According to Mark Webber, the involvement carried more significance, because it served "as a catalyst for alterations to NATO doctrine and force structures during the latter 1990s, established important precedents for development of civil-military cooperation (CIMIC) activities and, during the 2000s, NATO-EU relations."⁹⁰ Also, Ellen Hallams argued that NATO's success in Bosnia reflected the fact that NATO's institutional capacity allowed it to successfully to adapt to the new strategic environment and this provided advantages over a "looser coalition" of allies involved.⁹¹ NATO's actions in Bosnia indicated that it understood the shifting nature of the security threats it would encounter in the last decade of the 20th century. The safe return of refugees, apprehension of war criminals, and ensuring greater stability support the argument that NATO's adaptation to these new non-state challenges and threats created stability and security on the ground.

Case Study: Combating New Threats in Afghanistan

The attacks of September 11, 2001 represented the first time NATO ever invoked of Article V to respond to an attack on a member nation. However, this invocation was different than the original intent of the alliance because it targeted non-state actors, Al Qaeda and the Taliban, who perpetrated and supported the attacks on the United States. In addition to the first ever invocation of Article V, the mission in Afghanistan showed

⁸⁹ Tom Lansford, *All for One: Terrorism, NATO and the United States* (Burlington: Ashgate, 2002), 48-49; Ellen Hallams, *The United States and NATO since 9/11* (London: Routledge, 2010), 26-27.

⁹⁰ Webber, "NATO's Post-Cold War Operations in Europe," 64.

⁹¹ Hallams, *The United States and NATO since 9/11*, 27.

NATO's adaptation tested because it sought to conduct new military operations that focused on asymmetric warfare. Some of the responses included reconstruction and counterinsurgency (COIN) – new concepts that NATO had not encountered in the past. Being able to effectively conduct these strategies in subsequent operations would be difficult for an alliance that had only previously utilized airpower and peacekeeping in Bosnia and Kosovo prior to the Afghanistan campaign.

Invoking Article V and Operation Enduring Freedom

With its invocation of Article V, NATO obviously had an interest in supporting the U.S. mission in Afghanistan. However, in the earlier chapter on U.S. strategic interests, it was demonstrated that the United States initially prevented a NATO role in its response operations to the attacks. This meant that in Afghanistan the United States would unilaterally conduct operations to destroy the safe haven where Al Qaeda launched its attacks on New York, Washington, DC, and Pennsylvania. Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF) was strictly an American operation, but NATO would eventually take a role in Afghanistan during the stabilization and reconstruction efforts, as well as ongoing counterterror and COIN operations to destroy terrorists in Afghanistan and remove the Taliban from power.⁹²

NATO's involvement started out gradually, particularly with intelligence cooperation and protection of allied facilities within its borders to prevent further attacks on Americans, among other actions.⁹³ There was also the deployment of NATO aircraft to protect American borders from further attacks on U.S. soil, but these actions were more counterterrorism and homeland security-focused operations that did not involve

⁹² Lansford, *All for One: Terrorism, NATO and the United States*, 111.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, 112. Also, see Hallams, *The United States and NATO since 9/11*, 69.

actual deployments in Afghanistan.⁹⁴ NATO's contributions to OEF were fairly minor compared to burden that the United States chose to shoulder. However, as explained in chapter 1, the United States sought to avoid using NATO for the operations in Afghanistan because, the fear of wasting time on consensus-building to get NATO members involved. The United States wanted to pursue a rapid victory and its leaders believed that NATO involvement would hinder that objective. Nevertheless, the United States eventually found a considerable need for NATO – its role in the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) after delegating minor missions to the alliance and its members.

NATO and ISAF: Initial Operations

The ISAF mission was defined as a stability and reconstruction mission, which incorporated three main security tasks: “the aversion of a humanitarian crisis, the establishment and support of a legitimate government, and the presence of domestic security forces to support this government,” according to Ivanov.⁹⁵ ISAF's role under NATO's command eventually evolved to focus on “disrupt[ing] the insurgency, deny[ing] the Taliban the ability to unseat the government and train Afghan security forces to eventually take over this role.”⁹⁶ In essence, “ISAF was designed to facilitate nation building in a country that met all the conditions of a failed state,” according to Richard Rupp.⁹⁷ Dealing with a failed state was an unfamiliar task for NATO and something it had not responded to in the past. In Bosnia, state structures were in place

⁹⁴ Ibid., 112-114.

⁹⁵ Ivanov, *Transforming NATO: New Allies, Missions, and Capabilities*, 99. Also, see Astri Suhrke, “A Contradictory Mission? NATO from Stabilization to Combat in Afghanistan,” *International Peacekeeping* 15, no. 2 (02, 2008), 228.

⁹⁶ Alexander Mattelaer, “How Afghanistan Has Strengthened NATO,” *Survival* 53, no. 6 (06, 2011-2012), 131; Rupp, *NATO After 9/11: An Alliance in Continuing Decline*, 156.

⁹⁷ Rupp, *NATO After 9/11: An Alliance in Continuing Decline*, 156.

and the mission focused on providing stability to the existing state and keeping the peace between the warring parties. The mission in Afghanistan would focus on reconstructing a state from scratch requiring numerous moving parts.

When NATO took over command of ISAF in 2003, their operations primarily focused on securing the capital of Kabul and the immediate surrounding areas.⁹⁸ In addition, the actions consisted of maintaining Provincial Reconstruction Teams (PRTs), which “were designed to serve as a vehicle to provide regional security while building ties with the civilian population.”⁹⁹ This represented another operation that NATO did not have a previous background in and it received some criticism for not delivering effective PRTs. According to Rupp, the United States voiced criticism of NATO’s role in specific PRTs.¹⁰⁰ Additionally, Rupp explained that the NATO Supreme Allied Commander at the time criticized several NATO members for not adequately providing resources for the missions that ISAF needed to undertake in Afghanistan.¹⁰¹ The Congressional Research Service (CRS) added that between 2001 and 2006, these same issues arose mainly because of the restrictions that several NATO members placed on their forces for operations and involvement with the PRTs.¹⁰² CRS argued that “caveats” placed on operations by the NATO allies in the early years of ISAF caused major problems for NATO’s effectiveness.¹⁰³

The restrictions placed on operations by NATO members indicate that the organizational principles that allowed NATO to be more flexible in its response to non-

⁹⁸ Ibid., 160

⁹⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid., 161

¹⁰¹ Ibid.

