



Program Brief

“NATO'S FUTURE AND U.S. INTERESTS: CAN THE ALLIANCE MEET THE AFGHANISTAN AND RUSSIA-GEORGIA CHALLENGES?”

A talk by

Stanley R. SLOAN

Director of the Atlantic Community Initiative

Vienna

October 9, 2008

Background information provided by the
American Reference Center

U.S. EMBASSY VIENNA

Boltzmannngasse 16, 1090 Vienna

Tel.: 405 30 33

Fax: 406 52 60

e-mail: arc@usembassy.at

<http://www.usembassy.at>

Stanley R. Sloan

(<http://www.atlanticcommunity.org/sloan%20cv%20march%202007.html>;

image: <http://www.atlanticcommunity.org/Hampden-Sydney.jpg>)



Stan Sloan is the founding Director of the Atlantic Community Initiative (www.AtlanticCommunity.org), a Visiting Scholar at the Rohatyn Center for International Affairs at Middlebury College, and President of VIC–Vermont, a private consulting firm. For the past three years (2005 – 2007) he has taught a Winter term course on transatlantic relations at Middlebury College. His most recent book entitled *NATO, the European Union and the Atlantic Community: The Transatlantic Bargain Challenged* was published by Rowman and Littlefield in August 2005.

Stan was educated at the University of Maine (BA), Columbia University's School of International Affairs (MIA), and American University's School of International Service (abd Phd). He is a Distinguished Graduate of the Air Force Officers' Training School and served as a commissioned officer in the United States Air Force. Stan began his more than three decades of public service at the Central Intelligence Agency in 1967, serving as NATO and European Community desk officer, member of the U.S. Delegation to the Negotiations on Mutual and Balanced Force Reductions, and as Deputy National Intelligence Officer for Western Europe.

He was employed by the Congressional Research Service of the Library of Congress in a variety of analytical and research management positions from 1975-1999, including head of the Office of Senior Specialists. In April 1999, he retired from his position as the Senior Specialist in International Security Policy. During 1997-98, Stan was the rapporteur for the North Atlantic Assembly (now NATO Parliamentary Assembly) special presidential report on “NATO in the 21st Century.”

His recent publications include “Negotiating Article 5,” appearing in the Summer 2006 special issue of the *NATO Review*; “Taking the Atlantic Community Beyond NATO Transformation,” in *Freedom & Union*, the Journal of the Streit Council for a Union of Democracies, Summer 2006; and “We Should be Intolerant of Intolerance,” in *Europe's World*, Summer 2006. On May 19, 2006, the *International Herald Tribune* published his article entitled “All the president's truths.” In December 2005, his article entitled “How Does Religion Affect Relations between America and Europe?” appeared in *EuroFuture* magazine.

Mr. Sloan's recent books and monographs include *NATO, the European Union and the Atlantic Community: The Transatlantic Bargain Challenged* (Rowman and Littlefield, August 2005); *The Use of U.S. Power: Implications for U.S. Interests* [with Robert Sutter and Casimir Yost] (Georgetown University Institute for the Study of Diplomacy, June 2004); *NATO, the European Union and the Atlantic Community: The Transatlantic Bargain Reconsidered* (Rowman and Littlefield, 2003); *NATO and Transatlantic Relations in the 21st Century: Crisis, Continuity or Change?* (Foreign Policy Association, October 2002); *The United States and European Defence* (Chaillot Paper, Western European Union Institute, April 2000); *The Foreign Policy Struggle – Congress and the President in the 1990s and Beyond* [with Mary Locke and Casimir Yost] (Georgetown University Institute for the Study of Diplomacy, January 2000).

Stan has lectured widely on US foreign and security policy and Euro-Atlantic security issues in Europe and the United States. He has been a frequent presenter at the NATO College in Rome (where, in September 2005, he was named an “Honorary Ancien” of the College to acknowledge his contributions to the College and the NATO alliance), the Geneva (Switzerland) Center for Security Policy, the Wilton Park (UK) Foreign Office conference center, dozens of international conferences, and for the US public diplomacy program in many countries, most recently Germany, Russia and Estonia. In 2002, Stan was selected as a Woodrow Wilson Foundation Visiting Fellow and, in that capacity, lectured at Hampden-Sydney College in February 2007. Over the years, Stan has also presented to audiences at Dartmouth College, Ohio Wesleyan University, Kent State University, Harvard

2 “NATO's Future and U.S. Interests: Can the Alliance Meet the Afghanistan and Russia-Georgia Challenges?,”

October 9, 2008

Program brief by the American Reference Center

University, Middlebury College, University of Vermont, University of Arkansas, University of Virginia, University of Maryland, Johns Hopkins University SAIS, Georgetown University, George Washington University, National Defense University, Air War College, Army War College, Naval War College, US Naval Academy, US Air Force Academy, NATO Parliamentary Assembly, Vermont Council on World Affairs, International Institute of Strategic Studies, Chatham House, Oxford English Speaking Union, Cologne University, German Council on Foreign Relations, Dutch Atlantic Commission, Austrian Institute for European Security, French Institute for International Relations, University of Rome, University of Naples and many other venues.

Atlantic Community Initiative: <http://www.atlanticcommunity.org/>

Recent articles by Stanley Sloan

Why Should We Think NATO Can Survive Afghanistan?

Swords and Ploughshares, Summer 2008

The transatlantic alliance has just passed through one of the most difficult periods in the last sixty years of US-European relations. The factors contributing to the recent crisis may never occur in the same combination again. However, there is clearly some wisdom in trying to learn whatever lessons may be available to help understand and guide the relationship in the years ahead.

