

Canadian
Forces
College

Collège
des
Forces
Canadiennes



THE HOUSE OF NATO: BUILT ON A VALUE BASED FOUNDATION

Maj Jean-Paul Landry

JCSP 44

Exercise Solo Flight

Disclaimer

Opinions expressed remain those of the author and do not represent Department of National Defence or Canadian Forces policy. This paper may not be used without written permission.

© Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada, as represented by the Minister of National Defence, 2018.

PCEMI 44

Exercice Solo Flight

Avertissement

Les opinions exprimées n'engagent que leurs auteurs et ne reflètent aucunement des politiques du Ministère de la Défense nationale ou des Forces canadiennes. Ce papier ne peut être reproduit sans autorisation écrite.

© Sa Majesté la Reine du Chef du Canada, représentée par le ministre de la Défense nationale, 2018.

CANADIAN FORCES COLLEGE – COLLÈGE DES FORCES CANADIENNES
JCSP 44 – PCEMI 44
2017 – 2018

EXERCISE *SOLO FLIGHT* – EXERCICE *SOLO FLIGHT*

THE HOUSE OF NATO: BUILT ON A VALUE BASED FOUNDATION

Maj Jean-Paul Landry

“This paper was written by a student attending the Canadian Forces College in fulfilment of one of the requirements of the Course of Studies. The paper is a scholastic document, and thus contains facts and opinions, which the author alone considered appropriate and correct for the subject. It does not necessarily reflect the policy or the opinion of any agency, including the Government of Canada and the Canadian Department of National Defence. This paper may not be released, quoted or copied, except with the express permission of the Canadian Department of National Defence.”

Word Count: 4545

“La présente étude a été rédigée par un stagiaire du Collège des Forces canadiennes pour satisfaire à l'une des exigences du cours. L'étude est un document qui se rapporte au cours et contient donc des faits et des opinions que seul l'auteur considère appropriés et convenables au sujet. Elle ne reflète pas nécessairement la politique ou l'opinion d'un organisme quelconque, y compris le gouvernement du Canada et le ministère de la Défense nationale du Canada. Il est défendu de diffuser, de citer ou de reproduire cette étude sans la permission expresse du ministère de la Défense nationale.”

Compte de mots: 4545

THE HOUSE OF NATO: BUILT ON A VALUE BASED FOUNDATION

INTRODUCTION

In less than one year from now, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) will celebrate the 70th anniversary of its founding on 4 April 1949. For over forty years after its inception, NATO focused its attention on the threat posed by the Soviet Union. With the end of the Cold War through the dissolution of the Soviet Union on 26 December 1991, NATO could have easily dissolved in the following years as the common enemy of its members was arguably no longer a threat that required such an alliance. Instead, the subsequent decades saw NATO grow and evolve from a regionally focused organization into its current form where it operates globally in areas far away from its European roots. Naturally, the question to be asked is: how has NATO been able to adapt and remain together in the post-Cold War era given the complexities and challenges it has faced? This paper will strive to answer this question. There has been no shortage of stressors on NATO since 1991, everything from changes of governments, to armed conflicts involving state and non-state actors and even the process of enlargement have all been stressors on the alliance that could have resulted in its disbandment.¹ This paper will ultimately demonstrate that NATO was able to adapt to the dynamic post-Cold War era and transition to the role of global security actor by maintaining its founding principles.

The first section of the paper refers back to the founding of NATO in 1949 through the signing of the North Atlantic Treaty and establishes NATO's founding principles and purpose. This brief review of the treaty is necessary in order to create the baseline for future comparison.

¹Stanley R. Sloan, *Defense of the West: NATO, the European Union and the Transatlantic Bargain*, (Manchester : Manchester University Press, 2016), 339.

The second section of the paper looks at changes to NATO strategy since the end of the Cold War and compares it to the original North Atlantic Treaty. This section shows that though NATO has changed and adapted to the challenges of the 21st century, its overarching principles have remained the same. The third section examines NATO's links to the United Nations (UN) and its pursuit of legitimacy. This portion of the paper demonstrates the importance of the rule of law and NATO's connection with the United Nations (UN) as part of its development. The fourth section of the paper looks at the influence of the United States (US) and the importance of liberal democratic values in the longevity of NATO. The final section examines the unique relationship NATO has with the European Union (EU) and how common founding principles allow for both organizations to co-exist and support each other.

NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY - 1949

In order to better understand the post-Cold War NATO, one needs to go back to the origins of the alliance in the late 1940s. After the end of World War II, the United Nations was formed in 1945 with the purpose of maintaining the international peace and avoiding another global armed conflict.² The United States became an official member of the UN after congress passed into law the United Nations Participation Act, on 20 December 1945 which was significant as the US Senate did not ratify the Treaty of Versailles and therefore membership within the previous global governance body, the League of Nations in 1919.³ Throughout the first few years of the UN, there were growing concerns amongst Western Nations that the threat posed by the rise of the Soviet Union and its frustrating use of its veto in the UN Security

²United Nations, *Charter of the United Nations*, signed 26 June 1945.

³Stephen C. Schlesinger, *Act of Creation: The Founding of the United Nations*, (Boulder : Westview Press, 2003), 278-279.

Council could not be contained by the UN.⁴ Many European nations were still in the midst of reconstruction and increasing communist tension within Europe left them vulnerable to possible Soviet aggression. These fears became reality in late February 1948 when a coup in Czechoslovakia saw the pro-Western government replaced by a Communist regime, resulting in movements on both sides of the Atlantic Ocean to protect Europe.⁵

The inclusion of the US in any alliance was vital in order to counter the Soviet Union. Many of the government officials involved in the negotiations of a transatlantic alliance had also worked on the foundations of the UN, as it was only three years since the signing of the UN charter. The challenge during negotiations was to try to fit the potential treaty within the UN charter but also without being subordinate to the UN Security Council and ultimately the Soviet veto if they felt the need to act.⁶ The end result was a North Atlantic Treaty that emphasised the importance of the UN charter, which is evident in opening sentence of the treaty: “The Parties to this Treaty reaffirm their faith in the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and their desire to live in peace with all peoples and all governments.”⁷ Article 5 of the treaty directly references Article 51 of the UN charter as it describes the alliance’s right to collective self-defence.⁸ Similarly, the remaining founding principles of NATO outlined in the treaty: democracy, individual liberty, the rule of law and the preservation of peace and security have very similar wording to that found in Chapter 1 of the UN charter.⁹ It is clear that from the beginning, NATO principles were linked with those of the United Nations.

⁴Nicholas Henderson, *The Birth of NATO*, (Boulder : Westview Press, 1983), xiii-xiv.

⁵Lawrence S. Kaplan, *NATO 1948: The Birth of the Transatlantic Alliance*, (Lanham : Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc, 2007), 43-44.

⁶Lawrence S. Kaplan, *NATO and the UN: A Peculiar Relationship*, (Columbia : University of Missouri Press, 2010), 10-12.

⁷North Atlantic Treaty Organization, *The North Atlantic Treaty*, signed 04 April 1949.

⁸Ibid.

⁹United Nations, *Charter of the United Nations*, signed 26 June 1945.

POST-COLD WAR STRATEGIC CONCEPTS OF NATO

At the end of the Cold War, the strategic environment that NATO found itself in was far different from that of the previous forty years and the maintenance of its founding principles was central to its ability to adapt. In recognition of the rapid changes that the collapse of communism and dissolution of the Soviet Union was going to have on Europe, the members of the alliance conducted a strategic review which culminated with the release of NATO's "New Strategic Concept" in November 1991. The members recognized that the alliance would have a role to play in the development and stabilization of Central and Eastern Europe and that there was still potential threats and risks to armed conflict.¹⁰ Drafters of NATO's post-Cold War strategy could have changed the purpose and principles of the alliance but instead they reaffirmed their founding principles from 1949. Part II of the 1991 Strategic Concepts states:

"NATO's essential purpose, set out in the Washington Treaty and reiterated in the London Declaration, is to safeguard the freedom and security of all its members by political and military means in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter. Based on common values of democracy, human rights and the rule of law, the Alliance has worked since its inception for the establishment of a just and lasting peaceful order in Europe. This Alliance objective remains unchanged."¹¹

It is clear that the members of the alliance over forty years later still believed in the values expressed in the UN charter and North Atlantic Treaty (Washington Treaty).

This trend of support for the founding principles of NATO continued into the 1990s during a period of significant instability and conflict in the Balkans (Bosnia, Croatia, Kosovo, etc). Once again the changing strategic environment resulted in the members of the alliance

¹⁰North Atlantic Treaty Organization, *The Alliance's New Strategic Concept*, adopted 07-08 November 1991.