¹⁰² Vincent Morelli and Paul Belkin, “NATO in Afghanistan: A Test of the Transatlantic Alliance,” *Current Politics and Economics in Europe* 20, no. 4 (04, 2009), 484.

¹⁰³ Ibid., 497

state threats may have had a detrimental impact on ISAF operations in Afghanistan. However, NATO's inability to conduct these operations stemmed from the specific member, particularly with PRTs. In essence, PRTs operated "without an overarching concept of operations, [did] not provide a common range of services, [did] not have a unified chain of command, and often [did] not coordinate with each other or exchange information on best practices."¹⁰⁴ This could be viewed as a failure of NATO's adaptation to the nature of the mission and deliver effective military operations, which did not appear to change as NATO sought to implement a COIN strategy.

ISAF Moves to a COIN Strategy

As the situation deteriorated due to the emerging insurgency, NATO began implementing COIN to tamp down the violence and create an environment of stability. The success of COIN in Iraq may have influenced COIN's use in Afghanistan.¹⁰⁵ NATO began to implement a COIN strategy when it became evident that the Taliban achieved gains in the Helmand and Kandahar provinces.¹⁰⁶ In addition to the rise of the Taliban, a considerable absence of security existed in southern Afghanistan, which caused more problems for ISAF.¹⁰⁷ During 2006-2008, ISAF started to deploy its forces to southern Afghanistan to conduct reconstruction efforts and build the government in the region, but it lacked the tools to deal with the ongoing insurgency in that region.¹⁰⁸ According to John Nagl and Richard Weitz, the ISAF troops in the region lacked the proper training in

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., 500

¹⁰⁵ Sten Rynning, *NATO in Afghanistan: The Liberal Disconnect* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2012), 204.

¹⁰⁶ John Nagl and Richard Weitz, "Counterinsurgency and the Future of NATO," *The Chicago Council on Global Affairs*, October 2010, http://www.cnas.org/files/documents/publications/Trans-Atlantic%20Papers%201-Nagl%20Weitz_v4.pdf, 7.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid., 8

COIN and ineffectively delivered security to the region.¹⁰⁹ It appeared that NATO's problems for implementing a COIN strategy stemmed from not having the necessary assets and resources to conduct COIN-centric operations.¹¹⁰ However, in 2009, when the United States recalibrated its strategy in Afghanistan under the command of General Stanley McChrystal, support for a COIN strategy emerged as a method to stop the Taliban insurgency.¹¹¹ However, it seemed that the strategy may not have been effective for ISAF due to the time limits placed on the troop increase for the COIN campaign by President Obama.¹¹²

However, while the limits placed on campaign impacted NATO's ability to conduct the COIN campaign, Sean Kay and Sahar Khan argued that because of NATO's institutional design it could never really be equipped to run a COIN campaign.¹¹³ Kay and Khan commended NATO's adaptation to the post-Cold War environment, but the alliance did not possess the "tactical assets needed for counter-insurgency."¹¹⁴ According to Benjamin Schreer, NATO lacked the experience needed to prepare for counterinsurgency operations in the past, mainly because the last few NATO operations focused on peacekeeping.¹¹⁵ It appeared, according to Jens Ringsmose and Peter Dahl

¹⁰⁹ Ibid.

¹¹⁰ Sean Kay and Sahar Khan, "NATO and Counter-insurgency: Strategic Liability or Tactical Asset?" *Contemporary Security Policy* 28, no. 1 (01, 2007), 176.

¹¹¹ David E. Johnson, "What Are You Prepared to Do? NATO and the Strategic Mismatch Between Ends, Ways, and Means in Afghanistan-and in the Future," *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism* 34, no. 5 (05, 2011), 388-389.

¹¹² Ibid., 389-393.

¹¹³ Kay and Khan, "NATO and Counter-insurgency: Strategic Liability or Tactical Asset?" 163; Theo Farrell and Sten Rynning, "NATO's Transformation Gaps: Transatlantic Differences and the War in Afghanistan," *Journal of Strategic Studies* 33, no. 5 (05, 2010), 673-699; Nagl and Weitz, "Counterinsurgency and the Future of NATO," 5.

¹¹⁴ Kay and Khan, "NATO and Counter-insurgency: Strategic Liability or Tactical Asset?" 163. Also, see Benjamin Schreer, "NATO and Counterinsurgency: Lessons from Afghanistan," in *Counterinsurgency: The Challenge for NATO Strategy and Operations* ed. Christopher M. Schnaubelt (Rome: NATO Defense College, 2009), 45

¹¹⁵ Schreer, "NATO and Counterinsurgency: Lessons from Afghanistan," 46.

Thruelsen that the limited mandate for NATO's ISAF in Kabul caused the rest of the forces to lack the necessary resources to respond to terrorists throughout the country.¹¹⁶

NATO eventually expanded to other parts of Afghanistan, but it exhibited a “reluctance to commit the necessary materiel and human resources” to conduct a successful campaign against the Taliban and other Afghan terrorists.¹¹⁷ NATO encountered challenges of “making available the sufficient resources and coordinating military and non-military activities.”¹¹⁸ Another key test for the alliance to provide a successful COIN operation was its inability to coordinate among the allies that were active in ISAF. Ringsmose and Thruelsen argued that there was no strategic leadership in place in order to implement a unified COIN effort and since “unity of effort” was a tenet of COIN, this made it more difficult for NATO to be successful in its COIN operations.¹¹⁹ The criticisms appear more evident than the praises for NATO's adaptation to a COIN strategy to ensure stability on the ground. The strategies in Afghanistan were not successful, but it's possible this was caused by NATO's inability to use some of its new mechanisms.

One interesting omission was the utilization of a new mechanism created by NATO to quickly respond to unconventional threats. The NATO Response Force (NRF), NATO's rapidly deployable force of 20,000 troops, was created to respond to terrorist attacks and other security challenges requiring a quick deployment.¹²⁰ NRF's omission

¹¹⁶ Jens Ringsmose and Peter Dahl Thruelsen, “NATO's Counterinsurgency Campaign in Afghanistan: Are Classical Doctrines Suitable for Alliances,” *UNISCI Discussion Papers* 22 (2010), 62.

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*

¹¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 63.

¹¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 64.

