

Canadian
Forces
College

Collège
des
Forces
Canadiennes



NATO'S NEW STRATEGIC CONCEPT AND CANADA: MAINTAINING THE STATUS QUO

Lieutenant-Colonel Jamie Speiser-Blanchet

JCSP 37

Master of Defence Studies

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, 2011.

PCEMI 37

Maîtrise en études de la défense

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, 2011.

CANADIAN FORCES COLLEGE - COLLÈGE DES FORCES CANADIENNES
JCSP 37 - PCEMI 37

**NATO'S NEW STRATEGIC CONCEPT AND CANADA: MAINTAINING THE
STATUS QUO**

By/par LCol/lcol Jamie Speiser-Blanchet

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: 19,585

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 : 19,585

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to gratefully acknowledge the helpful advice and feedback kindly provided by Major Alex Haynes and the generous research assistance of Lieutenant-Colonel Brock Heilman. Most importantly, the author would like to thank Major Janin Blanchet, without whom this project would not have been possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	iii
ABSTRACT.....	v
INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 1 - HISTORICAL OVERVIEW	7
ORIGINS OF NATO	7
CANADA AND THE WASHINGTON TREATY	9
THE COLD WAR YEARS	12
Collective Defence.....	12
Burden-sharing and Tensions in the Alliance	13
CHAPTER 2 - NATO'S ADAPTATION TO THE CHANGING GLOBAL SECURITY ENVIRONMENT	17
NATO POST-COLD WAR TRANSFORMATION	20
The Shift in Focus from Military to Political Alliance	20
Partnerships and Expansion	22
The 1990's Out-of-Area Debate and Human Security	23
GLOBALIZATION AND THE IMPACT ON SECURITY	28
SEPTEMBER 11, 2001 AND NATO.....	30
NATO TRANSFORMATION AFTER 9/11	34
2002 Prague Summit.....	34
Istanbul Cooperation Initiative	34
Riga, Bucharest and Strasbourg/Kehl Summit Initiatives	35
NATO Enlargement.....	38
The NATO-Russia Relationship.....	41
NATO's Partners and the Global Role of NATO.....	43
CHAPTER 3 - CANADA'S SECURITY INTERESTS AND CHALLENGES.....	46
MULTILATERALISM, CANADIAN VALUES AND INTERESTS.....	49
CANADA'S RELATIONSHIP WITH THE UNITED STATES	55
IMPLEMENTATION OF CANADA'S SECURITY POLICY.....	58
Defence Spending	59
The ISAF Mission in Afghanistan	64
CHAPTER 4 - THE 2010 NATO STRATEGIC CONCEPT.....	67
GROUP OF EXPERTS REPORT	70
Core Tasks	70
NATO's Partnerships.....	71
Decision-making and Organizational Reform	72

CDAI-CDFAI REPORT – A CANADIAN PERSPECTIVE	73
The Atlantic Community	73
NATO’s Partnerships.....	74
Decision-making and Organizational Reform	75
Burden-sharing	76
THE 2010 STRATEGIC CONCEPT	77
Core Tasks	77
NATO’s Partnerships.....	77
Burden-sharing and Organizational Reform	79
Canada and the new Strategic Concept.....	81
CONCLUSION.....	84
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	87

ABSTRACT

NATO approved its new Strategic Concept at the 2010 Summit in Lisbon, Portugal on 19 November 2010. In so doing, the Alliance defined its approach to security and provided future guidance for political and military grand strategy.

The aim of this paper is to understand the importance of NATO for Canadian foreign policy; more specifically, to examine the relevance of the 2010 Strategic Concept as it relates to Canada. It will be shown that Canada's interests are best served by a globally oriented NATO which focuses on maintaining internationalist policies in the areas of partnerships and operational engagements beyond Alliance territory in pursuit of security and stability. While NATO is not necessarily a global alliance, it is engaged globally with nations that share common interests and values as it seeks to enhance stability abroad to the benefit of democratic societies around the world. The new Strategic Concept supports the premise of strengthening Alliance relationships beyond its borders and of countering threats arising from instability wherever it may rise. Canada can only benefit from such policy, as long as the government remains willing to contribute to these security efforts. The globalization of NATO, namely through more robust partnerships, is conducive to a sound and feasible Canadian security policy clearly aligned with Canadian interests and values. For Canada, this does not represent a shift in foreign and security policy but primarily maintenance of the status quo.

INTRODUCTION

Canada's membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) has formed a significant component of the nation's security policy and engagements since the Alliance was formed in 1949. As a founding member of NATO, Canada was influential in its inception after the Second World War, particularly in establishing the concept of an Atlantic Community united by common values and interests in the form of Article 2, which called for "political, economic and social cooperation among the signatories."¹ A testament to the Canadian propensity for partnership and dialogue, membership in NATO has represented Canada's commitment to internationalism in foreign and security policy for Canada. A country traditionally reliant on soft power in international circles, having a seat at the table of a powerful military alliance was the means by which the nation's security and political influence among more powerful allies could be enhanced.²

The enduring purpose of NATO was enunciated in the Washington Treaty in 1949: members were determined to "safeguard the freedom, common heritage and civilization of their peoples, founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty and the rule of law."³ While these principles have not changed, many other aspects of the Alliance have, notably its scope and political purpose. During the first 40 years of its existence, NATO provided a reassuring response to the Soviet threat to the Western world, which was united in its opposition to communism and the protection of liberal

¹ Joseph Jockel and Joel Sokolsky, "Canada and NATO: Keeping Ottawa in, expenses down, criticism out... and the country secure," *International Journal* 64, no. 2 (Spring 2009): 316.

² David Haglund, "The NATO of its Dreams? Canada and the Co-operative Security Alliance," *International Journal* 52, no. 3 (Summer 1997): 467; Greg Donaghy, "Domesticating NATO: Canada and the North Atlantic Alliance, 1963-68," *International Journal* 52, no. 3 (Summer 1997): 461.

³ NATO Public Diplomacy division, *NATO Handbook* (Brussels: NATO, 2006), 371.

democratic values. The world is no longer separated so divisively by geographic borders and globalization continues to unite nations economically and diplomatically. NATO has evolved dramatically throughout the years, growing from a nuclear deterrent to Soviet threats into a political entity aimed at projecting stability and democracy well beyond its borders. Canada has contributed significantly to these international efforts alongside its NATO allies and in collaboration with other multilateral organizations such as the United Nations (UN).

NATO was originally a primarily military alliance with the collective defence of its membership forming the cornerstone of its existence. When the Cold War ended with the demise of the Warsaw Pact, many predicted that the Alliance was no longer necessary and would dissolve with no *raison d'être*.⁴ It was believed that without the common interest of safeguarding from the Soviet threat, “NATO’s value to its members would decrease and the Alliance would suffer as a result.”⁵ And yet, 62 years later, NATO is still alive and arguably influential with respect to the security of the Euro-Atlantic region. David Haglund described NATO as “the most relevant of the contemporary security institutions,” in 1997 as it transformed from a predominantly military organization into a more political one.⁶ Today, NATO’s survival is a testament to its ability to adapt to the changing security world in order to remain relevant, but the new Strategic Concept was deemed critical to addressing shortfalls of the Alliance’s operational and institutional structures. Canadian Defence Minister Peter MacKay and US Secretary of Defense

⁴ Ellen Hallams, “NATO at 60: Going Global?” *International Journal* 64, no. 2 (Spring 2009): 434-435; Veronica Kitchen, *The Globalization of NATO: Intervention, Security and Identity* (New York: Routledge, 2010), 7.

⁵ Kitchen, *The Globalization of NATO...*, 7.

⁶ Haglund, “The NATO of its Dreams? Canada and the Co-operative Security Alliance,” 471.

Robert Gates both highlighted the need for continued structural reform and modernization in NATO's capabilities to be addressed by the new Strategic Concept.⁷

The aim of this paper is to understand the importance of NATO for Canadian foreign policy; more specifically, to examine the relevance of the 2010 Strategic Concept as it relates to Canada. It will be shown that Canada's interests are best served by a globally oriented NATO which focuses on maintaining internationalist policies in the areas of partnerships and operational engagements beyond Alliance territory in pursuit of security and stability. While NATO is not necessarily a global alliance, it is engaged globally with nations that share common interests and values as it seeks to enhance stability abroad to the benefit of democratic societies around the world. The new Strategic Concept supports the premise of strengthening Alliance relationships beyond its borders and of countering threats arising from instability wherever it may rise. Canada can only benefit from such policy, as long as the government remains willing to contribute to these security efforts. The globalization of NATO, namely through more robust partnerships, is conducive to a sound and feasible Canadian security policy clearly aligned with Canadian interests and values. For Canada, this does not represent a shift in foreign and security policy but primarily maintenance of the status quo.

Divided into four chapters, this paper will initially provide a historical overview of NATO, examining its inception and the challenges and tensions faced throughout its first 40 years. As will be seen, the interests of the United States, in addition to the US relationship with the European member nations, were always prominent, if not dominant,

⁷ Peter MacKay, Munich Security Conference Speech, 7 February 2010; <http://www.forces.gc.ca/site/news-nouvelles/news-nouvelles-eng.asp?cat=00&id=3294>; Internet; accessed 8 April 2011; Robert Gates, Remarks at the NATO Strategic Concept Seminar (Future of NATO), 23 February 2010; <http://www.defense.gov/speeches/speech.aspx?speechid=1423>; Internet; accessed 7 April 2011.

in the activities of NATO. The US has always provided direction and power to the Alliance, be it with their nuclear capabilities during the Cold War years or their military prowess to deal with non-state adversaries in subsequent conflicts, and NATO has always been deeply influenced by Canada's southern neighbour.

The second chapter details the evolution of global security as seen in the post-Cold War era. With specific focus on NATO's response to the new security threats, this chapter looks at the events which most affected the world views of global security. The end of the Cold War brought with it a rapprochement for European nations and those of the former Warsaw Pact who strived for democratic ideals. NATO enlargement and partnerships with former adversaries figured prominently in this timeframe, as the Alliance sought to project stability eastward under the belief that this would enhance European security. In the 1990's, there was a concerted focus on human security, where such conflicts as those in Bosnia and Kosovo brought to light the widespread repercussions of human rights' abuses, even when they occurred far beyond Alliance, and Canadian, borders. NATO's values-based approach was rooted in the premise that liberal democracy and the rule of law were necessary and conducive to stability that would benefit the entire European region. NATO's transformation into an organization in which common democratic values united its members gained particular importance and in fact remains a key element of its identity today. The resulting "transatlantic identity" has united member states and attracted new members of the Alliance, which has grown from the initial 12 members to 28 at the current time. Veronica Kitchen stipulated that the focus on common values in addition to common defence has always made the

Atlantic alliance more than a mere alliance, but rather a community.⁸ Wallace J. Thies further asserted that this sense of community and the value of relationships essentially keep the allies together, despite disagreements over collective action or the means by which to achieve it.⁹ The underlying foundation of security collaboration and dialogue among allies and partners is NATO's greatest strength, and represents the fundamental reason for Canadian membership.

Canada's specific security interests are the subject of the third chapter and are the essential elements in the evaluation of the impact of the new Strategic Concept. As will be seen, Canada's involvement in the creation of NATO was seen to be influential given its relative prosperity after the Second World War and continued commitment to the defence of Europe throughout the next two decades with respectably high levels of defence spending and military support in the Korean War effort. This commitment to defence spending declined over the remainder of the Cold War years, and arguably beyond them; with it the volume of Canada's voice at the table. As a primary component of Canadian foreign policy, Canada's security policy has recently become largely defined by the mission in Afghanistan, where Canada has contributed enormously to NATO's International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) mission. A renewed focus on defence spending and modernization in the past decade has enhanced Canada's waning international credibility on the security front, but the nation is struggling to maintain the momentum amidst dismal fiscal realities.

⁸ Kitchen, *The Globalization of NATO...*, 7.

⁹ Wallace J. Thies, *Why NATO Endures*, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 23; Examples of issues where Allies were seriously divided are the Suez crisis in 1956, support to Turkey in 2002 and the Iraq War in 2003. These crises were highly controversial and created tensions in NATO, but the Alliance survived nonetheless.

The 2010 Strategic Concept is the focus of the fourth chapter, and provides the overall review which influences this paper as it determines the impact it has on Canadian security interests. In 2009, the Secretary General convened a group of experts to study the requirements for the new Strategic Concept. Chaired by former US Secretary of State Madeleine Albright, this international team created the document *NATO 2020: Assured Security; Dynamic Engagement* known colloquially as the Group of Experts Report. In it, a detailed analysis and recommendations were provided to the Secretary General to assist with the development of the new Strategic Concept.

With a review of recommendations from both the Group of Experts report prepared for the Secretary General and that of the Conference of Defence Associations Institute and Canadian Defence and Foreign Affairs Institute (CDAI-CDFAI), the content of the Strategic Concept will be analyzed with respect to the issues it actually addresses and the potential impacts for Canada.

CHAPTER 1 - HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

ORIGINS OF NATO

In the aftermath of the Second World War, Europe was in a state of political and economic reconstruction and global security sat precariously on the balance of deteriorating East-West relations. Tensions were manifested most notably in the German standoff between the post-war occupying powers in Berlin and the creation of satellite states along the Soviet border, as the Soviet Union ominously sought to increase its communist power in Western Europe. Growing concern over this security challenge led Western European states and their North American allies to conceive of various diplomatic measures, thus planting the seeds of a formal defensive alliance that would complement the United Nations' Charter. While the first concrete move toward a defensive military partnership was the Brussels Treaty of 1948, Canadian diplomats and politicians spoke of a regional alliance outside the confines of the United Nations as early as August 1947. Secretary of State for External Affairs Louis St. Laurent's remarks to the United Nations General Assembly in September 1947 provide a notable example, where he was the first Western leader to strongly advocate a regional alliance.¹⁰

The Brussels Treaty, also known as the Brussels Pact, essentially combined the desires of the United Kingdom, Belgium, France, Luxembourg and the Netherlands to “develop a common defence system and to strengthen the ties between them in a manner which would enable them to resist ideological, political and military threats to their

¹⁰ Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, “Canada and the World: A History,” <http://www.international.gc.ca/history-histoire/world-monde/1945-1957.aspx?lang=eng>; Internet; accessed 20 Jan 2011; Robert A. Spencer, “Triangle into Treaty: Canada and the Origins of NATO,” *International Journal* 14, no. 2 (Spring 1959): 90.

security.”¹¹ This philosophy extended naturally to the democracies in North America. The United States and Canada were equally concerned with the Soviet threat and disillusioned by the failure of the United Nations Security Council to maintain world order. As prominent historian and academic leader Robert Spencer explains, “Soviet policies struck increasing terror into western hearts,” referring not only to the growing communist threat to such countries as Turkey and Greece, but also to the profound shock upon discovery of the Soviet spy ring in Canada following the defection of Igor Gouzenko in 1945 and the resulting revelations about previous assumptions regarding both the USSR and the United Nations. The United Nations Security Council was by all accounts divided and paralyzed by the application and potential misuse of the veto and was not able to offer a solution to the deteriorating situation in Europe.¹² This fact was also recognized by Canadian Secretary of State of External Affairs Lester B. Pearson in 1949, who commented on the United Nations’ inability to provide for economic stability and national security during a speech in New York.¹³ The North Atlantic Treaty was intended to compensate for this deficiency.

The Brussels Treaty powers initiated talks with Canada and the United States in July 1948, though formal negotiations began only in December of that year. The signing of the North Atlantic Treaty in Washington, DC, on 4 April 1949 thus marked the establishment of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the creation of a permanent transatlantic link uniting the nations of Western Europe with the democracies

¹¹ NATO Public Diplomacy Division, *NATO Handbook*, 17.

¹² Spencer, “Triangle into Treaty: Canada and the Origins of NATO,” 89.

¹³ Department of External Affairs Canada, Statements and Speeches, No. 49/15, April 7, 1949, 2.

of North America in a political and military alliance which unified defence and security efforts against the emergent Soviet threat. The final twelve signatories in 1949 also included Denmark, Iceland, Italy, Norway and Portugal, who joined at the invitation of the Western European nations.¹⁴

CANADA AND THE WASHINGTON TREATY

The United Kingdom and France are said to have inspired the North Atlantic Treaty, judging that any adequate security alliance to counter the Soviet threat would require the strength of the United States, both as a deterrent and as a possible force to combat aggression.¹⁵ In fact, as previously mentioned, Canada was also recognized as an early proponent advocating the formation of a collective defence grouping to counter Soviet actions.¹⁶ Lester B. Pearson declared in his foreign policy review in the House of Commons in April 1948 that Canada's foreign policy must be based on the fact that "totalitarian communist aggression endangers the freedom and peace of every democratic country" and expressed support for Canadian participation in "any appropriate collective security arrangements."¹⁷ Even though the United States was the principle target of the Brussels Pact nations at the inception, Canada's involvement in the drafting of the North Atlantic Treaty, or the Washington Treaty, provided a rare opportunity for a middle

¹⁴ NATO Public Diplomacy Division, *NATO Handbook*, 17; NATO Public Diplomacy Division, *NATO Transformed*, (Brussels: NATO, 2004), 3.

¹⁵ David Yost, *NATO Transformed: The Alliance's New Roles in International Security*, (Washington: United States Institute of Peace Press, 1998): 28.

¹⁶ Glenn Brown, "The Never-Ending Debate Over Burdensharing: The US, Canada and the Allies," in *Over here and Over there: Canada-US Defence Cooperation in a Era of Interoperability* (Kingston: Queen's Quarterly, 2001), 239.

¹⁷ Spencer, "Triangle into Treaty: Canada and the Origins of NATO," 92.

power to exert influence in an international arena, especially given the tendency for Canadian policy initiatives to live in the shadow of its powerful neighbour.¹⁸

Canada's participation in the actual drafting of the Washington Treaty was seen to have special significance in terms of contribution in three main areas: the degree of commitment, the status of individual states and the non-military aspect of the alliance. Both Canada and the United States adamantly protected their constitutional obligations in terms of the commitment to intervene in the event of an attack on one or more members, considered in Article 5 as an attack on the entire Alliance. It was necessary to ensure the appropriate language was used in the Treaty to appease the Brussels Pact nations regarding the assurance of intervention, but with the North American condition that that war could only be declared after due consultation with Parliament or Congress.¹⁹ Article 5 was thus influenced to reflect the provision that each member state upholds its individual rights and their international obligations for collective defence:

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 agree that, if such an armed attack occurs, each of them, in exercise of the right of individual or collective self-defence recognized 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.²⁰

¹⁸ Spencer, "Triangle into Treaty: Canada and the Origins of NATO," 88 and 97; Lawrence S. Kaplan, "Report of the Three Wise Men: 50 Years On," *NATO Review* (Spring 2006); <http://www.nato.int/docu/review/2006/issue1/english/history.html>; Internet; accessed 10 December 2010. Kaplan stated that "Canadian diplomats played an important role in drafting the Washington Treaty in 1948. Yet there was always ambivalence about its relationship to its larger neighbour."

