NATO-EAPC Research Fellowship 2001-2003

Final Report
June 2003

**Europe "Whole and Free":
NATO's Political Mission for the 21st Century**

Rebecca R. Moore, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Political Science
Concordia College, Moorhead, Minnesota, USA

Table of Contents   Page

Chapter One: Introduction

During a visit to Mainz, Germany following NATO's fortieth anniversary summit in May 1989, former President George Bush declared NATO's "new mission" to be the achievement of a Europe "whole and free." Over a decade later in Warsaw, President George W. Bush would proclaim that this vision was "no longer a dream," but rather "the Europe that is rising around us." "A new generation," he declared, "makes a new commitment: a Europe and an America bound in a great alliance of liberty—history's greatest united force for peace and progress and human dignity."[1]

Indeed, NATO had declared in 1990 that it intended to become "an agent of change;" its principal new political mission was the construction of a new security order in Europe—an order grounded on the liberal democratic values embodied in the preamble to the original NATO treaty; namely, "democracy, individual liberty, and the rule of law."[2] Although NATO has from the beginning been committed to the defense of these values, this new mission required that the Alliance transform itself into an organization with the capacity to promote its values outside its territory—in the fledgling democracies of central and eastern Europe.

Enhancing NATO's Political Dimension

As early as December 1989, U.S. Secretary of States James Baker told the Berlin Press Club that NATO was working "to build a new security structure in Europe, one in which the military component is reduced and the political one is enhanced."[3] Six months later during their June 1990 summit in London, the NATO Allies reaffirmed that "security and stability do not lie solely in the military dimension" and declared their intention "to enhance the political component of the Alliance as provided for by Article 2" of the original Washington Treaty. To some extent, the initiative stemmed from a desire to soften the blow to the Soviet Union of Germany's impending reunification and its entry into NATO by convincing the Soviets that NATO was increasingly becoming a political organization.[4] At the same time, however, the Allies viewed the changes in Eastern Europe as an opportunity to build on their success in stabilizing Western Europe by encouraging the development of democratic principles and practices in the former Soviet bloc.[5] Indeed, they had already declared their desire "to shape a new political order of peace in Europe" during their May 1989 summit in Brussels [6] The London Declaration issued a year later also asserted that changes in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe would allow NATO to "help build the structure of a more united continent, supporting security and stability with the strength of our shared faith in democracy, the rights of the individual and the peaceful resolution of disputes."[7]

The new Strategic Concept agreed to in Rome in November 1991 affirmed NATO's new political mission and explicitly recognized that "the opportunities for achieving Alliance objectives through political means [were] greater than ever." Of the four fundamental security tasks it set forth the first was "to provide one of the indispensable foundations for a stable security environment in Europe, based on the growth of democratic institutions and commitment to the peaceful resolution of disputes, in which no country would be able to intimidate or coerce any European nation or to impose hegemony through the threat or use of force."[8] Seeking to address the new challenges arising from ethnic rivalries, territorial disputes and other political and economic difficulties, the Alliance also declared its intention to broaden security policy to include "dialogue" and "cooperation" in addition to the "maintenance of a collective defense capability."

The enhancement of NATO's political dimension also encompassed the creation of new institutions, designed in part to foster NATO values beyond NATO territory. During its 1990 London summit, NATO extended a hand to its former Warsaw Pact adversaries by inviting the governments of the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, and Bulgaria to establish diplomatic liaisons to NATO.[9] The following year, the Allies invited all former Warsaw Pact members to join the North Atlantic Cooperation Council (NACC), a newly created institution designed to promote cooperation on political and security matters and encourage the development of democracy in central and eastern Europe. The NACC, which was succeeded in May 1997 by the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC), reflected NATO's desire to reach out to former adversaries, but the rhetoric surrounding it also suggested that genuine security was best achieved on the basis of shared democratic values and within a community that included the whole of Europe. As U.S. Secretary of State James Baker put it in an address before the NACC in 1991: "For forty years, we stood apart from one another as two opposing blocs. Now, history has given us the opportunity to erase those blocs, to join together in a common circle built on shared universal and democratic values."[10]

The fact that one of NATO's first priorities was to ensure that its values prevailed throughout the former Soviet bloc bore witness to the Allies' own conviction that shared democratic values were the key to their success in stabilizing Western Europe. Indeed, during their 40[h] anniversary summit in Brussels in 1989 they declared the peace and prosperity they had come to enjoy amongst themselves to be "the fruits of a partnership based on enduring common values and interests, and on unity of purpose."[11] Focusing on these shared values, then President Bush asserted, would provide the West with "both an anchor and a course to navigate for the future."[12]

The preservation of liberal democratic values had long been central to NATO's larger mission, but developments within the Alliance between 1989 and 1991 marked an important expansion of that mission. No longer would the Allies be content to preserve and promote NATO values chiefly by safeguarding NATO territory. In so explicitly enhancing NATO's political dimension, they had effectively committed themselves to developing the means necessary to encourage the growth of their values outside NATO territory. NATO's new mission was nothing less than the construction of a new European security order, grounded on democratic values and encompassing territory outside of NATO's traditional sphere of collective defense. As Secretary General Lord Robertson later stated it, NATO's task was now "to build the Euro-Atlantic security environment of the future—where all states share peace and democracy, and uphold basic human rights."[13]

New Institutions and New Partners

Even as of late 1991, however, NATO had no clear strategy for constructing a Europe "whole and free."[14] Reaching out to former adversaries through the NACC constituted one means of encouraging the growth of democratic values in central and eastern Europe but, by itself, was far from an adequate tool for carrying out the ambitious new political mission the Alliance had embraced. Throughout the 1990s, however, NATO would develop a variety of essentially political tools designed at least in part to promote NATO norms, values, and practices as those that should govern the whole of Europe.

Among these new tools was the Partnership for Peace (PfP). Proposed by the Clinton administration in October 1993, PfP sought to promote defense-related cooperation, including

cooperative military relations for training purposes and better interoperability with NATO forces. Open to all NACC and OSCE members and established within the framework of the NACC, the new institution did not encompass the security guarantees then sought by NATO's new partners, especially Czech President Vaclav Havel and Polish President Lech Walesa.[15]   Like the NACC, however, the Partnership was characterized as an instrument by which NATO could influence the direction of political and military reform to its east.   The PfP Framework document, in fact, declares "the protection and promotion of fundamental freedoms and human rights" to be "shared values fundamental to the Partnership" and requires member states to reaffirm their obligations under the U.N. Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Helsinki Final Act, and all subsequent CSCE [now OSCE] documents.[16]   Similarly, the EAPC, which serves as a forum for consultations on a "broad range of political and security-related issues," commits its members to the values and principles set out in the PfP Framework Document. Since the Partnership's inception NATO has also adopted measures aimed at enhancing PfP's political dimension, including the creation of a political-military framework for NATO-led PfP operations.   The new framework was designed to allow NATO partners to play a more active role in the planning and execution of non-Article 5 crisis response operations, such as that in Bosnia—an operation in which many of them have participated militarily.   Today, PfP and the EAPC encompass virtually the entire OSCE area, including the traditionally neutral states of Austria, Ireland, Sweden, Finland, and Switzerland.

NATO's partnerships also extend to Russia and Ukraine through the NATO-Russia Council, which replaced the earlier NATO-Russia Permanent Joint Council in May 2002, and the 1997 NATO-Ukraine Charter on a Distinctive Partnership.   Within the context of both of these relationships the advancement of democracy is an explicitly stated objective.   Additionally, NATO established a Mediterranean Dialogue in 1994, which now includes Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Mauritania, Morocco, Tunisia, and Algeria.   The Dialogue "is based on the recognition that security in the whole of Europe is closely linked to security and stability in the Mediterranean region."   Intended, to facilitate practical cooperation on matters related to security and defense issues, civil emergency planning, information and science, it constitutes one piece of NATO's "cooperative security" agenda.[17]

The Decision to Enlarge NATO

Arguably, however, it was the decision to admit new members that drew the most attention to NATO's new political mission   Although the Clinton administration appeared initially divided on the subject of enlargement, by 1994 the United States was characterizing it as "one part of a much broader, post-Cold War strategy to help create a peaceful, undivided and democratic Europe."[18]   Opening NATO's door to new members, the Clinton administration argued, would allow it to "do for Europe's East what it did for Europe's West: prevent a return to local rivalries, strengthen democracy against future threats and create the conditions necessary for prosperity to flourish."[19]   Administration officials even went so far as to evoke the Kantian notion of a "pacific federation" among liberal states in concluding that adding new members would serve to enlarge the zone in which "wars simply do not happen."[20]

To some degree, the decision to enhance NATO's political dimension made enlargement, if not a necessity, at least a logical next step in NATO's adaptation to the post-Cold War world. If NATO was to be understood primarily as a community of liberal democracies committed to the peaceful resolution of disputes, retaining the alliance's Cold War boundaries made little

sense—assuming that other European states were committed to its ideals. Enlargement, however, also served as a means of rewarding those central and eastern European states who were actively making the political and economic reforms essential to NATO's vision of a Europe whole and free. As Sean Kay has suggested, the decision to enlarge NATO was thus a "fundamentally political act rather than a military one."[21]

Indeed, the arguments the Clinton administration made on behalf of enlargement rested on an important assumption: that the lure of NATO membership would be sufficiently appealing to encourage prospective members to make the requisite political, economic, and military reforms. Although NATO has published no specific membership criteria, an internal study on enlargement released in September 1995, served to notify prospective members that only those states that had demonstrated a commitment to democratic values and practices would be considered for membership. This would include resolving ethnic and external territorial disputes by peaceful means and establishing "appropriate democratic and civilian control of their defense forces."[22] The study concluded that enlargement of the alliance could enhance security and stability in Europe by "encouraging and supporting democratic reforms," fostering in new members "patterns and habits of cooperation and consultation and consensus-building," and promoting good neighborly relations."

In at least one respect, the argument in favor of enlargement appeared a bit circuitous. The Clinton administration consistently argued that admitting new members would project stability to the east by allowing fledgling democracies to consolidate internal reforms, which in turn would serve to enlarge the zone of peace in Europe. Yet, prospective members were required to make democratic reforms prior to being admitted. President Clinton, in fact, stated publicly during the period preceding the first phase of enlargement that "countries with repressive political systems, countries with designs on their neighbors, countries with militaries unchecked by civilian control or with closed economic systems need not apply."[23] The democratic reform process was understood to require stability, but stability in turn hinged upon the consolidation of democracy. Former Clinton administration officials acknowledge, however, that they debated just where to draw the line in terms of the level of reform that needed to be achieved before an invitation to join NATO would be issued. While the aspirants were expected to achieve a certain level of reform before joining NATO, additional reforms above this line would still be required if democracy in central and eastern Europe was to be fully consolidated.[24]

Not all of those who supported the admission of Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic in 1999 shared this rationale. Some members of Congress and other influential figures in American foreign policy still viewed NATO as principally a military alliance which could be directed against a potentially resurgent Russia. This group included former Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chair Jesse Helms, and former national security advisers Henry Kissinger and Zbigniew Brzezinksi.[25] This was not, however, the perspective of the Clinton administration.

A Values-Based Conception of Security

Importantly, the Clinton rationale for enlargement, as does the enhancement of NATO's political dimension generally, reflects an evolving concept of security that evinces considerable faith in the pacifying effect of shared democratic institutions and values. Former Supreme Allied Commander Europe (SACEUR) General George Joulwan expressed this optimism well in 1997. In his words: "NATO is now more than ever a political alliance, but as a military man that suits

me fine. We represent shared ideals, not just tanks and soldiers. We want our values to take root in other countries because that is the best way we know to prevent conflicts from exploding into war."[26]

Indeed, this study assumes that the new initiatives NATO has implemented since the early 1990s were aimed to a significant degree at constructing an environment in the whole of Europe favorable to the flourishing of the values enshrined in the preamble to the original NATO treaty. These initiatives include NATO's new political and military partnerships, enlargement of the alliance itself, and peacekeeping missions in Bosnia, Kosovo, and Macedonia. Although NATO remains committed to the collective defense of its territory, these initiatives reflect an understanding of security that ultimately rests on the triumph of liberal democratic values throughout the whole of Europe. Exploring this essentially values-based conception of security constitutes an important part of the study. Notably, the heightened prominence of individual rights in NATO's new conception of security coincides with the emergence of what some commentators consider to be global norms of democracy and human rights. Hence, attention will also be devoted to examining the interface between these two trends, including ways in which NATO's new mission has both contributed to and been influenced by emerging international human rights norms.

The centrality of values to NATO's vision of a Europe "whole and free" also necessitates some assessment of NATO's viability as a vehicle for the promotion of democratic values and whether these values do indeed influence the way in which states conceive their interests as well as their choice of means for securing those interests. Shared democratic values have long been central to NATO's conception of itself, but constructing a liberal or values-based security order on a continent-wide scale requires that the Alliance succeed in its efforts to promote NATO values outside NATO territory. Indeed, NATO's success or failure in constructing the liberal security order it envisions has the potential to inform a growing body of literature on the role of values or ideas in shaping international systemic change.

The Unique Character of NATO

NATO's new partnerships also suggest that what has been labeled "cooperative security" can be achieved even in the absence of shared values. Indeed, cooperation with the Caucuses and Central Asian states as well as with Russia expanded considerably in the aftermath of September 11th as the United States looked to them for assistance in the war against terrorism. NATO's Mediterranean Dialogue also took on greater importance. One might ask, however, whether NATO's close cooperation with states that are far from having consolidated liberal democracy has the potential jeopardize NATO's own unique character as a community of liberal democracies. Maintaining the political as well as military integrity of the Alliance—especially where Russia is concerned—has been a concern of even some of NATO's newest members and those invited to join the Alliance during the 2002 Prague Summit. However, concerns have also arisen over possible regression on the part of new members in terms of both their political and military commitments.

A related question concerns the point at which Europe becomes "whole and free." Assuming that NATO remains a European alliance, where does Europe end? Should all states that demonstrate a commitment to democratic values and practices be eligible for membership? NATO has said that its door is open to all states that are "in a position to further the principles of the Treaty and contribute to peace and security in the Euro-Atlantic area." Yet, concerns persist

regarding the notion of unlimited enlargement. This worry appeared largely absent during the U.S. debate over the Prague enlargement, which will lead to the admission of seven new members (Slovenia, Slovakia, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Romania, and Bulgaria) in 2004. Yet concern that the alliance's cohesion and effectiveness will ultimately be threatened simply by the size of its membership persists.

Perhaps even more difficult is the question of whether NATO should be open to a democratic Russia. Although the alliance has never formally opposed Russia' entry, some influential leaders and commentators, including former Czech President Havel, have suggested that Russia is not culturally suited for membership and that its interests diverge fundamentally from NATO's.[27] This issue also raises questions about NATO's ability to encourage democratic reform in areas not universally regarded as historically part of the West. Those prospective members who have committed themselves to making the reforms necessary to join NATO have tended to characterize membership in both NATO and the EU as part of their "return to Europe." Returning to Europe means rejoining a community rooted in a shared history, common culture and shared values, which preceded and outlived the Cold War. Does NATO have the capacity to enlarge *this* community or influence how those states not traditionally considered part of the West define their interests? In other words, are there essentially cultural and historical limits to the zone of peace NATO seeks to construct?