¹²⁰ Ivanov, *Transforming NATO: New Allies, Missions, and Capabilities*, 123; Dzambic, “NATO's Strategic Concept: Non-Traditional Threats and Bridging Military Capability Gaps,” 21; Luca Bonsignore, “NRF: Key Element of NATO Transformation: The NATO Response Force (NRF),” *NATO's Nations & Partners for Peace* 50, no.2 (02, 2005), 44-49.

from the fight stems from NATO members who were totally opposed to using the NRF in Afghanistan.¹²¹ However, it may not have mattered if the allies were open to the idea. Schreer argued that the NRF concept could not work for COIN because it “ties up assets that would be useful in a [COIN] strategy.”¹²² It appears that even with assets created to respond to these specific threats, COIN was doomed from the start as the alliance did not have the institutional capacity to conduct an effective campaign.

While NATO was willing to adapt to the non-state threats of terrorism and insurgencies, it did not have the capacity or design to deliver stability and security through COIN operations. Even more revealing, observers believed this was inevitable because of NATO’s very nature as an integrated security organization. Ringsmose and Thruelsen pointed out that “progress toward a comprehensive counterinsurgency strategy has above all been stalled by NATO being what it is: an institutionalized cooperation between sovereign states.”¹²³ In addition to NATO’s COIN inadequacies that may have been caused by NATO’s design to exhibit consensus for collective defense, there may not have been the political will for the members to participate in a prolonged campaign, according to Noetzel and Schreer.¹²⁴ The ineffectiveness of NATO’s Afghanistan operations appeared to be an indication that the alliance was not ready to implement strategies like COIN, which were geared towards non-state threats.

¹²¹ Jens Ringsmose, “NATO’s Response Force: finally getting it right?” *European Security* 18, no. 3 (03, 2009), 299.

¹²² Schreer, “NATO and Counterinsurgency: Lessons from Afghanistan,” 51. Also, see Timo Noetzel and Benjamin Schreer, “NATO’s Vietnam? Afghanistan and the Future of the Atlantic Alliance,” *Contemporary Security Policy* 30, no. 3 (03, 2009), 534.

¹²³ Ringsmose and Thruelsen, “NATO’s Counterinsurgency Campaign in Afghanistan: Are Classical Doctrines Suitable for Alliances,” 66.

¹²⁴ Noetzel and Schreer, “NATO’s Vietnam? Afghanistan and the Future of the Atlantic Alliance,” 531-532.

Analysis: Success in Bosnia, but not in Afghanistan

The case study results show two different outcomes on whether NATO's adaptation allowed for the alliance to deliver successful military operations against non-state threats. Bosnia provided an example of successful military operations as seen from the results, as well as the withdrawal of SFOR in 2004. Some argued that originally the Bosnia conflict actually presented a crisis for NATO, because it forced the alliance to debate long-held beliefs about its role in Article 5 missions and whether a role existed in the emerging security challenges facing the alliance.¹²⁵ In the end, while NATO received criticisms for its overall mission in Bosnia, it seemed that the participation and management of IFOR and SFOR were effective and allowed for greater stability and security.

One could argue that this adaptation may have been successful, since NATO had the institutional capacity to conduct military operations that were not as complicated and received greater support from members. As Hallams argued earlier, NATO achieved success because it was more structured than a "looser coalition" of allies.¹²⁶ In addition, while NATO may have received criticisms about how it conducted its operations early on in the IFOR/SFOR missions, these criticisms served as a catalyst for NATO's adaptation to the changing nature of the missions. Eventually, NATO conducted a successful military operation that produced successful results in helping Bosnia rebuild and feel more secure following the wars of the 1990s. If the Bosnia operations helped NATO in anyway going forward, it was the confidence booster that the alliance received from the operations and the eventual establishment of new structures and guidelines for

¹²⁵ Webber, "NATO's Post-Cold War Operations in Europe," 59.

¹²⁶ Hallams, *The United States and NATO since 9/11*, 27.

cooperation between civilians and the military, particularly on conflict stabilization missions.¹²⁷

In Afghanistan, NATO's adaptation to the non-state threats failed to achieve significant stability in Afghanistan. This resulted from the alliance's inability to rebuild Afghanistan and to deliver a COIN strategy to project stability and security in the country. Given that NATO's adaptation allowed for stability and security in Bosnia, the outcome in Afghanistan surprised me, especially given NATO's willingness and actions to adapt and survive in the post-Cold War world. However, the inability to deliver successful stability and security may have occurred because NATO did not understand the necessary response to these particular threats, according to scholars in the earlier case study.¹²⁸ It seemed that COIN could not work in Afghanistan because of NATO's structures as a security organization. This might be related to the problems that the United States foresaw with NATO's consensus building process when it decided to initially avoid using NATO in Afghanistan, as highlighted in chapter 1.

Yet, it appeared that if NATO used past tactics in Afghanistan, a potentially different outcome may have occurred. Kay and Khan argued that the Bosnian model would have been more successful in Afghanistan, because it offered lessons on a "speedy and sizeable deployment of forces, a clear mission, and contributions to a secure environment that allowed other institutions to engage in long-term nation-building."¹²⁹ I think that the Bosnian model may have been more instructive for the alliance in Afghanistan to respond to these non-state threats and not utilizing that model seems to

¹²⁷ Webber, "NATO's Post-Cold War Operations in Europe," 64.

¹²⁸ Ringsmose and Thruelsen, "NATO's Counterinsurgency Campaign in Afghanistan: Are Classical Doctrines Suitable for Alliances," 62-66; Kay and Khan, "NATO and Counter-insurgency: Strategic Liability or Tactical Asset?" 163.

¹²⁹ Kay and Khan, "NATO and Counter-insurgency: Strategic Liability or Tactical Asset?" 177.

have cost the alliance in its effectiveness. As Ringsmose and Thruelsen stated, COIN may not necessarily work for an organization like NATO due to the tenet of unity of effort, which can be more successful for a single member. Afghanistan could have been an anomaly for the alliance, because it involved a different non-state threat from what the alliance dealt with in out-of-area conflicts, such as Bosnia, Kosovo, and eventually Libya. However, as threats evolve to focus more on insurgencies and terrorism, Afghanistan draws lessons for the alliance to recalibrate its adaptation to be more effective in future operations to ensure stability and security against non-state threats.

Conclusion:

While the results were mixed, the research demonstrates that NATO's adaptation can have moderate success in the post-Cold War world, particularly with regards to Bosnia. However, Afghanistan was an example where the adaptation failed because NATO overreached with a COIN strategy. Bosnia exhibits successful military operations due to NATO's adaptation towards specific non-state threats in out-of-area conflicts. With the withdrawal of SFOR in 2004, it seemed that NATO accomplished its goals by creating a sense of security and stability in the country. However, NATO's failure in Afghanistan offers caution for future NATO exercises in adapting to non-state threats. The inability to implement a successful strategy may have contributed to this failure, but NATO's actions in other conflicts show that the alliance can be an effective global security actor in the 21st century.