¹⁹ Spencer, "Triangle into Treaty: Canada and the Origins of NATO," 94.

²⁰ NATO Public Diplomacy Division, *NATO Handbook*, 17.

The Canadian government also fought for equal decisional weight among all members of the Alliance, thus ensuring Canada's voice would be heard amidst the stronger international powers. "If obligations and resources are to be shared," Pearson explained, "some sort of constitutional machinery must be established under which each participating country will have a fair share in determining the policies which affect all."²¹ This was included as Article 9 for the establishment of a North Atlantic Council which would include representation from all members and that decisions of the Council could only be taken by consensus.

Perhaps the most prominent Canadian contribution to the Washington Treaty was the insistence for pledges of non-military cooperation which appeared as Article 2, a position that was not initially shared by the United States or the United Kingdom. Despite this opposition, the Canadians "emphasized that a new security grouping must provide for something more than military cooperation" and ultimately convinced the signatories that economic strength and friendly international relations were necessary for a cohesive Atlantic community.²² Article 2 is often referred to as the Canadian article, and states that

The Parties will contribute toward the further development of peaceful and friendly international relations by strengthening their free institutions, by bringing about a better understanding of the principles upon which these institutions are founded, and by promoting conditions of stability and well-being. They will seek to eliminate conflict in their international economic policies and will encourage economic collaboration between any or all of them.²³

²¹ Spencer, "Triangle into Treaty: Canada and the Origins of NATO," 94.

²² *Ibid.*, 95; Kaplan, "Report of the Three Wise Men: 50 Years On."

²³ NATO Public Diplomacy Division, *NATO Handbook*, 371.

This article is specifically designed to foster economic, political and cultural collaboration between members. It did not survive Canadian attempts, initially and again upon review by the *Committee of Three* in 1956, to generate tangible results beyond inclusion in the treaty, but lived a revival of sorts after the Cold War, as will be discussed further in this paper.²⁴

THE COLD WAR YEARS

Collective Defence

NATO came into being with a specific goal of creating a powerful transatlantic military Alliance to counter the Soviet threat. As a result, from 1949 to the end of the 1980s, the Cold War period, the principle task of the Alliance was “to maintain sufficient military capabilities to defend its members against any form of aggression by the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact.”²⁵ An understanding of the political climate in this era is vital to the understanding of NATO’s current role.

As a founding member of NATO, Canada’s role in the Alliance was purposeful in the early years and Canada was well positioned as a middle power. John English explained that “through NATO Canada could influence other western powers and could avoid the entrapment of a narrowly bilateral relationship with the United States.”²⁶ He refers to the unique potential for Canada to effect compromise, as an ally to both the United States and the United Kingdom. This particular place at the NATO table influenced Canadian foreign and defence policy throughout the 1950s and arguably

²⁴ Kaplan, “Report of the Three Wise Men: 50 Years On.”

²⁵ NATO Public Diplomacy Division, *NATO Transformed*, 3.

²⁶ John English, “Problems in Middle Life,” in *Canada and NATO: Uneasy Past, Uncertain Future*, ed Margaret MacMillan and David Sorenson, (Waterloo: University of Waterloo Press, 1990), 47.

longer, though the status of relationships within the Alliance grew somewhat tumultuous into the 1960s.²⁷ A growing transatlantic tension between the European members and the United States was due to such factors as European economic recovery, financial burdensharing and the nuclear weapons debate. Though the focus was on the US-Euro relationships, Canada's early role may have developed the foundations of Canada's character within the Alliance to this day. While Canadian influence cannot be accurately measured, it has been noted that Canadian acted discreetly behind the scenes to help negotiate and build consensus among the major allies. As such Canada may be viewed as an enabler in achieving agreement on important collective decisions, thus highlighting Canadian propensity for the use of soft power and diplomacy.²⁸ Former Ambassador to NATO John Halstead once wrote that "Canada does not seek a mediating role between allies, but a 'bridging' one, an interpreter seeking for further mutual understanding and to maximise common ground."²⁹

Burdensharing and Tensions in the Alliance

NATO's main effort during the Cold War focused on how to deter aggression or military force used by the Soviet Union. The main responsibility for this collective defence was assumed by the United States who established a military presence in Europe and bore a disproportionate amount of the cost to defend Europe. It was hoped that economic recovery in Europe would reduce the burden, but as time would tell, the United States' attempts to persuade European allies to spend more did not yield substantial

²⁷ *Ibid.*

²⁸ Bernd Goetz, e-mail to the author, 24 January 2011.

²⁹ John G. H. Halstead, "Canada's Security in the 1980's: Options and Pitfalls," *Behind the Headlines* 41, no. 1 (1983): 12.

results. Even when the Allies agreed to a 3% increase in defence spending at the 1978 NATO summit, these increases were not honoured. This contributed to strain in the transatlantic relationships and Canada was not exempt from American disapproval when it came to defence spending. Canada's initial contribution of an Infantry Brigade Group based in Germany, an Air Division of four Sabre Fighter Wings based in France and Germany, as well as substantial naval assets in the North Atlantic to the common effort in Europe was commendable, as was the increase in Canadian defence spending in the early 1950s, specifically during the Korean War, but it was relatively short-lived. The tendency for traditionally low military spending inevitably drew criticism from Washington, who was already bearing a heavy defence burden in Europe. On the whole, Canada is said to have fared reasonably well in burdensharing debates when compared to the Europeans, though other issues existed which stressed Canada's bilateral relationship with the US during the Cold War. These included wavering over nuclear weapon acceptance, public unrest over cruise missile testing in the 1980s and Canada's restructuring of its NATO contribution under the Pearson government in the 1960s and the Mulroney government in the 1980s.³⁰

The important element of US nuclear commitment in Europe was also linked to burdensharing and economic recovery, all of which affected the relationships in the Alliance during the Cold War. Nuclear weapons, specifically those of the United States (though Britain and France also had their own nuclear capabilities), filled a critical role in

³⁰ Brown, "The Never-Ending Debate Over Burdensharing: The US, Canada and the Allies," 236-237, 240; English, "Problems in Middle Life," 50; Joseph T. Jockel, "US Interests and Canadian Defence Policy in the 1990's: New Epoch, New Era; Old Agenda" in *Canada and NATO: Uneasy Past, Uncertain Future*, ed Margaret MacMillan and David Sorenson, pages of ch (Waterloo: University of Waterloo Press, 1990), 107.

keeping peace and contributing to stability in the Euro-Atlantic region. The concept of US “extended deterrence” to include retaliation to a threat to allies vice just against the United States itself became significant as it concerned the types and roles of nuclear forces in Europe, and the Allied involvement in the decisions. David Yost wrote that “nuclear controversies were closely tied to European-American debates about the proper level of investment in conventional forces and burden sharing,” and about how best to evaluate the conventional force balance between NATO and the Warsaw Pact.³¹

The Europeans started to question the American assurance of full retaliation and the United States grew to view Europe as a “partner which failed to carry its load.”³² NATO Allies believed that US nuclear forces based in Europe were necessary to ensure the extended deterrence function, yet the United States began to reduce their nuclear arsenal in Europe in the late 1970s, leaving only the most politically visible elements. This reduction actually gave many Allies “a direct role in nuclear risk- and responsibility-sharing,”³³ and led to a lessening of the tensions, also enabled by the creation of the Nuclear Planning Group in 1966-67. These arrangements served to promote Alliance cohesion, and the NATO nuclear policy has evolved significantly since the end of the Cold War.

It is interesting to note that Canada did not play a significant role in these debates throughout this time. In fact, in Henry Kissinger’s 1965 analysis of NATO, *The Troubled Partnership*, he explained the intricacies of American-Euro relationship woes

³¹ Yost, *NATO Transformed...*, 33.

³² English, “Problems in Middle Life,” 49.

³³ Yost, *NATO Transformed...*, 33.

with no mention of Canada at all. John English described this omission as symbolic, representative of the degree of importance of Canada to the powers of the Alliance.³⁴ Time would eventually validate this sentiment in terms of Canadian credibility as it related to defence and security issues, a topic that will be discussed in Chapter 3.

The historic period between the end of the Cold War and the 2010 Lisbon Summit and new Strategic Concept was no less tumultuous for NATO than the history that has been presented in this chapter thus far. The events of September 11, 2001 changed the face of global security forever, and the Alliance has made great efforts to meet the new challenges. The 2010 Strategic Concept has fully embraced the premise of non-state threats to the new security environment that had emerged in the 1990's, most notably during the Balkan conflicts. It became widely recognized that security threats were now less likely to stem from calculated attack on Allied territory, but would more likely result from "instabilities precipitated by ethnic and religious rivalries, territorial disputes, failed reform efforts, human rights abuse, and the dissolution of states."³⁵ In 2010, the threats of instability in the form of terrorism and non-conventional extremist adversaries are still identified as being conducive to instability that can directly threaten Alliance security beyond its borders.³⁶ The next chapter will explore the global security situation as it evolved from the end of the Cold War through to the 2010 Lisbon Summit, highlighting NATO's institutional responses, thus allowing Canada's security interests to be viewed in this evolution.

³⁴ English, "Problems in Middle Life," 49.

³⁵ NATO, *The Alliance's Strategic Concept 1999*....

³⁶ NATO, *Strategic Concept for the Defence and Security of the Members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization: Active Engagement, Modern Defence*. (Brussels, Belgium 19 November 2010); http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_68580.htm?; Internet; accessed 9 March 2011.

CHAPTER 2 - NATO'S ADAPTATION TO THE CHANGING GLOBAL SECURITY ENVIRONMENT

Critics have predicted the demise of NATO since the end of the Cold War, predicting a lack of common interest necessary to maintain the necessary unity and sense of purpose of the Alliance.³⁷ Kenneth Waltz portended that "NATO's days may not be numbered, but its years are."³⁸ He was not alone in his views, as discussed extensively by Wallace J. Thies, who detailed the enormous literature that has been written about the perpetual state of crisis of the Alliance, most notably in 2003 when Allies disagreed over decisions concerning Iraq.³⁹ Despite this, NATO has consistently managed to evolve and remain responsive to changing security threats, both global and regional. This has certainly not been without challenges and criticisms, as will be seen in the development of this chapter detailing the changing security environment leading to the 2010 Strategic Concept.

NATO's longevity is impressive when one considers the intramural tensions that have long plagued its member states. In addition to ongoing struggles with actual military capabilities, NATO's ability to maintain unity of purpose and cohesively adapt to emerging non-state threats characterize the strains that prompted the Alliance to transform, over the last decade specifically.⁴⁰ Thies refers to NATO's "self-healing tendencies," that is, the greater value members place on their relationships with one

³⁷ Kitchen, *The Globalization of NATO*, 7; Roger E. Kanet, "The 'New' Members and Future Enlargement: The Impact of NATO-Russia Relations," in *NATO in Search of a Vision* (Washington: Georgetown University Press, 2010), 158.

³⁸ Kenneth Waltz, "The Emerging Structure of International Politics," *International Security*, Volume 18, no. 2, 76.

³⁹ Thies, *Why NATO Endures*, 23.

⁴⁰ Berdal and Ucko, "NATO at 60," 57-58.

another allowing them to overcome differences as a main reason NATO has endured.⁴¹ This underscores the primary unifying feature of the Alliance, namely relationships and the common sense of identity that they bring to members. This is especially important for Canada, a country which relies on multilateral affiliations for continued success in security and defence matters.

The changing security environment after the Cold War saw a shift first toward humanitarian emergencies and stabilization operations as seen in the Balkans, and subsequently toward the fight against international terrorism and weapons of mass destruction, brought into focus by the 9/11 attacks on the United States. NATO's future relevance depended on its ability to adjust to the new and increasingly global context of security, precipitating a review of its structure and capabilities amidst uncertainties over policy and the best methods to address these threats. Even though NATO's focus shifted significantly to encompass the projection of security eastward following the demise of the Warsaw Pact, it would take major shifts in the role of the Alliance through the 1990s and the attacks of September 11, 2001 to catalyze real transformation efforts. With a view to understanding the bearing on Canada's vital security interests in the next chapter, the impact of crisis management missions in the former Yugoslavia and the 9/11 attacks will be examined in this chapter to show how the Alliance was forced to adjust to globalization and a new world view of security.

This discussion will include a review of the initiatives undertaken by NATO over the past two decades in response to the new security threats brought about by globalization. Of note were the decisions taken at the 2002 Summit in Prague, where the

⁴¹ Thies, *Why NATO Endures*, 23.

creation of the NATO Response Force (NRF), a new military command structure and debate over “out-of-area” missions were considered key steps in the transformation of the Alliance. As the global security environment continued to evolve in subsequent years, NATO sought to further increase security cooperation and partnerships with non-member nations in the pursuit of long-term global and regional security. Partnerships and the adoption of a comprehensive approach to operations were deemed key to countering terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, again demonstrating the Alliance’s resolve to widen its focus beyond the Euro-Atlantic area.⁴² These, and continued efforts at subsequent summits have significantly contributed to the evolution of NATO throughout a period marked by morphing security threats and provide valuable context to understanding the 2010 Strategic Concept.

The ever-present theme of NATO enlargement remained central to NATO’s existence, in addition to, or perhaps in concert with, the further development of its relationships with the EU, Russia, the Mediterranean nations and the Middle East. The Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC) has remained a key element in NATO-European security cooperation, as has the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), demonstrating the unique importance of partnerships and collaboration for the Alliance. Furthermore, NATO’s involvement in new types of missions called for more collaboration with international and non-governmental organizations in addition to countries that were not members of the Alliance, such as those in the Partnership for

⁴² NATO, "Istanbul Cooperation Initiative," http://www.nato.int/cps/en/SID-25CF0C71-E7EF318F/natolive/topics_58787.htm; Internet; accessed 17 January 2011.

Peace program.⁴³ The result has been an increase in interoperability with non-NATO countries and other entities, such as the European Union. The prevalence of partnerships and dialogue has grown in importance for NATO, as has been reflected in several summit declarations leading up to the new Strategic Concept, thus generating much discussion over its evolution into a global alliance, or at least an alliance with global partners.⁴⁴

NATO POST-COLD WAR TRANSFORMATION

The Shift in Focus from Military to Political Alliance

The events that marked the end of the Cold War from 1989 to 1991 compelled the Alliance to redefine its purpose and include new roles in addition to the collective defence which had dominated its *raison d'être* until that time. The fall of the Berlin Wall, the unification of Germany and the disintegration of the Communist governments in East-Central Europe changed the context of global security and NATO's role therein. The new roles were primarily characterized by cooperation with former adversaries and the engagement in operations beyond Allied territory.⁴⁵ NATO enlargement figured prominently in this era, as the Alliance began to open its doors to former Communist countries who sought to shelter their new independence under the NATO umbrella. There were challenges as NATO tried to adapt to this evolving environment. The emerging character of the European security situation and the capability gap between the United States and European nations were issues that would perpetuate certain tensions in

⁴³ NATO Public Diplomacy Division, *NATO Transformed*, 30.

⁴⁴ Hallams, "NATO at 60: Going Global?" 450; Partnerships with nations outside the Euro-Atlantic nations are mentioned in the Summit Declarations from Riga in 2006, Bucharest in 2008, Strasbourg/Kehl in 2009 and again in the 2010 Lisbon Summit. Ellen Hallams contends that "for the immediate and foreseeable future, NATO will remain a transatlantic alliance with a global mandate and global partners – but not a global alliance."

⁴⁵ Yost, *NATO Transformed...*, 72.

the Alliance, despite the diminished Russian threat following the collapse of the Soviet Union.

The idea that NATO would be an “agent of change” was highlighted at the 1990 NATO Summit in London, where it was stressed that the Alliance must contribute to a more united and secure continent by reaching out in friendship to the countries of Central and Eastern Europe. The Allies asserted their intention “to enhance the political component of the Alliance as provided for by Article 2” of the Washington Treaty.⁴⁶ The Canadian article, which had remained under the shadow of military primacy, regained a certain degree of significance. This marked a telling shift in focus for the Alliance from a primarily military mission to a political one, and the premise of preserving liberal democratic values expanded in scope to encourage and promote such liberty outside of NATO’s territorial limits. At a time when NATO was viewed by many to be in danger of dissolution in the absence of the Soviet threat, a renewed focus on the unifying values of liberal democracy, human rights and the rule of law emerged within the Alliance.⁴⁷

The 1991 Strategic Concept encapsulated this premise by stating “...what is new is that, with the radical changes in the security situation, the opportunities for achieving Alliance objectives through political means are greater than ever before.”⁴⁸ Rather than

⁴⁶ NATO, *Declaration on a Transformed North Atlantic Alliance issued by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in London on 5-6 July 1990*, (Brussels: NATO, 1990); http://www.nato.int/cps/en/SID-3372D66C-3D9BCDAA/natolive/official_texts_23693.htm; Internet; accessed 7 April 2011.

⁴⁷ Rebecca Moore, *NATO’s New Mission: Projecting Stability in a Post-Cold War World* (Westport: Praeger Security International, 2007), 9.

⁴⁸ NATO, *The Alliance’s New Strategic Concept adopted by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council 7-8 November 1991*, (Brussels: NATO, 1991).

existing to simply defend NATO borders using military means, the Alliance “had committed itself to projecting stability beyond its borders.”⁴⁹

Partnerships and Expansion

The Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC) evolved from this sentiment, originating as the North Atlantic Cooperation Council (NACC) in 1991. NATO instituted the NACC as a mechanism for cooperation on political and security issues with Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania and the Soviet Union. The NACC, which was renamed the EAPC in 1997, initiated the dialogue that would develop into a more solid affiliation through the Partnership for Peace (PfP) program and represented a tangible effort to consolidate European security goals.

The Partnership for Peace initiative, launched in 1994, was an extension of this view. Non-NATO European states were invited to join and relationships were forged which demonstrated NATO’s commitment to expand and strengthen political cooperation throughout Europe while promoting democratic values and principles.⁵⁰ Seen by some as a first step for those seeking to join NATO, the PfP was also widely considered a substitute for NATO enlargement, which was not yet fully endorsed by all Allies. Nevertheless, the PfP’s membership grew quickly and allowed for military cooperation and interoperability with NATO forces and former Warsaw Pact nations, who participated in NATO’s post-Cold War peacekeeping and stabilization missions.⁵¹ Set in motion by PfP, NATO enlargement eventually became a reality and an Alliance priority

⁴⁹ Moore, *NATO’s New Mission...*, 1-2; Yost, *NATO Transformed...*, 73.

⁵⁰ Yost, *NATO Transformed...*, 73-74.

⁵¹ Moore, *NATO’s New Mission...*, 25, 38.

with the first round of new members welcomed in 2002. It remains an important issue in the Alliance to this day, as will be seen in the following chapter.