Weighing in on this debate Samuel Huntington has even gone so far as to hint that Greece and Turkey are illegitimate members of NATO because, in his view, NATO is essentially an alliance of Western civilization to which they do not belong. In keeping with his "clash of civilizations" thesis, Huntington argues that "the reality of a multicivilizational world suggests that NATO should be expanded to include other Western societies that wish to join and should recognize the essential meaninglessness of having as members two states each of which is the other's worst enemy and both of which lack cultural affinity with other members."[28]

The Transatlantic Relationship

Growing concern also exists regarding the continued cohesion of an alliance whose raison d'etre following the Cold War increasingly became the defense and promotion of democratic values. Although NATO survived predictions of its imminent demise throughout the 1990s and even hung together during its first war in Kosovo in 1999, the recent debate over whether to intervene militarily in Iraq—a dispute which at times pitted Germany, France, and Belgium against the United States and its supporters within the Alliance—has reignited the debate over NATO's ability to survive the loss of the common external threat that inspired it. While terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction may constitute shared threats, the persistent and growing military capabilities gap that exists between the United States has led numerous commentators to question NATO's continued relevance as a military alliance. Indeed, despite NATO's decision to invoke Article 5 for the first time ever in response to the September 11th terrorist attacks in the United States, the Bush administration effectively shut NATO out of its war in Afghanistan, having deemed the Alliance to be of insufficient assistance militarily to justify the frustrations associated with NATO's tradition of consensus-based decision-making.

Perhaps the most devastating development fueling the debate over NATO's future was the dispute that occurred when France, Belgium, and Germany blocked the initiation of defensive measures aimed at protecting Turkey against potential spillover from the war in Iraq, even though such an action appeared to many of the Allies to be at odds with their Article 5

commitments.   Taking note of the schism revealed by this dispute, Henry Kissinger wrote in early 2003 that the rift and challenges to NATO's framework by France and Germany had deeper causes than diplomatic missteps on the part of the Bush administration. This "diplomatic revolution," he argues, could not have taken place "had not the traditional underpinnings of the Alliance been eroded by the disappearance of a common threat, aggravated by the emergence into power of a new generation that grew up during the Cold War and takes its achievements for granted." Kissinger also suggests that "if the existing trend in transatlantic relations continues, the international system will be fundamentally altered. Europe will split into two groups defined by their attitude towards cooperation with America. NATO will change its character and become a vehicle for those continuing to affirm the transatlantic relationship."[29]

In an even gloomier assessment published in the *Financial Times* just prior to the 2002 Prague summit and well before the dispute over Turkey, Charles Kupchan argued that the seven aspirants receiving invitations to join NATO would "be entering a western alliance that is soon to be defunct." He concluded that while "pronouncements emanating from Prague" would "no doubt affirm that the Atlantic Alliance in is the midst of rejuvenation," in fact the summit would "merely postpone NATO's inevitable demise." Kupchan does not, however, base his conclusion principally on Europe's military weakness. Rather, he says, the United States and Europe "are drifting apart politically" due to the unilateralist bent of the Bush foreign policy.[30] Robert Kagan in a much-discussed essay first published in *Policy Review* in the summer of 2002 agrees that Europe and the United States are drifting apart politically, although he attributes the differences in how Americans and Europeans view the world to the power differential that currently exists between them and divergent views regarding the role of military power. According to Kagan:

> [Europe] is moving beyond power into a self-contained world of laws and rules and transnational negotiation and cooperation. It is entering a post-historical paradise of peace and relative prosperity, the realization of Immanuel Kant's 'perpetual peace'. Meanwhile, the United States remains mired in history, exercising power in an anarchic Hobbesian world where international law and rules are unreliable, and where true security and the defense and promotion of a liberal order still depend on the possession and use of military might.[31]

Indeed, the post-September 11th era does suggest that the Bush administration is more inclined to look to military means of achieving security than are most Europeans. Yet the vision of Europe whole and free, toward which the United States and Europe have been working since 1989, strongly resembles Kant's vision of "perpetual peace." Indeed, this study presumes that most of the tools with which NATO has sought to construct a new security order in Europe have been political rather than military. At the same time, however, the project recognizes that NATO's political and military dimensions cannot be divorced. What are the implications of NATO's military capabilities or lack thereof for NATO's political dimension and its vision of a Europe whole and free? This too is a question that must be addressed below.

Chapter Two: Theory and Literature Review

NATO: A Principally Political or Military Alliance?

Though widely considered the most successful military alliance in history, NATO throughout the Cold War was thought to be just that—a one-dimensional military alliance, aimed principally at deterring a Soviet attack on Western Europe. Consequently, many commentators did not expect NATO to outlive the threat that inspired it. In a widely read article published in *International Security* in the summer of 1990, John Mearsheimer offered a scenario of the post-Cold War order predicated upon the assumption that NATO had lost its raison d'etre and it, along with the Warsaw Pact, would dissolve. In his words: "The Soviet Union is the only superpower that can seriously threaten to overrun Europe; it is the Soviet threat that provides the glue that holds NATO together. Take away that offensive threat and the United States is likely to abandon the Continent, whereupon the defensive alliance it has headed for forty years may disintegrate."[32] Mearsheimer allowed that both NATO and the Warsaw Pact might "persist on paper," but neither in his view would continue to "function as an alliance."[33] Taking a slightly different but equally pessimistic perspective, Owen Harries argued in 1993 that proposals for a "new NATO" were "based on a most questionable premise: that 'the West' continues to exist as a political and military entity." Indeed, Harries asserted that "the political 'West' is not a natural construct but a highly artificial one. It took the presence of a life-threatening, overtly hostile 'East' to bring it into existence and to maintain its unity. It is extremely doubtful whether it can now survive the disappearance of that enemy."[34]

Although NATO has survived for well over a decade since the end of the Cold War, during that time taking in new members, adopting new missions, and for the first time ever invoking Article 5 in response to September 11th, bleak predictions regarding its future have continued. Robert Levine in an op/ed piece published in the *International Herald Tribune* in May 2003 pronounced NATO "irrelevant: a bureaucracy whose time has passed."[35] Just before the Prague Summit, Charles Kupchan, argued that a loss of interest in NATO by the United States was producing "a military pact that is hollowing out and of diminishing geopolitical relevance."[36]

There has, however, always been an alternative view of NATO, one that does not presume the Alliance to rest on its military mission alone. NATO optimists have long credited the Alliance with ameliorating the effects of anarchy among its members, thereby producing unprecedented stability in Western Europe during the Cold War years. Responding to NATO's skeptics, John Duffield put it this way in 1994:

> NATO pessimists overlooked the valuable intra-alliance functions that the alliance has always performed and that remain relevant after the cold war. More importantly, NATO has helped stabilize Western Europe, whose states had often been bitter rivals in the past. By damping the security dilemma and providing an institutional mechanism for the development of common security policies, NATO has contributed to making the use of force in relations among the countries of the region virtually inconceivable.[37]

Similarly, Rob deWijk, who had served with the Netherlands Ministry of Defense, observes that NATO's evolution "from a traditional military alliance for collective defense into a political-

military organization for security cooperation with an extensive bureaucracy and complex decision-making process" was key to its unprecedented adaptation to the end of the Cold War.[38] Those predicting an end to NATO, Robert McCalla agrees, had "adopted too narrow a perspective on NATO's function and history, focusing too much on NATO's military functions and geographic limitations." McCalla suggests that NATO's success in eliminating the use of force as a means of resolving conflicts among its members could be explained both by the liberal nature of the states that comprise it and by the institutional mechanisms they had created to promote cooperation.[39]

Explaining the Pacification of Western Europe

Indeed, both neo-liberal institutionalism and democratic peace theory can be understood to support the notion that NATO had a positive role in the pacification of Western Europe that occurred after World War II. Robert Keohane, a leading proponent of the former, argues that institutions such as NATO and the European Community should be considered an important source of stability that emerged during this period. As he explains it, "the nature and strength of international institutions are...important determinants of expectations and therefore state behavior. Insofar as states regularly follow the rules and standards of international institutions, they signal their willingness to continue patterns of cooperation, and therefore reinforce expectations of stability." Indeed, Keohane adds that "avoiding military conflict in Europe after the Cold War depends greatly on whether the next decade is characterized by a continuous pattern of institutionalized cooperation."[40]

Democratic peace theorists, on the other hand, locate the cause of stability in Western Europe during the Cold War in the nature of the region's governments. Liberal democratic regimes, they argue, are unlikely to go to war against each other. As John Owen notes, democratic peace theories assume both structural and normative explanations. "Structural accounts attribute the democratic peace to the institutional constraints within democracies" whereas normative theories points to "the ideas or norms held by democracies. Democracies believe it would be unjust or imprudent to fight one another."[41] Indeed, Michael Doyle who closely identifies his own views with those of Immanuel Kant, argues that "a liberal zone of peace, a pacific union, has been maintained and has expanded despite numerous particular conflicts of economic and strategic interest." In part, liberalism leads to peace because it tends to favor economic interdependence, which can "help create crosscutting transnational ties that serve as lobbies for mutual accommodation." Like Kant, however, Doyle believes that the liberal peace ultimately has a moral foundation. It emanates from the mutual respect that exists between states that respect individual rights as well as from the domestic constraints on going to war inherent in democratic societies.[42] Thomas Risse-Kappen also captures well the normative foundation of the democratic peace.

> In sum liberal theory argues that democracies do not fight each other because they perceive each other as peaceful. They perceive each other as peaceful because of the democratic norms governing their domestic decision-making processes. For the same reason, they form pluralistic security communities of shared values. Because they perceive each other as peaceful and express a sense of community, they are likely to overcome obstacles against international cooperation and to form international institutions such as alliances.[43]

Risse-Kappen's reference to "pluralistic security communities" stems from the work of Karl Deutsch, who in the 1950s defined a security community as one "in which there is real assurance that the members of that community will not fight each other physically, but will settle their disputes in some other way."[44] Although Deutsch himself concluded that NATO had not yet achieved the status of a security community as of 1957, he noted that there was considerable support for tightening NATO in order that it might become "a pluralistic/security community."[45] , Indeed, Risse-Kappen, writing in 1995, argued that "the picture emerging from the transatlantic relationship" did resemble both Deutsch's "pluralistic security community" and the "pacific federation" Immanuel Kant had envisioned in *Perpetual Peace*.[46]

The Foundation of the Transatlantic Community

Contrary to the notion that NATO was primarily a military alliance, which over time developed a sense of political community, Risse-Kappen suggests that the original members of NATO constituted a community that did not depend on the emergence of the Soviet threat, but actually preceded it. Together, the Allies came to construe the Soviet Union as a threat because its ideology coupled with its effort to dominate central and eastern Europe constituted an assault on their shared values. "The perceived Soviet threat threatened the sense of common purpose among the allies," Risse-Kappen acknowledges, but "it did not create the community in the first place."[47] The Clinton administration used a similar argument to support the enlargement of NATO in the mid-1990s. As Secretary of State Madeleine Albright put it: "NATO defines a community of interest among the free nations of North America and Europe that both preceded and outlasted the Cold War. America has long stood for the proposition that the Atlantic community should not be artificially divided and that its nations should be free to shape their destiny. We have long argued that the nations of Central and Eastern Europe belong to the same democratic family as our allies in Western Europe."[48] In his recent book about NATO's first post-Cold War round of enlargement, Ronald Asmus observed that, in defining a post-Cold War purpose for NATO, the Clinton administration had "returned to first principles, at times literally going back to the words and texts of NATO's founding fathers to capture the essence of what the Alliance was all about. The answer it came up with was a simple one, namely that NATO's core purpose was to defend the freedom, territory, and interests of its members from whatever threatened them."[49]

As Ian Thomas has noted, in the effort to gain support for NATO at its inception, U.S. Secretary of State Dean Acheson had also relied heavily on the notion that NATO—in Acheson's words—was "an affirmation of the moral and spiritual values which we hold in common." NATO, "did not create something new as much as it recorded a basic reality—a unity of belief, of spirit and of joint interest which was already felt by the nations of the North Atlantic community."[50] Sean Kay observes that British Secretary Ernest Bevin saw this community in much the same way. In pushing for a transatlantic alliance after World War II, Bevin had urged that "political and indeed spiritual forces must be mobilized in our defense."[51] Indeed, Kay suggests that, while the "primary reason for NATO's founding was the Soviet challenge in Eastern Europe," this fact was "insufficient to understanding why the states chose the particular institutional form that emerged in April 1949." "The negotiators," he says, "recognized that if a peacetime alliance were to withstand the ebbs and flows of the Cold War, it would have to reflect a broader purpose than collective defense."[52]

In the post-Cold War era, perhaps no one has articulated more forcefully and more eloquently the notion that NATO's identity and its purpose are ultimately rooted in its members'

shared democratic values than former Czech President Vaclav Havel. NATO, Havel wrote in 1997 "should urgently remind itself that it is first and foremost an instrument of democracy intended to defend mutually held and created political and spiritual values. It must see itself not as a pact of nations against a more or less obvious enemy but as a guarantor of Euro-American civilization."[53] Though coming from a very different perspective, Samuel Huntington has also characterized NATO as an alliance of "Western civilization." Indeed, he suggests that the perceived need to enlarge NATO at the end of the Cold War was at least partially responsible for the discussion that ensued regarding the nature of the West and a "renewed recognition that such a reality had existed."[54]

Without question, however, NATO's political identity has long been viewed as subordinate to its military dimension. One of the challenges, Nicholas Sherwen wrote in 1990, was "to correct the public image of an Organization which has been, from the very outset, a political tool created for a political purpose enshrined in a political treaty." "Current references for the need to become 'more political,' he argued, "express only half a truth. The fact is that throughout the post war years, the Alliance has been distracted from its underlying political purpose by the paramount need to contain the implicit threat of a militarily unstable imbalance of forces which, as Moscow now admits, could not but give the NATO Allies legitimate concerns regarding Soviet intentions."[55]

The Integration of Western Europe

Scholars, diplomats, and military leaders have also stressed that NATO's original purpose was always multi-dimensional. Perhaps no expression of the various tasks for which NATO was created has been quoted more than that of Lord Ismay, NATO's first secretary general, who bluntly stated that NATO was designed "to keep the Russians out, the Americans in, and the Germans down." Keeping the Germans down meant the political and economic integration of Germany—at least the western portion—into Western Europe, underpinned by U.S. military power. As Lt. General William Odom explained it in testimony before the U.S. House of Representatives' Commission on International Relations in 1996:

> We set up NATO for a set of rationales best articulated by Robert Schuman and Jean Monnet, the conceivers, the architects of European economic integration. They realized that Germany was the problem and that quarrels among the Germans, the British, and the French would prevent cooperation and rapid reconstruction after the war. They knew they needed a substitute for a supra-national authority there, and they asked the United States to provide it in the form of our military political presence in NATO, and we did.[56]

NATO, David Yost has also observed, "furnished the security framework of reassurance within Western Europe for political and economic integration."[57]

Importantly, however, European integration rested on the principles enshrined in the preamble to the 1949 Washington Treaty: "democracy, individual liberty, and the rule of law." Indeed, the treaty itself suggested that the Allies intended not only to safeguard their shared values, but also to promote them as a foundation for peace and stability amongst themselves. In Article 2, they explicitly recognized the importance of developing NATO's political dimension with a pledge to "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 on which these institutions are founded, and by promoting conditions of stability and well-being." They also agreed that they would "seek to eliminate conflict in their international economic policies and encourage economic collaboration between any or all of them."[58]