These conflicts offer instructive lessons for the new threats that NATO will be facing in the next decade. The information from these case studies can spark discussion on how to conduct future NATO military operations successfully against non-state, out-

of-area threats. The next decade seems to show that there will be a mix of threats for NATO to deal with, including non-state and state-on-state. Already NATO will need to respond to the current non-state threats, such as from a revitalized Al Qaeda, as well as the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant (ISIL). However, the Ukraine situation shows the essence of NATO's original mandate may be needed to respond to aggression from a state actor threatening geopolitical stability. If anything can be deduced from this chapter, NATO will continue to have a significant role to play in 21st century security and its survival will be vital to preserving global stability.

Conclusion

This thesis sought to understand how NATO could be a relevant and effective post-Cold War alliance through the conduct of its military operations in various conflicts. Given the arguments in the previous three chapters, NATO's military operations can still play a role to ensure global stability and security allowing NATO to be an effective post-Cold War alliance. The case studies throughout the three chapters support this claim in favor of NATO's effectiveness in the post-Cold War world to preserve security, with the exception of the Afghanistan case study in the third chapter. While NATO's purpose shifted from its original intent as a Cold War collective defense alliance, the organization seemed to have effectively used military operations to project security and stability in conflicts that differed greatly from what the alliance faced against the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact.

The first chapter of this thesis showed that even with the dominant role of the United States and its strategic interests, other member states and the organization itself voiced whether to conduct military operations, utilizing consensus-building mechanisms. NATO may have caused some of the issues that forced the United States to initially conduct unilateral operations in Iraq and Afghanistan due to the sluggish pace of consensus-building, but the fact that the United States needed the alliance in some capacity to have an impact on security and stability in these conflicts was a testament to the longevity of NATO and its effectiveness in 21st century global security. As the analysis indicates, the first chapter provided a useful starting point by showing the process of NATO decision-making and how this impacted NATO's conduct of military operations.

The second chapter used previous NATO organizational concepts to determine that different tiers of NATO members provided significant contributions to conduct effective military operations. The second chapter may have shown that the United States still played the most powerful role in the alliance and had the greatest impact in operations, but the research emphasized that the other member tiers could provide significant contributions to ensure security and stability in Kosovo and Libya. This idea of tiers presents an opportunity for future research about the implications on NATO operations and how best to utilize members to have the most valuable impact on security in Europe and beyond.

The third chapter showed a mixed record on NATO's adaptation to non-state threats produced successful military operations in out-of-area conflicts. NATO's impact in securing Bosnia and the subsequent withdrawal of the IFOR/SFOR demonstrated that NATO could effectively adapt to changing circumstances and utilize its mechanisms to impact the outcome. However, Afghanistan was a failure for NATO, particularly because it could not adequately implement a counterinsurgency strategy. The research from this chapter, as well as pieces from chapter 1, indicated that Afghanistan was not the proudest moment for the alliance in its effort to adapt to the new world. It can be argued that the shortcomings in Afghanistan were an anomaly in NATO's post-Cold War operations, given the successful outcomes of its other operations for the past two decades. However, NATO needs to recalibrate its focus to more adequately deal with asymmetric threats like insurgencies in the future, particularly with the rise of the Islamic State.

I am confident in the findings and argument of this thesis. The determination of NATO tiers may seem too general and reflect my opinion of where the allies fit within

the tiers based on a combination of previous concepts. Unfortunately, the literature on NATO tiers based on the allies' level of contributions is very sparse, but the research in this paper can start a useful conversation to look at the tiers of NATO in order to find a sustainable solution to burden-sharing. Burden-sharing will likely be a problem for the alliance as long as it remains in existence. In the third chapter, one could argue that NATO's failure to adapt to the non-state threat of insurgency in Afghanistan offers skepticism for the alliance's future to counter non-state threats. There is no dispute that NATO did not prove adept at implementing a counterinsurgency plan in Afghanistan. However, given NATO's military successes in the other conflicts, the alliance showed its capacity to effectively project stability and security in conflicts. This can be an argument in favor of NATO's post-Cold War relevance based on its military successes.

My intention for this thesis was to look at NATO's effectiveness as an alliance following the end of the Cold War based on its military operations and how it could serve global security interests in a changing and complex world. Based on the case studies, particularly Bosnia, Kosovo, and Libya, NATO was able to use military operations to have a positive effect on security and stability in the region and beyond. These conflicts are a positive element of NATO's post-Cold War actions to move out-of-area and conduct operations outside of its original scope. This paper can serve as a guide for policymakers in favor of using NATO to protect global security interests in the 21st century.

This paper did not focus on the concepts of enlargement or Russia's post-Cold War interactions with NATO, because those topics have been discussed at length by others and there was not more to add to the existing literature. The thesis was more

focused on NATO's actual abilities to conduct military operations and provide security to its members and out-of-area allies. This thesis shows NATO's capacity to preserve security and maintain a role as the leading global security military alliance in the world. While it is too soon to tell what the outcome will be, the current situation in Ukraine presents exciting research opportunities for the future. The domination of Vladimir Putin's Russia could be a major security threat in the coming years and NATO will be called upon to take action to counter Russian aggression in the near future. However, the ongoing threat from terrorist groups such as the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) also presents an opportunity to examine how NATO can successfully respond to this non-state threat, given its inability to implement a COIN strategy. There is no doubt that this is not the end of the conversation on the NATO alliance and its ongoing role in protecting global security. There will be plenty of future opportunities to discuss these issues and offer some perspective.