The 1990's Out-of-Area Debate and Human Security

In an age marked by enormous developments in information technology, reliance on global markets and increasingly permeable state borders, it became clear after the Cold War that security could not be considered purely state-centric.⁵² NATO adopted a new role in crisis management and peace operations that shifted the focus toward Alliance intervention in conflicts outside of Allied territory, notably in the former Yugoslavia. As the Alliance struggled with the potential consequences of instability in intrastate conflicts of Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union, it was forced to revise previous notions of collective defence and Article 5 to include what were referred to as non-Article 5 missions. NATO's humanitarian-based intervention in Kosovo, a state that had not attacked an ally, demonstrated not only the internal transformation of the Alliance and its purpose, but also the growing status of human rights in security discussions.⁵³

The political focus of the strategy aimed at integrating Central and Eastern Europe with the West was put to the test during the devastating war in the Balkans during the 1990s, where the criticality of NATO's military mission was once again brought to the forefront with crisis management missions. It became clear that "the mission of Europe whole and free could not be a purely political project" and that Europe's security relied

⁵² *Ibid.*

⁵³ Yost, *NATO Transformed*, 192; Moore, *NATO's New Mission*, 49.

heavily on the stability along its periphery.⁵⁴ NATO's engagement in the war in Bosnia from 1991 to 1995 revealed a deep division among the Allies concerning NATO's military responsibility for territory outside of its perimeter and brought to light alliance deficiencies. By hesitating to carry out air strikes against Bosnian-Serbs despite ill-equipped United Nations forces and a severely deteriorated security situation, NATO demonstrated a lack of resolve that again raised questions about its relevance in the post-Cold War period. The Alliance was ultimately able to sustain stabilization missions in Bosnia and Kosovo, but the debate continued over the Allies' willingness to act militarily out-of-area.⁵⁵

The concept of "individual" or "human" security gained further importance in the security debate throughout the 1990s because of the role of human rights, and violations thereof, on state security and stability. Former Canadian Foreign Minister Lloyd Axworthy described human security in terms of a measure for "judging the success or failure of national and international security policies, namely: do these policies improve the protection of civilians from state-sponsored aggression and civil, especially ethnic, conflict?"⁵⁶ British Prime Minister Tony Blair echoed this sentiment in 1999 when he linked NATO's intervention in Kosovo to the trend of globalization. He explained that globalization is a political and security phenomenon in addition to an economic one,

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 29; Gabriele Cascone, "NATO Enlargement and the Western Balkans," in *NATO in Search of a Vision* (Washington, Georgetown University Press, 2010), 175; President George W. Bush coined the term "Europe whole and free" when he spoke of what he called NATO's new mission in 1989.

⁵⁵ Moore, *NATO's New Mission ...*, 38.

⁵⁶ Lloyd Axworthy, "NATO's New Security Vocation," *NATO Review* 47, no. 4 (Winter 1999): 9.

elaborating that countries cannot ignore “conflicts and the violations of human rights within other countries” if they want to remain secure.⁵⁷

Security as conceived by NATO therefore encompassed the rights of the individual and this served to reinforce the underpinnings of the liberal democratic values that have always united the Alliance. In an increasingly interconnected world where human rights abuses need not be confined to single states, it became readily apparent that the consequences of such violations could have impacts on the NATO community as a whole. Clearly illustrated in the Bosnia and Kosovo conflicts, this drove NATO to adopt a new understanding of security, described by Lloyd Axworthy as “a continuum, comprising both state and individual concerns.”⁵⁸ Nevertheless, not everyone agreed that NATO’s interventions, particularly in the Kosovo airstrikes, were in accordance with the promotion or protection of human rights. The UN High Commissioner for Human Rights described the humanitarian objectives in Kosovo as a failure because of the civilian casualties resulting from the strikes. Still, NATO had demonstrated a clear pronouncement against the genocide and other human rights abuses taking place in Kosovo and continued along this vein with subsequent intervention in Macedonia and eventually in other missions such as Afghanistan, Iraq and Darfur.⁵⁹

In concert with NATO’s focus on the projection of values and stabilization, Canada’s foreign policy at the time was conveniently geared to the values-based premise of human security as a primary contributor to stability. As asserted by Nelson Michaud,

⁵⁷ Tony Blair, Speech to Chicago Economic Club, 22 Apr 99; http://www.pbs.org/newshour/bb/international/jan-june99/blair_doctrine4-23.html; Internet; accessed 5 February 2011.

⁵⁸ Axworthy, “NATO’s New Security Vocation,” 11.

⁵⁹ Moore, *NATO’s New Mission*, 52-53.

the promotion of human security represented a value-oriented legacy which was integral to Lloyd Axworthy's foreign policy choices. Examples of Canada's initiatives in this domain were the Ottawa Treaty banning the use of antipersonnel mines, the fight against the use of child soldiers and advocacy for the International Criminal Court.⁶⁰

The NATO operations in Bosnia and Kosovo also highlighted the significant capability gap between US forces and the rest of the Allies. This was demonstrated specifically in the area of precision-guided missiles, where 90% of the air strikes were carried out by American aircraft.⁶¹ "In the aftermath of the Kosovo intervention," explained Mats Berdal and David Ucko, "questions began to surface regarding the viability of this lopsided Alliance."⁶² While the imbalance of force capability was not new, it held the potential to undermine the cohesion of the transatlantic relationship because of the US dominance in operations. The US led the attempt toward NATO modernization to address this capability deficiency with the Defence Capabilities Initiative (DCI), sanctioned at the 1999 Washington Summit. The 1999 Strategic Concept endorsed the DCI and confirmed the Allies' commitment to the Transatlantic Link. While it was recognized that allies should take necessary action to build their military capacity in an effort to reduce the gap, the DCI was never fulfilled and it would not be until Prague 2002 that the second attempt at modernization would be made with the Prague Capability Commitments.

⁶⁰ Nelson Michaud, "Values and Canadian Foreign Policy-Making: Inspiration Or Hindrance?" in *Readings in Canadian Foreign Policy*, ed. Bratt, Duane and Kukucha, Christopher (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 344; Jasmin Cheung-Gertler, "A Model Power for a Troubled World? Canadian National Interests and Human Security in the 21st Century," *International Journal* 62, no. 3 (Summer 2007): 590.

⁶¹ Geir Anda et al, "NATO's 1999 Strategic Concept and the Transatlantic Link," in *Essays by Senior Course 97*, ed Dieter Ose and Laure Borgomano-Loup (Rome: NATO Defense College, 2001), 102.

⁶² Mats Berdal and David Ucko. "NATO at 60." *Survival* 51, no. 2 (April 2009): 59.

The 1999 Washington Summit characterized NATO as “an essential pillar of a wider community of shared values and shared responsibility” and the Allies pledged to strengthen relationships with other international organizations and partners to mutually reinforce Euro-Atlantic security and stability.⁶³ The advancement of shared democratic values was reaffirmed in the pursuit of a Europe whole and free through dialogue among states and other institutions, including the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), the European Union and the United Nations.

The Strategic Concept of 1999 referred to the ever-evolving Euro-Atlantic security situation in which NATO would figure prominently and in which the EU and NATO could cooperate on issues of security and defence. With the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council as the overarching framework for all aspects of NATO’s cooperation with partners, the Alliance expressed its commitment to close cooperation with the Western European Union (WEU) and the European Union through the European Security and Defence Identity (ESDI).⁶⁴ The Alliance essentially enabled the Europeans to conduct military operations without US involvement, naturally raising concerns in Washington and presenting yet another source of tension for the US-European allied relationship. The US trepidation involved what was called the 3 D’s: duplication of defence efforts, de-coupling of the US in issues regarding European collective security and discrimination, whereby non-EU NATO members might not be involved in decision-making.⁶⁵ The EU’s formulation of the European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP)

⁶³ NATO, *The Alliance’s Strategic Concept adopted by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Washington* (Brussels: NATO, 1999).

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*

⁶⁵ Anda et al, “NATO’s 1999 Strategic Concept and the Transatlantic Link,” 99-101.

exacerbated the transatlantic tensions because of parallel issues regarding involvement by non-EU NATO members, due to the fact that the only logical implementation of the ESDP was based on the EU having access to NATO capabilities. Clearly, a proper link between NATO's ESDI and the EU's ESDP was necessary to ensure a credible European security and defence policy and the appropriate balance of power within NATO allies.⁶⁶

GLOBALIZATION AND THE IMPACT ON SECURITY

Not only was the Alliance continually plagued by the eternal issues of disparity in burdensharing, it was also faced with revolutionary globalization beginning in the 1990s, with all its repercussions in the complex world of security. Identified as a key trend in the international environment by Canadian defence scientist Peter Gizewski, globalization referred to "the increased mobility of goods, services, labour, technology and capital throughout the world."⁶⁷ He contended that new technologies, primarily in the area of telecommunications, have revolutionized the international system with considerable uncertainty and volatility. The effect on security was an amplified vulnerability in advanced industrial societies with increased threats by non-state entities using unconventional methods, such as terrorism, information warfare and possibly weapons of mass destruction.⁶⁸ The alarming nature of the cyber threat has gained considerable visibility since the computer network attacks in Estonia in 2007 and more

⁶⁶ Javier Arnaiz et al, "ESDI and ESDP: Impact on the Transatlantic Link," in *Essays by Senior Course 97*, ed Dieter Ose and Laure Borgomano-Loup (Rome: NATO Defense College, 2001), 33.

⁶⁷ Peter Gizewski, *The Future Security Environment : Threats, Risks and Responses*. (Toronto: Canadian Institute for International Affairs International Security Series, 2007), 1; <http://www.onlinecic.org/resourcece/archives/internatio/issfutures>; Internet; accessed 19 December 2010.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 1-2.

recently with the attack on a nuclear plant in Iran, prompting NATO to make cyber security a priority by adopting a policy on cyber defence in January 2008.⁶⁹

In the Canadian Defence and Foreign Affairs Institute report *Security in an Uncertain World: A Canadian Perspective on NATO's new Strategic Concept*, Paul Chapin explained that “technology would increase both the breadth of Alliance vulnerabilities and the ease with which adversaries could disrupt Western societies.”⁷⁰ With a more hybrid threat emanating from failed and failing states, where traditional and irregular warfare tactics are combined to exploit western democratic vulnerabilities, NATO was required to act outside traditional areas of responsibility. This was also viewed as a battle for the values and ideals at the heart of democratic society, those same values which form the cornerstone of the Alliance. The authors of the report contended that individual democracies cannot protect their security interests unilaterally, suggesting that states who share liberal democratic values are therefore united in their security concerns. A united effort was necessary to protect those states wherever they may be from threats wherever they may rise.⁷¹ This succinctly demonstrated the inextricable link between the pursuit of interests and the advancement of values in foreign policy, a theme richly debated in academic circles. NATO has clearly pronounced its position on this issue, citing shared values and interests as the fundamental tenets uniting members of the Alliance, which represents “a community of values, such as democracy and human rights,

⁶⁹ Mathieu Labrèche, “NATO’s Jamie Shea on Emerging Security Threats,” *Toronto Review of International Affairs*, 28 December 2010; <http://torontoreview.ca/2010/12/28/natos-jamie-shea-on-emerging-security-threats/>; Internet; accessed 31 March 2011; NATO, “Defending against cyber attacks,” http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/topics_49193.htm; Internet; accessed 31 March 2011.

⁷⁰ Chapin et al, *Security in an Uncertain World: A Canadian Perspective on NATO's New Strategic Concept*, 29-30.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 32-33.

as much as a community of interests.”⁷² The operation in Kosovo had served to further prove that “NATO now defined its interests in such a way that they could not be fully separated from its values.”⁷³

This foreign policy focus on human security would nevertheless face serious challenges in the aftermath of September 11, 2001, as the international political climate dramatically changed perceptions of security and shifted focus toward national security and counterterrorism. The interests of the United States, initially with the war on terror and subsequently placing emphasis on weapons of mass destruction, took on a greater importance for Canada and for NATO, who were forced to reconcile their policy choices to the new environment.⁷⁴

SEPTEMBER 11, 2001 AND NATO

Even though globalization was seen to affect international security throughout the 1990s, urging a renewed focus on threats rising from instability in failed or failing states, it was the attacks of September 11, 2001 that had the most profound impact on collective views of world security. NATO’s purpose was vitally affected as the Alliance endeavoured to further transform into an organization able to respond to the unpredictable and dangerous threat of international terrorism. For the first time in its history, NATO invoked Article 5 in retaliation for the attacks on the United States. On September 12, 2001, NATO declared that an attack on the US was an attack on all members of the Alliance and the Allies quickly demonstrated their solidarity.

⁷² NATO Public Diplomacy Division, *NATO Transformed*, 44.

⁷³ Moore, *NATO’s New Mission*, 51.

⁷⁴ Cheung-Gertler, “A Model Power for a Troubled World? ...” 590.

Collaboration immediately followed in areas such as tracking 9/11 perpetrators, battling terrorist financing and increasing border and port of entry security. Militarily, support was pledged to Operation Enduring Freedom, the American-led mission to stop the Taliban regime and prevent support to Al-Qaeda. This cohesion of the Alliance was soon to be tested, however, with the Iraq crisis in 2002-2003. As President George W. Bush vied for allied support in confronting Saddam Hussein and his regime in Iraq, some countries, including Canada, France and Germany, opposed the proposed action and sought a UN sanctioned resolution. The position held by the US that the threat in Iraq, while out-of-area, constituted a requirement for mutual defence was not accepted by Allies who disagreed over the nature of the threat. The bitter diplomatic disputes that followed highlighted the blurring boundary between compulsory Article 5 collective defence missions and voluntary non-mutual defence missions, mainly out-of-area, stressing a need for clarity in NATO's mandate.⁷⁵

It has already been shown that the 1999 Strategic Concept acknowledged the “new threat” environment and that the acceptance of missions outside traditional Alliance borders was proof of NATO’s commitment to confront new realities. Yet the fateful 9/11 attacks on the United States showed that the “threat went beyond predictions of 1999 and highlighted limitations of the Strategic Concept.”⁷⁶ The attacks epitomized the modern threat stemming from non-state actors with global influence and brought the view of national security into full focus for the Western world, thereby obscuring human security. As explained by Jasmin H. Cheung-Gertler, “following the 11 September 2001 terrorist

⁷⁵ Kitchen, *The Globalization of NATO*, 80, 94.

⁷⁶ Stephen J. Mariano, *Untangling NATO Transformation*, (Kingston: Centre for International Relations Queen’s University, 2007): 23.

attacks in New York and Washington, public policymaking adapted to a combination of fear and threat that privileged public security, counterterrorism and defence expenditures over human rights, foreign aid, and international development.”⁷⁷ This brings into question the relationship or balance between NATO policy based on the projection of values presented in the preceding section and that based solely on security interests, thus presenting unique challenges for Canadian foreign and security policy specifically.

By establishing new national security and immigration policies in line with US interests after the 9/11 attacks, Canada was seen to shift focus from the human security perspective. Cheung-Gertler claimed that human security views were “supplanted by a focus on interoperable and combat-capable military forces, stabilization in failed and failing states, the threat posed by weapons of mass destruction, and the war on terror.”⁷⁸ Norman Hillmer and Jack Granatstein contended that there were political costs to Canadian-US military interoperability and intelligence sharing in Canada, whose citizens were “concerned about maintaining an appropriate balance between security and rights,” thus highlighting the human-public security dichotomy of the post 9/11 era.⁷⁹ The dramatic increase in US defence spending after 9/11 and the invasion of Afghanistan were illustrations of the American propensity for “hard power,” a contrast to the typical European and Canadian approach of using all instruments of power, including diplomatic, military and economic, in a comprehensive approach. This presented a challenge for NATO as Allies struggled with how best to respond to the new threat

⁷⁷ Cheung-Gertler, “A Model Power for a Troubled World?...” 590.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 591.

⁷⁹ Norman Hillmer and J.L. Granatstein, *Empire to Umpire: Canada and the World into the Twenty-First Century* (Toronto: Nelson, 2008), 327.

environment. As Christopher Davis asserted, divergent views on the means necessary to counter these security threats highlighted the “transatlantic divide,” and the potentially detrimental impact on Alliance cohesion.⁸⁰

The events of 9/11 and the subsequent US-led intervention in Afghanistan also underscored the continuing deficiencies of most Allies’ military capabilities and supported the criticality of reaching beyond Alliance territory.⁸¹ Moore asserted that the need to address out-of-area instability led NATO to reach out to its Central and Eastern European neighbours after the Cold War and reinforced the importance of partnerships. Essentially, the aftermath of 9/11 showed that NATO could not ignore global threats outside its periphery, and that any involvement would require both military and political means.⁸² The importance of this evolution in strategy was clearly apparent in the commitments made by the Allies at the 2002 Prague Summit, where the result was an increased urgency to adapt and modernize NATO’s critical capabilities. The initiatives agreed upon in Prague formed the impetus for continued transformation of NATO’s structure and purpose that has been continuously pursued throughout the past decade, as seen in subsequent summits in Riga in 2006, Bucharest in 2008 and Strasbourg/Kehl in 2009. This has included focus on a comprehensive approach to operations and significant emphasis on the criticality of partnerships in order to effectively respond to global threats.

⁸⁰ Christopher Davis, “NATO’s Next Strategic Concept: How the Alliance’s New Strategy will Reshape Global Security,” *Strategic Studies Quarterly* (Winter 2010): 42.

⁸¹ NATO Public Diplomacy Division, *NATO Transformed*, 9.

⁸² Moore, *NATO’s New Mission*, 54.

NATO TRANSFORMATION AFTER 9/11

2002 Prague Summit

Then NATO Secretary General Lord Robertson referred to the Prague Summit as a “Summit of NATO’s re-definition – of its comprehensive external and internal adaptation.”⁸³ Initiatives were presented in Prague in 2002 to transform and modernize the capabilities of the Alliance, its command structure and its mission focus outside traditional areas, all in response to the terrorist threat to global security. The Allies committed to strengthening NATO’s military capabilities in order to increase the effectiveness of future operations across the full spectrum of Alliance missions, while reinforcing the EU’s efforts toward European security in a mutually beneficial relationship. Specifically, the Prague Capability Commitments (PCC), the creation of the NATO Response Force (NRF) and a streamlined command structure were intended to reduce the capability gap, address the Alliance’s ability to provide a military response to crises, and improve Allied interoperability.⁸⁴ NATO enlargement, as an overarching objective toward stability in Europe, was maintained as a priority.

Istanbul Cooperation Initiative

At the 2004 Istanbul Summit, the Heads of State reiterated their support for the Prague Capability Commitments, but the most significant initiatives were those of increasing collaboration with the Mediterranean Dialogue countries and the unveiling of the Istanbul Cooperation Initiative (ICI). The Istanbul Cooperation Initiative (ICI) of

⁸³ Sec Gen Lord Robertson, Speech at Charles University in Prague, 21 March 2002; http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/opinions_19858.htm?selectedLocale=en; Internet; accessed 15 January 2011.

⁸⁴ NATO Public Diplomacy Division, *NATO Transformed*, 9.