Now, before the alliance can even celebrate surviving its latest near-death experience, it faces a new question: can it survive its difficult mission in Afghanistan? The task is to try to ensure that this “failed state” becomes, at a minimum, a relatively stable country in which a representative government is able to defend itself and provide for the needs of its people, ensuring that it will no longer serve as a launching pad for international terrorism or as a major source for the illicit international drug trade. Not an easy task, by any stretch of the imagination, and one likely to require many years of sustained effort. ...

FULL TEXT: http://www.acdis.uiuc.edu/Research/NATO/S&P-su2008_Sloan.pdf (pdf)

Negotiating Article 5

NATO Review, Summer 2006

During negotiations over the Washington Treaty, NATO's founding charter, the wording of Article 5 containing the collective-defence commitment was crafted to reassure European Allies of America's commitment to their security and ensure US Congressional and public acceptance of its terms. Ever since, the Allies have been forced to adapt Article 5's implementation to changing conditions within and outside the Alliance. It could be argued, in fact, that the way the commitment has been implemented has been at least as important as the Article's carefully chosen words. ...

FULL TEXT: <http://www.nato.int/docu/review/2006/issue2/english/art4.html>

Taking the Atlantic Community beyond NATO Transformation

Freedom & Union - Journal of the Streit Council, Summer 2006

NATO has been embarked on an impressive process of transformation, largely by taking on new roles and missions that have required dramatic changes in how alliance leaders think and how the alliance operates. Now, the NATO members need to move beyond thinking solely in the NATO box, and develop new forms of cooperation that respond to the security challenges that NATO and European Union members face today.

For a start, the transatlantic democracies need to breathe new life into the sense of common destiny among the Atlantic community of nations. This is a bigger task than simply reaffirming the goal of NATO unity, avoiding disastrous unilateralist policies, or tinkering with NATO's method of operations.

It requires policies that reflect and acknowledge the mutual dependence and shared values that still make the Euro-Atlantic community special. ...

FULL TEXT: http://www.streitcouncil.org/content/pdf_and_doc/F&U_2_Summer_2006_sloan.pdf (pdf)

STATEMENTS AND REMARKS

Statement by the President on Senate Confirmation of General David D. McKiernan as Commander of U.S. Forces-Afghanistan

The White House, October 2, 2008

Today, the Senate confirmed General David D. McKiernan as Commander of U.S. Forces-Afghanistan. This newly created position and realignment of the command structure provides General McKiernan authority over nearly all U.S. forces in Afghanistan, ensuring greater coordination in operational planning and execution. General McKiernan will continue to serve as Commander of the International Security Assistance Force.

General McKiernan's new responsibilities will strengthen both U.S. and NATO efforts in Afghanistan. I congratulate General McKiernan on his confirmation and commend the Senate for its quick action on this important nomination.

FULL TEXT: <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2008/10/20081002-8.html>

President Bush Meets with General David McKiernan, Commander for NATO International Security Assistance Force in Afghanistan

The White House, October 1, 2008

THE PRESIDENT: ... General, thank you for coming. I appreciate your service to the country. General McKiernan is briefing me on the situation in Afghanistan, what he is going to need to make sure that we continue helping this young democracy succeed.

Obviously, this is a situation where there's been progress, and there are difficulties. There's been progress when you consider the fact that millions of young girls go to school that didn't have a chance to go to school before in Afghanistan. That's incredible progress. There's progress when you realize that health care needs are being met for the first time in - around Afghanistan. There's progress when there are roads being built so farmers can get product to market. That's progress.

There's difficulties, of course, because killers can't stand this progress. And the General's job is to work with obviously not only our troops but the thousands of troops from NATO countries there to provide the security so the progress continues. And there's been some tough fighting, and we honor our American troops who have sacrificed so that Afghanistan never becomes a safe haven again for extremists who would harm our citizens.

We talked about the comprehensive strategy necessary to succeed. I announced more troops for Afghanistan, and the General, of course, is continually to assess his needs. But we also must make sure there's a civilian component that runs alongside our military, that there's good governance, and that there's aid programs that are effective and focused on the people of Afghanistan, and that the infrastructure progress continues to be made. ...

FULL TEXT: <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2008/10/20081001-7.html>

Building a Stronger Transatlantic Community, and a Modern NATO

Ambassador Kurt Volker, U.S. Permanent Representative on the North Atlantic Council

German Marshall Fund, Brussels, Belgium, September 29, 2008

... We have a huge set of challenges in Afghanistan. The Taliban has increased its attacks, drug production remains a critical problem, the people are concerned about their personal security, and the insurgents continue to be able to draw strength from across the border in Pakistani territory, despite the efforts of the Pakistani government and military. Yet we know from bitter experience – in New York, London, Barcelona or elsewhere – that what happens in Afghanistan, and Pakistan as well, is critical to the security and well-being of our own societies.

We have Russia having used force to change borders in Europe for the first time in decades, and having asserted a so-called “privileged role” in the affairs of its neighbors – a new euphemism for a 19th century sphere of influence. ...

Figuring out how to deal with this newly aggressive Russia is challenging West Europeans and Americans alike. We want to work together with Russia – not have to confront it – yet we cannot accept things like breaking up a neighbor's territory.

And we want to continue to support people in the East – that is, Europe's neighborhood – who are trying to advance their democratic political and economic development, and to live in security. We cannot sacrifice their future to a great power game.