Indeed, Kay notes that, from the beginning, NATO was tasked with strengthening and expanding "an international community based on democratic principles, individual liberty, and the rule of law in the context of a peaceful international society." Yet another task was "to build institutional structures to aid the completion of these goals."[59] Yost too emphasizes that "from the outset," NATO was about more than collective defense. "The Allies repeatedly declared their interest in pursuing positive political change in Europe while avoiding war" he observes, citing as just one example the 1967 Harmel Report, which committed NATO to pursuing detente with the Soviet bloc as well as maintaining its traditional role of military defense.[60]   The report's authors claimed that adopting this essentially political function would allow NATO "to pursue the search for progress towards a more stable relationship in which the underlying political issues [could] be solved."[61]

Though certainly among the better known statements of NATO's political strategy, the Harmel Report was hardly the Allies' only attempt to fulfill their Article 2 pledges and strengthen NATO's sense of political community. In 1956, the Allies had named the Committee of Three to advise the North Atlantic Council (NAC) on ways to improve NATO cooperation in non-military fields and to "develop greater unity within the Atlantic Community."[62] NATO also convened an Atlantic Convention in 1962, which was attended by citizens of NATO countries. As Jamie Shea has observed, these delegates, who were tasked with making recommendations as to means of achieving closer cooperation and fostering a "true Atlantic community," "urgently request[ed]" that their governments "reinforce and develop the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation as a political centre."[63] NATO's new Strategic Concept issued in 1999 also explicitly recognizes the continuity of NATO's underlying political mission. "NATO's essential and enduring purpose, set out in the Washington Treaty," it declares "is to safeguard the freedom and security of all it members by political and military means. Based on common values of democracy, human rights and the rule of law, the Alliance has striven since its inception to secure a just and lasting peaceful order in Europe."[64]

Re-thinking Security after the Cold War

As suggested above, post-Cold War predictions regarding NATO's future were influenced by theoretical assumptions regarding the causes of war and peace in Europe. Whereas Mearsheimer, attributed Cold War stability to the "distribution and character of military power,"[65] former President Bush—although usually tagged as a realist—embraced at least rhetorically, along with his successor, the notion of the "democratic peace." From this perspective, stability had never been purely a function of military power. Rather, the liberal democratic values NATO had pledged to uphold were also key to the unprecedented stability that developed in Western Europe. This assumption was central to the new European security architecture envisioned by both presidents and NATO's role in it. NATO needed to be preserved, both because it was essential to maintaining the transatlantic link, and because it embodied the values on which the European security order was now to be based. As then U.S. Assistant Secretary of State for European and Canadian Affairs Richard Holbrooke put it in 1995 with specific reference to Central Europe. "For the first time in history, the nations of this region

have the chance simultaneously to enjoy stability, freedom, and independence based on another first: the adoption of Western democratic ideals as a common foundation for all of Europe." Implying that NATO could support the growth of these values to its east, he further stated: "Expansion of NATO is a logical and essential consequence of the disappearance of the Iron Curtain and the need to widen European unity based on shared democratic values."[66]

Holbrooke's case for enlargement presumed that NATO had succeeded in helping to integrate Western Europe and that its success rested ultimately on the shared democratic values of the Allies. Responding to proponents of enlargement who focused, not so much on central and eastern Europe's fledgling democracies, but rather the possibility of a resurgent Russia, Odom also linked the case for enlargement to NATO's original political role and values. In his words:

> A much better argument for NATO's expansion is found in its inception: the concern of its proponents with internal political and economic affairs in Western Europe. While their national motives were at odds—Germany seeking early independence, France seeking to prevent a new German military threat—leaders in both countries realized that a U.S. military presence within an Atlantic alliance structure would create the security and political context for economic recovery and the building of new interstate relations. To play its role, the United States had not only to be a military hegemon; it also had to bring its political ideology to Europe. A purely realist American approach to NATO would have failed.[67]

While Mearsheimer and other realists argued that the end to the bi-polar balance of power on the European continent would "increase markedly" the "prospects for major crises and war in Europe[68]," liberal theorists argued that "peace and cooperation among the OECD nations [was] likely to be sustained, since they are not based on the power structure of the international system, but on the democratic domestic orders of these states." As stated by Risse-Kappen, "the liberal countervision for the post-cold war world expects a community of democratic nations with highly institutionalized and interdependent relationships from San Francisco to Berlin, Vladivokstok, and Tokyo."[69]

If NATO did indeed constitute a political entity that preceded the Cold War, with political tasks at least equally important to its military component, the dissolution of the Soviet threat destroyed neither that political community or what had always been NATO's principal political mission: the defense of the democratic values that were central to the way in which the individual Allies conceived their interests. Indeed, former NATO Secretary General Javier Solana insisted in 1999: "What unites us are shared interests, not shared threats. This is why the alliance has remained so strong beyond the end of the Cold War."[70] Supporting this claim, a 1998 U.S. Congressional Research Service report on NATO's evolving role asserted that NATO's "survival beyond the end of the Cold War suggests that its value foundation remains an important part of the glue that hold the Alliance together and attracts new members."[71]

Indeed, liberals argue that a state's values affect its identity, which in turn influences how it defines its interests and interacts with others.[72] Constructivist theorists go even further than some liberals in arguing that states' interests are not wholly material but can be shaped or, as Alexander Wendt has argued, actually constituted by ideas.[73] As John Gerard Ruggie explains, social constructivists—unlike neorealists who tend to believe that states' interests and identities are given and fixed—"argue and have shown that even identities are generated in part by international interaction."[74] Indeed, to some degree NATO's new mission appears to be

premised on constructivist assumptions that states' interactions with each other are governed in part by perceptions of shared identity and that these shared identities are based, at least in part on values or ideas.

Moving Beyond State-Centric Conceptions of Security

Notably, NATO's post-Cold War transformation has coincided with the emergence of so-called global norms of democracy and human rights. These new norms have lent themselves to a conception of security that is less predicated on the inviolability of borders principle than traditional state-centric conceptions of security and therefore more tolerant of military intervention on humanitarian grounds. Declaring that the sovereignty of states "must no longer be used as a shield for gross violations of human rights," U.N. Secretary General Kofi Annan has urged the U.N. Security Council to reach consensus on the principle that "massive and systemic violations of human rights" must not go unchecked. A greater awareness of the "sanctity and dignity of every human life," he argues, will require that we "look beyond the framework of states." In response to that challenge, the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty issued a report in December 2001 which frames the notion of a "right to intervene" in the alternative language of a "responsibility to protect." State sovereignty, the commissioners concluded, "implies responsibility, and the primary responsibility for the protection of its people lies with the state itself." However, in situations in which the state is unable or unwilling to meet this obligation, "the principle of non-intervention yields to the international responsibility to protect."[75]

Fueling this trend toward greater concern for individual rights and a less state-centric conception of sovereignty, is the fact that the vast majority of post-Cold War conflicts have been internal conflicts, arising from ethnic and religious rivalries, territorial disputes, economic difficulties, human rights abuse and the collapse of governments. As Jessica Tuchman Mathews observes these new threats to stability have also "fed a growing sense that individuals' security may not in fact reliably derive from their nation's security. A growing concern with this apparent disconnect between the fate of human beings and the security of the state has given rise to an alternative perspective for thinking about security, labeled "human security" which focuses primarily on the safety, basic needs, and rights of individuals rather than the survival of the state. Lending support to this alternative view, Richard Falk also writes:

> Security can no longer be simply defined in a purely statist context. Human factors must be considered: the right to freedom from fear, for example, and the satisfaction of basic survival needs. One must consider the conditions of domestic political order that shape attitudes toward war in foreign policy, and the role of international institutions (specifying limits on the permissible, and most recently, the demographic, environmental, and resource dimensions of sustainable development). International security becomes, then a synonym for whatever is valued in international life.[76]

In the eyes of some commentators, NATO's post-Cold War transformation reflects and reinforces the human security perspective. Indeed, following NATO's intervention in Kosovo in 1999 scholars argued that NATO had unilaterally challenged the UN Charter, traditionally read to prohibit influence in other states' internal affairs, while advancing in its place a new norm in favor of humanitarian intervention.[77] This study explores both how NATO has itself been

influenced by these evolving new norms and ways in which it might also be furthering them.

Indeed, one might ask whether NATO is effectively serving as what Martha Finnemore and Kathryn Sikkink have labeled a norm entrepreneur. Norm entrepreneurs, according to Sikkink and Finnemore, are those who "attempt to convince a critical mass of states (norm leaders) to embrace new norms."[78] NATO might not have been pushing any particular normative agenda in Kosovo, but it has clearly identified a particular set of norms on which to ground European security and which the aspirants must embrace if they hope to claim membership in NATO. This also begs the question of whether the democratic norms that NATO has promoted are themselves the source of its appeal and therefore a manifestation of what Joseph Nye has termed "soft power." Indeed, Nye and Robert Keohane have argued that soft power is "relative to norms: it is those actors who conform to widely admired norms that will gain influence as a result."[79]

The Realist Critique

The realist critique of NATO's post-Cold War transformation, however, tends to reject any link between NATO's values and its interests. In fact, Mandelbaum argued that NATO's intervention in Kosovo was a "failure" because "NATO waged the war not for its interests but on behalf of its values." For Mandelbaum and others the war served only to jeopardize two interests they deemed far more important: namely, U.S. relations with Russia and China.[80]

Moreover, many realists have expressed considerable skepticism regarding NATO's capacity for democracy promotion. As Mandelbaum stated it: "NATO is not only not the most effective instrument for promoting democracy, it is not in essence an organization for doing so. Rather it is a military alliance, an association of some sovereign states directed against others. The 'other' in this case is Russia."[81] Indeed, Mandelbaum and other realist scholars concluded early on that NATO enlargement was essentially irrelevant to democratization in central and eastern Europe.[82] NATO has little influence over the process because, in the words of Christopher Layne, democratic reforms are "internally not externally driven."[83] Rather, they argued that NATO enlargement would serve to undermine democracy in Russia by bolstering undemocratic forces there. Indeed, George Kennan went so far as to call the decision to expand NATO the "most fateful error of American foreign policy in the entire post-cold war era," partly due to its potential to "inflame nationalistic, anti-Western and militaristic tendencies in Russian opinion."[84] One puzzling aspect of this argument is the notion that NATO decisions would have little influence on the process of democratization in central and eastern Europe but a considerable impact on the process of democratization in Russia. Reform in the first instance apparently hinges on purely internal factors, while in the latter it depends heavily on external factors.

Criticisms of the notion that NATO constitutes a viable vehicle for the promotion of democracy can be divided into three primary strands. The first focuses on NATO enlargement and argues that it is simply not essential to the democratization of central and eastern Europe. This process has been driven by factors other than NATO, so it would occur even in the absence of enlargement. Indeed, Mandelbaum argued prior to the first round of enlargement that democracy in the three states that received invitations to join the alliance at Madrid (Poland, the Czech Republic, and Hungary) was "virtually guaranteed" even without NATO membership.[85] Therefore, NATO membership was being offered to those states that did not need it rather than to the states further to the east where democracy was shakier.[86] Similarly, Dan Reiter argued in an article published in *International Security* in 2001 that in the cases of Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic, NATO did not speed the democratization process "because their societies

and their elites were committed to democracy anyway." All three had established competitive electoral systems and held free elections in 1990, long before the "NATO carrot was dangled before them." He too therefore concludes that "NATO membership was not necessary for democratization."[87]

Secondly, critics argue that NATO has played little or no role in the regional cooperation and reconciliation that have occurred in Central and Eastern Europe. Plenty of other incentives existed to encourage the states of the region to patch up their differences with one another. Although the Clinton administration and enlargement supporters made frequent reference to various regional agreements resolving ethnic and border disputes throughout central and eastern Europe as evidence of NATO's influence, Reiter rejects this argument and points to other cases in the region in which he claims agreements were not reached.[88]

Finally, NATO's skeptics look to NATO's Cold War record in the area of democracy promotion and judge it to be poor. They commonly point out that Turkey, Spain, Portugal, and Greece all experienced periods of undemocratic rule and manifested poor human rights records subsequent to becoming NATO members. Yet, at no point were these states ever threatened with the loss of their membership.[89] Citing the above four cases, Reiter writes: "Overall, the cases provide almost no evidence that NATO membership significantly promoted democracy: The transgovernmental effects on civil-military relations were uneven, the stick of NATO ejection was never applied to members that reverted to autocracy, and in the instance of NATO entry there is no evidence of the NATO carrot spurring democratization."[90] Hence, there is little reason to be optimistic about the Alliance's capacity to promote democracy and respect for human rights today. Indeed, both Layne and Mandelbaum have argued that the fact that all current NATO members are democracies has little to do with their membership in the Alliance.[91]

Conclusion

In sum, those skeptical of NATO's ability to survive the end of the Cold War and assist in the construction of a Europe whole and free have tended to see the Alliance as primarily a military organization with insufficient shared interests to sustain it in the wake of the Soviet collapse. Shared values do not necessarily make for shared interests. Moreover, the skeptics see little reason to believe that NATO has the capacity to promote those values outside its territory. To the extent that democracy has taken hold in central and eastern Europe, it has been encouraged by factors other than NATO membership.

NATO optimists, on the other hand, tend to view NATO as an institution whose political dimension is and always has been of at least equal importance with its military component. Where the skeptics see a hollow shell of an alliance looking for new missions, the optimists see an alliance with one constant mission: the promotion of democratic values as a cornerstone of security in Europe. That mission did not end with the Cold War. Rather, the collapse of the Soviet Union brought with it new opportunities for extending NATO's values throughout the whole of Europe. Moreover, trends in international security since the end of the Cold War render it increasingly difficult for the Allies to ignore human rights abuse and other internal crises outside their territory. These trends are no longer peripheral to thinking about security. In an era of increasingly permeable state borders, they are increasingly at the root of the security challenges confronting the Allies today.

Chapter Three: A Value-Based Approach to Building Security

"Security in the 21st century," former NATO Secretary General Javier Solana wrote in the fall of 1999 is what we make of it."[92] Indeed, during the 1990s NATO's enhanced political dimension and its new mission of a Europe "whole and free" reflected an understanding of security that came to rest as much on the rights of the individual as it does on the right of sovereignty traditionally enjoyed by states. Although NATO remains committed to the collective defense of its territory, this new concept of security is less state-centric, less deferential to the Westphalian principle of non-intervention, and dependent to a considerable degree on the triumph of liberal democratic values. NATO's transformation since the end of the Cold War has, in fact, been shaped by a profound faith in the notion that genuine peace must be grounded on shared democratic values, especially respect for individual rights. Ultimately, all of the Alliance's new ventures—including its peacekeeping missions in the Balkans, its new partnerships, and the decision to admit new members—are aimed at advancing the democratic values NATO safeguarded during the Cold War as norms that should govern the whole of Europe. "Security policy, like any policy," Solana counseled in 1999, "must be value based."[93]

While NATO's post-Cold War transformation and the conception of security driving it were substantially influenced by NATO's internal experiences during the Cold War—above, all the Allies' success in establishing peace with one another—external developments have also played a role. The demise of communism, evolving global norms of democracy and human rights, global markets and information technology have all influenced, or at least reinforced, the conception of security that has guided NATO's transformation. Indeed, NATO's evolution reflects a larger trend as well. Growing numbers of international relations scholars and practitioners conclude that in an age of globalization marked by increasingly permeable state borders, security can no longer be conceived in purely state-centric terms. It must be understood to comprise the fate of the individual as well as that of the state. Not all states secure the rights of their citizens, and those who do not are increasingly regarded as sources of instability, and therefore perhaps no longer owed the traditional presumption of sovereignty.