2004 offered bilateral security cooperation with NATO to countries in the Middle East region, and was intended to be complementary to the Mediterranean Dialogue (MD) of 1994. The MD was transformed to achieve partnership status with NATO in Istanbul, thus allowing the North African countries involved more access to PfP activities and NATO training opportunities.⁸⁵ The ICI was designed for advice in areas of defence reform in the Middle Eastern region, according to specific needs of the states, and also addressed military-to-military cooperation, the fight against terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.⁸⁶ The Group of Experts report *NATO 2020: Assured Security; Dynamic Engagement* recommended extending dialogue beyond military to include political, economic, social and cultural issues in order to improve benefits of the relationships for all involved, noting that while it has encouraged valuable dialogue, the effectiveness of the ICI has been reduced by a “lack of common strategic vision and by rivalries among the partners and some Allies.”⁸⁷ This highlights realistic challenges inherent in Alliance efforts to expand its network of partnerships, challenges that can persist despite the best intentions and strategic direction.

Riga, Bucharest and Strasbourg/Kehl Summit Initiatives

The 2006 Riga Summit was characterized by the adoption of the Comprehensive Political Guidance (CPG) and the next round of NATO enlargement, in addition to

⁸⁵ Moore, *NATO's New Mission*, 119; Moore, “Partnership goes Global: The Role of Nonmember, Non-European Union States in the Evolution of NATO” in *NATO in Search of a Vision* (Washington: Georgetown University Press, 2010), 223; The Mediterranean Dialogue includes the seven states of Egypt, Israel, Morocco, Mauritania, Tunisia, Jordan and Algeria and is seen as successful forum for NATO cooperation with states in North Africa.

⁸⁶ NATO Public Diplomacy Division, *NATO Handbook*, p.28; The ICI lists Bahrain, Qatar, Kuwait and the UAE as members to date.

⁸⁷ NATO, *NATO 2020: Assured Security; Dynamic Engagement, Analysis and Recommendations of the Group of Experts on the New Strategic Concept for NATO*, The Honourable Madeleine K. Albright, Chair (Brussels: NATO, 2010), 28.

support to ongoing missions in the Balkans, Kosovo, the Mediterranean and Afghanistan.⁸⁸ The CPG provided clear guidance on the expectations for members and details on the range of tasks faced by the Alliance, reaffirming the core mission of NATO on Article 5-type territorial defence with equally critical acknowledgement of global out-of-area missions such as in Afghanistan.⁸⁹ Gülner Aybet stipulated that the CPG reinforced the need for a new updated Strategic Concept to clarify NATO's grand strategy and to address issues of waning consensus among Allies on priorities and purposes for these missions.⁹⁰

As the Alliance continued to pursue its transformation into a more globally-oriented organization capable of responding to a wide range of threats, there appeared a continued disconnect between the stated purpose and vision of the Alliance and the actual desires or commitments from the member nations. This underlines the importance of political will in maintaining a cohesive focus among allies, and importantly, the impact of the consensus principle in NATO decision making, a challenge that has grown with the size of the membership. Berdal and Ucko argued that the “constant search for consensus among ... member states will severely undermine the effective conduct of combat operations” as one example where the political process necessary to approve such a mission was “prohibitively time-consuming.”⁹¹ As will be seen, the topic of consensus and decision-making was identified by the Group of Experts as a key issue to be

⁸⁸ Mariano, *Untangling NATO Transformation*, 39-40.

⁸⁹ NATO, "Comprehensive Political Guidance," 2006; http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_56425.htm; Internet; accessed 17 January 2011.

⁹⁰ Gulnur Aybet, “The NATO Strategic Concept Revisited: Grand Strategy and Emerging Issues,” in *NATO in Search of a Vision* (Washington: Georgetown University Press, 2010), 44.

⁹¹ Berdal and Ucko, “NATO at 60,” 61-62.

addressed by the new 2010 Strategic Concept. A further test of the Alliance in this area is currently underway with the NATO mission in Libya, where Allies are reportedly not in agreement over the pace and intensity of military action.⁹²

At Riga and subsequent summits, NATO has clearly articulated a commitment to a comprehensive approach and the relationships which enable cohesive action among members and partners. These illustrate NATO's efforts toward global transformation and remain pertinent to the new Strategic Concept, the direction that must outline the purpose and tasks of the Alliance. With a view to enhancing NATO's ability to respond effectively to missions beyond its borders, the Riga Summit declaration described partnerships with other nations as "essential to the Alliance's purpose and its tasks."⁹³

The Action Plan for the Comprehensive Approach was adopted in Bucharest in 2008, where it was declared that:

Experiences in Afghanistan and the Balkans demonstrate that the international community needs to work more closely together and take a comprehensive approach to address successfully the security challenges of today and tomorrow. Effective implementation of a comprehensive approach requires the cooperation and contribution of all major actors, including that of Non-Governmental Organizations and relevant local bodies.⁹⁴

⁹² Steven Lee Myers, "NATO Showing Strain over Approach to Libya," http://www.nytimes.com/2011/04/15/world/africa/15nato.html?_r=1&ref=stevenleemyers; Internet; accessed 21 April 2011; Myers wrote that countries, such as the UK and France, are calling for more allies to contribute to the air strikes in Libya, as some nations are limiting their missions to maintain a less aggressive role due to political pressures at home.

⁹³ NATO, *Riga Summit Declaration Issued by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Riga on 29 November 2006*; http://www.nato.int/cps/en/SID-D3F4B609-7CC6FD06/natolive/official_texts_37920.htm; Internet; accessed 30 March 2011.

⁹⁴ NATO, *Bucharest Summit Declaration Issued by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Bucharest on 3 April 2008*, http://www.nato.int/cps/en/SID-79D83335-69D180B7/natolive/official_texts_8443.htm; Internet; accessed 30 March 2011.

The Strasbourg/Kehl Summit in 2009 echoed the pledge to strengthen cooperation with other international actors, including the United Nations, European Union, Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe and African Union, aiming to improve NATO's ability to deliver a comprehensive approach to meet security challenges.⁹⁵ The steps toward the creation of the new Strategic Concept were officially tasked and the Group of Experts was formed to provide analysis and recommendations for the Secretary General's deliberations. Encouragingly, in 2010, US Secretary of Defense Robert Gates characterized the transformation of NATO from a defensive Alliance to a security alliance as "the greatest evolution in NATO over the last two decades," emphasizing the adaptation to the new threats from failed or failing states and the non-state actors therein. He advocated the comprehensive approach not often associated with traditional American hard power preferences and as such represented an evolving view from the US government where partnerships with non-military multinational organizations and the importance of training and advising security forces of other nations are key to success. These issues, along with NATO's willingness to improve levels of defence spending in order to provide proper equipment and resources, contended Gates, were critical to the long-term viability and credibility of NATO.⁹⁶

NATO Enlargement

Since the end of the Cold War, NATO enlargement has figured prominently as a priority for the Alliance, which sought to secure a Europe whole and free, where liberal

⁹⁵ NATO, *Declaration on Alliance Security Issued by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Strasbourg/Kehl on 9 April 2009*; http://www.nato.int/cps/en/SID-9619B86D-54C71F69/natolive/news_52838.htm; Internet; accessed 30 March 2011.

⁹⁶ Gates, Remarks at the NATO Strategic Concept Seminar (Future of NATO).

democratic values and free market economies would prevail. European members looked to integration of the former Warsaw Pact nations and cooperative security as steps to ensure stability and democracy in Europe, though Allies did not always agree on the scope of NATO's actions, as would be seen in Bosnia and Afghanistan conflicts.⁹⁷ Conversely, the new Central and Eastern European members were eager to join the Alliance that would ensure their protection from Russian influence. In this vein, their policy choices, such as sending forces to Iraq, consistently demonstrated support for US initiatives. Despite success in projecting stability eastward, NATO enlargement brought with it a renewed debate over out-of-area missions and the fundamental role of the Alliance as it struggled with missions beyond its territory and forced NATO to consider the extent to which missions other than the fundamental collective defence mattered.⁹⁸

Enlargement was said to assume a new significance at the 2002 Prague Summit, where the idea of welcoming new members was meaningful in terms of potential contributions to the war on terror.⁹⁹ In particular, the United States embraced the concept of enlargement, publicly reinforcing the importance of “a Europe united on the basis of democratic principles, the rule of law, respect for individual rights and the other tenets of the Alliance” as better able to resist and defeat terrorist threats.¹⁰⁰ While the main reason for membership expansion has arguably been the projection of liberal democratic values and enhanced Euro-Atlantic security, it has been argued that membership growth has

⁹⁷ Moore, *NATO's New Mission*, 28.

⁹⁸ Cascone, “NATO Enlargement and the Western Balkans,” 175; Kanet, “The ‘New’ Members and Future Enlargement,” 164.

⁹⁹ Moore, “Partnership goes Global...,” 220.

¹⁰⁰ Douglas J. Feith, “NATO's Transformation: Securing Freedom for Future Generations,” *US Foreign Policy Agenda* 7, no. 1 (March 2002), 17.

actually hampered NATO's ability to gain consensus, with "the addition of each new member increas[ing] the risk of paralysis" in Alliance decision-making.¹⁰¹ Despite this, NATO has pursued enlargement and has worked at length with aspiring nations in the Partnership for Peace program. In November 2002, NATO welcomed the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland, followed by Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia in March 2004 and Albania and Croatia in 2009.

In the 1990's Canadians were not overly interested in expansion, demonstrating what was described by Eric Bergbusch as a "calm acquiescence" that would only be affected by drastic increases in defence budgets, which did not occur. He claimed that Canadians did seem supportive of the "new NATO", based on protecting human security and resolving conflicts in partnership with other institutions, but enlargement itself did not generate significant public discussion.¹⁰² Similarly, Allen Sens wrote in 1995 that "for many Canadians, the enlargement debate seemed largely irrelevant," though he advocated Canadian support for expansion, in addition to strengthened relationships with Russia and the Ukraine.¹⁰³ More recent discourse suggested that eastward enlargement was not particularly salient to Canada's interests considering the political and historical burdens that some new or aspiring countries would bring to the table, as noted in the CDAI-CDFAI report *Security in an Uncertain World*. The authors of the report instead supported the notion of expanding globally to include like-minded nations who share

¹⁰¹ Davis, "NATO's Next Strategic Concept..." 37.

¹⁰² Eric Bergbusch, "NATO Enlargement: Should Canada Leave NATO?" *International Journal* 53, no. 1 (Winter, 1997/1998): 158.

¹⁰³ Allen G. Sens, "Saying Yes to Expansion : The Future of NATO and Canadian Interests in a Changing Alliance," *International Journal*, 50, no. 4 (Autumn, 1995): 676; www.jstor.org; Internet; accessed 11 January 2011.

NATO's liberal democratic values.¹⁰⁴ Notwithstanding, Canada has officially been “a strong and consistent supporter of NATO enlargement” and was the first member of NATO to ratify the accession protocols in the 2004 enlargement process.¹⁰⁵

The NATO-Russia Relationship

A good deal of the debate over NATO enlargement has involved its impact on NATO's relationship with Russia. David Yost maintained that while NATO's stated purpose for enlargement was the promotion of wider security cooperation in Europe, it was initially seen by Russia as a potentially threatening move by the Alliance. Some critics warned that if Russians felt threatened, they could reassert control over former Soviet states or otherwise retaliate.¹⁰⁶ Russia has in fact remained opposed to eastward expansion of the Alliance over the years, but did not take retaliatory action against new members as some had predicted. Interestingly, the events of 9/11 were seen to ease tensions with Russia stemming from the 1999 conflict in Kosovo. Then NATO Secretary General Lord Robertson claimed not only that “September 11 had reinforced the logic of NATO enlargement,” but that these events were instrumental to a dramatic and surprising turn in NATO-Russia relations, which set the stage for a new NATO-Russia Council inaugurated at the Rome summit in May 2002.¹⁰⁷

¹⁰⁴ Chapin et al, *Security in an Uncertain World: A Canadian Perspective on NATO's New Strategic Concept*, 34.

¹⁰⁵ Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, “About NATO”; http://www.international.gc.ca/nato-otan/about-a_propos/index.aspx; Internet; accessed 8 April 2011.

¹⁰⁶ Yost, *NATO Transformed...*, 123.

¹⁰⁷ Lord Robertson, “An Attack on Us All: NATO's Response to Terrorism,” remarks at the Atlantic Council of the United States, National Press Club, Washington, DC, October 10, 2001; Moore, *NATO's New Mission*, 78-79.

In spite of perceived strains, NATO enlargement has remained an Alliance priority. The NATO-Russia relationship has developed positively through the NATO-Russia Council and other areas of military cooperation over the years, but the debate and tensions have not quite disappeared. NATO's condemnation of Russia's 2008 intervention in Georgia was seen to reveal "a division within NATO over the balance between maintaining a cooperative relationship with Russia and the project of enlarging the Euro-Atlantic community."¹⁰⁸ Aybet and Moore contended that the rift was evident in opposition to the United States' 2008 bid to extend invitations to Georgia and the Ukraine to join the Membership Action Plan, in large part to avoid further conflict with Russia.

In January 2010, US Secretary of State Hillary Clinton stated in a speech at l'École Militaire in Paris:

For years, Russia has expressed a sense of insecurity as NATO and the EU have expanded. But we strongly believe that the enlargement of both has increased security, stability and prosperity across the continent and that this, in turn, has increased Russia's security and prosperity.¹⁰⁹

She defended the process of NATO expansion and highlighted the need for a strong and secure Europe that includes Russia, whose confidence in its own security would enhance that of the United States.¹¹⁰ Subsequently, in February 2010, the Georgian Daily reported the approval of new Russian Military Doctrine that identifies NATO

¹⁰⁸ Gulnur Aybet and Rebecca Moore, "Introduction" in *NATO in Search of a Vision* (Washington: Georgetown University Press, 2010), 4.

¹⁰⁹ Hillary Clinton, Remarks to l'École Militaire, Paris, January 2010 <http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2010/01/136273.htm>; Internet; accessed 28 February 2011.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*

enlargement as “the main external military danger facing Russia.”¹¹¹ So despite claims in NATO publications advocating the success of cooperation efforts with Russia, there are clearly unsettled issues. The new Strategic Concept is one mechanism that can enable resolution, but words must clearly be met with actions in this ongoing topic.

NATO’s Partners and the Global Role of NATO

In addition to reinvigorating NATO’s partnership with Russia, September 11 was seen to have a positive and strengthening effect on the development of other Alliance partnerships. Prior to the 2002 Prague Summit, NATO conducted a Comprehensive Review of the EAPC and the PfP with a view to aligning the inclusion of new Alliance members with the changing security needs of the post-9/11 world. NATO adopted the Partnership Action Plan against Terrorism (PAP-T), the first PAP, calling for partners to enhance efforts against terrorism through such means as increased political consultation and information sharing.¹¹² NATO’s post-9/11 era missions in Afghanistan, Iraq, Darfur and the Mediterranean are evidence of an increasingly global outlook undertaken by the Alliance and of the extent to which NATO’s operational focus has broadened beyond the Euro-Atlantic area.

With continued assurances of the importance of strengthening partnerships, namely through PfP, EAPC, NATO-Russia Council, NATO-Ukraine Commission, NATO-Georgia Commission, the Mediterranean Dialogue nations and the Istanbul Cooperation Initiative, NATO has been steadfast in its commitment to collaboration with

¹¹¹ Roger McDermott, “New Russian Military Doctrine Opposes NATO Enlargement,” http://georgiandaily.com/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=16964&Itemid=132; Internet; accessed 28 February 2011.

¹¹² Moore, *NATO’s New Mission*, 92-93.

non-member nations and organizations in the pursuit of its mission. But the mission of establishing a Europe whole and free was now questioned by some who would see NATO change from a merely Atlantic Alliance to a more global one.

Advocates of the expansion of NATO membership to other democratic countries outside the Euro-Atlantic area contend that NATO should evolve into a full-fledged global alliance with other nations who share a common commitment to democratic values and ideals. It is proposed that modern global challenges can only be addressed by a truly global alliance.¹¹³ Currently working in Afghanistan with partners such as Australia and New Zealand, NATO has also partnered with countries like Japan and South Korea and has been emphatic about the vital nature of these relationships, though in a more cautious context. Former Secretary General Jaap de Hoop Scheffer characterized NATO as an “alliance with global partners,” rather than a “global alliance” in what was described as an appeasement to those members who were not supportive of the concept of a global NATO.¹¹⁴ France and Germany have both expressed opposition to initiatives which would extend membership outside the European or North Atlantic region in order to safeguard political cohesion, though they remained supportive of strong partnerships with non-member contributing nations. At a fundamental level, a shift of this magnitude engenders questions about NATO’s basic identity and purpose and it is not surprising that allies might not agree on these deep-seated issues.

Criticisms of a global NATO were noted to invariably include speculation on the potential success of the already contentious consensus principle and the military

¹¹³ Hallams, “NATO at 60: Going Global?” 426; Hallams proposes that the concept of NATO becoming a global alliance is a distinctly American one, given the support expressed by US officials and policymakers.

¹¹⁴ Moore, “Partnership goes Global...,” 227-229.

capability gap, both of which would be exacerbated by additional members from around the world. Additionally, Ellen Hallams made reference to the risks of undermining the transatlantic identity and the possible alienation of other non-member countries as hindrances to the idea.¹¹⁵ While working with global partners is clearly recognized as vital in the pursuit of global stability, it does not appear likely that NATO will seek to expand its membership beyond European territory for the time being. A global mandate requires close collaboration with partners around the world and NATO must establish the extent of that collaboration, but actual membership with some partners would not yet be amenable to all Allies.

Aybet and Moore identified relations with Russia and the extent to which cooperation with global partners should be institutionalized as current issues of tension among allies. Members who resist the global role of NATO have suggested possible erosion of its core function of collective defence, in addition to the threat to the transatlantic identity. The challenge in reconciling the two roles of collective defence and out-of-area missions, according to Aybet and Moore, remains in defining collective defence in light of the unpredictable and hybrid security environment.¹¹⁶ These are profound issues that NATO has been continually struggling with for many years as the organization has successfully sought to adapt to this new threat environment. Canada has also faced challenges while adapting to the changing security context; the following chapter will explore Canada's security interests and identity in order to understand the impact of the new Strategic Concept.

¹¹⁵ Hallams, "NATO at 60: Going Global?" 443.

¹¹⁶ Aybet and Moore, "Introduction" in *NATO in Search of a Vision*, 5 .

CHAPTER 3 - CANADA'S SECURITY INTERESTS AND CHALLENGES

In the 2004 report *Securing an Open Society: Canada's National Security Policy* Canada's core national security interests were identified as: the protection of Canada and the safety and security of Canadians at home and abroad, the assurance that Canada is not a base for threats to our allies and, finally, the contribution to international security.¹¹⁷

These goals cover a broad range of Canada's concerns as they extend from the importance of secure homeland borders with the United States to international engagement in the pursuit of global security. Canadian security policy has traditionally been divided between a strong loyalty to Europe, from whence it came and whose security culture it shares, to an unavoidable commitment to the United States, for reasons of geography and continental defence. The resulting "strategic schizophrenia" has resulted in a gap between what Canada says it will accomplish and what is realistically capable with its resources.¹¹⁸ Canada has faced considerable criticism in the areas of defence spending and burden-sharing since the end of the Cold War and these issues have impacted Canadian credibility on the world stage. This credibility in foreign and security policy has presented a very real challenge for Canada as governments have attempted to reconcile the country's continental and international security interests into a coherent security policy.