¹¹Ibid.

conducting a strategic review and releasing an up-to-date Strategic Concepts document on 24 April 1999. This document highlighted the risks to European peace and security posed by ethnic conflict, oppression, and the collapse of political order.¹² Like the decisions of the drafters of the 1991 Strategic Concepts, the drafters of the 1999 Strategic Concepts did not deviate from the original principles of 1949. Part I of the 1999 Strategic Concepts states:

“NATO's essential and enduring purpose, set out in the Washington Treaty, is to safeguard the freedom and security of all its members by political and military means. Based on common values of democracy, human rights and the rule of law, the Alliance has striven since its inception to secure a just and lasting peaceful order in Europe.”¹³

The members of NATO decided once again to maintain the founding principles even though the alliance had evolved from a purely defensive military role during the Cold War to conducting active military operations in the Balkans, outside the state boundaries of its members.

With the turn of the century and the attacks in the United States on 11 September 2001, the active military operations conducted by NATO forces continued to expand further away from Europe. By taking the lead of the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) in Afghanistan, NATO completed its transition from a regional to a global security provider and in doing so, it was necessary to examine the organization's strategic vision. The Heads of State and Government of the NATO nations adopted a new Strategic Concepts document on 19-20 November 2010. The purpose and principles espoused were very similar to previous iterations. The document states:

“NATO's fundamental and enduring purpose is to safeguard the freedom and security of all its members by political and military means. NATO member states form a unique community of

¹²North Atlantic Treaty Organization, *The Alliance's Strategic Concept*, adopted 24 April 1999.

¹³Ibid.

values, committed to the principles of individual liberty, democracy, human rights and the rule of law. The Alliance is firmly committed to the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, and to the Washington Treaty, which affirms the primary responsibility of the Security Council for the maintenance of international peace and security.”¹⁴

The noticeable addition to the principles promoted is the principle of human rights, which is not a surprise given the atrocities and gross human rights violations in the late 1990s and early 2000s in the Balkans, Africa and Middle-East. International Relations professor at Vilnius University and Deputy Defence Adviser to Lithuania’s delegation to NATO, Martynas Zapolskis used cooperative security theory to conduct a comparative analysis of the 1999 and 2010 NATO Strategic Concepts. He concluded that the 2010 version of the primary NATO strategy document is “more evolutionary than revolutionary and the main elements and functions of the alliance remain unchanged”.¹⁵ The challenge for NATO leaders in the 21st century is that strategic reviews will have to continue as NATO is an active participant in the shaping of the world order and as a result requires the cycle of strategic review to continue.¹⁶

It is evident that through the three iterations of NATO strategic review in the post-Cold War era, the purpose and values from the original North Atlantic Treaty from 1949 remained the same. Even with the challenges of globalization, increased violence from non-state actors and economic crises, the alliance remained together. NATO’s area of operations expanded from

¹⁴North Atlantic Treaty Organization, *Strategic Concept for the Defence and Security of the Members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization*, adopted 19-20 November 2010, 6.

¹⁵Martynas Zapolskis, “1999 and 2010 NATO Strategic Concepts: A Comparative Analysis,” *Lithuanian Annual Strategic Review* 10, no 1 (January 2012): 35.

¹⁶Michael J. Williams, “NATO and the risk society” in *Theorising NATO: New Perspectives on the Atlantic Alliance*, (New York : Routledge, 2016), 197.

Europe to Africa and the Middle-East yet at its core, it did not waver from its founding principles of democracy, individual liberty, the rule of law and the preservation of peace and security.

NATO-UN: THE RULE OF LAW AND LEGITIMACY

The first section of the paper has already highlighted the similarities of the North Atlantic Treaty with the UN charter and how the founding members of NATO attempted to keep the treaty within the spirit of the UN charter without being subordinate to the decisions of the UN Security Council and ultimately the Soviet veto. This attempt to at least make the North Atlantic Treaty within the spirit of the UN charter demonstrates the value placed in the principle of international rule of law. The relationship between the UN and NATO was fundamentally separate during the Cold War but after the dissolution of the Soviet Union and the subsequent conflict in the Balkans, the relationship between the two organizations became closer.¹⁷ The UN provided the legitimacy that NATO wanted in order to abide by the UN Charter and NATO provided the much needed military capabilities and multinational military experience that the UN was lacking.¹⁸

The NATO involvement in Bosnia and Herzegovina in the early 1990s began with maritime and aerial compliance operations in support of multiple UN resolutions and a UN peacekeeping force on the ground. However, after the massacre in the town of Srebrenica in July 1995 which was witnessed by helpless Dutch UN peacekeepers, the UN recognized its

¹⁷Lawrence S. Kaplan, *NATO and the UN: A Peculiar Relationship*, (Columbia : University of Missouri Press, 2010), 211.