Bibliography

- “The Alliance’s Strategic Concept,” North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Accessed September 12, 2014 http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_27433.htm.
- Anrig, Christian F. “Allied Air Power over Libya,” *Air & Space Power Journal* 25, no. 4 (2011), 89-109.
- Auerswald, David. “Explaining Wars of Choice: An Integrated Decision Model of NATO Policy in Kosovo,” *International Studies Quarterly* 48, no. 3, (2004), 631-662.
- Auerswald, David and Stephen Saideman. *NATO in Afghanistan: Fighting Together, Fighting Alone*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2014.
- Aybet, Gulnur. “The NATO Strategic Concept Revisited: Grand Strategy and Emerging Issues,” in *NATO in Search of a Vision*. ed. Gulnur Aybet and Rebecca R. Moore. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2010, 35-50.
- Baltrusaitis, Daniel F. and Mark E. Duckenfield. “Operation Unified Protector: Triumph or Warning Sign?” *Baltic Security and Defence Review* 14, no. 2 (2012), 21-47.
- Behnke, Andreas. *NATO's Security Discourse After the Cold War: Representing the West*. London; New York: Routledge, 2013.
- Bell, Joseph P. and Ryan C. Hendrickson. “NATO’s Visegrad Allies and the Bombing of Qaddafi: The Consequence of Alliance Free-Riders,” *Journal of Slavic Military Studies* 25, no. 2, (2012), 149-161.
- Bensahel, Nora, Stuart Johnson, Timothy Liston, John E. Peters, and Traci Williams. *European Contributions to Operation Allied Force: Implications for Transatlantic Cooperation*. Santa Monica, RAND Corporation, 2001.
- Bonsignore, Luca. “NRF: Key Element of NATO Transformation: The NATO Response Force (NRF),” *NATO’s Nations & Partners for Peace* 50, no.2 (2005), 44-49.
- Brockmeier, Sarah. “Germany and the Intervention in Libya,” *Survival* 55, no. 6, (2013), 63-90.
- Capezza, David. “Iraq Training Mission Shows NATO's Future,” *The New Atlanticist*, October 28, 2008, Accessed November 18, 2012 http://www.acus.org/new_atlanticist/iraq-training-mission-shows-natos-future
- Carment, David and Frank Harvey. *Using Force to Prevent Ethnic Violence: An Evaluation of Theory and Evidence*. Westport: Praeger, 2001.

Carr, Fergus and Kostas Ifantis. *NATO in the New European Order*. London: MacMillan Press LTD, 1996.

Chun, Kwang Ho. "NATO: Adaptation and Relevance for the 21st Century," *Journal of International and Area Studies* 20, no. 2 (2013), 67-82.

Cimbala, Stephen J., and Peter Forster. *The US, NATO and Military Burden-Sharing*. London: Routledge, 2005.

Clark, Gen. Wesley. "An Army of One?" *The Washington Monthly* 34, no. 9 (2002), 19-23.

Cody, Edward. "After 43 years, France to rejoin NATO as full member," *Washington Post*, March 12, 2009, Accessed March 28, 2014 <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/03/11/AR2009031100547.html>.

"Consensus decision-making at NATO," North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Accessed March 2, 2014 http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/topics_49178.htm.

Corsini, Roberto. "The Balkan War: What Role for Airpower?" *Airpower Journal* 9, no. 4 (1995), 53-68.

Daalder, Ivo. "NATO in the 21st Century: What Purpose, What Missions?" *Brookings Institution*, April 1999, <http://www.brookings.edu/~media/research/files/reports/1999/4/nato%20daalder/reportintro>.

Daalder, Ivo and James Goldgeier. "Global NATO," *Foreign Affairs* 85, no. 5 (05, 2006), 105-113.

Daalder, Ivo and Michael O'Hanlon. *Winning Ugly: NATO's War to Save Kosovo*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 2000.

Daalder, Ivo and James Stavridis. "NATO's Victory in Libya: The Right Way to Run an Intervention." *Foreign Affairs* 91, no. 2, (2012), 2-7.

Davidson, Jason W. *America's Allies at War: Kosovo, Afghanistan, and Iraq*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2011.

Davidson, Jason W. "France, Britain and the intervention in Libya: an integrated analysis." *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* 26, no. 2 (2013), 310-329.

Department of Defense. *Kosovo/Operation Allied Force After-Action Report*, (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Defense, January 31, 2000), Accessed March 14, 2014 <http://www.dod.mil/pubs/kaar02072000.pdf>.

Douglas, Frank R. *The United States, NATO, and a New Multilateral Relationship*. Westport: Praeger Security International, 2008.

Duffield, John S. "NATO's Functions after the Cold War," *Political Science Quarterly* 109, no. 5 (1994-1995), 763-787.

Dzambic, Muhidin. "NATO's Strategic Concept: Non-Traditional Threats and Bridging Military Capability Gaps." *Connections* 10, no. 3 (2011), 14-36.

Erlanger, Steven. "France Will Take Full NATO Membership Again, With Greater Military Role," *New York Times*, March 11, 2009, Accessed March 25, 2014

http://www.nytimes.com/2009/03/12/world/europe/12france.html?_r=0

"EU-NATO Declaration on ESDP," North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Accessed November 27, 2014, http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_19544.htm

Farrell, Theo and Sten Rynning. "NATO's Transformation Gaps: Transatlantic Differences and the War in Afghanistan," *Journal of Strategic Studies* 33, no. 5 (2010), 673-699.

Finlay, Brian and Michael O'Hanlon. "NATO's Underachieving Middle Powers: From Burdenshedding to Burdensharing," *International Peacekeeping* 7, no. 4, (2000), 145-160.

Forster, Anthony and William Wallace. "What is NATO For?" *Survival* 43, no. 4 (2001-2002), 107-122.

Friedman, Julian R. "Alliance in International Politics," in *Alliance in International Politics*, ed. Julian Friedman, Christopher Bladen, and Steven Rosen. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1970, 3-32.

Frunzeti, Teodor. "Asymmetric, Unconventional and Hybrid Actions in 21st Century Warfare," *Strategic Impact* 46, no.1 (2013): 6-15.

Frunzeti, Teodor. "Conventional and Unconventional in Military Actions," *Strategic Impact* 45, no. 4 (2012), 6-13.

Galen Carpenter, Ted. "Conflicting Agenda and the Future of NATO," *Journal of Strategic Studies* 17 no. 4 (1994), 143-164.

Gaub, Florence. *The North Atlantic Treaty Organization and Libya: Reviewing Operation Unified Protector*. Carlisle Barracks: The Strategic Studies Institute, 2013.

Glaser, Charles, L. "Why NATO is Still Best," *International Security* 18, no. 1 (1993), 5-50.

Golden, James R. *NATO burden-sharing: Risks and opportunities*. New York: Praeger, 1983.

Gordon, Philip H. "An alliance for Iraq: A NATO role would heal many hurts," *New York Times*, April 15, 2003, Accessed November 18, 2012
http://www.nytimes.com/2003/04/15/opinion/15iht-edgordon_ed3.html

Gordon, Philip and Jeremy Shapiro. *Allies At War: America, Europe and the Crisis Over Iraq*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 2004.

Gramone, Jim. "Gates: NATO Has Become Two-tiered Alliance," *American Forces Press Service*, June 10, 2011, Accessed January 30, 2014
<http://www.defense.gov/news/newsarticle.aspx?id=64268>

Hallams, Ellen. "The Transatlantic Alliance Renewed: The United States and NATO Since 9/11," *Journal of Transatlantic Studies* 7, no. 1 (2009), 38-60.