¹¹⁷ Government of Canada, *Securing an Open Society: Canada's National Security Policy* <http://www.pco-bcp.gc.ca/docs/information/publications/natsec-secnat/natsec-secnat-eng.pdf>; Internet; accessed 15 February 2011.

¹¹⁸ Julian Lindley-French, "Reconnecting Canada to the World (via Europe)", *International Journal* 60, no. 3 (Summer 2005): 661-662; Joe Jockel and Joel Sokolsky, "Lloyd Axworthy's Legacy: Human Security and the Rescue of Canadian Defence Policy," *International Journal* 56, no. 1 (Winter 2000/2001): 7; Jockel and Sokolsky stipulate that with the UN, NATO and the US all largely pursuing human security after the Cold War, the long-standing schizophrenia in Canadian external relations was ameliorated.

Canadian security interests are intimately linked to the nation's economic and political ties worldwide, most vitally to those with the United States, in addition to its unique geography. The sheer size of Canada's landmass, with three bordering oceans, would require an extensive military capacity to protect its sovereignty from outside threats. With a relatively small population and military force, it is clear that Canada is "virtually indefensible against external threats without allied support."¹¹⁹ As such, Canada's role in international affairs can greatly influence its ability to ensure its own security and defence. This has traditionally been apparent through policy choices in the pursuit of collaboration with like-minded states, as evidenced with multilateral cooperation in international and regional security forums, namely NATO, the United Nations, the Organization of Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) and the Organization of American States (OAS), to highlight a few. Canada will therefore always need to review these policy choices and nurture the relationships that enable political and diplomatic collaboration in the pursuit of stability and prosperity, which pertain directly to national security interests. As explained by Greg Donaghy, "for Canada, collective defence arrangements not only contribute to our own security but also represent one of the ways in which [Canada has] sought to play an international role recognized as being responsible."¹²⁰

In order to better understand the impact of the 2010 NATO Strategic Concept on Canada, this chapter will explore the unique aspects of Canada's foreign policy as it

¹¹⁹ Adam Chapnick, "Taking Sides: The Myth of Canadian Neutrality in World Affairs," *Canadian Military Journal* 8, no. 2 (Summer 2007): 70; <http://www.journal.forces.gc.ca/vo8/no2/doc/chapnick-eng.pdf>; Internet; accessed 19 February 2011.

¹²⁰ Greg Donaghy, "Domesticating NATO: Canada and the North Atlantic Alliance, 1963-68," 460.

relates to security and look at how it has been influenced by membership in NATO. Consideration will first be given to the political values that have guided Canadian policy choices, demonstrating the liberal internationalist approach Canada has adopted in accordance with the expression of democracy, defence of human rights and respect for the rule of law it seeks to represent abroad. Included in these values is a profound belief in pluralism, which Canadians regard not simply as a policy but as a crucial aspect of their national identity.¹²¹ It is important to understand how Canadians see themselves and their country's role in international affairs if one is to gain an appreciation for the security commitments made by the government over the years with NATO and in other forums.

Next, a review of Canada's distinctive relationship with the United States will provide fundamental and necessary context to understanding Canada's security interests, which are extensively shared with the United States. The nature of Canada-US collaboration in areas of security will be examined, with emphasis on the dramatic changes following the September 11 attacks. The successful accomplishments and tensions that come to light emphasize the criticality of this vital relationship to Canadian security. Canada's political and economic ties to the US, its largest trading partner, have unique relevance to the collective security of the North American continent and indeed have profoundly affected Canadian foreign and defence policies. Canada relies on the maintenance of these ties in order to protect its own security interests.

Finally, this chapter will review some of the practical implementations of Canadian foreign policy with a view to better grasping the political implications and their impact on the security environment in which Canada functions. Canada has long been

¹²¹ Osvaldo Croci, "Canada: Facing up to Regional Security Challenges" in *National Security Cultures, Patterns of Global Governance*, ed Emil J. Kirchner and James Sperling (Oxon: Routledge, 2010), 128.

criticized for underspending in the area of defence and security, specifically throughout the 1990s and early 2000s. Numerous authors and scholars have attributed this spending decline to a very real waning in Canada's world influence and credibility in multilateral circles, which they view as being dependent on Canada's ability to contribute militarily.¹²² It is therefore relevant to consider the initiatives undertaken by the Government of Canada in the past decade to increase defence spending and modernize the Canadian Forces in order to assess the impact on Canada's role in the world and subsequent ability to achieve security objectives. Clearly vital to this discussion is the "no-fail" mission in Afghanistan, currently a governmental priority and prominent Canadian contribution to global security. The implications of Canada's involvement in the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) mission highlight Canada's commitment to NATO and showcase the current context of Canadian defence and security policy.

MULTILATERALISM, CANADIAN VALUES AND INTERESTS

In 1947, Canadian Secretary of External Affairs Louis St. Laurent laid the foundations of a values-based, multilaterally focused foreign policy with the historic Gray Lecture in Toronto. The values he championed have endured over time and have continually influenced the policy choices of successive Canadian governments. Specifically, Canadians have espoused the expression of the core values of freedom, democracy, human rights and the rule of law, as seen in the pursuit of political liberty and

¹²² Kim Richard Nossal, "Canada: Fading Power or Future Power?" *Behind the Headlines* 59, no. 3 (Spring 2002): 9; Jennifer Welsh, "Canada in the 21st Century: Beyond Dominion and Middle Power," *Behind the Headlines* 61, no. 4 (September 2004): 2-3; Denis Stairs, "Trends in Canadian Foreign Policy: Past, Present, and Future," *Behind the Headlines* 59, no. 3 (Spring 2002): 2.

in a strong sense of international responsibility.¹²³ These values have long affected Canadian policy choices in the area of security and defence through support for international missions abroad for the protection of human rights and the pursuit of global stability. Canada's military contributions to United Nations efforts during the Korean War in 1950 and the Iraq War in 1991 and to NATO peace keeping and crisis management missions in the Balkans in the late 1990s have demonstrated this tendency.¹²⁴ More recently, with the mission in Afghanistan, the purpose of pursuing Canadian values abroad has been expounded by the government, as evidenced by Prime Minister Stephen Harper's address to Canadian Forces troops in Kandahar in 2009, where he stated:

You came here to defend our national interests, our freedoms and our values. You are here to protect your country and the entire world against terrorism and barbarism; you are here to help the Afghan people rebuild this country too long ravaged by war... As a prosperous and free country, we have the moral duty to share our good fortune, our freedoms and our opportunities with the citizens of the world who have too long had to endure violence, oppression and privation.¹²⁵

The Prime Minister's remarks highlight the important connection between promoting values and protecting Canadian interests. It has been stipulated that Canada's support to the Afghanistan effort was more accurately rooted in the real interest for Canada to assist in destroying the "haven and base that Afghanistan had become from which international terrorists could continue to attack the west."¹²⁶ However, Jennifer

¹²³ Louis St. Laurent, *The Foundations of Canadian Foreign Policy in World Affairs* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, Duncan and John Gray Memorial Lecture, 1947).

¹²⁴ Chapnick, "Taking Sides: The Myth of Canadian Neutrality in World Affairs," 70.

¹²⁵ Stephen Harper, "Prime Minister's Address in Kandahar," 7 May 2009; <http://pm.gc.ca/eng/media.asp?category=2&featureId=6&pageId=46&page=5>; Internet; accessed 18 February 2011.

Welsh has asserted that peacekeeping and multilateralism are sources of pride for Canadians and that “internationalism has become a deeply ingrained feature of the new Canadian identity.”¹²⁷ Welsh also maintained that as a member of the Alliance, Canada is committed to assuming international responsibilities, most commonly designed to protect the values of democracy and human rights, which Canadians share with “like-minded states.” If Canada is to benefit from the security provided by membership in NATO, it must be prepared to contribute accordingly. This can be seen as a primary reason for Canada’s involvement in Afghanistan and also clearly links Canada’s security interests to its values. “Canada’s security,” continued Welsh, “and the security of its allies – is enhanced by addressing the problem of failed states such as Afghanistan and preventing them from becoming a source of instability or haven for illegal activities in the future.”¹²⁸ Not simply explained by a sense of responsibility, it is also in Canada’s interest to contribute to the “rehabilitation of societies that have experienced military intervention.”¹²⁹ Welsh has succinctly linked the concept of establishing security policy in the pursuit of Canada’s interests with that of its values, demonstrating that they are not mutually exclusive in this debate.

The Canadian government openly espouses the need for a security policy that reflects values shared by its citizens. The Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade website describes security concerns that are not limited to Canadian

¹²⁶ Jockel and Sokolsky, “Canada and NATO: Keeping Ottawa in, expenses down, criticism out...and the country secure,” 329.

¹²⁷ Welsh, “Canada in the 21st Century: Beyond Dominion and Middle Power,” 12.

¹²⁸ Jennifer Welsh, *At Home in the World: Canada's Global Vision for the 21st Century*. (Toronto: Harper Collins Publishers, 2006), 205-206.

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*, 206.

self-interests, and includes the desire to help other nations build stability as a motivator for its policies. This is rooted in the conclusion that Canadians understand that their security and prosperity are vitally tied to “a security policy that promotes peace in every part of the world with which Canada has close economic and political links.”¹³⁰ As such, Canada’s security policy can best be achieved by broadening responses to global security issues beyond military options to aim for promotion of international cooperation, building stability and preventing conflict.¹³¹ Canadians understand that their “economic and security interests are best served by the widest possible respect for the environment, human rights, participatory government, free markets and the rule of law.”¹³² Regions in which these values and rights are not observed are more susceptible to instability and poverty that can have international repercussions, which clearly demonstrates a connection between security interests and economic stability. The concept of human security figures highly in this discussion and, as seen previously, was a dominant factor in Canadian foreign and security policies throughout the 1990s.

In addition to supporting UN efforts, Canada has manifested its commitment to global security in multilateral engagement with OSCE missions, mainly in the former Soviet Union, and has also contributed personnel, albeit in small numbers of observers, to European Union missions in Indonesia, Lebanon and the Democratic Republic of Congo. These non-NATO engagements, while smaller in scope when compared to such high-

¹³⁰ Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, “The Protection of our Security, within a Stable Global Framework,” http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/foreign_policy/cnd-world/chap4-en.asp; Internet; accessed 17 February 2011.

¹³¹ *Ibid.*

¹³² Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, “Projecting Canadian Values and Culture,” http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/foreign_policy/cnd-world/chap5-en.asp; Internet; accessed 18 February 2011.

profile missions as Afghanistan, serve to illustrate the importance Canada places on the promotion of security beyond its borders by promoting democratic civil-military relations in cooperation with international organizations.¹³³ Furthermore, Canada's commitment to the G8 Global Partnership Against the Spread of Weapons and Materials of Mass Destruction and to counter-terrorism efforts with its G8 partners can be seen as a compelling indicator of policy in support of global security as it affects Canadian values and interests alike.¹³⁴

Differing views exist as to why Canada has chosen to adopt a multilateral approach to security policy, but the bottom line rests with Canada's ability to influence allies since it can not defend itself unilaterally. "Membership in NATO," postulated Greg Donaghy, "fostered relations with Europe which served to offset the preponderant United States' influence on Canada and constituted a forum where smaller powers could influence the policies of larger ones."¹³⁵ According to Frédéric Mérand, Canada has favoured multilateral institutions to avoid choosing between its European heritage and its strong geographical obligation to the United States. In the security domain, NATO has provided the forum for Canada to sit at the table with both the Americans and the Europeans. Since the end of the Cold War, Mérand contended that Canada felt able to "reconcile its continental security interests with its normative objectives," namely the

¹³³ Croci, "Canada: Facing up to Regional Security Challenges", 134.

¹³⁴ Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, "Statement of G8 Leaders – The G8 Global Partnership Against the Spread of Weapons and Materials of Mass Destruction," http://www.canadainternational.gc.ca/g8/summit-sommet/2002/global_partnership-partenariat_mondial.aspx?lang=eng; Internet; accessed 18 February 2011.

¹³⁵ Donaghy, "Domesticating NATO: Canada and the North Atlantic Alliance," 461.

projection of democratic values.¹³⁶ Since Canada's security can not be separated from that of continental defence and given the Canadian dependence on trade with the United States, Mérand suggested that Canada should focus on strengthening its security relationship with the US and the European Union, the main security actors for Canada, rather than invest too much in NATO.¹³⁷ Julian Lindley-French also advocated the strengthening of ties to Europe and maintaining the "vibrancy of its international alliance," claiming that the security relationship with the European Union is as important to Canada as that with the United States.¹³⁸ Even without the traditional Soviet threat, Canada's security interests remain linked to European security through the pursuit for international economic and political stability. Canada is able to address this challenge by remaining engaged with European allies, through NATO or other forums. This is relevant to understanding how the future of NATO as it is described in the new Strategic Concept will affect Canadian policy.

In the report *Security in an Uncertain World: A Canadian Perspective on NATO's New Strategic Concept*, Paul Chapin stated that "for Canadians, NATO is a means to an end – not an end in itself."¹³⁹ This statement reflects the emphasis on multilateralism not only in Canadian foreign policy but also in the Canadian security identity as represented by membership in international forums. Ultimately, Canadians are seen to identify

¹³⁶ Frédéric Mérand, "NATO, ESDP, and Transatlantic Security: Where does Canada fit?" prepared for *The Transatlantic Security Triangle: Where Does Canada Fit?* June 12, 2006, Ottawa, 1; <http://www.carleton.ca/europecluster/>; Internet; accessed 20 November 2010.

¹³⁷ *Ibid.*

¹³⁸ Lindley-French, "Reconnecting Canada to the World (via Europe)," 663.

¹³⁹ Paul Chapin et al, *Security in an Uncertain World: A Canadian Perspective on NATO's New Strategic Concept*, 22.

strongly with the expression of values abroad, and this has been seen as a unifying link with NATO nations since the inception of the Alliance. As long as Canadians and their government continue to embrace a sense of international responsibility beyond its own borders in a pursuit of peace and security reflective of Canadian values and interests, then a multilateral approach is necessarily central to Canada's foreign, security and defence policies.¹⁴⁰

CANADA'S RELATIONSHIP WITH THE UNITED STATES

The unique symbiotic relationship between Canada and the United States in the areas of trade and collective North American security is paramount to Canadian prosperity and security. Roy Rempel wrote that "there are absolutely no alternatives to the Canada-US relationship. There are no alternatives in a political sense. There are no alternatives in a strategic sense. And there are certainly no alternatives in an economic sense."¹⁴¹ Jennifer Welsh conceded to the paramount importance of the relationship, but expressed some doubt about Rempel's certainty and his further contention that the degree to which Canada will be taken seriously by other states is proportional to the closeness of its relationship to the US. She claimed that defining a Canadian foreign policy by its relationship to the United States is not the only way to be taken seriously in global politics.¹⁴² Notwithstanding, it is difficult to deny the critical importance of a robust bilateral economic relationship with the United States for Canadian security interests and

¹⁴⁰ David Dewitt, "Directions in Canada's International Security Policy: from Marginal Actor at the Centre to Central Actor at the Margins," *International Journal* 55, no. 2 (Spring 2000): 184.

¹⁴¹ Roy Rempel, *Dreamland: How Canada's Pretend Foreign Policy Has Undermined Sovereignty*, (Montreal & Kingston, McGill-Queen's University Press, 2006), 151-152.

¹⁴² Jennifer Welsh, "Are Interests really Value Free?" *Literary Review of Canada* 14, no. 9 (2006): 1.

the significant incentive for Canada to maintain a positive political bond with her powerful neighbour. But the relationship is decidedly complex, as seen with repercussions over ballistic missile defence, border issues after 9/11 and the Iraq War in 2003, as will be discussed.

In the early years of the Alliance, Canada enjoyed a middle power role seen to subtly influence the United States in international forums, capitalizing on “quiet persuasion to constrain American behaviour.”¹⁴³ This allowed Canadian views to be heard and thus positioned the country favourably for its role in security discussions. But, as Kim Nossal argued, Canadian influence with the United States waned over the years, reaching an absolute low in 2003 with the Chrétien government’s embarrassing management of the war in Iraq. He claimed that the way in which the government publicly waffled on the issue of support to the US-led “coalition of the willing” resulted in an ambiguous and confusing Canadian policy and rendered Ottawa’s voice in Washington utterly irrelevant. Additionally, short-sighted and insulting public comments by parliamentarians were viewed as highly inappropriate and damaging to Canada’s reputation. In Nossal’s view, while Canada is not necessarily obligated to blindly agree with all American policy choices, a lack of appropriate diplomacy can be very damaging to Canada’s interests as it will prevent any influence in future discussions.¹⁴⁴ Denis Stairs supported this premise by explaining that policy differences must be rooted in “reasoned argumentation and/or clear accounts of interests, and not in self-proclaimed attachments to principles of the loftier sort.”¹⁴⁵

¹⁴³ Nossal, “Canada: Fading Power or Future Power?” 12.

¹⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 12-14.

Canada's relationship with the United States has decidedly improved since 2003, but the tensions serve to illustrate the importance of Canadian policy choices in the areas of defence and security. By some accounts, despite the government's open declarations about the advancement of values, Canada's engagement in Afghanistan since 2003 can also be seen to not only reflect a sense of responsibility to NATO, but to ensure continued conciliation to the United States. John Kirton and Jenilee Guebert viewed Canada's renewed commitment in Kabul in 2003 as a solution meant to appease Canada-US relations, which had become strained by Ottawa's decision to not support the US in Iraq in 2003.¹⁴⁶ Patrick Lennox claimed that then Prime Minister Martin's 2005 decision to increase presence in Kabul was also in this vein, not only because of the Iraq decision, but also because of Canada's stance against ballistic missile defence.¹⁴⁷

The attacks of September 11, 2001 had significant repercussions on Canada's relationship with the United States. Most obviously, issues of physical security gained importance and Canada rapidly implemented measures to increase border security with the US and established new governmental priorities dominated by public security and the defence of North America. By exposing the collective vulnerability of the United States and Canada, 9/11 served to strengthen resolve against terrorism and the potential threat of weapons of mass destruction. To author Douglas A. Ross, Canadian foreign policy needed to address these issues by "developing a sound Canadian position in the

¹⁴⁵ Stairs, "Trends in Canadian Foreign Policy: Past, Present and Future," 6.

¹⁴⁶ John Kirton and Jenilee Guebert, "Two Solitudes; One War: Public Opinion, National Unity and Canada's War in Afghanistan" (Université de Québec à Montréal, Montréal, QC, University of Toronto, 8 October 2007), 12.