In this circumstance, we all put the highest emphasis on transatlantic unity – and it's a good thing, because thus far, different instincts in different capitals have the potential to pull us apart. ...

FULL TEXT: http://nato.usmission.gov/ambassador/2008/Amb_Volker_092908.htm

Secretary Rice Addresses U.S.-Russia Relations at the German Marshall Fund

Secretary Condoleezza Rice

Renaissance Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C., September 18, 2008

... With the end of the Cold War, we and our allies have worked to transform NATO – from – to bring it from an alliance that manned the ramparts of a divided Europe, to a means for nurturing the growth of a Europe whole, free, and at peace – and an alliance that confronts the dangers, like terrorism, that also threaten Russia.

We have opened NATO to any sovereign, democratic state in Europe that can meet its standards of membership. We've supported the right of countries emerging from communism to choose what path of development they pursue and what institutions they wish to join.

And this historic effort has succeeded beyond imagination. Twelve of our 28 neighbor NATO allies are former captive nations. And the promise of membership has been a positive incentive for these states: to build democratic institutions, to reform their economies, and to resolve old disputes, as nations like Poland, and Hungary, and Romania, and Slovakia, and Lithuania have done.

Just as importantly, NATO has consistently sought to enlist Russia as a partner in building a peaceful and prosperous Europe. Russia has had a seat at nearly every NATO summit since 2002. So to claim that this alliance is somehow directed against Russia is simply to ignore recent history. In fact, our assumption has always been – and it still is – that Russia's legitimate need for security is best served not by having weak, fractious, and poor states on its borders – but rather peaceful, prosperous, and democratic ones.

It is simply not valid, either, to blame Russia's behavior on the United States – either for being too tough with Russia, or not tough enough, too unaccommodating to Russia's interests or too naïve about its leaders. Since the end of the Cold War – spanning three administrations, both Democratic and Republican – the United States has sought to encourage the emergence of a strong, prosperous, and responsible Russia. We have treated Russia not as a vanquished enemy, but as an emerging partner. We have supported – politically and financially – Russia's transition to a modern, market-based economy and a free, peaceful society. And we have respected Russia as a great power, with which to work to solve common problems. ...

FULL TEXT: <http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2008/09/109954.htm>

New Challenges and New Responses for NATO's Old Mission of Collective Defense

Ambassador Kurt Volker, U.S. Permanent Representative on the North Atlantic Council

Center for European Reform, London, UK, September 12, 2008

... My arrival at NATO has therefore corresponded with and been shaped by the crisis in Georgia. And that has driven NATO straight into some tactical questions of crisis management, as well as some longer term questions of real strategic significance.

- How do we help the Georgian people get through this crisis, and get Georgia back on its feet?
- How do we reaffirm Georgia's independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity?
- How can we support President Sarkozy's efforts to get Russia to implement fully the ceasefire and withdraw its forces?
- What are the implications for Europe's other neighbors in the region, such as Ukraine, and how can we help them maintain their sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity?

How do we reassure our NATO Allies in the East, such as Poland and the Baltic States, when they see Russia using military force and still occupying part of Georgia proper?

“NATO's Future and U.S. Interests: Can the Alliance Meet the Afghanistan and Russia-Georgia Challenges?,” 5
October 9, 2008

Program brief by the American Reference Center

And finally, what is the wider implication for NATO, which still has Afghanistan as its number one operational priority, and which still must adapt to address new kinds of challenges, such as cyber attacks, energy security, terrorism, WMD proliferation, and the consequences of failed states and regional conflicts? Serious questions. In some ways, the short-term answers are easy, and it's the long-term answers that are hard. So if anything, the last four weeks have demonstrated the importance of a solid strategic framework for addressing these questions in the months and years ahead. ...

FULL TEXT: http://nato.usmission.gov/ambassador/2008/Amb_Volker_091608.htm

Protocols to the North Atlantic Treaty

Daniel Fried, Assistant Secretary of State for European and Eurasian Affairs

Testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee

Washington, D.C., September 10, 2008

As prepared

... NATO, the world's most successful military alliance, has been and remains the principal security instrument of the transatlantic community of democracies. It is both a defensive alliance and an alliance of values. While it was created in the context of Soviet threats to European security, it is in fact not an alliance directed against any nation. Article 5 – NATO's collective defense commitment – mentions neither the Soviet Union nor any adversary. One of NATO's purposes was and remains to defend its members from attack. But another purpose was to provide a security umbrella under which rivalries among West European nations – France and Germany in particular – could be reconciled and general peace in Europe could prevail after the 20th century's two world wars. A third purpose was to institutionalize the transatlantic link. NATO's first Secretary General Lord Ismay described NATO's role in an acerbic but telling aphorism, saying that the Alliance's purposes were "to keep the Soviets out, the Germans down, and the Americans in." In the Cold War, NATO succeeded: under its umbrella, Western Europe remained free and united peacefully in the European Union.

Article 5 remains the core of the Alliance. Throughout most of the Alliance's history, we had expected that if Article 5 were ever invoked, it would have been in response to a Soviet armored assault on Germany. We never expected that Article 5 would be invoked in response to an attack on the United States originating in Afghanistan. But that is what occurred. NATO's response was swift and decisive. The United States was attacked on September 11, 2001, and on September 12, NATO invoked Article 5 for the first time in its history. In fact, while NATO's purpose of collective defense has remained constant, new threats have arisen. NATO thus has been required to carry out its core mandate in new ways, developing an expeditionary capability and comprehensive, civil-military skills. NATO is now "out of area" but very much in business – fielding major missions in Afghanistan and Kosovo, and a training mission on the ground in Iraq. NATO is doing more now than at any time during the Cold War. ...