¹⁸*Ibid*, 212-213.

limitations in the conflict and welcomed a more significant involvement of NATO.¹⁹ After a focused air bombing campaign brought the parties to the peace table, the NATO Implementation Force (IFOR) of peacekeepers took over from the previous UN lead peacekeeping force. Having the UN mandate to conduct the air bombing campaign and subsequent peace enforcement tasks provided the much needed legitimacy NATO desired and allowed them to continue demonstrate its support to the international rule of law. NATO followed similar paths in the decision making process in Libya in 2011. UN Security Council Resolution 1973 provided the legitimacy NATO members desired before committing forces to the proposed NATO operation.²⁰ Once again the principle of rule of law was important in the NATO decision. A main difference in the Libya campaign was the reduced leadership presence of the United States. Operation Unified Protector was unique for NATO as it was politically and militarily led by European members of NATO and commanded by a Canadian officer.²¹ This mission was also important in achieving international legitimacy as it demonstrated that the decision making process was not directed solely by the United States. The operation also incorporated military contributions from non-NATO member countries such as the United Arab Emirates and Sweden which not only added operational capability but also credibility through the support from like-minded allies from across the globe.

NATO critics are quick to counter the aforementioned rule of law and UN support argument by pointing out that NATO became involved in the Kosovo air war campaign on 24

¹⁹Tim Ripley, *Operation Deliberate Force: The UN and NATO Campaign in Bosnia 1995*, (Lancaster : Centre for Defence and International Security Studies, 1999), 24.

²⁰John Ibbitson, "Commons unanimously backs Canada's deployment to Libya," *The Globe and Mail*, last updated 30 April 2018, <https://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/politics/commons-unanimously-backs-canadas-deployment-to-libya/article573406/>

²¹Dave Sloggett, *The RAF's Air War in Libya: New Conflicts in the Era of Austerity*, (South Yorkshire : Pen & Sword Books Ltd, 2012), xv.

March 1999 without a UN resolution and therefore violated international law.²² If one interprets international law restrictively then this argument has some validity. In this case, the rule of law principle was trumped by the principle of individual liberty. The actions of ethnic cleansing had already begun and waiting for a UN resolution for a humanitarian intervention would have resulted in the loss of many lives. The actions of NATO were eventually justified by the passing of UN Security Council Resolution 1244 which removed the administration of Kosovo from Yugoslavia and placed it under the interim international leadership from the UN and other institutions like NATO and the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE).²³ NATO's actions in Kosovo were morally justified as the alliance's actions were focused on assisting the Albanian victims of ethnic violence.²⁴ NATO though perhaps acting outside the global governance structure of the time, acted with the same overarching moral principles that are were later enshrined in international law under the Responsibility to Protect (R2P).

The previous paragraphs have demonstrated that in the post-Cold War era, during the transition from a defensive regional alliance to a global security provider, NATO remained committed to its founding principles of individual liberty and rule of law. The relationship with the United Nations became stronger and the commitment to the pursuit of international legitimacy in its decisions continued into the 21st century.

²²Peter Duigan, *NATO: Its Past, Present, and Future*, (Stanford : Hoover Institution Press, 2000), 113.

²³United Nations, *United Nations Security Council Resolution 1244*, adopted 10 June 1999.

²⁴Enver Bytyçi, *Coercive Diplomacy of NATO in Kosovo*, (Newcastle : Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2015), 297.