As will be discussed further in chapter five, the events of September 11th have served to broaden NATO's focus to encompass threats to security stemming from outside of Europe. They also cast light on the fact that NATO was ill-equipped to address terrorism and weapons of mass destruction even though these threats had been recognized by NATO's 1999 Strategic Concept. However, the trend toward a more global NATO, including initiatives adopted during the 2002 Prague Summit aimed at improving NATO's capacity to address new "out of area" threats do not alter the Allies' basic premise emphasized repeatedly during the 1990s, that true peace and stability ultimately depend upon the triumph of liberal democratic values.

Enhancing NATO's Political Dimension

As noted earlier, the realist critique of NATO's transformation tends to reject any presumed link between NATO's values and its interests. However, this critique bears little appreciation for the fact that NATO has from the beginning, understood the values enshrined in its preamble to be central to its mission. NATO's political leaders have long characterized the alliance as a community united not only by a shared enemy, but also by shared values. The dissolution of the Soviet threat therefore did not destroy what had always been NATO's principal political mission: namely the defense of those values that were central to the way in which the

individual allies conceived their interests and to the collective identity of the alliance as a whole.

NATO's success in establishing a zone of peace in Western Europe has led many commentators to suggest that it resembles the "pacific federation" envisioned by Immanuel Kant in *Perpetual Peace*—a community of states that have *established* peace with one another.[94] During the Cold War, this essentially political dimension of the alliance was generally viewed as subordinate to what was commonly perceived to be NATO's real raison d'etre: deterrence of a Soviet attack on Western Europe. After 1989, however, NATO's political dimension came to the fore, partly out of necessity if NATO was to survive the dissolution of the Soviet threat. Equally important, though was a determination by the former Bush administration as early as mid-1989 that enhancing NATO's political dimension constituted a means by which the allies could guide the dramatic changes then sweeping across Europe. NATO, the administration argued, could act as a catalyst for democratic political reform in central and eastern Europe. Democratic values were, in fact, at the heart of the new European security order Bush described during a commencement address at the U.S. Coast Guard Academy on May 24, 1989. In his words:

> It is a growing community of democracies anchoring international peace and
> stability, and a dynamic free-market system generating prosperity and progress on
> a global scale. The economic foundation of this new era is the proven success of
> the free market—and nurturing that foundation are the values rooted in freedom
> and democracy.[95]

The following week in Mainz, Germany, he declared the creation of a Europe "whole and free" to be the "new mission of NATO."[96] Later that year in December, U.S. Secretary of State James Baker also stated in an address to the Berlin Press Club that NATO was working "to build a new security structure for Europe, one in which the military component is reduced and the political one is enhanced." "That," he said, is NATO's first new mission."[97] With the Soviet threat waning, NATO's future depended on emphasizing the alliance's political dimension.

The Bush administration did not, however, suggest that the mission of achieving a Europe "whole and free," was to be NATO's alone. During his Mainz address, Bush had also called on the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) to "promote free elections and political pluralism in Eastern Europe" as a means of encouraging further political reform in the region.[98] Meeting in Brussels that same month, NATO heads of state, had also stated their intention to develop the CSCE process further "in all its dimensions, and to make the fullest use of it" in an effort to "bring all Eastern countries to enshrine in law and practice the human rights and freedoms agreed in international covenants and in the CSCE documents, thus fostering progress towards the rule of law."[99]

Although little progress was made in this direction in 1989, by June 1990 when CSCE members met in Copenhagen, revolution had swept across Europe bringing with it far-reaching democratic reforms. CSCE member states now unanimously adopted the Bush administration's earlier proposal calling for free elections and political pluralism and declared their commitment "to build democratic societies based on free elections and the rule of law." Pluralistic democracy and the rule of law, they agreed, were "essential for ensuring respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms."[100] As Thomas Buergenthal has observed, the Copenhagen conference constituted an important step in moving CSCE beyond the practice of merely protesting human rights violations toward a concerted effort to create the democratic institutions that would best ensure respect for human rights.[101]

At a second summit in Paris in November 1990, CSCE members reaffirmed their intention "to build, consolidate, and strengthen democracy as the only system of government of [their] nations."[102] Evoking the premise of the initial CSCE agreement signed at Helsinki in 1975, the Charter of Paris for a New Europe recognized the inalienability of "human rights and fundamental freedoms" and declared that "their observance and full exercise are the foundations of freedom, justice and peace."[103] In order to facilitate the democracy promotion activities consistent with this new commitment, CSCE subsequently established several new institutions, including an Office for Free Elections in Warsaw—later renamed the Office of Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR).

In short, shared democratic values, not territory or the balance of power, were the foundation of the security order envisioned by the Charter of Paris. As former U.S. Ambassador to NATO Robert Hunter observed, the conception of security underpinning this new order differed appreciably from that associated with earlier balance of power experiments:

> For the first time, Europe has a chance to found continent-wide security on a basis other than the balance of power with its associated risk of a catastrophic clash of arms. This experiment centers on an attempt to move Eastward one of the most thrilling achievements of the past half century: the abolition of war itself, among the states of Western Europe."[104]

The security order envisioned by the Charter of Paris differed from previous orders in at least one other important respect as well. As Timothy Garton Ash has noted, it "explicitly legitimated the interest of participating states in each other's internal affairs."[105]

NATO's new Strategic Concept agreed to in Rome in November 1991 affirmed the Alliance's role in the construction of this new order. The first of four fundamental security tasks NATO set for itself was "to provide one of the indispensable foundations for a stable security environment in Europe, based on the growth of democratic institutions and commitment to the peaceful resolution of disputes."[106] The 1991 Strategic Concept also observed that radical changes in Europe's security situation ensured that "the opportunities for achieving Alliance objectives through political means [were] greater than ever." At the same time, the Allies acknowledged that they now faced a more diverse array of security challenges, including instabilities arising from ethnic rivalries, territorial disputes, and other economic, social and political troubles, which ultimately jeopardized NATO's vision of a Europe "whole and free." Seeking to address these new threats, the alliance declared its intention to broaden security policy to include "dialogue" and "cooperation" in addition to the "maintenance of a collective defence capability."

The NATO allies also took an additional step toward operationalizing the CSCE process in June 1992 when they agreed in Oslo "to support, on a case-by-case basis...peacekeeping activities under the responsibility of the CSCE." Making explicit reference to the initiatives they had taken since 1990 to "reinforce the CSCE and its ability to contribute to a Europe in which changes takes place in conformity with CSCE principles," the Allies argued that strengthening "the means available to the CSCE for conflict prevention and crisis management" would be essential to maintaining "peace and prosperity" in Europe.[107] The significance of this decision as Rob de Wijk has noted, was that CSCE could now "evolve from an institution which only determined norms and standards of behavior of the participating states into a more operational organisation."[108] Six months later, NATO also agreed to support "on a case-by-case basis," peacekeeping operations authorized by the UN Security Council.[109] These 1992 decisions

marked the beginning of an evolutionary process within NATO, culminating in the adoption of a second new Strategic Concept in 1999, which formally added conflict prevention and peacekeeping activities to NATO's military mission. The Allies' assumption of peacekeeping responsibilities represented a broadening of NATO's military missions but it also reflected a growing conviction among them that their own security was "inseparably linked to that of all other states in Europe."[110] Both NATO's 1991 and 1999 Strategic Concepts also observed the need for a broader approach to security, given the altered strategic environment. As stated in the 1999 Strategic Concept: "The Alliance is committed to a broad approach to security, which recognises the importance of political, economic, social and environmental factors in addition to the indispensable defence dimension."[111]

Enlarging NATO

The decision to enhance NATO's political dimension and increasingly cast security in terms of shared values would have important implications, both for the size of the alliance and for its military and non-military missions. Building security across Europe effectively meant enlarging the community of states that embraced NATO values. One means of achieving that goal became enlargement of the alliance itself.

In his own study of NATO enlargement, James Goldgeier suggests that a number of "compelling problems" in the early 1990s opened the window for enlargement, including a general concern about instability in central and Eastern Europe. In the United States, the need to put forward a new strategy to replace containment had led then national security adviser Anthony Lake during a speech at Johns Hopkins University in 1993 to articulate a strategy of "enlargement"—"enlargement of the world's free community of market democracies."[112] "The central and eastern Europe region, located adjacent to the transatlantic community and showing prospects for success," Goldgeier observes, "was a perfect place to demonstrate that the administration could implement its vision."[113]

Indeed, the Clinton administration's 1994 announcement that it would support the enlargement of NATO can be understood as an extension of the President's desire to place democracy promotion at the center of his foreign policy. Opening NATO's door to new members, Clinton administration officials consistently argued, constituted one means by which NATO could extend eastward the values and practices that had helped to stabilize Western Europe. NATO enlargement represented "one part of a much broader, post-Cold War strategy to help create a peaceful, undivided and democratic Europe."[114] Moreover, the administration argued that, while other European institutions, including the European Union and the OSCE had important roles to play in the achievement of this goal, NATO's role was vital. "Only NATO," Clinton asserted during the Allies' 1994 summit in Brussels, "has the military forces, the integrated command, the broad legitimacy and habits of cooperation that are essential to draw in new participants and respond to new challenges."[115]

Although NATO has published no specific membership criteria, it did release an internal study on enlargement in September 1995, which notified prospective members that only those states which demonstrated a commitment to democratic values and practices would be considered for membership. This would include resolving ethnic and external territorial disputes by peaceful means and establishing "appropriate democratic and civilian control of their defense forces."[116]
The study concluded that enlargement of the alliance could enhance security and stability in Europe by "encouraging and supporting democratic reforms," fostering in new members

"patterns and habits of cooperation and consultation and consensus-building," and "promoting good neighborly relations."

During its April 1999 summit in Washington, NATO again asserted that new members were expected to "enhance overall security and stability in Europe."[117] This meant that aspirants were required to demonstrate that they could produce security by peacefully resolving conflicts with neighbors, embracing liberal democratic principles, including respect for minority rights, and working toward meeting all NATO military obligations. Former NATO Secretary General Willy Claes had, in fact said of the enlargement process in 1996: "We do not need security consumers," but rather states who can bear the full responsibility of membership. An anonymous NATO official put it more bluntly: "We don't need any more Frances, Spains, Greeces, or Turkeys.[118]

Partnership and Cooperative Security

The tools with which NATO has sought to construct Europe whole and free have not been limited to enlargement, however.   Indeed, beginning in the early 1990s, NATO committed itself to the construction of a security community that extends well beyond its borders—"a common security space from Vancouver to Vladivostok." Based on the premise that "no single transatlantic institution meets the varied security requirements of North America and all of Europe," the Allies also stressed the need for "partnership" with states and institutions outside of or overlapping NATO's borders.[119]

The EACP, which began as the NACC and was renamed in 1997 was designed as a forum for political consultation and practical cooperation on security issues. Originally open to all former Warsaw Pact members, the EAPC now encompasses virtually the entire OSCE area, including the traditionally neutral states of Austria, Finland, Ireland, Sweden, and Switzerland. Its membership essentially parallels that of PfP, which was created in 1994 to "expand and intensify political and military cooperation throughout Europe."   While PfP was initially viewed as a substitute for enlargement of NATO itself, it also grew out of a recognition that true cooperation with NATO's former adversaries required more than just the dialogue facilitated by what was then the NACC.   NATO enhanced the political dimension of PfP in 1997 through the creation of a political-military framework for NATO-led PfP operations, a step intended to allow partners to play a more active political and military role in the planning and execution of non-Article 5 crisis response operations.

By providing opportunities for political and military cooperation with NATO, PfP serves to blur the line between NATO and non-NATO members. NATO "Partnerships" with Russia, Ukraine, and six Mediterranean states (Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Mauritania, Morocco, and Tunisia) through the Mediterranean Dialogue are also part of a broader effort to erase divisions in Europe and construct a security order that encompasses the entire Euro-Atlantic area and beyond. NATO's emphasis on these partnerships highlights the extent to which the Allies understand security today as necessarily a cooperative endeavor, requiring dialogue and cooperation among states and other institutions, including the OSCE and the European Union, as well as the United Nations.   According to the 1999 Strategic Concept, NATO's "aim is to build a European security architecture in which the Alliance's contribution to the security and stability of the Euro-Atlantic area and the contribution of these other international organisations are complementary and mutually reinforcing, both in deepening relations among Euro-Atlantic countries and in managing crises."[120]

Importantly, the advancement of democratic values is also a stated goal of virtually all of

NATO's partnerships. The Partnership for Peace Framework Document, for example, declares the "protection and promotion of fundamental freedoms and human rights" to be "shared values fundamental to the Partnership," and partners are expected to reaffirm their obligations under the U.N. Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Helsinki Final Act, and all subsequent CSCE documents.[121] PfP's objectives also include the achievement of transparency in national defense planning and budgeting processes and the consolidation of democratic control over defense forces. Indeed, PfP, along with the enlargement process, constitutes an important tool for achieving a security order grounded on liberal democratic values. As former U.S. Ambassador to NATO Robert Hunter put it: " Both the Partnership and NATO's expansion are part of a grand experiment that has no precedent in a thousand years of trying to create something better than the balance of power. We are doing nothing less than trying to extend the European Civil Space eastward—one cautious step after another."[122]

Even within the context of NATO's relationships with Russia and the Ukraine, the advancement of democracy is an explicitly stated objective. The NATO-Russia Founding Act adopted in 1997 states that "NATO and Russia will work together to contribute to the establishment of common and comprehensive security based on the allegiance to shared values, commitments and norms of behavior in the interests of all states."[123] Although the desire to advance democratic values was certainly not the driving force behind either of these relationships, this should not detract from the fact they exist in the context of a definition of security that is ultimately value-based.[124] Indeed, according to one NATO official well-versed in the NATO-Ukraine agreements, democracy promotion is a "defacto reality" within the context of the relationship "simply because of the way in which NATO defines security and because all NATO members stress Alliance values in their interactions with Ukraine."[125]

Importantly, however, these partnership efforts amount to much more than a one-way effort on NATO's part to influence the domestic and foreign policy practices of other states. In reality, NATO's partners have not only trained with NATO forces; they have also participated in significant numbers in NATO's peacekeeping missions in the Balkans, Afghanistan, and most recently Iraq. Even Russia and Ukraine contributed forces to NATO's KFOR mission in Kosovo. Given these contributions, partners have also demanded a greater say in Alliance decision-making, which NATO has attempted to accommodate to some degree. Additionally, EAPC/PfP members have reached out to assist each other in a variety of ways. For example, the Baltic states—among NATO's newest invitees—have already indicated their willingness to share their reform experience with Georgia as it too makes a bid for NATO membership. NATO has encouraged precisely this sort of regional cooperation as a demonstration of partners' ability to produce rather than simply consume security. During the Prague Summit, NATO also moved to intensify practical cooperation within the EAPC, beginning with the Partnership Action Plan against Terrorism. The Plan constitutes "the first issue-specific" mechanism for co-operation between NATO and its partners and outlines specific actions to be taken in the effort to combat terrorism.[126]