FULL TEXT: <http://www.state.gov/p/eur/rls/rm/109477.htm>

We Need a Strong NATO with a Big Vision

U.S. Ambassador to NATO Ambassador Kurt Volker

Norwegian Foreign Policy Institute, Oslo, Norway, August 21, 2008

... I think the events of the past two weeks illustrate some broader conclusions.

First, Europe and North America really are a single democratic community, defined by shared commitment to human values.

Also this week we had Taliban attacks in Afghanistan, press freedoms challenged in Beijing, continued suffering in Darfur... in this world, Europe and North America do have something special in common.

Second, while the Cold War is over, threats to our democratic, transatlantic community have not gone away. They have changed, to be sure. And in other days, we would be talking about terrorism, and proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, and the consequences of failed states.

Today, we also have to think about the use of military force on European soil, energy security, cyber attacks.

Third, because of this, Europe and North America still need a strong NATO. We need a modern NATO.

One not rooted in old-thinking of the past, not one based on a narrow perspective on security rooted solely in nuclear deterrence and conventional weapons.

But one able to deal with the security challenges we face today and in the future – one with a comprehensive approach to security, integrating civil and military approaches, and building societies like Afghanistan so Taliban-hosted terrorist threats do not reemerge, while still standing with those who want to protect their own freedom.

And fourth, this NATO needs to have a vision big enough to accommodate both the unwavering support for a Europe whole, free and at peace, and a relationship with Russia and any others in the world who will join with us in building a more peaceful, stable, secure, and prosperous world. ...

FULL TEXT: http://nato.usmission.gov/ambassador/2008/Amb_Volker_082108.htm

Remarks after the Meeting of the North Atlantic Council at the Level of Foreign Ministers

Secretary Condoleezza Rice

NATO Headquarters, Brussels, Belgium, August 19, 2008

... SECRETARY RICE: ... This was an extraordinary meeting of the North Atlantic Council. And that, in itself, is a clear indication of NATO's interest in this crisis and NATO's concern that this crisis has a real impact on peace and stability in this region and therefore is crucial to the alliance.

There are several elements to the declaration. But perhaps most important, I think the declaration clearly shows that NATO intends to support the territorial integrity, independence and sovereignty of Georgia, and to support its democratically elected government, its democracy, and to deny Russia the strategic objective of undermining that democracy, of making Georgia weaker or of threatening Georgia's territorial integrity. In that regard, a number of steps will be taken to support Georgia, including the creation, as the Secretary General has just said, of a NATO-Georgia Commission to oversee cooperation with Georgia on a wide range of matters and to oversee the program to achieve the goals of Bucharest. The Council reaffirmed the Bucharest Declaration of our heads of state, as well as developing this program of specific steps that we will take.

Secondly, there was very strong language in the declaration and very strong language around the table of the need for Russia to honor the ceasefire commitment that its president has undertaken. It is time for the Russian President to keep his word to withdraw Russian forces from Georgia, back to the August 6/7 status quo ante and to return, in fact, all forces that were not in South Ossetia at the time of that – of the outbreak of that conflict. That means that Russian peacekeepers “who were there” are one thing, but those who reinforced in some way into the zone of conflict should also return to the status quo ante.

Finally, this document is a very clear statement that this alliance, NATO, having come so far after the end of the Cold War and the collapse of the Soviet Union in achieving a Europe that is whole, free and at peace, is not going to permit a new line to be drawn in Europe, a line between those who were fortunate enough to make it into the transatlantic structures and those who still aspire to those transatlantic structures. And thus, as I have said, there was the reaffirmation of Bucharest that the circumstances for Georgia and Ukraine to become members of MAP will be taken up by the ministers in December, as was envisioned in Bucharest, but that there will absolutely be no new line. NATO does not accept that there is a new line, and we are acting as if there is no new line. ...

FULL TEXT: <http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2008/08/108557.htm>

Statement: Meeting of the North Atlantic Council at the Level of Foreign Ministers

NATO Headquarters, Brussels, August 19, 2008

The North Atlantic Council met in special Ministerial session on 19 August 2008, expressed its grave concern over the situation in Georgia and discussed its wider implications for Euro-Atlantic stability and security. A peaceful and lasting solution to the conflict in Georgia must be based on full respect for the principles of Georgia's independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity recognised by international law and UN Security Council resolutions. We deplore all loss of life, civilian casualties, and damage to civilian infrastructure that has resulted from the conflict. We are assisting humanitarian relief efforts. We met with the Chairman-in-Office of the OSCE, Finnish Minister of Foreign Affairs Mr. Alexander Stubb, to discuss the key issues which he believed needed to be addressed.

We welcome the agreement reached and signed by Georgia and Russia, through the diplomatic efforts of the European Union, the OSCE and the US, to end the hostilities and to bring about a political solution to

the conflict. We stand fully behind these efforts. We stress the urgency of swift, complete, and good faith implementation of the agreement, including a new international mechanism to monitor respect for these engagements. Military action must cease definitively and military forces must return to their positions held prior to the outbreak of hostilities. Fully international discussions must begin on the modalities for security and stability in Abkhazia and South Ossetia. Economic activity in Georgia, including international aviation and shipping, must not be hindered. ...