NATO-US: THE INFLUENCE OF LIBERAL DEMOCRATIC IDEALS

As previously mentioned in the first section of this paper, the inclusion of the United States in the transatlantic alliance was critical to countering the Soviet threat in the late 1940s. The role of the US as the dominant nation within NATO has remained constant throughout NATO's existence and it is therefore no surprise that long standing American values such as freedom, liberty and democracy are integral to the organization. NATO was formed in a bipolar world where the United States and the Soviet Union dominated the global economic and military arenas. With the end of the Cold War, the world fundamentally changed to a unipolar world with the emergence of the US as the global hegemon. The United States could have easily decided that NATO was no longer necessary as its only competitor for global influence, the Soviet Union, had fallen, but instead it continued to support the growth of the alliance. Dr. Yanan Song, professor in politics at the University of Exeter proposes the main reason for the continued US commitment to NATO is the interaction of realism and liberal internationalism as part of US foreign policy.²⁵ She states that "US decision-making on international intervention has been greatly influenced by the debate over the relationship between self-interest and universal values like democracy, freedom and human rights."²⁶ The influence of liberal internationalism can not be overlooked when analyzing the US relationship with Europe.

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization is an alliance primarily composed of by liberal democracies. The link between the US and Europe is cultural as both regions support the same democratic, liberal and humanitarian values that ultimately influence foreign policies.²⁷ The interactions between the US and other NATO alliance members are fundamentally different

²⁵Yanan Song, *The US Commitment to NATO in the Post-Cold War Period*, (New York : Palgrave Macmillan, 2016), 238.

²⁶Ibid, 5.

²⁷Magnus Peterson, *The US NATO Debate*, (New York : Bloomsbury Publishing Inc., 2015), 3-4.

compared to similar interactions in historical military alliances with non-democratic members as exchanges between the US and other NATO members are exchanges between liberal democracies which have the same foundation of values.²⁸ This allows for internal disputes between NATO members to be overcome and the alliance to remain together and move forward. For example, the United States and many of its NATO allies disagreed with the invasion of Iraq in 2003 and yet, they were able to work together in Afghanistan during the same time period. The liberal democratic ideals transcend the periodic changes of US foreign policy between isolationism and internationalism.

Even though the foundation of the alliance is based on shared principles, a discussion about the US relationship with NATO is not complete without bringing up the topic of burden sharing. The United States has the vast majority of NATO defence spending as high as 75 percent in recent years.²⁹ As a result it has a large leadership role in the military operations that NATO conducts. The Supreme Allied Commander Europe (SACEUR) is the head of the Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe (SHAPE), and is the highest military position within NATO; this position has always been held by a US military officer since the position was established in April 1951. The combination of continuous leadership and the status of being the global hegemon have allowed the US to guide operations to suit its foreign policy.

The total financial burden of American NATO commitments combined with the inequitable share the US has had to carry has fueled NATO critics calling for reduced US support for the alliance.³⁰ This argument from a US perspective does have merit, but it would

²⁸Wallace Thies, *Why NATO Endures*, (New York : Cambridge University Press, 2009), 287.

²⁹Younghoon Moon, "The Future of NATO," *Harvard International Review* 34, no. 3 (Winter 2013): 19

³⁰Joshua Shiffrin, "Time to Consolidate NATO?" *The Washington Quarterly* 40, no. 1, (Spring 2017), 117-119.

require the US to relinquish some of its control, which may not be palatable at the strategic level despite the heavy resource burden. It also appears to be a less convincing argument due to the Declaration of the Wales Summit in 2014 after the Russian annexation of Crimea resulted in a renewed commitment by alliance members to the NATO guideline for members to spend at least two percent of their Gross Domestic Product (GDP) on defence spending.³¹ Further to this point, the 2017 NATO Secretary General's annual report shows that European alliance members and Canada have increased defence spending each year since 2015 and the percentage of the US's share of the total alliance defence expenditure is down to less than 72 percent. The commitment and subsequent actions to the Wales declaration demonstrates that the members of the alliance still see a benefit to being part of NATO and are willing to accept a more equitable share of the burden. The Wales declaration also reinforces the special bond between the alliance members that reflect traditional American values as it states: "Our commitment to defend freedom, individual liberty, human rights democracy and the rule of law makes our community unique."³² For these reasons, the view of NATO from the US perspective should not be negative but rather, cautiously optimistic as the last few years have shown a positive trend that eases the burden shouldered by the US without changing any of the structural advantages within NATO that the US benefits from.

NATO-EU: COMMON VALUES

The origins of the European Union date back to 1951 when Germany, France, Italy, the Netherlands, Belgium and Luxembourg signed the Treaty of Paris resulting in the pooling of

³¹North Atlantic Treaty Organization, *The Wales Declaration on the Transatlantic Bond*, issued 05 September 2014.