¹⁴⁷ Patrick Lennox, "The Illusion of Independence," in *An Independent Foreign Policy for Canada? Challenges and Choices for the Future*, ed. Bow, Brian and Lennox, Patrick (Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press, 2008): 56.

prolonged struggle to contain nuclear risk, and more broadly to help promote stability and greater security to the ‘WMD file’ through coherent multilateral action.”¹⁴⁸ He claimed that the most desirable approach for Canada would be for the United States to adopt a cooperative security strategy, even though it would be expensive for Canada. What was reinforced was the essential nature of full cooperation and information-sharing between Canada and the US on issues of national security and border security. Anything less would have negatively impacted trade relations in addition to counter-terrorism efforts and would threaten Canadian prosperity and security.¹⁴⁹

IMPLEMENTATION OF CANADA’S SECURITY POLICY

This chapter has thus far examined the roots of Canadian security policy which lie in an internationalist approach with pronounced links to a vital bilateral relationship with the United States. Governments have historically called upon Canadian values as a key motivator to international policy and defence engagements and have sought to reflect those values, namely democracy, respect for human rights and the rule of law, in pursuit of security objectives. Yet, the degree to which Canada has effectively implemented a security strategy that accurately accomplishes the aim of regaining an influential role in the world has been in question, mainly due to a gap between what defence policy wishes to accomplish and the resources that actually exist to achieve goals. The intent is clearly there but commitments are simply not matched by capabilities.¹⁵⁰ Julian Lindley-French

¹⁴⁸ Douglas A. Ross, “Foreign Policy Challenges for Paul Martin: Canada’s International Security Policy in an era of American Hyperpower and Continental Vulnerability,” *International Journal* 58, no. 4 (Fall 2003): 554.

¹⁴⁹ Chapnick, “Taking Sides: The Myth of Canadian Neutrality in World Affairs,” 71.

¹⁵⁰ Dewitt, “Directions in Canada’s international security policy: from marginal actor at the centre to central actor at the margins,” 172-173.

described this phenomenon as being particularly apparent in the security field “in which Canada endlessly talks internationalism but actually spends isolationism,” claiming that the 2005 International Policy Statement issued by the Martin government had in fact widened the gap between rhetoric and capabilities.¹⁵¹ By examining how Canadian political intent has actually been put into action, one can see the steady decline in credibility since the 1960s and a hopeful, tentative increase in the past decade through Canada’s renewed commitment to defence spending and the mission in Afghanistan.

Defence Spending

After the Second World War, Canadian foreign policy was focused on collective security and the Soviet threat to European, indeed North Atlantic, security figured prominently. Lester B. Pearson quite aptly stated in 1963 that

Today, defence policy is based more on the interdependence than the independence of nations. No country, not even the most powerful, can defend itself alone. The only security, especially for a country like Canada, lies in collective action through a defensive alliance such as NATO, which rests, or should rest, on a pooling of strengths.¹⁵²

In the early Cold War years Canada maintained a considerable military presence in Europe and increased allocations to unprecedented levels of defence spending. This fiscal commitment culminated in 1953 at the end of the Korean War when Canada’s defence/GDP ratio was the fourth highest in NATO, accounting for 45% of federal spending.¹⁵³ Referred to as the “golden age” of Canadian foreign policy, this represented

¹⁵¹ Julian Lindley-French, “Reconnecting Canada to the World (via Europe),” 654.

¹⁵² Lester B. Pearson, *Words & Occasions*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1970): 200.

¹⁵³ David G. Haglund, “The NATO of its Dreams? Canada and the Co-operative Security Alliance,” 467-468.

a historic accomplishment which enabled Canada's voice to be heard among the great powers of the world.

Canada's sizeable contribution to defence was, however, not sustainable and the budgets subsequently decreased to the extent that Canada became one of the lowest contributors to defence spending of NATO countries. By 2003, Canada ranked seventeenth of the nineteen NATO members with 1.1% of GDP and this steady fiscal decline over the years was widely associated with an equivalent waning of the country's international credibility. Nossal has stipulated that Canada's prominence in world affairs shrunk because of reduced spending on international affairs and development assistance in addition to security and defence, but others highlight the connection to military spending.¹⁵⁴ Andrew Cohen listed several examples of what he referred to as overwhelming evidence of the weakening of Canada's political influence directly related to its posture on military expenditures. He outlined reports by the auditor general and the Conference Board of Canada and testimonies of experts before parliamentary committees detailing "plunging morale and hopeless equipment; embarrassing news stories of ill-suited uniforms and ill-informed ministers" as substantiation of Canada's fading influence on the world stage.¹⁵⁵ He is joined by Denis Stairs, who viewed Canada's "unseemly demotion in the diplomatic pecking order" as the result of Canada's inability to provide adequate security assets to the proverbial table of international security debate.¹⁵⁶ Similarly, Jennifer Welsh purported that "Canada has less meat to put on the

¹⁵⁴ Nossal, "Canada: Fading Power or Future Power?" 9.

¹⁵⁵ Andrew Cohen, "Seize the day", *International Journal* 58, no.2 (Winter 2002-2003): 144-146.

¹⁵⁶ Stairs, "Trends in Canadian Foreign Policy: Past, Present and Future," 2.

international table and is increasingly relying on its past record of good international citizenship.”¹⁵⁷ These authors are not alone in their views as much literature exists outlining the various ways Canadian foreign, defence and security policies have translated to declining influence and ability to be heard in international circles, like NATO and the UN. This has figured prominently among the challenges Canada still faces in determining an effective security policy capable of addressing pertinent interests.

Not everyone agrees with the assessment that Canada has suffered such an extensive deterioration in credibility when it comes to its security, lending support to the premise that Canada has in fact made a significant contribution to international security and established a well-respected reputation in this area. David Dewitt outlined the compelling contribution of Canadians to international security throughout the 1990s when he explained that “Canadian troops were valued both because of their training in a modern multipurpose, combat capable force, but also because of the political context and role Canada played within the multilateral world of the United Nations and related institutions.”¹⁵⁸ He asserted that operational contributions, including those through NORAD, NATO and the UN, enhanced the nation’s reputation and allowed Canada to “share the larger burdens of international security operations with its NATO partners.”¹⁵⁹ Benjamin Zyla supported this view, explaining that in the post-Cold War era, when NATO was struggling with burden-sharing issues and the capability gap with the US, Canada’s performed over and above some of the allies and “made more resources

¹⁵⁷ Welsh, “Canada in the 21st Century...,” 3.

¹⁵⁸ Dewitt, “Directions in Canada’s International Security Policy: from Marginal Actor at the centre to central Actor at the margins,” 175.

¹⁵⁹ *Ibid.*

available than it was given credit for.”¹⁶⁰ For Zyla, the defence spending with percentage of GDP as an indicator of commitment level was outdated in the post-Cold War era, specifically because it did not account for the changing security environment. He further stipulated that Canadian reductions in military spending were consistent and comparable with those of other allies and that they were in fact less than other NATO middle powers such as Belgium, the Netherlands, or Spain.¹⁶¹

The Canadian governments of the past decade have also been criticized for straying away from global peacekeeping missions, viewed by some as Canada’s vocation and tradition. Oswaldo Croci explained that these critics, citing dismally low Canadian support to United Nations peacekeeping missions, have often failed to recognize the significant Canadian contributions to non-UN missions conducted with other international organizations, such as NATO, the OSCE, the EU and even the Commonwealth. In his view, this has contributed to a gross underestimation of the Canadian contribution to global security.¹⁶² This is reinforced by Zyla, who argued that Canadian contributions to non-UN peacekeeping operations were commensurate with the size of the Canadian population.¹⁶³

While the common theme for Canadian foreign and security policy has been one of declining credibility, the authors of the Canadian International Council report *Open Canada: A Global Positioning Strategy for a Networked Age* have argued that the

¹⁶⁰ Benjamin Zyla, “NATO and post-Cold War burden-sharing: Canada ‘The Laggard’?” *International Journal* 64, no. 2 (Spring 2009), 340.

¹⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 346.

¹⁶² Croci, “Canada: Facing up to Regional Security Challenges,” 135.

¹⁶³ Zyla, “NATO and post-Cold War burden-sharing: Canada ‘The Laggard’?” 350.

Canadian military is “in a renaissance.”¹⁶⁴ Indeed, the change in the government’s defence spending trend in 2006 started what may be a reversal in the debate. In 2006, the Liberals injected CAD 5.3 billion into the budget over five years. This was closely followed in 2008 by the Conservative plan to increase the defence budget by two percent per year with a long-term plan to bring annual expenditures close to CAD 30 billion by 2027. Titled the Canada First Defence Strategy (CFDS), this strategy marked a turning point in Canadian security and defence policy, which had been endlessly plagued by criticism and underfunding.¹⁶⁵

According to Defence Minister Peter MacKay, the CFDS represented the government’s commitment to “rebuilding [Canada’s] armed forces into a first-class, modern military that can defend sovereignty at home and contribute effectively to international security.”¹⁶⁶ He stressed the importance of the collective responsibilities of individual members of the Alliance and the need for clear policy direction and adequate resources in order for allies to live up to transformational goals. The Conservative government was criticized after the CFDS announcement for not being able to effectively explain the detailed spending plan to Canadians and there were many critics who claimed the costs were too high for taxpayers. Ironically, the actual amount of funding required to revitalize Canada’s military is likely higher than that proposed in the CFDS, but the fact remains that the fiscal and economic complexities were difficult to comprehend in

¹⁶⁴ Edward Greenspon et al, *Open Canada: A Global Positioning Strategy for a Networked Age* (Ottawa, ON: Canadian International Council, 2010), 9-14.; <http://www.onlinecic.org/opencanada>; Internet; accessed 17 February 2011.

¹⁶⁵ Croci, *Canada: Facing up to Regional Security Challenges*, 142.

¹⁶⁶ Peter MacKay, “A Blueprint for National Efforts,” NATO’s Nations & Partners for Peace 53, no. 1 (2008): 34.

layman terms.¹⁶⁷ For a country widely criticized for lacking sufficient assets and military funding, this strategy, if reinforced by political action, could allow Canada to better contribute to its security commitments and enhance its tarnished reputation. One can argue that the political will has been evident with the Harper government, with such defence acquisitions as the C-17 Globemaster aircraft and Medium-Heavy Lift Helicopters in 2006, Leopard II Main Battle Tanks in 2007 and even the current and politically controversial F-35 Joint Strike Fighter procurement project, but government action can change significantly after an election.¹⁶⁸

The ISAF Mission in Afghanistan

The Afghanistan mission embodies Canada's response to a key threat to its national security interests, and also to Canada's values-based commitment to global security. Since 9/11, terrorism emanating from failed and failing states outside of Europe has governed policy choices with the United States, and to a large degree with NATO. Canada, as a free and liberal nation has contributed to this effort toward peace with military, diplomatic and developmental efforts, notably in the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) mission in Afghanistan.¹⁶⁹ Canada is currently devoting the bulk of its military and development funding and resources to the economic reconstruction of Afghanistan, with approximately 80 percent of incremental costs

¹⁶⁷ Gerry Madigan, "Canada First Defence Strategy: A Retrospective Look. Too much? Too Little? Or Just Right?" *Canadian Military Journal* 10, no. 3 (Summer 2010): 34-35.

¹⁶⁸ Department of National Defence, "Major DND/CF Investments," <http://www.forces.gc.ca/site/pri/2/invest-eng.asp>; Internet; accessed 21 April 2011.

¹⁶⁹ Chapin et al, *Security in an Uncertain World: A Canadian Perspective on NATO's New Strategic Concept*, 30; Jockel and Sokolsky, "Canada and NATO: Keeping Ottawa in, Expenses down, Criticism out... and the Country secure," 335.

attributed since 2001.¹⁷⁰ Though Canadian public support for the military has been growing, support for the Afghanistan mission has fluctuated since 2006, causing partisan politics to prevail in debates over Canada's level of engagement and end date for involvement.¹⁷¹ An Independent Panel was established in 2007 to assess Canada's role in Afghanistan, led by liberal former Deputy Prime Minister John Manley. The report prepared by the Panel recommended that the mission continue, "judging it to be in line with Canada's traditional multilateral approach to international security as well as its values."¹⁷²

For some, Canada was seen to regain some influence in multilateral circles like NATO, and also with the US. Political scientist Alexander Moens claimed that Prime Minister Harper used the Canadian engagement in Afghanistan and the revival of the defence budget as a means to build respect and political capital in Washington. In so doing, he "changed the tone and substance of Canada's role in the world," stipulated Moens; "the hallmark policy of his revolution is Afghanistan."¹⁷³

Clearly, Canada's pursuit of a coherent defence policy which adequately responds to its security needs is rooted in the relationships it fosters with allies. Intrinsic to this is the credibility with which Canada is able to exert influence in multilateral forums in the pursuit of economic prosperity and stability, and it has been shown that Canada is making progress after a long hiatus in that department. If the Canadian government can meet

¹⁷⁰ Croci, "Canada: Facing up to Regional Security Challenges," 138.

¹⁷¹ Alexander Moens, "Afghanistan and the Revolution in Canadian Foreign Policy," *International Journal* 63, no. 3, (Summer 2008), 580.

¹⁷² Croci, "Canada: Facing up to Regional Security Challenges," 139.

¹⁷³ Moens, "Afghanistan and the Revolution in Canadian Foreign Policy," 586.

security policy commitments with capabilities, military and diplomatic, then Canadian values and interests will undoubtedly be listened to by the international community. In the next chapter, the impact of the 2010 NATO Strategic Concept on Canada's ability to achieve an articulate foreign, defence and security policies will be studied in more detail, in order to better view Canada's current challenges.

CHAPTER 4 - THE 2010 NATO STRATEGIC CONCEPT

The new NATO Strategic Concept adopted by NATO Heads of State and Government at the Lisbon Summit on 19 November 2010 outlined the way ahead for the Alliance, with consideration given to its core tasks, the new security environment and the necessary measures to be taken to ensure NATO has the full range of capabilities necessary to counter threats. Entitled *Active Engagement, Modern Defence*, this document was eagerly awaited by the international security community, as a replacement for the previous and arguably outdated Strategic Concept of 1999. The global security environment has changed dramatically since the last Strategic Concept, and NATO has lived through monumental events such as the invocation of Article 5 for the first time in history the day after the 9/11 attack on the United States and engagement in its most challenging out-of-area mission in Afghanistan. After a particularly tumultuous decade where terrorism and global instability have governed NATO's agenda, the 2010 Strategic Concept was intended to update the purpose and goals of the Alliance, providing a vision and roadmap to guide its future decisions.¹⁷⁴ Congruently, the Lisbon Summit Declaration issued by the Heads of State and Government on the same day outlined the more detailed commitments and the steps Allies have agreed upon in order to achieve the vision of the Strategic Concept.¹⁷⁵ Both documents reaffirm NATO's commitment to the

¹⁷⁴ NATO, *Strategic Concept for the Defence and Security of the Members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization: Active Engagement, Modern Defence*.

¹⁷⁵ NATO, *Lisbon Summit Declaration Issued by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Lisbon*. (Brussels, Belgium, 20 November 2010); http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_68828.htm?mode=pressrelease; Internet; accessed 9 March 2011.

principles and values of the UN Charter and the Washington Treaty, resting on a strong transatlantic framework for collective defence.

While the security context has changed, the basic foundational elements of NATO have not, these specifically being the premise of collective security for all Allies and the sense of political and economic community united by shared values and beliefs.

Secretary General Anders Fogh Rasmussen, when outlining his views on the upcoming Strategic Concept in the weeks prior to its release, explained that the commitment to collective defence was the most fundamental aspect of the Alliance. “An attack against one NATO Ally,” he stated, “is considered an attack against all. That is a binding commitment. It is the most powerful possible signal of solidarity.”¹⁷⁶ The new Strategic Concept clearly outlined NATO’s unchanged essential mission: “to ensure that the Alliance remains an unparalleled community of freedom, peace, security and shared values,” where all members will defend one another against attack.¹⁷⁷ While some aspects of NATO will change, the fundamentals remain anchored in the commitment to collective defence, NATO’s military capability and the criticality of political consultations.

With emphasis on the preservation of NATO as the only transatlantic bridge and the community of shared values, the Secretary General pointed out the need to modernize defence and deterrence across the spectrum, including with its nuclear posture.

¹⁷⁶ Anders Fogh Rasmussen, “The New Strategic Concept: Active Engagement, Modern Defence,” *Hampton Roads International Security Quarterly*, (January 2011): 811; <http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?index=0&did=2228470201&SrchMode=2&sid=1&Fmt=3&VInst=PROD&VType=PQD&RQT=309&VName=PQD&TS=1299096756&clientId=1711>; Internet; accessed 3 March 2011.

¹⁷⁷ NATO, *Strategic Concept for the Defence and Security of the Members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization: Active Engagement, Modern Defence*.

Stipulating that reform of crisis management was necessary, he also stressed the importance of the comprehensive approach through coordination of political, civilian and military efforts and the continued development of robust partnerships with countries around the globe.¹⁷⁸ As will be seen, this notion was strongly reflected in the 2010 Strategic Concept.

The Group of Experts report, *NATO 2020: Assured Security; Dynamic Engagement*, represented an international perspective on what issues were salient to the new Strategic Concept. An additional report was created in Canada outlining areas of concern from a Canadian perspective, intended as a contribution to the Group of Experts study. The Conference of Defence Associations Institute (CDAI), in partnership with the Canadian Defence and Foreign Affairs Institute (CDFAI), published *Security in an Uncertain World: A Canadian Perspective on NATO's New Strategic Concept*, in which the authors defined the Canadian security landscape and identified potential impacts of the new Strategic Concept for Canada. This report, written by Paul Chapin in collaboration with several influential contributors with extensive experience in Canadian and NATO security policy, outlined the challenges and opportunities for the Alliance and offered specific recommendations for consideration in the new Strategic Concept, several of which were consistent with the Group of Experts report.¹⁷⁹ An overview of these reports will permit a better understanding of the issues actually addressed in terms of NATO's new vision and purpose and, more significantly, those that were not.

¹⁷⁸ Rasmussen, "The New Strategic Concept: Active Engagement, Modern Defence."

¹⁷⁹ The group of contributors consisted of Canadian military, diplomatic and policy practitioners in addition to academics. The list includes a former Minister of National Defence, three former Chiefs of Defence Staff and a former Chairman of the Military Committee of NATO, a former Ambassador to NATO, a clerk of the Privy Council, former NATO staff officers and strategists and academic experts, among others.

The Strategic Concept remains critical in any assessment of NATO's role in the world, since it describes modern security threats and the ways in which the Alliance seeks to address them. Jamie Shea, a Deputy Assistant Secretary General in the Political Affairs Division at NATO HQ, aptly stated that "the credibility of the new Strategic Concept will be in its implementation."¹⁸⁰ For Canada, what remains to be seen is the extent to which NATO's plan actually changes Canada's role or purpose in the Alliance. The aim of this chapter is to analyze the expectations of the report with the actual product in order to determine the particular impact to Canada, if any.