FULL TEXT: <http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/2008/p08-104e.html>

NATO-ISAF Operations in Afghanistan

With General Dan K. McNiell, Commander, NATO International Security Assistance Force (ISAF)

Foreign Press Center Videoconference Briefing, Washington, D.C., May 21, 2008

... GEN MCNEILL: ... I'd like to point out that the NATO alliance here called ISAF, International Security Assistance Force, is indeed stronger than it had been in Afghanistan when I first took over. It was a shade under 36,000 people, now it's just a shade under 51,000, 40 countries and here at the invitation of the legitimate Government of Afghanistan.

We work along three lines of operation. That would be security, reconstruction and enabling governance. We're organized with the headquarters in Kabul and five regional commands scattered about Afghanistan. Those regional commands superimpose over the various Afghan corps, thus facilitating good combined operations with the Afghans. When we first began our tour here February of last year, we had a little over 42,000, as I recall, Afghans in uniform. That figure's well over 50,000 today and that uniform being of the Afghan National Army.

We had a lot of police afield, but not a whole lot of employees that were properly trained. The army has made great strides and continues to go forward, in fact, has been leading some operations over the last six months, mostly in Regional Command East and right now in Regional Command North as well. The police are going through a retraining and a rebuilding effort of their institution and we're just beginning to see the signs of progress for those police. So our expectation is, barring any cataclysmic occurrence, that we will see impending development of Afghan national security forces moving to a point somewhere ahead of us where the Afghans should be able, with the backing of the international forces, the international community, to begin to take over most of the battle space in this country and to have the lead in prosecuting the counterinsurgency operations here.

We're up to 26 PRTs as part of the ISAF force scattered about the country. They, in the years that have passed since their initial inception, have been accountable for hundreds of millions of dollars in U.S. equivalent or euro equivalent of projects and helping the Afghan people in their destroyed state to get back on their feet. And we think they're having a lot of success in putting in roads and water lines and increasing electricity, helping to build schools, and so forth. ...

FULL TRANSCRIPT: <http://fpc.state.gov/fpc/105050.htm>

AMERICA.GOV ITEMS

(published by the Bureau of International Information Programs/U.S. Department of State)



NATO Seen as Strengthening Security for All, Including Russia

Enlargement of NATO not a threat to Russia, experts say

October 1, 2008

Washington — Despite Russian claims that NATO enlargement is directed at Russia, the record demonstrates quite the opposite — that a new NATO has helped create an area of security, freedom and democratic governance which benefits, rather than threatens, neighboring Russia.

“NATO enlargement did not create any new threat on Russia’s western border,” said Ronald Asmus of the German Marshall Fund. “That border is the most peaceful, safe and secure border Russia has anywhere.” Asmus, a deputy assistant secretary of state in President Bill Clinton’s administration, is head of the German Marshall Fund’s Transatlantic Center in Brussels.

8 “NATO’s Future and U.S. Interests: Can the Alliance Meet the Afghanistan and Russia-Georgia Challenges?,”

October 9, 2008

Program brief by the American Reference Center

NATO enlargement has also been a positive development for Europe as a whole, according to foreign policy specialists.

Paul Saunders, director of the Nixon Center in Washington, told *America.gov*, “Strategically, NATO enlargement has firmly bound Eastern Europe to Western Europe —especially because it has mostly been followed by [European Union] membership, which would have been quite difficult without NATO enlargement first.”

“If any strategic decision of the 1990s has stood the test of time, it is the decision to enlarge NATO to Central and Eastern Europe,” said Asmus in a recent news commentary....

FULL TEXT: <http://www.america.gov/st/peacesec-english/2008/October/20081001123238dmslahrellek0.2439997.html&distid=ucs>

NATO Supports Georgia’s Integrity, Unity against Russian Action

Czech Republic, United States also sign pact tied to missile-defense radar

September 19, 2008

Washington — NATO defense ministers concluded an informal meeting in London by expressing support for Georgia in the crisis that broke out with Russia in August while suggesting that a political solution will entail concessions by all sides.

British Defense Secretary Des Browne hosted the September 18-19 meeting in London to give momentum to the pressing task of reforming the 60-year-old alliance. Reforming NATO means cutting its bureaucracy, pooling resources and pressuring members to increase the size of their defense budgets.

Discussions about increasing defense budgets, while not new, were reported to be lively as they occurred against the backdrop of a world financial crisis. NATO Secretary-General Jaap de Hoop Scheffer said he was already worried about the defense budget issue even before the crisis hit, but said it is very important for alliance members to achieve the goal of devoting at least 2 percent of individual nations’ gross domestic product to defense. ...

FULL TEXT: <http://www.america.gov/st/peacesec-english/2008/September/20080919150709sjhtrop0.5804254.html&distid=ucs>

Allies Launch NATO-Georgia Commission

New body underlines trans-Atlantic support for aspiring alliance member

September 15, 2008

Washington — The 26 NATO allies met in Tbilisi, Georgia, to launch the new NATO-Georgia Commission aimed at helping Georgia rebuild following Russia’s August 2008 invasion and prepare for future NATO membership.

“Despite the crisis, despite the very difficult political situation Georgia is facing today, NATO ambassadors and I have come to support Georgia,” Secretary-General Jaap de Hoop Scheffer said, “to show Georgia that we are interested in its ambition for Euro-Atlantic integration.”

While an alliance meeting in Tbilisi September 15 had been scheduled ahead of Russia’s August 8 attack, the event took on added significance following an August 19 emergency session of NATO’s North Atlantic Council, which voted unanimously to create the new NATO-Georgia Commission.