³²Ibid.

natural resources in order to support the coal and steel industries in the founding six countries.³³ Similar treaties were signed in following years in areas of economy, atomic energy and even politics. On 7 February 1992, the Treaty of the European Union is signed in Maastricht, Netherlands, formally creates the European Union as an institution and sets the basis for the use of a single currency amongst its members.³⁴ Though there have been many important decisions and publications from the EU since its formal creation in 1992, one of the seminal documents for the purposes of this paper is the publication of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union dated 07 December 2000. This document is important when comparing NATO to the EU as it demonstrates the common values between the two institutions. The opening section of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union promotes the same principles as the North Atlantic Treaty: "... the Union is founded on the indivisible, universal values of human dignity, freedom, equality and solidarity; it is based on the principles of democracy and the rule of law."³⁵ This is not surprising given that many members of the EU are also members of NATO. Nevertheless, the drafters of the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights consciously affirmed those values as the fundamental basis for the institution. This demonstrates an alignment of the core visions of both NATO and the EU which provides a common ground for discussion and negotiations between the two organizations.

Similarly, just as there are common liberal democracy ideals there are also some areas of functional overlap between NATO and EU that can cause tension between the members of the two organizations. The primary area of common interest is in the realm of foreign and security

³³European Union, "A peaceful Europe – the beginnings of cooperation," last accessed 07 May 2018. https://europa.eu/european-union/about-eu/history/1945-1959_en

³⁴European Union, "Europe without frontiers," last accessed 07 May 2018. https://europa.eu/european-union/about-eu/history/1990-1999_en

³⁵European Union, "Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union," proclaimed on 7 December 2000. <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX%3A12012P/TXT>

policy. The EU outlines its foreign and security policy as seeking to: “preserve peace & strengthen international security, promote international cooperation and develop & consolidate: democracy, the rule of law, and respect for human rights & fundamental freedoms.”³⁶ The wording is similar to that of the purpose and principles of NATO but lacks the more aggressive tone of a military alliance like NATO which incorporates the principle of collective defence as a fundamental part of its doctrine. The space of overlap between NATO and the EU does not occur in the combat operations section of the spectrum of conflict but rather in the peace-keeping, stabilization operations and humanitarian assistance aspects of the spectrum. It is in these areas where each organization is trying to encourage member states to provide resources. The nations who are members of both institutions are put in a difficult place as the funding and personnel available are finite and they are forced to make difficult decisions on which organization to support. These situations can create tension not only between NATO and the EU but also amongst their members and even tensions internal to the nation making the tough decision. As tensions rise and fall, the foundation of common principles between NATO and the EU allows for productive communication and some cases cooperation and mutual support.

EU deployments to Bosnia and Kosovo are some examples of the EU taking over from a NATO mission after the conflict cools down as the EU is better suited to support nation building activities.³⁷ Similarly, the EU is more appropriate at times to deal with Russia as it does not carry any of the historical US versus the Soviet Union baggage that NATO does. This was evident in the EU’s role in the peace talks between Russia and Georgia in 2008.³⁸ The US membership in

³⁶European Union, “Foreign & Security Policy,” last accessed 07 May 2018. https://europa.eu/european-union/topics/foreign-security-policy_en

³⁷Robert E. Hunter, “NATO and the European Union: Inevitable Partners” in *Visions of the Atlantic Alliance*, (Washington : The Center for Strategic International Studies Press, 2005), 59.

³⁸European Union, “Foreign & Security Policy,” last accessed 07 May 2018. https://europa.eu/european-union/topics/foreign-security-policy_en

NATO gives the alliance a strong military force to support it where the EU does not. Though the interests of the US and the EU are different, the liberal democratic values are the same and as a result potential differences are more likely to result in consultation and cooperation rather than conflict.³⁹ The same premise can be used when considering potential disagreements between NATO and the EU. They are more likely to find a solution by working together rather than pushing each other away as there are cultural synergies that link the two intuitions. Furthermore, the potential gap that US membership within NATO poses to potential cooperation between NATO and the EU is not wide enough to impede progress between the two organizations.⁴⁰