GROUP OF EXPERTS REPORT

Core Tasks

The Group of Experts report reinforced NATO's enduring fundamental principles by explaining that "NATO's Strategic Concept must begin and end with NATO's founding ideals."¹⁸¹ Collective security was, and is, the main reason NATO exists, but it is intricately linked with the shared democratic values which unite the Allies. From a security standpoint, the report emphasized the new threats brought about by globalization, resulting in a need to view repercussions to events in far-reaching areas as salient impediments to security in the Euro-Atlantic region. These factors resulted in recommendations by the Group of Experts on their determination of NATO's four core tasks: deter and defend member states against any threat of aggression, contribute to the broader security of the Euro-Atlantic region, act as the transatlantic link for discussion

¹⁸⁰ Labrèche, "NATO's Jamie Shea on Emerging Security Threats."

¹⁸¹ NATO, *NATO 2020: Assured Security; Dynamic Engagement*, 12.

and consultation on crisis management and security issues and the enhance of the scope and management of partnerships.¹⁸²

These core tasks should, it was stipulated, shape NATO's military missions and defence capabilities. Capabilities include the ability to deter and defend against ballistic missile and cyber attacks in addition to the fundamental Article 5 responsibilities and expeditionary operations. Identified as the last core task by the Group of Experts, the enhancement of partnerships actually serves as an enabler to the others and rests on the very foundations of multilateralism embodied by the Alliance and embraced by Canada.

NATO's Partnerships

The status of NATO's relationships speaks to the importance of the organization's ability to cooperate with numerous international actors and security providers through productive affiliations, as is evidenced in Afghanistan where strong collaboration with Australia, New Zealand and Russia has been valuable to the ISAF mission.¹⁸³ Inherent to this is a comprehensive approach in which the military, political, economic and social dimensions of a security situation must be considered. The Group of Experts report provided specific recommendations regarding improved institutional links and enhanced partnerships with the prominent organizations that NATO should continue to work with in either a leading or complementary role – the EU, UN, OSCE and EAPC figuring primarily on this list. It recognized that NATO need not always be the primary partner in a situation where another organization may be better suited to respond. For example, it was highlighted that better complementarity with the EU, seen to have more relevant

¹⁸² *Ibid.*, 19-21.

¹⁸³ *Ibid.*, 38.

expertise than NATO in countering non-military issues related to terrorism, cyber attacks and energy vulnerabilities, would allow a more comprehensive and cost-effective response to such threats.

Additionally, the Group of Experts recommended that NATO do more to develop its relationships with countries beyond the Euro-Atlantic area with whom operational collaboration may already exist, extending the notion of partnerships to a global reach. It was noted that formal partnership may not be necessary, but that diplomatic ties are essential with countries from Central and South-East Asia, Africa and Latin America who share NATO's commitment to global security and the rule of law.

Decision-making and Organizational Reform

In the area of political and organizational reform examined by the Group of Experts, the observations reflected lessons from the Afghanistan mission. The report stressed the importance of a unified chain of command and addressed the operational encumbrance of caveats put in place by individual nations. Decision-making was identified as an area in need of modification, and the recommendation was made to review the consensus principle at certain levels of the organization, limiting it to the most prominent North Atlantic Council resolutions and any other area as judged necessary by the NAC.¹⁸⁴ The Group of Experts is not alone in its criticism over the consensus issue as an impediment to action within NATO. The point was also noted in the CDAI-CDFAI report, as will be seen. Other authors agree, such as University of Waterloo Professor Veronica Kitchen, who referred to the “importance of consensus and solidarity in the current conception of NATO's identity” and suggested that if the new Strategic Concept

¹⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 22-24, 29, 31, 34.

addressed the issue, it would serve to increase the organization's efficiency and relevance.¹⁸⁵

CDAI-CDFAI REPORT – A CANADIAN PERSPECTIVE

The Atlantic Community

The authors of *Security in an Uncertain World: A Canadian Perspective on NATO's New Strategic Concept* described Canada's involvement in NATO has having traditionally been a logical means by which to address the nation's security interests, specifically in the early years of the Alliance. Canada helped shape NATO and fought to ensure it was not just a military pact through insistence over Article 2 and the inclusion of the Atlantic community concept. Ironically, the credibility of this concept was only really recognized in the years after the Cold War, when the Soviet threat to the Alliance was replaced by terrorism, extremism, regional conflict and economic instability. In order to comprehend how Canadian interests are served by membership in NATO today, the report contends that it is necessary to ask how the Alliance intends to respond to the modern threats, to clarify the responsibilities of Allies in this context and to determine what Allies can expect in return for their contributions.¹⁸⁶

The CDAI-CDFAI report stipulated that “current trends within the Alliance are not particularly promising for Canadians.”¹⁸⁷ The prominence of the US relationship with Europe, the growing role of the EU in NATO, and the continued eastward expansion of the Alliance all contribute to limiting Canada's influence in many NATO discussions.

¹⁸⁵ Veronica Kitchen, *The Globalization of NATO*, 120.

¹⁸⁶ Chapin et al, *Security in an Uncertain World: A Canadian Perspective on NATO's New Strategic Concept*, 20-23.

¹⁸⁷ *Ibid*, 22.

The report outlined conditions under which Canada's interests would not be served by NATO and provides specific recommendations on NATO enlargement and its institutional architecture, in addition to specific organizational issues such as decision-making, the commitment of resources and command and control arrangements for NATO missions. These are useful criteria for examination in light of the new Strategic Concept and what changes it has in fact initiated.

NATO's Partnerships

The report supported the view that a global effort is required to protect liberal democratic states collectively from threats that may arise well beyond their borders. To do this, it is suggested that NATO enlargement, rather than simply extending through eastern Europe, should actually seek to add member states who share the same democratic values but who are geographically beyond the Euro-Atlantic region, in locations "where NATO's interests are engaged."¹⁸⁸ This is akin to the similar recommendation from the Group of Experts and the concept was supported by the Secretary General in his October 2010 speech, where he stated that "the Alliance must develop deeper, wider political and practical partnerships with countries around the globe."¹⁸⁹ Since the proposed list of candidates includes those nations who have made contributions to NATO efforts in Afghanistan and elsewhere, for Canada, this would mean more Alliance members who are able to share the costs of operational missions. The simple addition of eastern European countries, the report contended, brings with it

¹⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, 33.

¹⁸⁹ Rasmussen, "The New Strategic Concept: Active Engagement, Modern Defence."

risks and burdens from ongoing historical internecine conflicts, which do not serve Canadian or Alliance interests.¹⁹⁰

Decision-making and Organizational Reform

Also in the same vein as the Group of Experts report, several observations were brought forward regarding decision-making within NATO and the need to improve the process for future effectiveness. While it is argued that NATO is unrivalled as a forum for security and defence discussions, the authors claim that decision-making is too argumentative and onerous, often limiting timely results due to national political controversies and the inability to achieve consensus among all 28 members. The CDAI-CDFAI paper also recommended a modification to the consensus principle such that at levels below the North Atlantic Council or the Military Committee the weight of opinion should be factored into decisions vice unanimity. Additionally related to decision-making was the concern expressed over the practice of allied governments approving operations without the allocation of sufficient resources. This is seen as severely incapacitating to NATO, who must then find the resources elsewhere. Lastly, emphasis was put on the whole-of-government contribution to decision-making and the importance of the sizeable non-military capabilities of member-states, the EU and other regional organizations for effective management of engagements.¹⁹¹

¹⁹⁰ Chapin et al., *Security in an Uncertain World: A Canadian Perspective on NATO's New Strategic Concept*, 34.

¹⁹¹ *Ibid.*, 41-42, 44.

Burdensharing

Consistent with the Group of Experts analysis, the CDAI-CDFAI report highlighted deficiencies in the military resources available for expeditionary campaigns and the requirement for multinational and comprehensive financial support in line with the commitments the Alliance wishes to undertake. With reference to the *ad hoc* arrangements currently in place in which each contributing nation is financially responsible for their own logistics in theatre, Chapin *et al* suggested a mechanism to not only allow a more equitable burdensharing among the Allies, but also a robust deployable logistics capability. The goal would be to ease the fiscal burden for countries like Canada and the US, who bear heavy costs to deploy overseas, and to simplify support to operations.¹⁹²

The CDAI-CDFAI echoed the recommendation for a more streamlined command and control structure defined by NATO operations doctrine, designed to decrease response time to crises and eliminate redundancy in the chain of command. It was recognized that this will be challenging given the non-military capabilities that are arguably essential to future missions, but the presence of civilian components, specifically in governance and reconstruction efforts as seen in Afghanistan, must be considered.¹⁹³

¹⁹² NATO, *NATO 2020: Assured Security; Dynamic Engagement*, 39; Chapin et al, *Security in an Uncertain World: A Canadian Perspective on NATO's New Strategic Concept*, 46, 50-51.

¹⁹³ Chapin et al, *Security in an Uncertain World: A Canadian Perspective on NATO's New Strategic Concept*, 49.

THE 2010 STRATEGIC CONCEPT

Core Tasks

Many of the recommendations made by the Group of Experts and the CDAI-CDFAI were evident in the new Strategic Concept, mainly in the core tasks, restated as the three essential core tasks of collective defence, crisis management and cooperative security. They embody the fundamental constants of the Article 5 commitment but also encapsulate the need to use an appropriate blend of political and military means to manage crises with active engagement with other relevant countries and organizations. Instability beyond Alliance borders is widely recognized as a prominent threat to the Euro-Atlantic region in terms of its contribution to terrorism, the proliferation of nuclear weapons and cyber attacks. Deterrence remains a fundamental task for NATO and a mix of nuclear and conventional capabilities was identified as a core element of overall strategy. The Strategic Concept reaffirmed that “as long as there are nuclear weapons in the world, NATO will remain a nuclear alliance.”¹⁹⁴

NATO’s Partnerships

Particularly present in the updated vision was the theme of improved collaboration with partners in the wider international community. The Strategic Concept and the Lisbon Summit Declaration very clearly supported the essential role played by partnerships with numerous references to the criticality of dialogue, cooperation and collaboration with other organizations and states. Not surprisingly, an enhanced cooperation between NATO and the United Nations was deemed necessary for more substantive contribution to global peace and security while a strengthened relationship

¹⁹⁴ NATO, *Strategic Concept for the Defence and Security of the Members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization: Active Engagement, Modern Defence*.

with the EU was seen to bear similar fruit in the Euro-Atlantic context. Efforts toward more profitable relationships were also specifically mentioned with the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council, the Partnership for Peace countries, Russia, Georgia, the Ukraine and the partners in the Mediterranean and the Middle East and covered areas of collaboration across the crisis spectrum, including terrorism, missile defence, proliferation, cyber and energy security.¹⁹⁵ In so doing, the Strategic Concept unmistakably acknowledged that it cannot address all security threats alone and can best contribute to international security by working with partners who share common goals. This attitude is directly aligned with the Canadian approach to security.

NATO has demonstrated a desire to enhance cooperation with global partners, countries such as Australia, New Zealand, Japan and South Korea, who are all contributing to the ISAF mission in Afghanistan, though this has been seen as a source of tension among the Allies in terms of the extent of the partnerships.¹⁹⁶ Despite this, the new Strategic Concept has identified NATO's intent to "develop political dialogue and practical cooperation with any nations and relevant organizations across the globe that share [Allies'] interest in peaceful international relations."¹⁹⁷

Thus far, the Strategic Concept has reflected the main recommendations put forth by the Group of Experts and the CDAI-CDFAI. With respect to NATO enlargement eastward, there is divergence in what the Group of Experts recommended and what the

¹⁹⁵ *Ibid.*; NATO, *Lisbon Summit Declaration Issued by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Lisbon*.

¹⁹⁶ Gülner Aybet and Rebecca Moore, "Missions in Search of a Vision," in *NATO in Search of a Vision*, ed. Gülner Aybet and Rebecca Moore, (Washington: George Brown University Press, 2010), 5.

¹⁹⁷ NATO, *Strategic Concept for the Defence and Security of the Members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization: Active Engagement, Modern Defence*.

CDAI-CDFAI report contended was best for Canada. The Strategic Concept reflected the Group of Experts recommendation that NATO maintain its Open Door policy in Europe, welcoming any European democracy “willing and able to share the responsibilities and obligations of membership, and whose inclusion can contribute to common security and stability.”¹⁹⁸ From the Canadian perspective, it is certainly in the EU’s interest for all European states to become members, but as Paul Chapin argued, it may not be in NATO’s best interest if an offer to join the Alliance might actually undermine international peace and security.¹⁹⁹ The CDAI-CDFAI report more explicitly stated that “the Alliance has nothing to gain from allowing its attention to be diverted by third-tier problems at least as vexing as those between Turkey and Greece which have encumbered the organization so long and so pointlessly.”²⁰⁰ Clearly, on this issue, NATO’s European focus has not been diverted by concerns expressed by this group of Canadian policy experts, since the Strategic Concept reaffirmed its commitment to NATO’s eastward enlargement.

Burdensharing and Organizational Reform

Certain aspects from both the Group of Experts and the CDAI-CDFAI report were not explicitly dealt with by the Strategic Concept, largely in the area of organizational reform, to which two brief paragraphs were devoted. While it mentioned the requirement for sufficient resources, coherence in defence planning, cost-effectiveness, continual reform and streamlined structures, the wording was considerably broad. The Strategic

¹⁹⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁹⁹ Chapin, “Canada in the rear-view mirror: NATO Charts an Eastward Course at the Lisbon Summit,” *On Track* 15, no. 4 (Winter 2010/2011): 15.

²⁰⁰ Chapin et al, *Security in an Uncertain World: A Canadian Perspective on NATO’s New Strategic Concept*, 34.

Concept did not address burden-sharing in any detail and did not go beyond mention of the need for sufficient financial, military and human resources to address the financial and logistics challenges identified by the Group of Experts and the CDAI-CDFAI.²⁰¹ The specific topic of decision-making, with reference to the consensus discussion, was notably absent. This suggests that the challenges presented by the need for unanimous sanction by all members will persist within NATO. For an Alliance fundamentally rooted in the consensus principle, quick resolution of this issue is unlikely. However, given the weight of credibility of the Group of Experts, critics should be encouraged by the fact that discussion has been initiated.

While the Strategic Concept document did not specifically address the NATO command structure, the Lisbon Summit Declaration outlined the decision taken by the Heads of State and Government to direct the “implementation of a more effective, leaner and affordable Alliance Command Structure, and the consolidation of the NATO Agencies.”²⁰² As such, the results will not be measurable until the implementation plan is formulated, but it is heartening to note that the issue was recognized. The development of Political Guidance was also tasked for further improvement of the defence capabilities and military implementation of the new Strategic Concept, to be approved by NATO Defence Ministers in 2011. Whether these official endorsements of organizational reforms will lead to the much desired streamlined command structure clearly remains to be seen.

²⁰¹ NATO, *Strategic Concept for the Defence and Security of the Members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization: Active Engagement, Modern Defence*.

²⁰² NATO, *Lisbon Summit Declaration Issued by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Lisbon*.

Canada and the new Strategic Concept

From a Canadian perspective, Prime Minister Stephen Harper made very positive remarks about the Lisbon Summit and what was accomplished, stating that “this summit was a success – allies emerged strong and united. Allies agreed that organizational reform is critical to NATO’s long-term effectiveness, a position that Canada has consistently advocated for years.” He underscored the decisions to streamline the NATO command structure, improve collaboration with partners like Russia and discuss transition plans for the Afghanistan mission as ways in which the Alliance will address modern challenges with the new Strategic Concept.²⁰³

Paul Chapin described the achievements of the Lisbon Summit as remarkable, standing “in stark contrast to the sterile deliberations and empty outcomes so often associated with other international summit meetings.” Despite these encouraging comments, however, Chapin contended that there was little Canadian involvement in the Strategic Concept, that European members maintained an eastern focus, and that “Canada is already in the rear-view mirror” for the Alliance. He elaborated on the absence of adequate mention of issues such as burden-sharing and the unequal costs of operations on the Allies, items that were also identified in the CDAI-CDFAI report.²⁰⁴

The ISAF mission is arguably important from a Canadian point of view, given the substantial commitments being undertaken by the government in Afghanistan. The Strategic Concept identified the need for a comprehensive approach to operations, a

²⁰³ Stephen Harper, “Statement by the Prime Minister of Canada on the NATO Summit,” 20 November 2010; <http://pm.gc.ca/eng/media.asp?category=3&featureId=6&pageId=49&id=3799>; Internet; accessed 8 April 2011.

²⁰⁴ Chapin, “Canada in the rear-view mirror: NATO Charts an Eastward Course at the Lisbon Summit”, 15.

lesson derived specifically from NATO's experience in Afghanistan, and this will logically factor into future missions of similar nature. The Strategic Concept, as the roadmap for the next decade, remains broad in its scope, but the Lisbon Summit Declaration contains the official declaration that "Afghanistan's security and stability are directly linked with our own security."²⁰⁵ NATO remains committed to the mission in Afghanistan for the long term, implying continued involvement for Canada, though in a role currently being defined.

So how does the new NATO Strategic Concept address Canada's security concerns? Overall, there does not seem to be much substance which significantly changes Canada's position on NATO issues. The Strategic Concept was particularly emphatic on the importance of robust partnerships with international organizations, principally with the UN and the EU, and with political consultations with Allies and partner states, such as Russia. In this regard, it continues to be in Canada's interest to strengthen collaboration with international organizations and other states, specifically within the European context. Defence Minister Peter MacKay highlighted the key role played by NATO in maintaining constructive relationships with European nations when he spoke of a "well-defined, flexible and pragmatic comprehensive approach" optimizing input from all participating nations in international operations:

. . . A strong and vibrant EU, in the political, economic and the security and defence areas, is certainly in the interests of Canada and the wider transatlantic community. . . Canada, the United States and the EU working together can produce a synergy that can make a difference at home and around the world.²⁰⁶

²⁰⁵ NATO, *Lisbon Summit Declaration Issued by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Lisbon*.

²⁰⁶ Peter MacKay, Remarks at the Bled Strategic Forum, 29 August 2010; <http://www.forces.gc.ca/site/news-nouvelles/news-nouvelles-eng.asp?cat=00&id=3585>; Internet; accessed 5 March 2011.

Canada's significant contribution to the ISAF mission in Afghanistan has served to strengthen Canadian credibility within NATO, but sustained efforts will be required to continue this trend. The Harper government's consistent commitment to furthering NATO efforts in Afghanistan while contributing to humanitarian missions, such as in Haiti, is indication of such efforts on the political level. By working toward better multi- and bilateral relations abroad, Canada will only improve its ability to serve its security interests, an ability which relies heavily on international partnerships. Canada's dependency on multilateral relationships provides a healthy and primary mechanism for pursuing and addressing its foreign and security interests. Despite NATO's obvious penchant for European-focused security collaboration, the Strategic Concept proves that the Alliance is reaching out on a more global level. Canada's main benefit as a member of NATO will come from keeping a seat at the multilateral table with a global focus.