An Integrated Political, Economic, and Social Space

The common security space NATO seeks to achieve with its partners is also characterized by economic and social integration. During the 1999 Washington Summit, the Allies pledged to "contribute to building a strong and broader Euro-Atlantic community of democracies—a community where human rights and fundamental freedoms are upheld, where borders are increasingly open to people, ideas and commerce, where war becomes

unthinkable."[127]   Enlargement and partnership might constitute means of enlarging the "pacific federation," but NATO also sees itself at the core of a growing cosmopolitan society, much like that envisioned by Kant, which would also serve to facilitate cooperation and, ultimately, support the security community NATO seeks to create. Promoting such a society does not constitute a new objective for NATO. From the beginning, NATO sought to provide the basic military security necessary to support economic recovery and ultimately the establishment of a liberal economic order in Western Europe. NATO also deliberately cultivated a "social dimension" within the Alliance as early as 1969 when it established the Committee on the Challenges of Modern Society (CCMS) to address shared environmental concerns by combining the expertise and technology of member countries.[128] NATO opened the committee to participation by members of the NACC beginning in 1992 as part of its effort to promote cooperation and integration with non-NATO members. Much more recently, participation in CCMS activities has been opened to the members of the Mediterranean Dialogue.   In short, NATO appears to have long recognized that integration of the broader Euro-Atlantic area on multiple levels is essential to achieving both political and military goals. As John Gerard Ruggie has observed, Karl Deutsch and colleagues concluded in 1957 that purely military alliances constituted "a relatively poor pathway" toward integrated security communities unless they were—to borrow Ruggie's phrase—"embedded in a broader process of political, economic, and social integration."[129]

Today, globalization in the form of global markets and information technology is assisting the integration process by facilitating not only the exchange of goods, but also the exchange of ideas at both the state and societal levels. This latter exchange is crucial to building security as understood by the new NATO. Ultimately, NATO envisions a common security space extending beyond NATO's borders, which is facilitated by dialogue, cooperation and partnership and grounded on shared values. Indeed, the importance of democratic values to this vision should not be understated. As the Allies put it during the 1999 Washington Summit, they understood NATO to be"an essential pillar of a wider community of shared values and shared responsibility" and pledged to intensify "contacts and co-operation with other international organisations with a role to play in consolidating democracy and preserving peace in the Euro-Atlantic area."[130]

It should also be remembered that, as early as May 1989, President Bush expressed the need to embed NATO in a larger community of shared values in calling upon CSCE to accept responsibility for encouraging free elections and respect for human rights in central and eastern Europe. Since then, the organization has, like NATO, undergone an internal transformation allowing it to play an important role in, not only articulating, but also helping to implement norms of democracy and human rights in the entire Euro-Atlantic community. Indeed, the Charter for European Security agreed to by OSCE members in Istanbul in 1999 opens with the declaration of a "firm commitment to a free, democratic, and more integrated OSCE area where participating States are at peace with each other, and individuals and communities live in freedom, prosperity and security."[131]

Linking Security to Democracy and Human Rights

At the core of the values on which NATO's post-Cold War conception of security is founded are the rights of the individual. Although the defense of democracy and individual liberty has always been fundamental to NATO's mission, concern for individual rights is playing an increasingly prominent role in NATO's conception of security and, consequently, its military

activities.   The prominence of human rights in NATO's security agenda derives from a variety of factors, one of which has to do with the nature of threats confronting NATO in the post-Cold War era. Both the 1991 and 1999 Strategic Concepts note that security threats are now "less likely to result from calculated aggression against the territory of the Allies" and more likely to stem from instabilities precipitated by ethnic and religious rivalries, territorial disputes, failed reform efforts, human rights abuse, and the dissolution of states.   Indeed, the vast majority of armed conflicts since the end of the Cold War have been intra-state rather than inter-state conflicts.   NATO now also counts such transnational threats as drug trafficking, organized crime, terrorism, environmental decline, and weapons of mass destruction among its chief security concerns. Similarly, the OSCE's 1999 Istanbul Charter recognizes that threats to security "can stem from conflicts within states as well as from conflicts between states" and that these conflicts "have often resulted from flagrant violations of OSCE norms and principles."[132] In fact, Vaclav Havel expressed considerable concern in the early 1990s about the potential for ethnic or nationalist conflicts such as that unfolding in Bosnia, to spread given the presence of a security vacuum in central and eastern Europe. "If the West does not stabilize the East," he warned, "the East will destabilize the West."[133]

Many post-Cold War era conflicts have, in fact, been driven by political rather than military threats, often involving disregard for or blatant violations of individual and minority rights.[134] As noted earlier, growing concern with this apparent disconnect between the fate of individual human beings and the security of the state has given rise to an alternative perspective for thinking about security labeled 'human security."[135]   According to former Canadian Foreign Minister Lloyd Axworthy, human security 'establishes a new 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?'[136] Axworthy also points to NATO's intervention in Kosovo in 1999 as 'a concrete expression of this human security dynamic at work'.[137]   In the midst of that intervention the Allies had, in fact, declared that they "remained determined to stand firm" against those "who violate human rights" as well as those who "wage war and conquer territory."[138]   Similarly, the U.S. Department of Defense's transatlantic security strategy, released in December 2000, recognized the link between individual rights and security in Europe quite explicitly:

> Our abiding commitment to human rights and democracy is not only the right
> thing to do, it is also in our own best interests. Grave violations of human rights,
> in the Balkans or elsewhere, challenge our values and our security. The security
> of the Euro-Atlantic Community must spring from the consent of free peoples and
> must be built upon shared purposes and values that can be defended when the
> need arises.[139]

Simply put, the rights of the individual cannot be divorced from security as conceived by the 'new NATO'.   As Richard Cohen has observed, human security—or what he terms "individual security"—"stands at the center of any real international security system built around liberal democratic ideals."[140]   Indeed, the need to further adapt and enhance NATO's capacity to address internal conflicts also led the Allies to formally add peacekeeping and conflict prevention to its military mission through the 1999 Strategic Concept.

The Impact of Globalization

The increased permeability of state borders and the heightened public awareness fostered by modern-day communications technology also make it virtually impossible in practice to separate values from basic security interests as realists have long prescribed
Coupled with the nature of conflict in the post-Cold War era, the effects of globalization have only served to reinforce the view that egregious human rights violations in any given state have potential implications for the system as a whole. Speaking before the Chicago Economic Club in April 1999, British Prime Minister Tony Blair directly linked NATO's intervention in Kosovo to the phenomenon of globalization.

> Twenty years ago we would not have been fighting in Kosovo....The fact that we are engaged is a result of a wide range of changes—the end of the Cold War; changing technology; the spread of democracy. But it is larger than that. I believe the world has changed in a more fundamental way. Globalisation has transformed our economies and our working practices. But globalisation is not just economic. It is also a political and security phenomenon. We live in a world where isolationism has ceased to have a reason to exist. By necessity we have to co-operate with each other across nations...We are all internationalists now, whether we like it or not. We cannot refuse to participate in global markets if we want to prosper. We cannot ignore new political ideas in other countries if we want to innovate. We cannot turn our back on conflicts and the violations of human rights within other countries if we still want to be secure."[141]

As Blair implied, the effects of conflicts deriving from the abuse of human rights are in an increasingly interconnected world rarely confined within any one state. Rather, such conflicts are likely to draw in neighboring states or create refugee crises, which also inevitably affect the surrounding region. Given the prevalence of such conflicts in the 1990s, NATO stood little chance of remaining relevant in the post-Cold War world if it did not adapt its mission and its tools accordingly. As Axworthy observed in a 1998 speech to the OSCE:

> To be sure, the old realities of power persist. Classic interstate conflicts and their consequences remain an unfortunate feature of the global landscape. But let there be no mistake: At the end of the 20th century, the humanitarian agenda is no side show. On the contrary, it is rapidly becoming the main event of global affairs.[142]

Importantly, NATO's new military missions and its willingness to abridge state sovereignty in the name of human rights should not be interpreted to suggest that security defined in terms of the state is no longer important. Indeed, from a liberal perspective, the state, properly constituted, is essential to the preservation of human rights. However, the conflicts in Bosnia and Kosovo, coupled with the increasing permeability of state borders underscored the view that, not only are the security of the individual and the security of the state not necessarily synonymous, but human rights violations in any given state have at least the potential to threaten the security of the community as a whole. Accordingly, NATO's post-Cold War transformation encompassed the adoption of a broader conception of security than that which guided the Alliance during the Cold War—one that might also be understood as both less state-centric and increasingly value-laden. As Axworthy has suggested, 'security for the new NATO' must be

understood as 'a continuum, comprising both state and individual concerns'.[143]

Emerging Global Norms of Democracy and Human Rights

The end of the Cold War not only fostered a new understanding of security; it also opened up new opportunities for NATO to encourage the growth of democratic values using both political and military means. Certainly, the withdrawal of Soviet forces from Eastern Europe beginning in the late 1980s removed a key obstacle to the use of force in the region, including on behalf of humanitarian objectives. Yet, in many respects the collapse of communism in both Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union was at least equally, if not more, important in shaping NATO's increasingly interventionist agenda. As de Wijk observes of the Cold War period:

> Ideological differences of opinion between the two superpowers constituted the most important obstacle to interventions. Any intervention could, after all, be construed by the other camp as an attempt to increase their sphere of influence and could therefore be interpreted as a *casus belli*. As a result of this there was no legal basis for military interventions in the internal affairs of other countries. Once the ideological differences of opinion had been removed, the former opponents worked together to promote peace and security, which resulted in an enormous increase in the number of peace operations since 1989.[144]

While the end of Cold War did not necessarily produce an international consensus regarding the conditions under which interventions might be deemed permissible, the apparent triumph of democratic ideas in central and eastern Europe as well as parts of Latin America, Africa, and Asia, did prompt many commentators to greet the new era by proclaiming the emergence of global norms of democracy and human rights. Indeed, NATO's increasingly pro-active and value-based approach to security has coincided with a greater willingness over the past decade on the part of governments, international institutions, non-governmental organizations, and scholars to acknowledge a positive relationship between peace and security and the growth of democracy around the globe. As former U.N. Secretary General Boutros Boutros-Ghali put it in his 1996 *Agenda for Democratization*, 'democracy contributes to preserving peace and security, securing justice and human rights, and promoting economic and social development'.[145] Similarly, the OSCE's 1999 Charter for European Security states: 'Peace and security in our region is best guaranteed by the willingness and ability of each participating State to uphold democracy, the rule of law and respect for human rights'.[146] Even more recently, U.N. Secretary General Kofi Annan declared in his Nobel Peace Prize acceptance speech in Oslo that states which "undermine the rule of law and violate the rights of their individual citizens become a menace not only to their own people, but also to their neighbors, and indeed the world. What we need today is better governance—legitimate governance that allows each individual to flourish, and each State to thrive."[147]

Such statements reflect a growing consensus that only democracy can ultimately guarantee respect for human rights. One of the more remarkable expressions of this emerging, albeit far from universal, consensus is the U.N. Human Rights Commission's passage of resolutions in 1999 and 2000 affirming a fundamental link between democracy and human rights and appealing to member states to sustain and expand programs aimed at promoting and consolidating democracy around the globe.[148]

(http://www.state.gov/www/global/human_rights/democracy/9957_unresolution. html) and 'U.S. Applauds Decision by the United Nations Commission on Human Rights to Pass a Resolution on the Right to Democracy', Press Statement by James P. Rubin, Spokesman, April 25, 2000 (http://secretary.state.gov/www/briefings/statements/2000/ps000525.html). Even within the academic and human rights communities, which for many years resisted linking human rights and democracy, this trend became increasingly apparent during the 1990s.[149]

Although the challenge of cultural relativism persists, notions of democracy and human rights once regarded as essentially "Western" ideas are now widely understood to be global norms of responsible state behavior. As Thomas Risse has observed, "states that want to be members of international society 'in good standing' increasingly realize that they have to respect basic human rights and meet some minimum standards of behavior toward their citizens...Dictators can no longer claim 'interference in internal affairs' when confronted with gross violations of human rights. This is a profound change in the principles of international society."[150]

The end of the Cold War certainly facilitated the interest in democracy promotion activities, but the idea that democracy promotion would serve the causes of both human rights and international peace and security was evident in the context of US foreign policy long before the end of the Cold War. Presidents Reagan, Bush, and Clinton all embraced essentially Wilsonian ideas in arguing repeatedly that the United States would be more secure in an international community that shared its values, including a belief in the inalienable rights of the individual. The Reagan administration, in fact, proclaimed a worldwide 'campaign for democracy' as early as 1982, and both Presidents Bush and Clinton subsequently made democracy promotion an important component of their foreign policies.[151] To some extent, it might even be argued that the United States sought to use both NATO and the then CSCE process as vehicles for advancing its own democracy promotion agenda. According to former Clinton State Department official Ronald Asmus, U.S. policy in the 1990s was driven in part by the need to adapt "America's alliances to meet the needs of an increasingly interdependent and globalized world."

> The Clinton administration believed that Europe was America's key partner and NATO its premier alliance. In its view, consolidating democracy and winning the peace in Europe was not only an important strategic interest, but also had broader consequences for American's position around the world. Confident that Europe was secure, the U.S. would be much better off if and when it had to confront other major threats beyond Europe. Achieving a Europe whole and free also made it more likely that America's allies on the continent would now join the U.S. in working together to meet new challenges beyond Europe.[152]

At the same time, NATO's success in establishing peace in western Europe during the Cold War period had lent credence to the notion of the liberal peace and thereby contributed to what might be construed as evolving global norms of democracy and human rights. These emerging norms, in turn, have served to support NATO's efforts to construct a liberal security order and its underlying premise, that human rights are a legitimate concern of international politics. Indeed, an examination of the nexus between NATO's post-Cold War initiatives and the burgeoning popularity of democratic ideas on a global scale reveals an interactive process through which NATO has contributed to the evolution of new global norms, but which has also bolstered the Alliance's efforts to construct a new European security order. As evidenced by

remarks made by Secretary General Robertson in September 2001, NATO has sought to situate its new mission within the context of recent trends. NATO has an "historic" opportunity, Robertson suggested, because its values are "now coming to be shared more broadly across the continent. Democracy has swept across Central, Eastern, and Southern Europe. Market economies are increasingly the norm, rather than the exception. And basic human rights are being protected, both in law and reality. NATO's mission as we enter the 21st century is to nourish that common culture."[153]

Rethinking State Sovereignty

The above trends have also had far-reaching implications for the Westphalian principle of non-intervention, which are reflected in, and have tended to reinforce, NATO's post-Cold War missions. Human rights activists have long regarded the state and the presumption of sovereignty it enjoys to be the primary obstacle to respect for human rights. Yet, despite a number of international human rights agreements, including the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the 1968 U.N. Covenants, not until the late 1970s did human rights truly come to be recognized as a legitimate topic of international politics, and even then, this trend was primarily a Western phenomenon. In recent years, however, growing numbers of scholars and practitioners have begun to challenge the presumptive legitimacy of states. Some have even suggested that states legitimately derive their sovereignty only from the freely expressed consent of their citizens. From this perspective, sovereignty resides ultimately in the individual rather than the state.