Hallams, Ellen. *The United States and NATO Since 9/11: The Transatlantic Alliance Renewed*. London: Routledge, 2010.

Hallams, Ellen and Benjamin Schreer. "Towards a 'post-American' alliance? NATO burden-sharing after Libya," *International Affairs*, 88, no. 2, (2012), 313-327.

Hartley, Keith and Todd Sandler. "NATO Burden-Sharing: Past and Future," *Journal of Peace Research*, 36, no.6, (1999), 665-680.

Hellmann, Gunther and Reinhard Wolf, "Neorealism, Neoliberal Institutionalism, and the Future of NATO," *Security Studies*, 3, no. 1, (1993), 3-43.

Hendrickson, Ryan C. "Crossing the Rubicon," *NATO Review*, September 1, 2005, Accessed March 1, 2014
<http://www.nato.int/docu/review/2005/issue3/english/history.html>

Hendrickson, Ryan C. *Diplomacy and War at NATO: The Secretary General and Military Action after the Cold War*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2006.

Hendrickson, Ryan C. "NATO's Visegrad allies: The first test in Kosovo," *The Journal of Slavic Military Studies* 13, no. 2, (2000), 25-38.

Holsti, K.J. "Diplomatic Coalitions and Military Alliances," in *Alliance in International Politics*, ed. Julian Friedman, Christopher Bladen, and Steven Rosen. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1970, 93-103.

Ikenberry, G. John. "State Power and the Institutional Bargain: America's Ambivalent Economic and Security Multilateralism," in *US Hegemony and International Organizations*, ed. Rosemary Foot, S. Neil McFarlane, and Michael Mastanduno. New York: Oxford University Press, 2003, 49-70.

Ivanov, Ivan Dinev. *Transforming NATO: New Allies, Missions, and Capabilities*. Lanham: Lexington Books, 2011.

Johnson, David E. "What Are You Prepared to Do? NATO and the Strategic Mismatch Between Ends, Ways, and Means in Afghanistan-and in the Future," *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism* 34, no. 5 (2011), 383-401.

Johnson, Rebecca and Micah Zenko. "All Dressed Up and No Place to Go: Why NATO Should be on the Front Lines in the War on Terror," *Parameters: U.S. Army War College* 32, no. 4 (2002), 48-63.

"Jones: Transforming NATO Into 21st Century Alliance," *Sea Power* 47, no. 11 (2004), 28-33.

Kagan, Robert. *Of Paradise and Power: America and Europe in the New World Order*. New York: Vintage Books, 2004.

Kaplan, Lawrence S. *The Long Entanglement*. Westport: Praeger, 1999.

Kaufman, Joyce P. "A Challenge to European Security and Alliance Unity," *World Affairs* 161, no. 1 (1998), 22-32.

Kay, Sean and Sahar Khan. "NATO and Counter-insurgency: Strategic Liability or Tactical Asset?" *Contemporary Security Policy* 28, no. 1 (2007), 163-181.

Keohane, Robert O. *After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984.

Keohane, Robert O. "Institutional Theory and the Realist Challenge After the Cold War," in *Neorealism and Neoliberalism: The Contemporary Debate*, ed. David A. Baldwin. New York: Columbia University Press, 1993, 269-300.

Kitchen, Veronica M. "NATO's Out-of-Area Norm from Suez to Afghanistan," *Journal of Transatlantic Studies* 8, no.2 (2010), 105-117.

Knorr, Klaus. "Burden-Sharing in NATO: Aspects of U.S. Policy," *Orbis* 29, no. 3, (1985), 517-536.

Kolko, Gabriel. "Iraq, the United States and the End of the European Coalition," *Journal of Contemporary Asia* 33, no. 3 (2003), 291-298.

Kozaryn, Linda D. "Cohen Thanks Greek Allies for Support to NATO," *American Forces Press Service*, July 15, 1999, Accessed February 18, 2014
<http://www.defense.gov/news/newsarticle.aspx?id=42112>

Krause-Jackson, Flavia and Giovanni Salzano. "Italy Most Exposed to Libya as Top Trading Partner," *Bloomberg*, February 22, 2011, Accessed March 29, 2014 <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2011-02-22/italy-most-exposed-to-libya-as-top-trading-partner-chart-of-the-day.html>

Kugler, Richard L. *NATO Military Strategy for the Post-Cold War Era: Issues and Options*. Santa Monica: Rand Corporation, 1992.

Kupchan, Charles A. "Kosovo and the Future of U.S. Engagement in Europe: Continued Hegemony or Impending Retrenchment?" in *Alliance politics, Kosovo, and NATO's war: allied force or forced allies?* ed. Pierre Martin and Mark R. Brawley. New York: Palgrave, 2001, 75-90.

Laity, Mark. "The Latest Test for NATO," *Journal of the Royal United Services Institute for Defence Studies* 157, no. 1 (2012), 52-58.

Lansford, Tom. *All for One: Terrorism, NATO and the United States*. Burlington: Ashgate, 2002.

"Libya: Operation Unified Protector," U.S. Mission to NATO, April 28, 2011, Accessed March 4, 2014 http://nato.usmission.gov/issues/our_issues/libya/libya-fact-sheet2/libya-fact-sheet.html

Leurdijk, Dick A. "Before and after Dayton: the UN and NATO in the former Yugoslavia," *Third World Quarterly* 18, no. 3 (1997), 457-470.

Lizza, Ryan. "The Consequentialist," *New Yorker*, May 2, 2011, 44-55.

Lombardi, Ben. "The Berlusconi Government and Intervention in Libya," *The International Spectator* 46, no. 4 (2012), 31-44.

Lugar, Richard. "NATO: Out of Area or Out of Business: A Call for U.S. Leadership to Revive and Redefine the Alliance." (August 2, 1993) in Mats Berdal and David Ucko. "NATO at 60," *Survival* 51, no.2 (2009), 55-76.

Malone, David M. "When America Banged the Table and the Others Fell Silent," *New York Times*, December 11, 2001, Accessed November 15, 2012 http://www.nytimes.com/2001/12/11/opinion/11iht-edmalone_ed3.html

Marrone, Alessandro. "The Equilibrium of the 2010 NATO Strategic Concept," *The International Spectator* 46, no. 3 (2011), 93-111.

Mattelaer, Alexander. "How Afghanistan Has Strengthened NATO," *Survival* 53, no. 6 (2011-2012), 127-140.