One narrative that is presented by some NATO critics is that the EU is a better institution for European foreign and security policy as it has a full range of mechanisms at its disposal ranging from aid and trade to diplomacy and sanctions and even military forces.⁴¹ This is a valid argument as it removes the foreign policy interests of the United States, Canada and other non-EU members that are part of NATO from the discussion. However, the EU recognizes some of its limitations from a military perspective as it does not have a standing army and requires ad-hoc combination of forces from member nations.⁴² Furthermore, it does not have the established military command structure and associated doctrine that NATO has spent almost seventy years developing and refining. The EU is not structured for a crisis requiring combat operations; NATO is the correct organization to take the lead in these situations. The final counter point is that the impact to the EU as a result of the “Brexit” vote that is causing in the voluntary withdrawal of the United Kingdom from the union is still unknown. The absence of the UK

³⁹Wallace Thies, *Why NATO Endures*, (New York : Cambridge University Press, 2009), 296.

⁴⁰Robert E. Hunter, “NATO and the European Union: Inevitable Partners” in *Visions of the Atlantic Alliance*, (Washington : The Center for Strategic International Studies Press, 2005), 64.

⁴¹Sven Biscop, *Peace Without Money, War Without Americans*, (Surrey : Ashgate Publishing Limited), xii.

⁴²European Union, “Foreign & Security Policy,” last accessed 07 May 2018. https://europa.eu/european-union/topics/foreign-security-policy_en

from the EU removes the second largest economy based on GDP and one of the most combat capable military forces in Europe.⁴³ The NATO-EU relationship has closer linkages than one might think and the common values and shared basic principles allow these two organizations to not only coexist but to mutually support each other. One institution may be able to make European foreign and security policy work on its own but the two organizations working together are far more likely to achieve success across all aspects of the spectrum of conflict.

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this paper was to attempt to answer the question: how has NATO been able to adapt and remain together in the post-Cold War era given the complexities and challenges it has faced? The subsequent analysis demonstrated that NATO was able to adapt to the dynamic post-Cold War era and transition to the role of global security actor by maintaining its founding principles. The first section of the paper referred back to the core values espoused during the founding of NATO in 1949 through the signing of the North Atlantic Treaty in order to provide a reference for comparison. The second section of the paper looked at changes to NATO strategy since the end of the Cold War and showed that the core purpose and principles almost seventy years after the original North Atlantic Treaty remain virtually unchanged despite the organization changing from a regional to a global security provider. The third section examined NATO's links to the United Nations and its pursuit of legitimacy. This portion of the paper demonstrated the importance of the rule of law and NATO's connection with the UN as part of its development and pursuit of legitimacy. The fourth section of the paper highlighted the influence of the United

⁴³Eurostat, "Gross domestic product at market prices," last accessed 07 May 2018.
<http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/tgm/refreshTableAction.do?tab=table&plugin=1&init=1&pcode=tec00001&language=en>

States and the importance of traditional American liberal democratic values democracy within the alliance. The final section demonstrated the unique relationship NATO has with the European Union and how common principles and values allow for both organizations to coexist and mutually support each other.

Perhaps the best word to explain the ability of NATO to evolve and remain intact after almost seventy years is *resilience*. In this case, the most appropriate definition of resilience is: “the capacity of any enterprise to maintain its core purpose and integrity in the face of dramatically changed circumstances.”⁴⁴ Over the past decades, there was no shortage of challenges or crises that put NATO under significant stress. Yet, as this paper demonstrates, the only elements that remained unchanged throughout the transformation of the organization were its founding principles of democracy, individual liberty, the rule of law and the preservation of peace and security. It would be presumptuous to extrapolate from this paper that NATO’s longevity is limitless as long as its core values remain its foundation. However, if NATO’s values and principles remain consistent with those predominant across the globe and within the global governance structure, NATO has the potential to last another seventy years. In closing, it is appropriate to quote Stanley Sloan who eloquently summarizes the concept presented in this paper when he writes: “NATO’s survival beyond the end of the Cold War suggests that its value foundation and inherent logic of Euro-Atlantic cooperation remain important ingredients in the glue that holds the alliance together.”⁴⁵

⁴⁴Christopher Coker, “Rethinking Strategy: NATO and the Warsaw Summit”, in *NATO and Collective Defence in the 21st Century: An Assessment of the Warsaw Summit* (New York: Routledge, 2017) 87-88.