As former German Defense Minister Volker Ruhe observed in 1993: "During the Cold War, the policy of non-intervention was an important political principle. Now, however, there is a growing international consensus that suppression of ethnic minorities and violations of human rights within state borders can no longer be tolerated."[154] Similarly, Richard Cohen has argued that "the Westphalian concept of the absolute right of states to act as they see fit within their own territories is no longer accepted by liberal democratic states nor, increasingly, by nations within international organizations such as the United Nations."[155]

Sovereignty, today, is increasingly understood to depend upon a state's ability to implement respect for human rights. Annan expressed this sentiment quite clearly when he told the the U.N. Human Rights Commission during NATO's 1999 bombing of Kosovo:"Emerging slowly, but I believe surely, is an international norm against the violent repression of minorities that will and must take precedence over concerns of sovereignty."[156] Although Annan ultimately expressed concern that NATO's action had occurred in the absence of a Security Council mandate, he also seemed to imply that the international community had a duty, based on UN principles, to act in such cases. "When we read the [UN] charter today," he argued in September 1999, "we are more than ever conscious that its aim is to protect individual human beings, not to protect those who abuse them." Annan acknowledged a division within the international community regarding the practice of humanitarian intervention, but he insisted that this new norm should be "welcome[d]" "because despite all the difficulties of putting it into practice, it does show that humankind today is less willing than in the past to tolerate suffering in its midst, and more willing to do something about it."[157]
Czech President Vaclav Havel delivered an even more impassioned defense of NATO's Kosovo action in an address before the Canadian Parliament.

This war gives human rights precedence over the rights of states. The Federal

Republic of Yugoslavia has been attacked without a direct United Nations mandate for NATO's action; but NATO has not acted out of license, aggressiveness, or disrespect for international law. On the contrary, it has acted out of respect for the law—for the law that ranks higher than the protection of the sovereignty of states. It has acted out of respect for the rights of humanity as they are articulated by our conscience as well as by other instruments of international law."[158]

Although Havel's views were far from universally accepted, including by some NATO members, the Alliance's intervention in Kosovo as well as its larger efforts to construct a value-based security order in Europe do reflect, not only the alliance's own internal transformation, but also the growing prominence of human rights discourse in international politics and a growing recognition that conflict within states can have far-reaching implications for international security. By initiating military action against a sovereign state that had attacked no NATO member, the Alliance had effectively accorded the rights of the Kosovar Albanians primacy over the sovereignty of a rights-abusive, non-democratic state. Such action, Havel seemingly implied, was fully justified on the basis of universal moral principles, even if those principles were not fully codified in international law. The absence of a clear legal basis for NATO's action did prompt many commentators to suggest that the Alliance had unilaterally challenged the U.N. Charter, which has traditionally been read to prohibit interference in other states internal affairs, while advancing in its place a new norm favoring humanitarian intervention.[159] Yet, NATO's intervention in Kosovo should not be characterized as an affront to accepted principles of international politics. The trend over the past half century—and particularly the past decade—has been unmistakably toward a qualified conception of state sovereignty. "Sovereignty," in the words of Robert Keohane and Joseph Nye "is up for grabs in a way that has not been the case since the seventeenth century."[160]

Moreover, the end of the Cold War had inspired considerable hope during the early 1990s that, after years of paralysis, the U.N. would finally be able to respond effectively to a new generation of conflicts.[161] As Stanley Hoffman has observed:

Between 1991 and 1993—from the end of the 1991 Gulf War to the misfortunes of the UN in Somalia and Yugoslavia—a kind of euphoria about collective action for good causes, leading to a new and better world order, built up around what the French champion of humanitarian intervention Bernard Kouchner had called the *droit d'ingerence*—a right to intervene for humanitarian reasons that overrides sovereignty. Traditional interpretations of international law and of the UN Charter that denied the legality of such forcible intrusions were declared obsolete partly because of the new salience of human rights, partly because the newly favored intrusions were presented as collective ones, authorized by the UN, rather than unilateral resorts to force.[162]

The U.N., however, ultimately failed to avert a series of humanitarian tragedies in Somalia, Rwanda, and Bosnia. By 1995, the organization appeared, at best, incompetent in terms of enforcing even its own resolutions. As one member of NATO's international staff suggested, NATO's action's in Kosovo might therefore be viewed as a contribution to an evolving process in favor of intervention, carried out largely because of the U.N.'s inability to act. At the time, no other organization possessed either the will or capacity for a successful operation in Kosovo.[163]

It should be noted though, that with respect to earlier humanitarian crises, NATO members also had a poor track-record, which ultimately appeared to generate some regrets. Indeed, some commentators have suggested that NATO's decision to act in Kosovo must be understood partly as a function of the Allies' own sense of shame for their inaction during earlier crises, especially the war in Bosnia. There, NATO had dragged its feet through nearly four years of bloodshed, even as the Allies unveiled their vision for a Europe "whole and free."[164]

Indeed, NATO justified its intervention in Kosovo largely on the basis of moral rather than legal arguments, although its action was, in the view of some scholars, not in "unambiguous violation of international law." Adam Roberts, for example, has argued that NATO's action was legally justifiable on two primary grounds. The first plank of NATO's defense, he suggests, rested on the requirements of the U.N. Security Council resolutions passed prior to NATO's intervention. In fact, the Security Council had voted unanimously in favor of a series of resolutions, which ultimately declared that the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia had committed gross and systematic violations of human rights against Albanians living in Kosovo and demanded a cessation of these actions.[165] The second part of NATO's legal case, Roberts argues, rests on general international law since 1945. Agreements such as the Geneva Conventions of 1948 and 1949 may be understood to provide grounds for intervention even if it is not explicitly provided for in the treaties themselves. "It cannot be right," says Roberts, "to tolerate acts which violate widely supported legal norms just because the charter does not explicitly provide for military action in such circumstances, or because a veto on the Security Council makes UN-authorised action impossible."[166] Richard Falk has also observed that, while the U.N. failed to endorse NATO's intervention in Kosovo, it also resisted "censuring that intervention, and has even appeared to ratify the outcome by agreeing to play such a pivotal role in the post-war administration of Kosovo." Furthermore, he notes, NATO's "willingness to respond in Kosovo definitely helped build political support for a UN humanitarian peacekeeping mission undertaken immediately thereafter for the sake of the people of East Timor."[167]

Although Robertson later defended the legality of the Kosovo intervention using arguments similar to those presented above, at the time of the intervention NATO members chose to rely primarily on moral and practical arguments to justify their action.[168] As the Allies explicitly recognized in a statement issued during the 1999 Washington summit, the crisis then unfolding in Kosovo represented "a fundamental challenge to the values for which NATO has stood since its foundation."[169] British Prime Minister Tony Blair, in particular, stressed the moral concerns underpinning NATO's action. "This is a just war, based not on any territorial ambitions but on values," he insisted in a speech before the Chicago Economic Club in April 1999. "We cannot let the evil of ethnic cleansing stand."[170] Outlining what ultimately came to be called the "Blair Doctrine" for intervention, Blair asserted that, while the principle of non-interference was not one "we would want to jettison too readily," it must be "qualified" because "acts of genocide can never be a purely internal matter." "When oppression produces massive flows of refugees which unsettle neighbouring countries," he concluded, "then they can properly be described as 'threats to international peace and security'."[171] In making this claim, Blair had effectively asserted that both NATO's interests and its values were at stake in Kosovo.

Still, some commentators argued that NATO intervened in Kosovo because it needed a new raison d'etre.[172] It's true that NATO needed to demonstrate its relevance in the post-Cold War era, and the Allies had been very slow to respond in Bosnia. NATO did not need a new mission, however. The goal of a Europe whole and free remained incomplete, and it was on this basis that the Alliance publicly justified the war in Kosovo. As Solana put it, had NATO not acted in Kosovo, "the entire logic of turning Europe into a common political, economic, and

security space would have been invalidated."[173] Making essentially the same argument Bill Clinton wrote in *The New York Times:* "We are in Kosovo with our allies to stand for a Europe, within our reach for the first time, that is peaceful, undivided and free. And we are there to stand against the greatest remaining threat to that vision: instability in the Balkans, fueled by a vicious campaign of ethnic cleansing."[174] Similarly, Madeleine Albright called southeastern Europe "the critical missing piece in the puzzle of a Europe whole and free." That vision, she insisted "cannot be fulfilled if this part of the continent remains divided and wracked by conflict."[175]

In part, the crisis threatened the vision of a Europe whole and free because, as Blair had suggested in his Chicago speech, it threatened "to further destabilise areas beyond the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (FRY).". Perhaps the most alarming scenario was that the conflict would spread to the south, ultimately drawing in both Greece and Turkey. The Clinton administration also expressed concern for the "small and struggling democracies" surrounding Kosovo that were "being overwhelmed by the flood of refugees," triggered by Milosevic's actions.[176] Indeed, NATO did have at stake more traditional security interests which factored into its decision-making in a way that Blair subsequently deemed completely appropriate. "The mass expulsion of ethnic Albanians from Kosovo demanded the notice of the rest of the world," he noted, but it also mattered that these events were "taking place in such a combustible part of Europe."[177] As one NATO official described it, the Kosovo case was one in which NATO's "self-interest curve" intersected with a "morality curve" that had been rising steadily in the realm of international politics.[178]

Indeed, to ask whether NATO ultimately acted on behalf of its values as opposed to its interests is only to set up a false dichotomy.   In reality, NATO had come to define its interests in such a way that they could not be fully separated from its values. Indeed, as Adam Roberts has suggested, NATO's operation in Kosovo served to further the "trend towards seeing certain humanitarian and legal norms inescapably bound up with conceptions of national interest."[179] As the Allies explicitly recognized in a statement issued during the Washington summit, the crisis represented "a fundamental challenge to the values for which NATO has stood since its foundation,"[180] and on which it sought to ground a new security order.   Building security, as NATO had defined it, required taking these values seriously. NATO's decision to intervene in Kosovo, Solana subsequently wrote, 'sent a strong signal that in our Atlantic community, values have a meaning'.[181]

Whether NATO would be willing to undertake a similar operation again in the future remains to be seen. Robertson has stated that Kosovo "represented a unique circumstance" and should not be viewed as a precedent for NATO.[182]   Indeed, while no Ally formally broke ranks during the war, some, including Greece, were clearly uncomfortable with the mission. Disputes also arose over the actual conduct of the war. NATO officials, in fact, acknowledge that Kosovo raised expectations about the Alliance's future role—expectations which might not be met. "We've witnessed the growing permissibility of intervention," one NATO international staff member noted, "but not necessarily a growing willingness to intervene."

Additionally, NATO's tendency to justify the intervention in terms of lofty moral principles exposed the Alliance to charges of hypocrisy regarding the conduct of the war.   For example, U.N. High Commissioner for Human Rights Mary Robinson pronounced the Alliance's humanitarian objectives in Kosovo a failure because the air strikes had produced civilian casualties.[183] Human Rights Watch also issued a report in February 2000, concluding that NATO had "violated international humanitarian law," and citing, in particular: NATO's use of cluster bombs in populated areas; air attacks on "targets of questionable military legitimacy;" and NATO's alleged failure to verify adequately that military targets did not contain high

concentrations of civilians. The organization further claimed that the number of civilian casualties was three to four times higher than had been acknowledged by U.S. defense officials.[184]

Indeed, the Allies demonstrated little willingness to assume any substantial risk to their own soldiers during the course of the intervention. The bombing missions over Kosovo, which were flown largely by U.S. pilots, were conducted at high altitudes, thereby reducing the danger to NATO pilots, but placing the Kosovar Albanians, whose lives they were purportedly trying to save, at greater risk. Several NATO members also openly resisted any talk of putting NATO troops on the ground. Such tactics led even Zbigniew Brzezinski to write: "The high-tech standoff war was waged as if its underlying premise was that the life of even one American serviceman was not worth risking in order to save the lives of thousands of Kosovars."[185]

NATO, however, did not retreat from the concerns that drove the Kosovo intervention. When ethnic hostilities in Macedonia threatened to spread beyond the borders of the state, the Allies opted for early intervention coupled with diplomacy, ultimately launching a series of three operations (Essential Harvest, Amber Fox, and Allied Harmony) designed to facilitate the implementation of an agreed peace plan. The EU took responsibility for the latter mission, Operation Allied Harmony, in the spring of 2003. NATO's concern with instability in southeastern Europe has not faded, however. Rather the Allies have continued efforts to improve poor border security, which leaves the region vulnerable to drug smuggling, weapons smuggling, terrorism, and human trafficking. In sum, the Kosovo and Macedonia experiences have only contributed to NATO's recognition that what might be construed as political instability increasingly threatens not just democracy in the region but security in Europe as a whole.

Conclusion

Bidding farewell to NATO in the fall of 1999, Solana expressed optimism about the alliance's ability to transform the nature of security in Europe. As he put it: "The future can be shaped if there is a common vision, the means, and the solidarity to implement it."[186] At the time, the vision seemed clear. Genuine security as conceived and characterized by the new NATO constitutes an almost tangible entity. Indeed, the security order to which the Allies aspire appears a strikingly Kantian one—an expanding pacific federation, informed by a common commitment to democratic principles and embedded in an increasingly integrated Euro-Atlantic area. Security for the new NATO not only encompasses the rights of the individual; it ultimately rests on the sovereignty of the individual rather than the sovereignty of the state.

Since September 11th, however, it has become increasingly clear that while NATO was developing tools designed to enlarge the zone of democracy and stability in Europe, it did little to prepare for new threats stemming from outside of Europe, including terrorism and weapons of mass destruction. Indeed, the enhancement of NATO's political dimension appeared to be met by a growing apathy regarding the Alliance's military capabilities. Its focus was turned inward on Europe and the so-called "out-of-area" debate went unresolved despite repeated appeals from the Clinton administration that NATO further transform itself to deal with global threats. September 11th effectively resolved the debate. While the 2002 Prague Summit had been billed as an enlargement summit—an opportunity to further the vision of Europe whole and free—the context for thinking about enlargement and the role of NATO's Partners was fundamentally altered by the events of that day. As will be discussed in chapter five, NATO's conception of

security has not necessarily changed. Nor have the Allies abandoned their vision of Europe whole and free. Rather the vision has expanded to include not just what NATO can do for aspirants and partners, but also what they can contribute to yet another transformation of NATO—this one focused on equipping the Alliance to address threats stemming from beyond Europe.

Chapter Four: The New NATO: An Instrument for the Promotion of Democracy and Human Rights?

As suggested in chapter one, NATO's mission of a Europe whole and free requires that the Allies not simply defend, but actually promote democratic norms and practices outside their territory. Indeed, this new mission places considerable faith both in the power of democratic values to stabilize Europe and in NATO's ability to promote these values successfully. The previous chapter concludes that NATO has advanced a conception of security that is ultimately dependent on these values. However, the question remains: Does NATO actually have the capacity to promote its values outside its territory?

As Dan Reiter observed in *International Security* in 2001, this question "has been underexamined in the public debate and deserves closer scrutiny."[187] As noted previously, however, at least some realist scholars concluded early on that NATO has had little, if any, influence on the democratization process in central and eastern Europe. These critiques, including Reiter's have focused primarily on the enlargement process, no doubt in part because Bill Clinton had based his case for enlargement to a significant degree on its potential for democracy promotion. This study, however, concludes that the skeptics tend to ignore the complex processes by which NATO, partly through its interactions with other European institutions, has helped to generate norms for the whole of Europe that appear to be influencing the way in which the states of central and eastern Europe perceive their own interests and,

consequently, their behavior at home and abroad. Indeed, the record of reform in central and eastern Europe over the past decade supports the notion that the values with which NATO is identified are themselves part of its appeal to prospective members and therefore also a source of its capacity to influence their behavior.