Similar to a body established in 1997 to oversee NATO relations with Ukraine, the commission will support Georgia as it pursues a future path to NATO membership pledged at the 2008 NATO summit in Bucharest, Romania. It will also help Georgia assess damage from the Russian incursion and restore essential services to communities in the conflict zone.

Russia has voiced strong opposition to Georgia’s membership aspirations and those of neighboring Ukraine in seeking a Membership Action Plan (MAP) — a path to future membership after a multiyear program of intensive dialogue and reforms. ...

FULL TEXT: <http://www.america.gov/st/peacesec-english/2008/September/20080915164305idybeekcm0.9356806.html&distid=ucs>

NATO Enlargement Not Directed at Russia

Russian actions distorting relations with the West, State’s Fried says

“NATO’s Future and U.S. Interests: Can the Alliance Meet the Afghanistan and Russia-Georgia Challenges?,” 9
October 9, 2008

Program brief by the American Reference Center

September 11, 2008

Washington — The post-Cold War enlargement of NATO was not directed against Russia, a senior U.S. official says.

"NATO enlargement was intended to achieve emergence of a Europe whole, free and at peace — all of Europe, not just its western half," said Assistant Secretary of State Daniel Fried. "In designing NATO's new role for the post-Cold War world, the United States and NATO allies have sought to advance NATO-Russia relations as far as the Russians would allow it to go."

Fried said the United States assumed Russia was a partner that, over time, would move toward more democracy at home and more cooperation with its neighbors and the world. Something, though, changed.

...

FULL TEXT: <http://www.america.gov/st/peacesec-english/2008/September/20080911143953dmslahrellek0.7698023.html&distid=ucs>

NATO Strengthens Ties with Georgia

No "business as usual" without "concrete action" from Russia

August 19, 2008

Washington - NATO will strengthen its ties to Georgia through a newly created commission designed to support reconstruction and stabilization in the aftermath of the Russian-Georgian conflict that erupted over two Georgian breakaway regions.

The North Atlantic Council, meeting in emergency session August 19, said in a joint declaration that "we have determined that we cannot continue with business as usual" with Russia until its combat forces now in Georgia are withdrawn and it recognizes the territorial boundaries of Georgia.

The new NATO-Georgia Commission, similar to a body established in 1997 to oversee NATO relations with Ukraine, will help Georgia assess damages from the Russian incursion and restore essential services to communities in the conflict zone. And the commission will support Georgia as it pursues future NATO membership pledged at the 2008 NATO summit in Bucharest, Romania.

NATO will deploy 15 civil emergency planning experts to help Georgian officials conduct damage assessments of roads, utilities, public health facilities and other essential infrastructure and systems, NATO Secretary-General Jaap de Hoop Scheffer said at a post-meeting press conference. The alliance also will act as a clearinghouse for humanitarian aid for more than 150,000 people displaced by the conflict.

The alliance stopped short of a full freeze in diplomatic contacts with Russia, but expressed concern about NATO's future relations with Moscow in the wake of the conflict. ...

FULL TEXT: <http://www.america.gov/st/peacesec-english/2008/August/20080819160731idybeekcm0.4339105.html>

Russia Will Not Be Allowed to Destabilize Europe, Rice Says

United States praises creation of a NATO-Georgia Commission

August 19, 2008

Washington - Russia will not be allowed to win in Georgia and destabilize Europe by creating spheres of influence along its borders, Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice said after an emergency meeting of NATO foreign ministers in Brussels, Belgium.

"We're determined to deny them their strategic objective," Rice said. "We're not going to allow Russia to draw a new line at those states that are not yet integrated into the trans-Atlantic structures like Georgia and Ukraine."

The North Atlantic Council, the policymaking body of the alliance, met August 19 in Brussels and agreed to create a NATO-Georgia Commission to oversee cooperation with Georgia on a wide range of political, economic, security and related issues, and to help achieve the goals set at the 2008 Bucharest NATO Summit, Rice said. Among those goals were plans eventually to offer membership in the alliance to Georgia and Ukraine through a process known as a Membership Action Plan.

The council also agreed on the need for Russia to honor the six-point cease-fire agreement between Russia and Georgia brokered by French President Nicolas Sarkozy on behalf of the European Union, Rice said at a press conference following the council meeting. Russia agreed to withdraw its armored combat forces from

Georgia to positions held by both countries on August 6 before fighting erupted over Georgia's South Ossetia region.

The North Atlantic Council also declared its support for Georgia's territorial integrity, independence and sovereignty. ...

FULL TEXT: <http://www.america.gov/st/peacesec-english/2008/August/20080819130003dmslahrellek0.2731745.html>

NATO Ministers Weigh Response to Georgia Crisis

Alliance meets in Brussels to reconsider relationship with Moscow

August 18, 2008

Washington - NATO's 26 foreign ministers will meet in an emergency session to underline the alliance's commitment to Georgia's future and weigh future relations with Russia in the wake of its air and ground attack on the emerging South Caucasus democracy.

"Right now, we're focused very heavily on getting Russian forces out of Georgia, getting the cease-fire to hold, helping the Georgian people," Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice said in an August 17 interview on NBC Television's *Meet the Press*. "Georgia will rebuild. Russia's reputation may not be rebuilt."

Rice gave a series of interviews after she briefed President Bush on her August 13-15 visits to France and Georgia and before setting off for Brussels, Belgium, where NATO ministers will meet August 19 to discuss a planned international monitoring mission and reconstruction aid, as well as to formulate a united diplomatic response to Russia's military intervention. ...