CONCLUSION

In the era of NATO's conception and during the Cold War years, Canada had a fundamental interest in European security, where the prevention of domination by the Soviet Union was seen as vital to security in the entire North Atlantic region. When the security environment shifted to become more global, NATO values remained rooted in democracy, liberty and the rule of law as the institution sought to counter new types of threats.²⁰⁷ Today, globalization has transformed the security threat into one that is more unpredictable and complex, characterized by terrorism, weapons of mass destruction and even cyber attacks which threaten the security of all modern states. As was dramatically demonstrated by the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, the defeat of terror is of essential interest to Canada and its security. This has led to a principal role in the NATO mission in Afghanistan and a commitment by Canada to remain engaged multilaterally in the pursuit of global security. As long as the terrorism threat persists, as suggested by Jockel and Sokolsky, a more global NATO remains in Canada's national security interest.²⁰⁸

The dramatic changes in the international security environment since the end of the Cold War have directly contributed to the recognition that Canada is affected by security challenges elsewhere in the world. Canadians are seen to appreciate the vital connection between their own security and prosperity and the security of others, and they accept that a global approach is needed to enhance security abroad and at home.²⁰⁹ This

²⁰⁷ Kitchen, *The Globalization of NATO*, 7.

²⁰⁸ Jockel and Sokolsky, "Canada and NATO: Keeping Ottawa in, expenses down, criticism out...and the country secure," 316, 335.

fact impacts Canada's security choices, most notably through contributions to missions with NATO allies, as seen in the Balkans throughout the 1990s and currently in Afghanistan.

Internationalism has long been an integral component of Canadian foreign policy as the nation has sought to enhance its own security through collaboration with other nations. The United States is Canada's most vital ally and remains the primary actor in continental North American security, but Canada's historical ties to Europe have also been maintained, in large part through NATO. Multilateral relationships and the promotion of common values are seen to be important to Canadians, in addition to a sense of international responsibility. NATO's existence as a transatlantic community of nations with shared values and interests has long characterized the Alliance and continues to influence Canada's participation in international missions in failed and failing states aimed at countering modern global threats. NATO has widely advocated the strengthening of partnerships and dialogue with nations around the world who share these common values and the new Strategic Concept has reinforced the notion of an Alliance with global reach and global partners. The currently unfolding NATO mission in Libya, led at the operational level by Canadian Lieutenant-General Charlie Bouchard, provides further proof of the Alliance's global scope in the pursuit of stability and the support shown by the assignment of Canadian military assets to the mission is indicative of Canada's continued commitment in this vein. Nevertheless, the mission in Libya is also proof that NATO continues to face challenges, notably in terms of consensus decision-

²⁰⁹ Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, "The Protection of our Security, within a Stable Global Framework," http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/foreign_policy/cnd-world/chap4-en.asp; Internet; accessed 17 February 2011.

making and collective action. This has been apparent in the reported disagreement among Allies over the scope of military action required and is demonstrative of the fragile political cohesion which can potentially undermine NATO's ability to deliver the results set out in Lisbon with the new Strategic Concept.²¹⁰

Ultimately, the new Strategic Concept was necessary to bring the Alliance into the 21st Century but the real success will only be measurable by its implementation. For Canada, not much has really changed and the Canadian academic/think tank analyst world has not expressed a notable reaction. Harkening to the analysis in the CDAI-CDFAI report *Security in an Uncertain World*, it would appear the authors are correct in their interpretation of Canada not figuring prominently in current NATO discussions. If this translates to maintenance of the status quo for Canada in terms of its role in the Alliance, this is probably not a negative position for a struggling middle power. Canada has been contributing extensively to the mission in Afghanistan and has made concerted efforts to increase defence spending to appropriate levels for NATO, therefore keeping the coveted seat at the table with all her powerful friends. By nurturing the multilateral relationships enjoyed with NATO, the European Union, the United Nations and other international institutions, along with the numerous existing bilateral security relationships around the globe, Canada will be best positioned to protect security interests at home and abroad.

²¹⁰ Steven Lee Myers, "Pace of Attacks in Libya Conflict is Dividing NATO," <http://www.nytimes.com/2011/04/13/world/africa/13nato.html?ref=stevenleemyers>; Internet; accessed 21 April 2011.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anda, Colonel Geir et al. "NATO's 1999 Strategic Concept and the Transatlantic Link." In *Essays by Senior Course 97*, edited by Dieter Ose and Laure Borgomano-Loup. Rome, Italy: NATO Defense College, 2001.
- Arnaiz, Colonel Javier et al. "ESDI and ESDP: Impact on the Transatlantic Link." In *Essays by Senior Course 97*, edited by Dieter Ose and Laure Borgomano-Loup. Rome, Italy: NATO Defense College, 2001.
- Axworthy, Lloyd. "NATO's New Security Vocation." *NATO Review* 47, no. 4 (Winter 1999).
- Aybet, Gülner and Rebecca Moore, eds. *NATO in Search of a Vision*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2010.
- Berdal, Mats and David Ucko. "NATO at 60." *Survival* 51, no. 2 (2009).
- Bergbusch, Eric. "NATO Enlargement: Should Canada Leave NATO?" *International Journal* (Winter 1997/1998).
- Blair, Tony. *Speech to the Chicago Economic Club*, 22 April 1999.
- Brown, Glenn. "The Never-Ending Debate Over Burdensharing: The US, Canada and the Allies." In *Over here and Over there: Canada-US Defence Cooperation in an Era of Interoperability*, edited by David G. Haglund. Kingston, Ontario: Queen's Quarterly, 2001.
- Cantalapiedra, David García and Javier García González. "The Changing Nature of Nato: Towards a Regional Security Organization?" *UNISCI Discussion Papers* no. 22 (01, 2010).
- Chapin, Paul. "Canada in the Rear-View Mirror: NATO Charts an Eastward Course at the Lisbon Summit." *On Track* (Winter 2010/2011).
- Chapin, Paul et al. *Security in an Uncertain World. A Canadian Perspective on NATO's New Strategic Concept*. Ottawa, Ontario: Conference of Defence Associations Institute and the Canadian Defence and Foreign Affairs Institute, 2010.
- Chapnick, Adam. "The Canadian Middle Power Myth." *International Journal* 55, no. 2 (Spring 2000).
- . "Taking Sides: The Myth of Canadian Neutrality in World Affairs." *Canadian Military Journal* 8, no. 2 (2007).

- Cheung-Gertler, Jasmin. "A Model Power for a Troubled World? Canadian National Interests and Human Security in the 21st Century." *International Journal* 62, no. 3 (Summer 2007).
- Cohen, Andrew. "Seize the Day." *International Journal* 58, no. 2 (Spring 2003).
- Croci, Osvaldo. "Canada: Facing Up to Regional Security Challenges." In *National Security Cultures: Patterns of Global Governance*, edited by Emil J. Kirchner and James Sperling. Oxon: Routledge, 2010.
- Davis, Christopher R. "NATO's Next Strategic Concept: How the Alliance's New Strategy Will Reshape Global Security." *Strategic Studies Quarterly* (Winter 2010).
- Department of Foreign Affairs. *Canada's International Policy Statement: A Role of Pride and Influence in the World*. Ottawa: Government of Canada, 2006.
- . "Protecting Canadian Values and Culture." http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/foreign_policy/cnd-world/chap5-en.asp (2011).
- . "The Protection of our Security, within a Stable Global Framework." http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/foreign_policy/cnd-world/chap4-en.asp (2011).
- . "Statement of G8 Leaders - the G8 Global Partnership Against the Spread of Weapons and Materials of Mass Destruction." http://www.canadainternational.gc.ca/g8/summit-sommet/2002/global_partnership-partenariat_mondial.aspx?lang=eng.
- Department of National Defence. "Major DND/CF Investments." <http://www.forces.gc.ca/site/pri/2/invest-eng.asp> (2011).
- Dewitt, David. "Directions in Canada's International Security Policy: From Marginal Actor at the Centre to Central Actor at the Margins." *International Journal* 55, no. 2 (Spring 2000).
- Donaghy, Greg. "Domesticating NATO: Canada and the North Atlantic Alliance, 1963-68." *International Journal* 52, no. 3 (Summer 1997).
- English, John. "Problems in Middle Life." In *Canada and NATO: Uneasy Past, Uncertain Future*, edited by Margaret Olwen MacMillan and David S. Sorenson. Waterloo, Ontario: University of Waterloo Press, 1990.
- Feith, Douglas. "NATO's Transformation: Securing Freedom for Future Generations." *US Foreign Policy Agenda* 7, no. 1 (March 2002).
- Gates, Robert M. . *Remarks at the NATO Strategic Concept Seminar (Future of NATO)*, 23 February 2010, <http://www.defense.gov/speeches/speech.aspx?speechid=1423>.

- Gizewski, Peter. . *The Future Security Environment: Threats, Risks and Responses*. Toronto: Canadian Institute of International Affairs, March 2007.
- Gotlieb, Allan. "Romanticism and Realism in Canada's Foreign Policy." Toronto, C.D. Howe Institute, 3 November 2004.
- Government of Canada. *Securing an Open Society: Canada's National Security Policy*, April 2004.
- Greenspon, Edward et al. *Open Canada: A Global Positioning Strategy for a Networked Age*. Ottawa, ON: Canadian International Council, 2010.
- Haglund, David G. "The NATO of its Dreams? Canada and the Co-Operative Security Alliance." *International Journal* 52, no. 3 (Summer 1997).
- Haglund, David G. and Joel J. Sokolsky, eds. *The US-Canada Security Relationship: The Politics, Strategy, and Technology of Defense*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1989.
- Hallams, Ellen. "NATO at 60: Going Global?" *International Journal* 64, no. 2 (Spring 2009).
- Halstead, John G. H. "Canada's Security in the 1980's: Options and Pitfalls." *Behind the Headlines* 41, no. 1 (1983).
- Harper, Stephen. "Prime Minister's Address in Kandahar," 7 May 2009.
- . *Statement by the Prime Minister of Canada on the NATO Summit*, 20 November 2010.
- Hillmer, Norman and J. L. Granatstein. *Empire to Umpire: Canada and the World into the Twenty-First Century*. 2nd ed. Toronto: Nelson, 2008.
- Holloway, Steven Kendall. "Defining the National Interest." In *Canadian Foreign Policy: Defining the National Interest*. Peterborough, ON: Broadview Press, 2006.
- Jockel, Joseph T. "U.S. Interests and Canadian Defence Policy in the 1990's: New Epoch, New Era; Old Agenda." In *Canada and NATO: Uneasy Past, Uncertain Future*, edited by Margaret MacMillan and David Sorenson. Waterloo, Ontario: University of Waterloo Press, 1990.
- Jockel, Joseph T. and Joel J. Sokolsky. "Canada and NATO: Keeping Ottawa in, Expenses Down, Criticism Out... and the Country Secure." *International Journal* 64, no. 2 (Spring 2009).

- . "Lloyd Axworthy's Legacy: Human Security and the Rescue of Canadian Defence Policy." *International Journal* 56, no. 1 (2000/2001).
- Kaplan, Lawrence S. "Report of the Three Wise Men: 50 Years on." *NATO Review* no. 1 (Spring 2006).
- Kirton, John. "Multilateralism, Plurilateralism, and the United Nations." In *Canadian Foreign Policy in a Changing World*. Toronto: Thomson-Nelson, 2007.
- Kirton, John and Jenilee Guebert. "Two Solitudes; One War: Public Opinion, National Unity and Canada's War in Afghanistan." Université de Québec à Montréal, Montréal, 8 October 2007.
- Kitchen, Veronica M. *The Globalization of NATO: Intervention, Security and Identity*. New York: Routledge, 2010.
- Labrèche, Mathieu. "NATO's Jamie Shea on Emerging Security Threats." *Toronto Review of International Affairs* (28 December 2010); <http://torontoreview.ca/2010/12/28/natos-jamie-shea-on-emerging-security-threats/>.
- Lawless, Michael. "Canada and NATO: A Starving Fish in an Expanding Pond." *Canadian Military Journal* 7, no. 2 (Summer 2006).
- Lindley-French, Julian. "Reconnecting Canada to the World (Via Europe)." *International Journal* 60, no. 3 (Summer 2005): 651.
- MacKay, Peter. . *Munich Security Conference Speech*, 7 February 2010.
- . *Remarks at the Bled Strategic Forum*, 29 August 2010.
- MacKay, Peter. "A Blueprint for National Efforts." *NATO's Nations & Partners for Peace* 53, no. 1 (03, 2008).
- Mackenzie, Hector. "Canada in World Affairs." *International Journal* 65, no. 1 (Winter 2009/2010).
- MacMillan, Margaret Olwen and David S. Sorenson. *Canada and NATO: Uneasy Past, Uncertain Future*. Waterloo, Ont., Canada: University of Waterloo Press, 1990.
- Madigan, Gerry. "Canada First Defence Strategy: A Retrospective Look Too Much? Too Little? Or just Right?" *Canadian Military Journal* 10, no. 3 (Summer 2010).
- Mariano, Stephen J. *Untangling NATO Transformation* . Kingston: Centre for International Relations, Queen's University, 2007.

- McDermott, Roger. "New Russian Military Doctrine Opposes NATO Enlargement." *The Georgian Daily* (10 February 2010); http://georgiandaily.com/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=16964&Itemid=132.
- McNamara, Sally. . *NATO Summit 2010: Time to Turn Words into Action*, December 2010.
- Mérand, Frédéric. "NATO, ESDP, and Transatlantic Security: Where does Canada Fit?" Ottawa, Ontario, 12 June 2006.
- Michaud, Nelson. "Values and Canadian Foreign Policy-Making: Inspiration Or Hindrance?" In *Readings in Canadian Foreign Policy*, edited by Bratt, Duane and Kukucha, Christopher. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Moens, Alexander. "Afghanistan and the Revolution in Canadian Foreign Policy." *International Journal* 63, no. 3 (Summer 2008).
- Moore, Rebecca. *NATO's New Mission: Projecting Stability in a Post-Cold War World*. Westport, Conn.: Praeger Security International, 2007.
- Myers, Steven Lee. "NATO Showing Strain over Approach to Lybia," http://www.nytimes.com/2011/04/15/world/africa/15nato.html?_r=1&ref=stevenleemyers
- Myers, Steven Lee and Schmitt, Eric. "Pace of Attacks in Libya Conflict is Dividing NATO," <http://www.nytimes.com/2011/04/13/world/africa/13nato.html?ref=stevenleemyers>
- NATO. *The Alliance's New Strategic Concept Agreed by the Heads of State and Government Participating in the Meeting of the North Atlantic Council 7-8 November 1991*. Brussels: NATO, 1991.
- . *The Alliance's Strategic Concept Approved by the Heads of State and Government Participating in the Meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Washington D.C. 1999*. Brussels: NATO, 1999.
- . *Bucharest Summit Declaration Issued by the Heads of State and Government Participating in the Meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Bucharest on 3 April 2008*. Brussels: NATO, 2008.
- . *Comprehensive Political Guidance*. Brussels: NATO, 2006.
- . *Declaration on a Transformed North Atlantic Alliance Issued by the Heads of State and Government Participating in the Meeting of the North Atlantic Council in London 5-6 July 1990*. Brussels: NATO, 1990.

- . "Defending Against Cyber Attacks." http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/topics_49193.htm (2011).
- . *Istanbul Cooperation Initiative*. Brussels: NATO, 2004.
- . *Lisbon Summit Declaration Issued by the Heads of State and Government Participating in the Meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Lisbon on 20 November 2010*. Brussels: NATO, 2010.
- . *NATO 2020: Assured Security, Dynamic Engagement, Analysis and Recommendations of the Group of Experts on a New Strategic Concept for NATO*. Brussels: NATO, 2010.
- . *Riga Summit Declaration Issued by the Heads of State and Government Participating in the Meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Riga on 29 November 2006*. Brussels: NATO, 2006.
- . *Strasbourg/Kehl Summit Declaration Issued by the Heads of State and Government Participating in the Meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Strasbourg/Kehl on 4 April 2009*. Brussels: NATO, 2009.
- . *Strategic Concept for the Defence and Security of the Members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation Adopted by Heads of State and Government in Lisbon*. Brussels: NATO, 2010.
- NATO Public Diplomacy Division. *NATO Handbook*. Brussels, Belgium: NATO, 2006.
- . *NATO Transformed*. Brussels: NATO, 2004.
- Nossal, Kim. "Canada: Fading Power Or Future Power?" *Behind the Headlines* 59, no. 3 (Spring 2002).
- Pearson, Lester B. *Words & Occasions*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1970.
- Potter, Pitman B. "The United Nations Four Years Old." *World Affairs* 112, no. 3 (Fall, 1949).
- Rasmussen, Anders Fogh. "The New Strategic Concept: Active Engagement, Modern Defence." *Hampton Roads International Security Quarterly* (January 2011).
- Rempel, Roy. *Dreamland: How Canada's Pretend Foreign Policy has Undermined Sovereignty*. Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2006.
- Robertson, Lord. . *Speech at Charles University in Prague*, 21 March 2002, http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/opinions_19858.htm?selectedLocale=en.

- Ross, Douglas Alan. "Canada's International Security Strategy." *International Journal* 65, no. 2 (Spring 2010).
- . "Foreign Policy Challenges for Paul Martin: Canada's International Security Policy in an Era of American Hyperpower and Continental Vulnerability." *International Journal* (Fall 2003).
- Sens, Allen G. "Saying Yes to Expansion: The Future of NATO and Canadian Interests in a Changing Alliance." *International Journal* 50, no. 4 (Autumn, 1995).
- Spencer, Robert A. "Triangle into Treaty: Canada and the Origins of NATO." *International Journal* 14, no. 2 (Spring, 1959).
- St. Laurent, Louis. *The Foundations of Canadian Policy in World Affairs*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, Duncan and John Gray Memorial Lecture, 1947.
- Stairs, Denis. "Trends in Canadian Foreign Policy: Past, Present, and Future." *Behind the Headlines* 59, no. 3 (Spring, 2002).
- Thies, Wallace J. *Why NATO Endures*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Waltz, Kenneth. "The Emerging Structure of International Politics." *International Security* 18, no. 2.
- Welsh, Jennifer. "Are Interests really Value Free?" *Literary Review of Canada* 14, no. 9 (2006).
- . "Canada in the 21st Century: Beyond Dominion and Middle Power." *Behind the Headlines* 61, no. 4 (September 2004).
- Welsh, Jennifer. *At Home in the World: Canada's Global Vision for the 21st Century*. Toronto: Harper Collins Publishers, 2004.
- Yost, David S. *NATO Transformed: The Alliance's New Roles in International Security*. Washington: United States Institute of Peace Press, 1998.
- Zyla, Benjamin. "NATO and Post-Cold War Burden-Sharing: Canada "the Laggard?"" *International Journal* 64, no. 2 (Spring 2009).