Morever, examining NATO's capacity for democracy promotion exclusively through the lens of the enlargement process takes too narrow a view of NATO's role in the democratization process. Indeed, NATO's efforts to extend democratic values and practices eastward long preceded the decision to enlarge the Alliance. As early as 1990, NATO had moved to create new institutions and partnerships that were also intended to shape political developments to the east in accordance with NATO values. While the influence of these institutions might have been slim initially, they have evolved to encompass virtually all European states and also serve to facilitate democracy promotion activities by both NATO and non-NATO members.

The Democratization Process

Admittedly, however, it was the decision to admit new members that drew the most attention to NATO's democracy promotion mission. Even Secretary General Robertson has declared that enlargement constitutes the "most concrete way" by which NATO has sought to "nourish a common culture of democracy and respect for human rights."[188] As noted above, the Clinton administration also argued vigorously during the mid-1990s that opening NATO's door to new members would allow the Alliance to "do for Europe's East what it did for Europe's West: prevent a return to local rivalries, strengthen democracy against future threats and create the conditions necessary for prosperity to flourish."[189]

In critiquing this claim in *International Security*, Reiter focuses mainly on the notion that prospective NATO membership serves as a lure or "carrot" by which NATO can encourage democratic reforms beyond its borders. Examining the case of the Alliance's three newest members—Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic—he concludes that NATO did not speed the democratization process "because their societies and their elites were committed to democracy anyway." All three had established competitive electoral systems and held free elections in 1990, long before the "NATO carrot was dangled before them." Hence, "NATO membership was not necessary for democratization."[190]

This argument is somewhat misleading with respect to the claims made by enlargement supporters. Even the Clinton administration, whose rhetoric regarding NATO's democracy promotion potential might have been somewhat overblown at times, never suggested that NATO enlargement was *necessary* for democratization or even that it constituted a primary incentive for democratization. More importantly, the assessments of Reiter and other skeptics appear to be based on rather simplistic conceptions of democracy. Free elections and a firm commitment by political elites to democratization are certainly important first steps in the democratization process, but they do not constitute the consolidation of *liberal* democracy, as NATO's new mission requires.[191] Indeed, scholars who focus on democratization commonly cite as essential elements of liberal democracy: respect for individual rights, including minority rights; the rule of law; civil society; civilian control of the military; and the embedding of democratic values in the local culture.[192] In states with a long legacy of communist rule and little prior experience with democracy, achieving all of these elements is, at best, a lengthy and difficult process. Indeed, one lesson of worldwide U.S. democracy promotion efforts over the past two decades is a growing appreciation for the complexity of the democratization process.[193]

Even in those central and eastern European states thought to have made considerable

progress toward liberal democracy during the 1990s, significant problems remained a full decade following the collapse of communism, especially with respect to individual and minority rights.[194]   A study published by the Congressional Research Service in 2000, for example, expressed concerns about the treatment of minorities throughout the region, including the Baltic states where language and citizenship laws have been alleged to violate the rights of ethnic Russian minorities.[195]   Reports of discrimination against the Roma have also been common.

Yet, another difficulty the region has faced has to do with the consolidation of civilian control over the military. For example, Jeffery Simon in a 1996 study of the region's civil-military relations observed that, while Slovakia was at that time the only member of the original Visegrad group (Poland, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia) that had not made progress toward achieving "effective" democratic control over its armed forces, Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic all had "significant work to do" to make elected civilian control over the military "effective" and "ensure the reform process is irreversible."[196] In Poland, for example, until 1997 the military was politicized and did not cooperate effectively with the civilian defense ministry. Chief of staff General Tadeusz Wilecki had resisted civilian authority and President Lech Walesa, who had appointed him, refused to order his dismissal. Finally, in 1997 a new constitution was adopted subordinating the general staff to the Ministry of Defense—a clear requirement of NATO membership. Wilecki was also fired by incoming President Aleksander Kwasniewski, who was determined to bring Poland into the Alliance.[197] A related difficulty, which persists throughout the region has to do with the need for effective parliamentary oversight on defense matters. Given the lack of such oversight during the communist period, parliamentary representatives who are knowledgeable about defense issues have been in short supply.[198] The fragility of the region's democracies is also evidenced by decidedly undemocratic trends in Slovakia following Vladimir Meciar's rise to power in 1993.   Indeed, nearly ten years later, real concern arose that Meciar might return to power following the Fall 2002 elections. Notably, Macedonia—a state lauded for much of the post-Cold War period as a model multi-ethnic democracy—also witnessed armed, ethnic-based conflict following the war in Kosovo, which ultimately required the deployment of NATO forces.   In short, the consolidation of liberal democracy in central and eastern Europe has proven to be a long, complex process, requiring, not simply free elections and a commitment to democracy at the top, but also difficult social and cultural adjustments and reforms.

The Lure of Enlargement

As for NATO's role in facilitating such change, the record suggests that, while NATO may not have served as the impetus for the region's democratization, it has had an impact on both the direction of domestic reform in prospective member states and the way in which these states have interacted with each other. Although NATO has never established strict political criteria for membership, it did release an internal study on enlargement in September 1995, which concluded that NATO could contribute to enhanced security and stability in the Euro-Atlantic area by "encouraging and supporting democratic reforms," fostering in new members "patterns and habits of cooperation and consultation and consensus building," and "promoting good neighborly relations." The study, which was distributed to prospective members, stressed that new members would be expected to conform to the basic principles of the Washington Treaty—democracy, individual liberty, and the rule of law—and demonstrate a firm commitment to the principles and objectives of the Partnership for Peace Framework Document, which also commits its members to democratic principles and the peaceful resolution of disputes.[199]

Additionally, prospective member states received notice that they would be expected to subscribe to OSCE norms and principles, which include resolving ethnic and external territorial disputes by peaceful means; "promoting stability and well-being by economic liberty, social justice and environmental responsibility," and establishing civilian control over their militaries. Following the study's release, NATO officials emphasized repeatedly that the willingness and ability of states to meet NATO's political as well as military standards would be a critical factor in decisions about who would be invited to join the Alliance.

U.S. Secretary of Defense William Perry had also argued in 1995 that enlargement must be guided by the principles upon which the stabilization of Western Europe depended: collective defense, democracy, consensus, and cooperative security. Applying what came to be known as the "Perry Principles," he set forth the following criteria for enlargement: 1) New members must have the capacity and the will to defend NATO. 2) New members "must uphold democracy and free enterprise, protect freedom and human rights inside their borders, and respect sovereignty outside their borders" in addition to placing their military forces under civilian control.   3) NATO must continue to operate on a consensus basis. 4) New members must achieve interoperability with NATO.[200]

The criteria appear to have been taken seriously by NATO aspirants during both the 1997 and 2002 enlargement rounds. Although it's likely that many of the domestic reforms that have transpired in the region would have occurred even in the absence of NATO enlargement, central and eastern European leaders have asserted repeatedly a link between the evolution of their foreign and domestic policies and the prospect of NATO enlargement.   For example, during a series of three public hearings conducted in April 1997 by the U.S. Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe to assess the progress of prospective NATO members in meeting their obligations under the Helsinki Final Act and OSCE agreements, invited representatives from ten aspirant states stressed that the prospect of NATO membership had served as an important incentive for both domestic reforms and improved relations with neighbors.[201] These public acknowledgments suggest that NATO and its expectations have, at least, been a factor in internal political decisions.

Moreover, while NATO's enlargement decisions—unlike those of the EU—are ultimately political, the Allies have invested considerable resources in assessing and providing the aspirants with feedback regarding their progress in meeting the political and military expectations articulated in the 1995 enlargement study. NATO's determination not to admit states who have failed to meet these expectations was well-demonstrated by the fact that Slovakia was not among those invited in 1997 to join the Alliance—even though it had originally been considered a top candidate—due to widespread concerns about the authoritarian nature of Meciar's government. More recently, in January 2002, U.S. Ambassador to Slovakia Ronald Weiser forewarned the Slovaks that the country's upcoming Fall 2002 elections would influence whether Slovakia received an invitation from NATO during the November Prague summit. Noting that "Slovakia had a government that had different values than the alliance" during the first round of enlargement, Weiser declared: "If the situation repeats itself, there will not be an invitation."[202] With respect to Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic, all of whom gained invitations to join NATO in 1997, the *New York Times* concluded in April 1998 that, while they had "a way to go in meeting Western standards of democratic rule and stable market economies, no issue has dominated [their] internal political behavior...as much as the aspiration to belong to the Western security alliance."[203]

The MAP

In 1999, following the accession of Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic to NATO, the Alliance also introduced a Membership Action Plan (MAP), reaffirming that the remaining aspirants would be expected to "demonstrate a commitment to the rule of law and human rights" and "establish appropriate democratic and civilian control of their armed forces." The new program also served to make the assessment process for aspirants more structured and rigorous. Based on the 1995 enlargement study, it required each aspirant state to submit an Annual National Programme regarding its preparations for NATO membership in five key areas: political and economic, defence/military, resources (to meet member commitments), security (to protect NATO information) and legal (legal arrangements to govern cooperation with NATO).[204] NATO would then provide each individual aspirant with feedback on its progress in meeting the goals established in its own national program.[205]

According to diplomats from the Prague invitees, the requirements of the current MAP process are useful because they have provided leverage for reformist elements of their societies in internal debates over domestic and foreign policy.[206] NATO diplomats and staff also observe that significant progress toward meeting MAP goals has been achieved since the introduction of the MAP process.[207] Indeed, a recent of enlargement published by the Rand Corporation agrees that "from the perspective of improving regional security and advancing democracy in the former communist states in central and southern Europe, the NATO enlargement process has had the desired effect."[208]

It is also an indication of the seriousness with which NATO has approached the MAP process that Albania and Macedonia, both of them MAP and active PfP members, did not receive invitations at Prague. Neither was ever seriously in the running because of a clear consensus among the Allies that these two states simply were not ready in terms of their domestic reform process. Concerns about possible regression on the part of the Prague invitees also led NATO to require that all seven submit "timetables" detailing their plans for completion of the expected reforms by March 2003. The timetables, which were attached to letters from the invitees' foreign ministers are viewed as a firm political commitment and thus a mechanism for maintaining NATO's leverage over the invitees for as long as possible.[209] Indeed, the Prague Summit Declaration states that progress on the timetables "will be expected before and after accession."[210]

The perceived success of the MAP process—both inside and outside the Alliance—also led NATO to introduce a new program at Prague known as the Individual Partnership Action Plan (IPAP), which is intended to upgrade cooperation with partner states that have not yet been accepted into the MAP but who have expressed a desire for closer cooperation with NATO. Although the first IPAP has yet to be written, both Azerbaijan and Georgia have formally applied, and the process is expected to function much as the MAP process does. Participants will write their own national plans detailing the specific reforms they plan to undertake. Like the MAP, the IPAP will also have a political chapter giving NATO a greater opportunity to influence domestic political as well as defense reforms.

While the IPAP is not formally a "waiting room" for the MAP, some NATO staff and diplomats do see it as a sort of stepping stone into the MAP process as well as an opportunity for NATO to assess how serious the Central Asian and Caucasus states are about making the kinds of reforms that are required of prospective NATO members. According to NATO international staff, given that the MAP program has required substantial resources on NATO's part, the Alliance needs a serious commitment to reform from the Central Asian and Caucuses states if it is to expend significant resources there. One NATO staff member also acknowledged, however,

that it is not yet clear whether the "carrot" that NATO was offering—NATO's assistance in implementing political and military reforms—"was big enough for them to actually make changes."[211]

As noted earlier, NATO and Ukraine also agreed to a new NATO-Ukraine Action Plan in 2002, which is intended to deepen and broaden the relationship by allowing for a more intense dialogue on political, economic, and defense issues. Also much like the MAP, it outlines specific objectives and principles toward which Ukraine will work as it pursues its goal of closer integration into Euro-Atlantic security structures. Indeed, one NATO member military representative with experience in the region described the new action plan as a sort of "MAP, light."[212] Importantly, the new mechanism provides another opportunity for NATO to push Ukraine in the direction of democratic political reform, the importance of which was recently highlighted by U.S. Ambassador to Ukraine Carlos Pascal. Attempting to squash speculation that the U.S. and NATO would ignore violations of democratic values "if Ukraine takes part in the rebuilding of Iraq," Pascal stressed that, while Ukraine's participation in peacekeeping activities would be supported by NATO, without democratic reforms Ukraine would not have a strong basis for NATO membership. "Democracy," he insisted, "must be the main aspect of Ukraine's integration into European society."[213]

Regional Cooperation

The lure of NATO membership also appears to have encouraged the resolution of long-standing ethnic and border disputes throughout Central and Eastern Europe. As noted earlier, the *Study on NATO Enlargement* alerts prospective members that resolving such issues will be a significant factor in making membership decisions. Included among the many agreements reached since the mid-1990s are two treaties Hungary signed in 1995 and 1996 with Romania and Slovakia, establishing mechanisms for dealing with the large Hungarian minorities in both states.[214] Romania, as did Poland, also signed an agreement with Ukraine over border disputes and past recriminations.[215] For its part, the Czech Republic took a significant step toward improving relations with Germany in January 1997 when the two governments signed a much debated declaration acknowledging previous wrongs committed against each other—namely, Nazi crimes against Czechs and the Czechoslovakia's expulsion of 2.5 million Sudeten Germans after World War II.[216]

Prospective NATO members have also launched a variety of regional cooperation mechanisms. These arrangements include an inter-parliamentary assembly established by Lithuania and Poland to strengthen cultural relations and protect minority rights, and a forum known as the "Five Presidents," which brought together the leaders of Poland, Ukraine, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia to discuss regional security, economic cooperation, and cultural exchange issues."[217] Referring to these various agreements, then U.S. Ambassador to Poland, Daniel Fried, observed in 1998: "When Poland and Hungary became more confident of their NATO membership, they increased their outreach to their neighbors—Hungary to Romania, and Poland to Lithuania."[218]

Perhaps the best known association for regional cooperation is the Visegrad group which emerged in 1991 when Poland, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia met to coordinate their efforts to join NATO and the European Union. Although cooperation among the group members lapsed after 1993 due partly to Czechoslovakia's Velvet Divorce," the Visegrad group revived itself in 1999 when its members, including Slovakia, met in Bratislava and proclaimed a new beginning. During the course of the meeting, NATO's three newest members also pledged to help Slovakia

join the Alliance.[219] Given that the Visegrad group initially materialized in 1991 long before NATO announced its intention to enlarge, it's clear that NATO was not the sole factor mobilizing regional cooperation. Yet, in a variety of instances, cooperation does appear to have been encouraged and sustained by the enlargement process. In an analysis of the Czech Republic's security policies, Stephen J. Blank observed that the Czech's desire for NATO membership was the one issue that had prompted regional defense cooperation between Prague, Warsaw, and Budapest. In his view, the cooperation occurred largely because NATO had advised new members that they would not be accepted until they could work together on both economic and defense issues. Given the Czech Republic's earlier lack of interest in other forms of cooperation, says Bank, its willingness to engage in defense cooperation at the behest of NATO reflected its "priority goal of gaining NATO membership."[220]

The Clinton administration made frequent reference to these various regional agreements to support its case that the enlargement process was indeed generating stability and reform in central and eastern Europe. "To align themselves with NATO these states are resolving problems that could have led to future Bosnias," Madeleine Albright observed in 1998. "This is the productive paradox at NATO's heart: by extending solemn security guarantees, we actually reduce the chance that our troops will again be called to fight in Europe."[221] Solana also attributed the various regional agreements completed between 1996 and 1998 to the enlargement process. NATO, he said, had essentially told prospective members "you have no chance of being in this club [unless] you make a real effort to solve minority problems."[222]

The skeptics, however, maintain that the enlargement process was not necessary "as an incentive for European states to resolve their disputes with one another." Indeed, Reiter has argued, that "supposed successes" such as the treaty between Hungary and Romania in 1996 "should be weighed against Romania's failure to reach similar agreements with Moldova, Ukraine, and Russia."[223] In fact, Romania has set aside differences with both Moldova and Ukraine.[224] It is also of some significance that, at the time, none of these three states (Russia, Moldova, Ukraine) had formally applied for NATO membership.[225] Indeed, in its 2000 report on the status of NATO applicants the U.S. Congressional Research Service hypothesized that one possible reason for the delay in signing another border agreement—this one between Russia and Estonia—"is that Russia does not want to sign a treaty that it thinks might enhance Estonia's chances for NATO membership by removing what might be seen as a 'territorial dispute.'"[226] On the other hand, the record of cooperation is fairly remarkable with respect to situations involving two or more NATO candidates.