FULL TEXT: <http://www.america.gov/st/peacesec-english/2008/August/20080818163506idybeekcm5.462283e-02.html>

CRS REPORTS

(Congressional Research Service/Library of Congress)

Afghanistan: Post-War Governance, Security, and U.S. Policy

Updated September 2, 2008

U.S. and outside assessments of the effort to stabilize Afghanistan are increasingly negative, although the Administration notes continued progress on economic development and expansion of central government authority in some areas of Afghanistan. The outside studies emphasize a growing sense of insecurity in areas previously considered secure, increased numbers of suicide attacks, and growing divisions within the NATO alliance about total troop contributions and the relative share of combat. ...

The United States and partner countries now deploy a 53,000 troop NATO-led International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) that commands peacekeeping throughout Afghanistan. Of those, about 14,300 of the 33,600 U.S. forces in Afghanistan are part of ISAF; the remainder are conducting anti-terrorism missions under Operation Enduring Freedom. U.S. and partner forces also run regional enclaves to secure reconstruction (Provincial Reconstruction Teams, PRTs), and are building an Afghan National Army and National Police. ...

FULL REPORT: http://www.usembassy.at/en/download/pdf/afghan_security.pdf (pdf)

Armenia, Azerbaijan, and Georgia: Political Developments and Implications for U.S. Interests

Updated August 13, 2008

The United States recognized the independence of Armenia, Azerbaijan, and Georgia when the former Soviet Union broke up at the end of 1991. The United States has fostered these states' ties with the West in part to end the dependence of these states on Russia for trade, security, and other relations. The United States has pursued close ties with Armenia to encourage its democratization and because of concerns by Armenian-Americans and others over its fate. Close ties with Georgia have evolved from U.S. contacts with its pro-Western leadership. ...

FULL REPORT: <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RL33453.pdf> (pdf)

"NATO's Future and U.S. Interests: Can the Alliance Meet the Afghanistan and Russia-Georgia Challenges?," 11
October 9, 2008

Program brief by the American Reference Center

NATO in Afghanistan: A Test of the Transatlantic Alliance

Updated July 18, 2008

The mission of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) in Afghanistan is a test of the alliance's political will and military capabilities. The allies intended to create a "new" NATO, able to go beyond the European theater and combat new threats such as terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

Afghanistan is NATO's first "out-of-area" mission beyond Europe. The purpose of the mission is the stabilization and reconstruction of Afghanistan. The mission is a difficult one because it must take place while combat operations against Taliban insurgents continue. Recent assessments of the current situation in Afghanistan point to a rise in the overall level of violence due to increased Taliban military activity and an increase in terrorist-related activities including, suicide bombings.

FULL REPORT: http://www.usembassy.at/en/download/pdf/nato_afghanistan.pdf (pdf)

The NATO Summit at Bucharest, 2008

Updated May 5, 2008

NATO held a summit in Bucharest, Romania, April 2-4, 2008. The summit did not become the occasion to adopt major new ideas or initiatives. A "Strategic Vision" paper on Afghanistan clarified several issues but did not lead to a greater sharing of the combat burden among NATO governments. Croatia and Albania, but not Macedonia, were invited to begin accession negotiations for membership. In a contentious debate, neither Georgia nor Ukraine were admitted to the MAP process. The debate over missile defense led to the consolidation of an evolving allied position. ...

FULL REPORT: http://www.usembassy.at/en/download/pdf/nato_bucharest_summit.pdf (pdf)

Enlargement Issues at NATO's Bucharest Summit

Updated April 18, 2008

NATO held a summit in Bucharest on April 2-4, 2008. A principal issue was consideration of the candidacies for membership of Albania, Croatia, and the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (FYROM, or the Republic of Macedonia). These states are small, with correspondingly small militaries, and their inclusion in the alliance cannot be considered strategic in a military sense. However, it is possible that they could play a role in the stabilization of southeastern Europe. The allies issued invitations only to Albania and Croatia. ...

FULL REPORT: http://www.usembassy.at/en/download/pdf/nato_bucharest.pdf (pdf)

Georgia [Republic] and NATO Enlargement: Issues and Implications

March 7, 2008

Georgia joined NATO's Partnership for Peace (PFP) program in 1994. At the NATO Summit in Prague in November 2002, Georgia declared that it aspired to eventual NATO membership and sought to intensify ties with NATO through an Individual Partnership Action Plan (IPAP) to increase the interoperability and capability of its military forces. After Georgia's "rose revolution" of late 2003 brought a new reformist government to power, Georgia placed top priority on integration with Western institutions, including NATO and the European Union (EU). During the presidential election campaign in late 2003, candidate Mikheil Saakashvili ran on a platform that included a pledge to work toward NATO membership. Georgia began sending troops to assist NATO forces in Kosovo in 1999, began hosting multinational PFP military training exercises in 2001, and recently pledged to send troops to assist the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) in Afghanistan. In late 2004, Georgia concluded an IPAP with NATO, which allowed the Alliance to provide more assistance on domestic reforms, including defense institutional and policy reforms and political reforms. After extensive public debate, the Georgian government approved a national security concept in late 2005 that committed the country to carry out the reforms outlined by the IPAP. ...

FULL REPORT: http://www.usembassy.at/en/download/pdf/nato_georgia.pdf (pdf)

NATO and the European Union

Updated January 29, 2008

Since the end of the Cold War, both NATO and the European Union (EU) have evolved along with Europe's changed strategic landscape. While NATO's collective defense guarantee remains at the core of the alliance, members have also sought to redefine its mission as new security challenges have emerged on Europe's periphery and beyond. At the same time, EU members have taken steps toward political integration with decisions to develop a common foreign policy and a defense arm to improve EU member states' abilities to manage security crises, such as those that engulfed the Balkans in the 1990s.