- McCalla, Robert B. "NATO's Persistence after the Cold War," *International Organization* 50, no.3 (1996), 445-475.
- McMahon, Patrice C. "Rebuilding Bosnia: A Model to Emulate or to Avoid?" *Political Science Quarterly* 119, no. 4 (2004-2005), 569-593.
- Mearsheimer, John J. "The False promise of International Institutions." *International Security* 19, no. 3 (1994-1995), 5-49.
- Michaels, Jeffrey H. "Able but not Willing: A Critical Assessment of NATO's Libya Intervention," in *The NATO Intervention in Libya*. ed. Kjell Engelbrekt, Marcus Mohlin, and Charlotte Wagnsson. New York: Routledge, 2013, 17-40.
- Morelli, Vincent and Paul Belkin. "NATO in Afghanistan: A Test of the Transatlantic Alliance," *Current Politics and Economics in Europe* 20, no. 4 (2009), 473-537.
- Moore, Rebecca R. *NATO's New Mission: Projecting Stability in a Post-Cold War World*. Westport: Praeger Security International, 2007.
- Morgenthau, Hans. "Alliances," in *Alliance in International Politics*, ed. Julian Friedman, Christopher Bladen, and Steven Rosen. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1970, 80-92.
- Morgenthau, Hans. "Alliances in Theory and Practice," in *Alliance Policy in the Cold War*, ed. Arnold Wolfers. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1963, 184-212.
- Nagl, John A. and Richard Weitz. "Counterinsurgency and the Future of NATO," *The Chicago Council on Global Affairs*, October 2010, http://www.cnas.org/files/documents/publications/Trans-Atlantic%20Papers%201-Nagl%20Weitz_v4.pdf.
- Nagl, John A. *Learning to Eat Soup with a Knife: Counterinsurgency Lessons from Malaya and Vietnam*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002.
- "NATO ends SFOR mission," North Atlantic Treaty Organization, December 2, 2004, Accessed October 5, 2014 <http://www.nato.int/DOCU/update/2004/12-december/e1202a.htm>.
- "NATO's New Strategic Concept," North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Accessed September 12, 2014 http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_23847.htm;
- "The NATO Response Force," North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Accessed November 9, 2012, http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/topics_49755.htm

- Noetzel, Timo and Benjamin Schreer. "Does a Multi-Tier NATO Matter? The Atlantic Alliance and the Process of Strategic Change," *International Affairs* 85 no. 2 (2009), 211-226.
- Noetzel, Timo and Benjamin Schreer. "More Flexible, Less Coherent: NATO after Lisbon," *Australian Journal of International Affairs* 66, no. 1 (2012), 20-33.
- Noetzel, Timo and Benjamin Schreer. "NATO's Vietnam? Afghanistan and the Future of the Atlantic Alliance," *Contemporary Security Policy* 30 no. 3 (2009), 529-547.
- "The North Atlantic Treaty," North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Accessed September 29, 2012, http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_17120.htm
- Olson, Mancur. "Increasing the Incentives for International Cooperation," *International Organization* 25, no. 4 (1971), 866-874.
- Olson, Jr., Mancur and Richard Zeckhauser. "An Economic Theory of Alliances," *The Review of Economics and Statistics* 48, no. 3 (1966), 266-279.
- Oma, Ida M. "Explaining states' burdensharing behaviour within NATO," *Cooperation and Conflict* 47 no. 4 (2012), 562-573.
- Oneal, John R. "The Theory of collective action and burden sharing in NATO," *International Organization* 44, no.3 (1990), 379-402.
- Oneal, John. R. and Mark A. Elrod. "NATO Burden Sharing and the Forces of Changes," *International Studies Quarterly* 33, no. 4 (1989), 435-456.
- "Operation Deliberate Force," GlobalSecurity.org, Accessed February 28, 2014 http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/ops/deliberate_force.htm
- "Opération Harmattan," French Ministry of Defense, November 8, 2011, Accessed March 28, 2014 <http://www.webcitation.org/63rgPazcA>
- "Operation Iraqi Freedom: Coalition Members," The White House, Accessed November 18, 2012 <http://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2003/03/20030327-10.html>
- Osgood, Robert. *Alliances and American Foreign Policy*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1968.
- Press-Barnathan, Galia. "Managing the Hegemon: NATO Under Unipolarity," *Security Studies* 15, no. 2 (2006), 271-309.

Rathbun, Brian C. "Before Hegemony: Generalized Trust and the Creation and Design of International Security Organizations," *International Organization* 65, no.2 (2011), 243-273.

Rearden, Steven L. "NATO's Strategy: Past, Present, and Future," in *NATO in the Post-Cold War Era: Does It Have a Future?* ed. S. Victor Papacosma and Mary Ann Heiss. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995, 71-92.

Ringsmose, Jens. "NATO Burden-Sharing Redux: Continuity and Change after the Cold War," *Contemporary Security Policy* 31, no. 2 (2010), 319-338.

Ringsmose, Jens. "NATO's Response Force: finally getting it right?" *European Security*, 18, no. 3 (2009), 287-304.

Ringsmose, Jens and Sten Rynning. "Come Home, NATO? The Atlantic Alliance's New Strategic Concept," *Danish Institute for International Studies*, 2009, http://www.post322.org/www.Post322.org/NATO_News_files/2009%2003%2010%20-%20DIIS%20Report%20-%20NATOs%20New%20Strategic%20Concept.pdf Accessed August 28, 2014.

Ringsmose, Jens and Peter Dahl Thruelsen. "NATO's Counterinsurgency Campaign in Afghanistan: Are Classical Doctrines Suitable for Alliances," *UNISCI Discussion Papers* 22 (2010), 56-77.

Rupp, Richard E. *NATO After 9/11: An Alliance in Continuing Decline*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.

Russett, Bruce. *What Price Vigilance? The Burden of National Defense*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1970.

Rynning, Sten. *NATO in Afghanistan: The Liberal Disconnect*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2012.

Sandler, Todd and John F. Forbes. "Burden Sharing, Strategy, and the Design of NATO," *Economic Inquiry* 18, no.3 (1980), 425-444.

Schreer, Benjamin. "NATO and Counterinsurgency: Lessons from Afghanistan," in *Counterinsurgency: The Challenge for NATO Strategy and Operations* ed. Christopher M. Schnaubelt (Rome: NATO Defense College, 2009), 43-57.

Siegel, Pascale Combelles. "Target Bosnia: Integrating Information Activities in Peace Operations," *Department of Defense Command and Control Program*, January 1998, http://www.dodccrp.org/files/Siegel_Bosnia.pdf.