⁴⁵Stanley R. Sloan, *Defense of the West: NATO, the European Union and the Transatlantic Bargain*, (Manchester : Manchester University Press, 2016), 9.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Biscop, Sven. *Peace Without Money, War Without Americans*. Surrey : Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2015.
- Bytyçi, Enver. *Coercive Diplomacy of NATO in Kosovo*. Newcastle : Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2015.
- Coker, Christopher. “Rethinking Strategy: NATO and the Warsaw Summit.” In *NATO and Collective Defence in the 21st Century: An Assessment of the Warsaw Summit*, 86-94. New York: Routledge, 2017.
- Duigan, Peter. *NATO: Its Past, Present, and Future*. Stanford : Hoover Institution Press, 2000.
- European Union. “A peaceful Europe – the beginnings of cooperation.” Last accessed 07 May 2018. https://europa.eu/european-union/about-eu/history/1945-1959_en
- European Union. “Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union.” Proclaimed 7 December 2000. <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX%3A12012P/TXT>
- European Union. “Europe without frontiers.” Last accessed 07 May 2018. https://europa.eu/european-union/about-eu/history/1990-1999_en
- European Union. “Foreign & Security Policy.” Last accessed 07 May 2018. https://europa.eu/european-union/topics/foreign-security-policy_en
- Eurostat. “Gross domestic product at market prices.” Last accessed 07 May 2018. <http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/tgm/refreshTableAction.do?tab=table&plugin=1&init=1&pcode=tec0001&language=en>
- Henderson, Nicholas. *The Birth of NATO*. Boulder : Westview Press, 1983.
- Hunter, Robert E. “NATO and the European Union: Inevitable Partners” in *Visions of the Atlantic Alliance*. Washington : The Center for Strategic International Studies Press, 2005.
- Ibbitson, John. “Commons unanimously backs Canada’s deployment to Libya.” *The Globe and Mail*. Last updated 30 April 2018, <https://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/politics/commons-unanimously-backs-canadas-deployment-to-libya/article573406/>
- Kaplan, Lawrence S. *NATO 1948: The Birth of the Transatlantic Alliance*. Lanham : Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc, 2007.
- Kaplan, Lawrence S. *NATO and the UN: A Peculiar Relationship*. Columbia : University of Missouri Press, 2010.

- Moon, Younghoon. "The Future of NATO." *Harvard International Review* 34, no. 3 (Winter 2013): 19-21.
- North Atlantic Treaty Organization. *Strategic Concept for the Defence and Security of the Members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization*. Adopted 19-20 November 2010.
- North Atlantic Treaty Organization. *The Alliance's New Strategic Concept*. Adopted 07-08 November 1991.
- North Atlantic Treaty Organization. *The Alliance's Strategic Concept*. Adopted 24 April 1999.
- North Atlantic Treaty Organization. *The North Atlantic Treaty*. Signed 04 April 1949.
- North Atlantic Treaty Organization. *The Wales Declaration on the Transatlantic Bond*. Issued 05 September 2014.
- Peterson, Magnus. *The US NATO Debate*. New York : Bloomsbury Publishing Inc., 2015.
- Ripley, Tim. *Operation Deliberate Force: The UN and NATO Campaign in Bosnia 1995*. Lancaster : Centre for Defence and International Security Studies, 1999.
- Schlesinger, Stephen C. *Act of Creation: The Founding of the United Nations*. Boulder : Westview Press, 2003.
- Shiffrinson, Joshua. "Time to Consolidate NATO?" *The Washington Quarterly* 40, no. 1, (Spring 2017), 109-123.
- Sloan, Stanley R. *Defense of the West: NATO, the European Union and the Transatlantic Bargain*. Manchester : Manchester University Press, 2016.
- Sloggett, Dave. *The RAF's Air War in Libya: New Conflicts in the Era of Austerity*. South Yorkshire : Pen & Sword Books Ltd, 2012.
- Song, Yanan. *The US Commitment to NATO in the Post-Cold War Period*. New York : Palgrave Macmillan, 2016.
- Thies, Wallace. *Why NATO Endures*, New York : Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- United Nations. *Charter of the United Nations*. Signed 26 June 1945
- United Nations. *United Nations Security Council Resolution 1244*. Adopted 10 June 1999.
- Williams, Michael J. "NATO and the risk society" in *Theorising NATO: New Perspectives on the Atlantic Alliance*. New York : Routledge, 2016.
- Zapolskis, Martynas. "1999 and 2010 NATO Strategic Concepts: A Comparative Analysis." *Lithuanian Annual Strategic Review* 10, no 1 (January 2012): 35-56.