The evolution of NATO and the EU, however, has generated some friction between the United States and several of its allies over the security responsibilities of the two organizations. U.S.-European differences center around threat assessment, defense institutions, and military capabilities. Successive U.S. administrations and the U.S. Congress have called for enhanced European defense capabilities to enable the allies to better share the security burden, and to ensure that NATO's post-Cold War mission embraces combating terrorism and countering the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. U.S. policymakers, backed by Congress, support EU efforts to develop a European Security and Defense Policy (ESDP) provided that it remains tied to NATO and does not threaten the transatlantic relationship. ...

FULL REPORT: http://www.usembassy.at/en/download/pdf/nato_eu.pdf (pdf)

ARTICLES & THINK TANK ITEMS

(for full text please contact the American Reference Center at: arc@usembassy.at)

Building a New Atlantic Alliance: Restoring America's Partnership with Europe

By James P. Rubin

Foreign Affairs, July/August 2008

This Spring's NATO summit in Bucharest marked the end of President George W. Bush's stewardship of the transatlantic alliance. This year, Germany, not the United States, played the role of NATO power broker. All the key NATO foreign ministers were huddled with German Chancellor Angela Merkel to determine the future of NATO enlargement. When their decision was announced, Georgia and Ukraine were stunned that the clout of the United States was not enough to put them on the path to NATO membership.

Why NATO Must Win in Afghanistan: A Central Front in the War on Terrorism

By Sally McNamara

Backgrounder #2148, The Heritage Foundation, June 23, 2008

Jonathan Evans, director general of Britain's security service MI5 describes al-Qaeda and its associated groups as, "the main national security threat that we face today." Through a series of attacks and attempted attacks, Islamist extremists have declared war on the values that underpin the liberal democracies of Britain, Europe, and the entire West. In an extraordinary public speech, Mr. Evans detailed a growing and evolving al-Qaeda threat to the United Kingdom, where at least 2,000 individuals have been identified as a threat to national security because of their support for terrorism. He went on to identify the increased threats posed by the "extension of the al-Qaeda brand" in both the Middle East and Europe.

When the North Atlantic Treaty was signed in 1949, NATO's founding members agreed on the sacred Article 5 clause stipulating that "an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all." As a collective defensive military alliance, NATO rightly invoked Article 5 following al-Qaeda's 9/11 attacks on the United States. The Alliance must now follow through on that invocation and continue to deny al-Qaeda a safe haven in which to operate by winning in Afghanistan. ...

FULL TEXT: <http://www.heritage.org/Research/Europe/bg2148.cfm>

NATO Expansion, A Decade On

By John Kornblum and Michael Mandelbaum

The American Interest, May/June 2008

Just over a decade after the first round of NATO expansion there is still no consensus on whether expanding the Alliance was a wise decision. With U.S. relations with Russia becoming increasingly troubled, *The American Interest* asked former Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs John Kornblum and one of the most outspoken opponents of the decision at the time, Michael Mandelbaum, to exchange views about the record of the last decade, and to look ahead into the next.

Europe's Eastern Promise: Rethinking NATO and EU Enlargement

By Ronald D. Asmus

Foreign Affairs, January/February 2008

After the Cold War, NATO and the EU opened their doors to central and Eastern Europe, making the continent safer and freer than ever before. Today, NATO and the EU must articulate a new rationale for enlarging still further, once again extending democracy and prosperity to the East, this time in the face of a more powerful and defiant Russia.

FULL TEXT: <http://www.foreignaffairs.org/20080101faessay87107/ronald-d-asmus/europe-s-eastern-promise.html>

The Bell Tolls for NATO

By Ilana Bet-El and Rupert Smith

The National Interest, January/February 2008

The article discusses the viability of NATO, which is being tested and found wanting by the war in Afghanistan. Topics discussed include the Cold War origins of the military alliance, the state of U.S.-European Union relations, and the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) in Afghanistan.

USEFUL LINKS

- **U.S.-NATO** – U.S. Embassy Vienna
<http://www.usembassy.at/en/policy/nato.htm>
- **U.S. and NATO: New Responsibilities in a New Era** – Bureau of International Information Programs/U.S. Department of State
<http://fpolicy.america.gov/fpolicy/security/nato.html>
- **NATO** – Bureau of European and Eurasian Affairs/U.S. Department of State
<http://www.state.gov/p/eur/rt/nato/>
- **United States Mission to NATO**
<http://nato.usmission.gov/>
- **North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)**
<http://www.nato.int/>
 - *NATO review*
<http://www.nato.int/docu/review/>

Please visit the homepage of the U.S. Embassy Vienna, Austria at: <http://www.usembassy.at>



The program page on **“NATO's Future and U.S. Interests: Can the Alliance Meet the Afghanistan and Russia-Georgia Challenges?”** will be available at: <http://www.usembassy.at/en/embassy/photo/sloan.htm>

Information about the services and resources of the American Reference Center is available at: <http://www.usembassy.at/en/embassy/arc.htm>



This program brief was prepared by the American Reference Center. For your convenience all links included in this brief are hyperlinked. The brief will be made available on the program page at <http://www.usembassy.at/en/embassy/photo/sloan.htm>. For printouts of items referred to in this brief or for any additional information please contact the American Reference Center at: arc@usembassy.at.