Sloan, Elinor C. *Bosnia and the New Collective Security*. Westport: Praeger, 1998.

Sloan, Elinor C. *Modern Military Strategy*. New York: Routledge, 2012.

Sloan, Stanley R. "NATO and the United States," in *NATO in the Post-Cold War Era: Does It Have a Future?* ed. S. Victor Papacosma and Mary Ann Heiss. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995), 153-178.

Smith, Ben. "Nicolas Sarkozy's War," *Politico*, March 22, 2011, Accessed March 28, 2014 <http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0311/51708.html>

Smith, Leighton W. *NATO's IFOR in Action: Lessons from the Bosnian Peace Support Operations*. Washington, DC: National Defense University Institute for National Strategic Studies, 1999.

Snidal, Duncan. "The Limits of Hegemonic Stability Theory," *International Organization* 39 no. 4 (1985), 579-614.

Snyder, Glenn. "The Security Dilemma in Alliance Politics," *World Politics* 36, no. 4 (1984), 461-495.

Solomon, Binyam. "NATO Burden Sharing Revisited," *Defence and Peace Economics* 15, no. 3 (2004), 251-258.

"Strategic Concept," North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Accessed September 1, 2014 http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_82705.htm.

Suhrke, Astri. "A Contradictory Mission? NATO from Stabilization to Combat in Afghanistan," *International Peacekeeping* 15, no. 2 (2008), 214-236.

Terriff, Terry. "Fear and Loathing in NATO: The Atlantic Alliance After the Crisis over Iraq," *Perspectives on European Politics & Society* 5, no. 3 (2004), 419-446.

Tertrais, Bruno. "The Changing Nature of Military Alliances," *Washington Quarterly* 27, no. 2 (2004), 133-150.

Tuschoff, Christian. "NATO Cohesion from Afghanistan to Iraq," in *European Security and Transatlantic Relations after 9/11 and the Iraq War*, ed. Heinz Gartner and Ian M. Cuthbertson. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2005, 149-166.

U.S. Government Accountability Office. *U.S.-NATO Burden Sharing: Allies Contributions to Common Defense During the 1980's*, GAO/NSIAD-91-32 (Washington, DC: United States General Accounting Office, October 23, 1990), Accessed March 15, 2014, <http://www.gao.gov/assets/150/149781.pdf>

U.S. Library of Congress, CRS, *Kosovo: Lessons Learned from Operation Allied Force*, by Paul Gallis, CRS Report RL30374 (Washington, DC: Office of Congressional Information and Publishing, November 19, 1999).

U.S. Library of Congress, CRS, *NATO's Decision-Making Procedure*, by Paul Gallis, CRS Report RS21510 (Washington, DC: Office of Congressional Information and Publishing, May 5, 2003), Accessed November 15, 2012, <http://www.fas.org/man/crs/RS21510.pdf>

Vachudova, Milada A. "The Atlantic Alliance and the Kosovo Crisis," in *Alliance politics, Kosovo, and NATO's war: allied force or forced allies?* ed. Pierre Martin and Mark R. Brawley. New York: Palgrave, 2001, 201-220.

Valasek, Tomas. "What Libya says about the future of the transatlantic alliance," *Centre for European Reform*, July 2011, Accessed March 11, 2014 http://www.cer.org.uk/sites/default/files/publications/attachments/pdf/2011/essay_libya_july11-146.pdf

Vincent, Jack E., Ira L. Straus, Richard R. Biondi. "Capability Theory and the Future of NATO's Decisionmaking Rules," *Journal of Peace Research* 38, no. 1 (2001), 67-86.

Wagnsson, Charlotte. "NATO's Role in the Strategic Concept Debate: Watchdog, Fire-fighter, Neighbour, or Seminar Leader?" *Cooperation and Conflict* 46, no. 4 (2011), 482-501.

Wallander, Celeste A. "Institutional Assets and Adaptability: NATO After the Cold War." *International Organization* 54, no. 4 (2000), 705-735.

Walt, Stephen M. "Alliances in a Unipolar World," *World Politics* 61, no.1 (2009), 86-120.

Walt, Stephen M. *Taming American Power: The Global Response to U.S. Primacy*. New York: W.W. Norton, 2005.

Walt, Stephen. *The Origins of Alliances*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1987.

Walt, Stephen. "Why Alliances Endure or Collapse," *Survival*, 39, no.1 (1997), 156-179.

Weber, Steve. "Shaping the Postwar Balance of Power: Multilateralism in NATO," *International Organization* 46, no. 3 (1992), 633-680.

Webber, Mark. "NATO's Post-Cold War Operations in Europe," in *NATO After Sixty Years: A Stable Crisis*, ed. James Sperling and S. Victor Papacosma. Kent, Ohio: The Kent State University Press, 2012, 56-80.

Webber, Mark. "NATO: The United States, Transformation and the War in Afghanistan," *British Journal of Politics and International Relations* 11, no. 1 (2009), 46-63.

Weitsman, Patricia. *Waging War: Alliances, Coalitions, and Institutions of Interstate Violence*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2013.

Willsher, Kim. "Sarkozy opposes NATO taking control of Libya operation," *The Guardian*, March 22, 2011, Accessed March 18, 2014
<http://www.theguardian.com/world/2011/mar/22/sarkozy-nato-libya-france>

Winrow, Gareth. "NATO and Out-of-Area: A Post Cold War Challenge," *European Security* 3, no.4 (1994), 617-638.

Wolff, Andrew T. "The Structural and Political Crisis of NATO Transformation." *Journal of Transatlantic Studies* 7, no. 4 (2009), 476-492.

Yost, David, S. "NATO and the anticipatory use of force," *International Affairs* 83, no. 1 (2007), 39-68.

Yost, David S. "NATO's Evolving Purposes and the Next Strategic Concept," *International Affairs* 86, no. 2 (2010), 489-522.

Yost, David S. *NATO Transformed*. Washington, DC: U.S. Institute for Peace, 1998.

Curriculum Vita

Zachary M. Silberman was born June 25, 1985 in Highland Park, Illinois. Mr. Silberman graduated from Miami University in Oxford, Ohio in 2007 with a Bachelor of Arts in History and Journalism. His senior capstone focused on the transatlantic relationship between British Prime Minister Winston Churchill and U.S. President Franklin D. Roosevelt during World War II. Mr. Silberman's writing on various national security and foreign policy topics has been widely published in newspapers, blogs, and other media.