In his study of Romanian-Hungarian relations since the end of the Cold War, Ronald Linden also ties the generally peaceful nature of that relationship directly to the process of NATO enlargement. Linden argues that when NATO released its 1995 study on enlargement, it became clear for Hungary and Romania as well as other prospective NATO members that "simply reflecting Western norms would no longer be enough; action to put these into practice had to take place." It was at that point, he says, that both Hungary and Romania "realized that resorting to the 'old' ways of interethnic and interstate conflict would severely retard their chances of gaining entry into Western institutions." Linden also quotes Hungarian Prime Minister Gyula Horn who, himself, gave credit to the external pressures supplied by European institutions for regional dialogue and cooperation. "[We] have to put an end once and for all to the constant dissecting of imagined or real historical wrongs," Horn asserted. "This Hungarian Government has recognized from the outset that the community of European states will under no circumstances admit into its ranks countries that squabble relentlessly among themselves."[227]

The willingness of Bulgaria, Romania and other surrounding states to cooperate with

NATO during the conflict in Kosovo, despite a lack of support by their respective publics, might also be construed as evidence of NATO's continuing appeal. Indeed, Bulgaria's prime minister said, at the time, that support for the Alliance was "a question of Euro-Atlantic solidarity, and choosing European values."[228] Similarly, the Bulgarian Ambassador to the United States said of Bulgaria's supportive stance: "What we're trying to achieve now is not just a safe Bulgaria, a safe home...Now we want a safe neighborhood."[229]

Furthermore, regional cooperation and reform among both prospective and new NATO members continues. In October 2000, the defense ministries of Poland and Bulgaria signed an agreement involving the exchange of experience and information to assist Bulgaria in preparing for possible NATO membership.[230] In May 2001, Romania and Macedonia signed a basic treaty, which, according to Romanian President Ion Iliescu, sets a framework for bi-lateral cooperation amidst EU and NATO integration efforts.[231] That same month, Slovakia and the Czech Republic agreed to establish a Czech-Slovak military unit to operate within the KFOR contingent in Kosovo.[232] And, in mid-June, the Romanian government adopted a strategy called "Romania catches up with NATO," which was reportedly based on Romania's obligations for joining NATO and thus aimed at improving the state's prospects for membership.[233] Much as his predecessor did, Lord Robertson has linked such examples of continuing regional cooperation to the appeal of NATO membership. In his words:

> The prospect of NATO membership serves as an incentive for aspirants to get their houses in order. Just look at Central and Eastern Europe today. NATO's decision to take in new members has sparked a wave of bilateral treaties, and supported the resolution of border disputes. It has also encouraged many to establish proper democratic control over their militaries. Why? Because all aspirants know that if they want to join NATO they need to do their homework. In short, NATO's willingness to open its doors has brought Europe closer together—in spirit and practice.[234]

A Response to the Skeptics

Despite this record of domestic and foreign policy reforms, Many of NATO's skeptics draw their conclusions as much from the Cold War period as from the experience of the past decade. As noted in chapter two, they commonly point out that Turkey, Spain, Portugal and Greece all experienced periods of undemocratic rule and manifested poor human rights records even after becoming NATO members. Having concluded that NATO demonstrated minimal influence over the domestic politics of its members during the Cold War, the skeptics also assert that it has little, if any, capacity for democracy promotion today.[235]

This comparison is not a useful one, largely because NATO now operates in a fundamentally different environment than it did during the Cold War, and decisions regarding new members follow from a different set of criteria—one in which democratic values have achieved a significantly higher profile. New members, NATO declared at its 1999 summit in Washington, must be in a position to "enhance overall security and stability in Europe." Today, that means upholding the values underpinning the liberal security order NATO envisions for the whole of Europe.[236] Greece, Turkey, and Spain may have been admitted for political as well as strategic reasons but they were not held to the same standards that the current aspirants face. Given NATO's new mission and the radically altered strategic environment in which it currently operates, states that fail to demonstrate a commitment to democracy are unlikely to be deemed

the security *producers* NATO demands today. In short, it makes little sense to draw conclusions about NATO's current democracy promotion potential based on a period during which the Alliance was chiefly concerned with preventing a Soviet attack on Western Europe.

NATO's critics have also argued that the EU is far better equipped than NATO to assist in the consolidation of political and economic reforms in central and eastern Europe. It has even been suggested that central and eastern Europeans have found NATO membership attractive largely because it serves as a sort of reference in their bids to join the EU.[237] However, to the larger task of consolidating a liberal order in Europe, NATO contributes two crucial commodities that the EU cannot provide: military power in defense of shared values and a strong link to the United States, whose military strength continues to be regarded as vital to the defense of the values for which NATO stands. NATO therefore possesses a leverage for influencing reforms that the EU does not enjoy. As Petr Lunak observes, the paradox associated with the desire of central and eastern Europeans to join Western European institutions is that it has been "marked by a mistrust of purely European institutions."[238] This mistrust is likely grounded, not only in the region's World War II experience, but also in the European Union's failure to prevent or stem the violence emanating from the former Yugoslavia in the early 1990s. Numerous statements by central and eastern European leaders also emphasize the link between security and the consolidation of democracy in the region. Polish Foreign Minister Bronislaw Geremek, for example, has said that Poland chose to join NATO because it "is an alliance which has put its immense military might in service of fundamental values and principles that we share. NATO can make Europe safe for democracy. No other organization can replace the Alliance in this role."[239] Vaclav Havel echoed these thoughts in slightly different terms. As he put it: "While the European Union focuses on political and economic integration, NATO constitutes an irreplaceable instrument for the collective defense of these values."[240]

The region's leaders have also insisted that a U.S. presence is essential to security on the European continent. In the words of Polish President Kwasniewski: "The two world wars proved to the peoples of Europe and America that without a U.S. presence in Europe, European security is unlikely to be achieved."[241] A Polish official quoted by *The New York Times* just prior to Poland's accession to NATO, made the same point even more explicitly: "We want to be good Europeans. But more than anyone except perhaps the British, we understand how important it is to keep the Americans involved in Europe."[242] Such sentiments were also on full display during the spring 2003 dispute over the war with Iraq in which the central and eastern Europeans generally lined up on the side of the Bush administration. Indeed, as Zbigniew Brzezinski has suggested, it is the security provided by the transatlantic alliance that has made reconciliation in Europe possible, both today and during the Cold War.[243] Referencing the numerous examples of regional cooperation witnessed in central and eastern Europe since the mid-1990s, Brzezinski wrote: [T]he ongoing reconciliation between Germany and Poland would not have been possible without the American presence in Germany and the related sense of security that Poland's prospective membership has fostered in Poland. The same is true of the Czech Republic and Germany, Hungary and Romania, Romania and Ukraine; and the desire to get into NATO is also having a similar influence on Slovenia's attitude toward Italy and Lithuania toward Poland.[244] Furthermore, as Linden has observed, while the EU and NATO both made democratic institutions and processes a necessary condition for admission, only "NATO insisted that the East European states also pursue peaceful policies among each other, that they commit themselves to settling rather than replaying old conflicts and to setting up a system for settling present and future disputes."[245]

The skeptics have also tended to present a sort of caricature of NATO's democracy

promotion efforts as nothing more than the carrot of security guarantees dangled in front of aspirants. Unfortunately, this picture neglects not only NATO's increasingly important political institutions but also the many programs through which NATO members have provided practical democracy assistance to the states of central and eastern Europe since long before the decision to enlarge NATO was announced. Through PfP/EAPC, NATO sponsors a variety of conferences, workshops, and seminars designed to assist the aspirants in carrying out political and defense-related reforms and, ultimately, meeting NATO's membership expectations.[246] Individual NATO members have also provided a variety of educational opportunities for partners. For example, The George C. Marshall European Center for Security Studies based in Garmisch, Germany and supported jointly by the United States and Germany also hosts courses annually for civil and military leaders from central and eastern Europe aimed at assisting the democratization process in the region, including the establishment of civilian control of the military.[247] These activities led *Washington Post* reporter Dana Priest to suggest in 1998 that the Marshall Center had "become the intellectual center for the inconspicuous revolution taking place inside the militaries of Eastern Europe."[248]   Importantly, these opportunities have not been limited to MAP members.

Moreover, NATO's Partnership provides an opportunity for the non-NATO, EU partners to share their democracy know-how with those partners whose democratic processes and institutions are far less well developed. For example, despite its continued neutrality, Switzerland has played a particularly active role in efforts intended to promote democratic control of the region's militaries, especially in Central Asia and the Caucuses states. Indeed, the Swiss have even contributed a number of their own initiatives, including the establishment of the Geneva Centre for Democratic Control of Armed Forces (DCAF), an institution designed to promote democratic reform of military force structures.[249]

Such initiatives also allow military and civilian personnel from participating states considerable contact with their counterparts from well-developed democracies, thereby also providing them an opportunity to experience the culture and practices associated with liberal democracy. These encounters constitute part of what Igor Lukes has termed the "pedagogical component" associated with NATO enlargement. "Central European administrators and soldiers who come into contact with the alliance," Lukes suggests, "will gradually internalize the values reflected in its daily operations."[250] This process might not be particularly dramatic or visible, but it does constitute one small piece of a much larger effort to influence the political, economic, and military reform process in central and eastern European in ways that are consistent with NATO's vision of a Europe "whole and free."

NATO as a "Norm Entrepreneur"

Ultimately, it would be impossible to sort out methodologically the precise impact of various external forces on the process of democratization and reconciliation in Central and Eastern Europe. Institutions such as the EU and NATO as well as the broader process of globalization generated by global markets and information technology have all influenced the direction of political , economic, and military reform taking place throughout the region. As Zdenek Kavan and Martin Palous wrote of the changes in the Czech Republic, "the observed process is not just one transition, but the conjunction of transitions in the domestic, regional, and international systems. The collapse of state socialism in Central and Eastern Europe was accompanied by the collapse of the Soviet empire, which has sparked further and broader processes occurring on a global scale."[251]   Indeed, the phenomenon of globalization, which

many scholars view as narrowing appreciably the economic and political choices available to states, is likely having a greater impact on the states of central and eastern Europe than any one outside institution. At the same time, however, both NATO and the EU must be understood as part of this phenomenon. Both are contributing to increasing political and economic integration. And, by championing their own democratic values and practices, both also help to foster the emergence of so-called global norms of democracy and human rights. Indeed, the various internal and external forces influencing the direction of reform in the region are interactive and often mutually reinforcing—frequently, deliberately so. Nonetheless, it seems reasonable to argue that, by championing its democratic values as the linchpin of the peaceful and prosperous Euro-Atlantic community constructed after World War II and therefore norms that should govern the whole of Europe, NATO is operating as what Kathryn Sikkink and Martha Finnemore have termed a "norm entrepreneur."[252] By articulating political, economic, and military arrangements that prospective members must adopt in order to be eligible for NATO membership, NATO has effectively promoted what might be defined as "regulative" norms—norms that prescribe or identify what constitutes appropriate behavior within a given identity.[253] In fact, the Rand Corporation has concluded that NATO's enlargement strategy, "serves to impose a behavioral regime on much of unintegrated Europe" and establishes "a set of behavioral incentives for new and prospective members' domestic and foreign policy."[254]

NATO's norms, however, are more than simply prescriptive; they are also instrumental to the Alliance's own identity. Indeed, NATO leaders have used the concept of identity as a means of influencing how the states of Central and Eastern Europe actually conceive their interests and therefore interact with others. Recognizing that many prospective members look to both NATO and EU membership as confirmation of their place in a particular civilization, NATO has consistently advised the aspirants that being identified as a member of the "West," requires first embracing and actively implementing its values.

A Return to Europe

Indeed, the concept of identity has played an intriguing role in the enlargement process, reflected most visibly in the degree to which central and eastern Europeans have characterized their desire to join NATO as a "return to Europe." Joining both NATO and the EU, the region's leaders have argued, symbolizes a return to a community from which they were alienated during the Cold War—a community to which they believe they rightfully belong based on their history and culture.[255] Polish Foreign Minister Bronislaw Geremek put it this way in late 1997:

> We have...spared no effort to return to the roots of our culture and statehood, to
> join the Euro-Atlantic family of democratic nations. We will not rest until Poland
> is safely anchored in Western, economic, political, and military structures. This is
> the essence of our aspirations to join NATO.[256]

Hungarian Foreign Minister Janos Martonyi echoed these thoughts upon Hungary's accession to NATO in March 1999. "Hungary has come home," he pronounced. "We are back in the family."[257] As John Gerard Ruggie has explained it, for NATO's "would-be members, expansion has become less of an issue of security than of identity politics, an affirmation that they belong to the West."[258]

The notion of a "return to Europe," however, casts NATO's role in the region in a slightly different light than do portrayals of the Alliance as a vehicle for projecting democratic

values eastward. The sentiments expressed by Central and Eastern European leaders suggest that NATO is not so much projecting its values eastward as it is that they are "moving westward," embracing opportunities denied to them during the Cold War. As Hungarian President Arpad Goncz put it: The rhetoric of NATO enlargement suggests that NATO is moving eastward at the instigation of the present 16 allies. Instead, what is happening is that the countries of Central and Eastern Europe are moving westward. Separated from West-European and Euro-Atlantic institutions for 40 years, these countries now have the freedom and opportunity to join institutions such as NATO, the European Union and the Western European Union.[259] Interestingly, NATO Secretary General Lord Robertson, himself, utilized this sort of rhetoric in discussing Alliance efforts to persuade the Russians that they have no need to fear the expansion of NATO. Robertson acknowledged that NATO "may not convince Russia fully," but he also expressed optimism that "if a realistic attitude in Russia prevails, Moscow will see that NATO is not "moving East," but that Central and Eastern Europe—and Russia itself—are gradually moving West."[260]

If one accepts this perspective, NATO's ability to assist in the democratization and stabilization of central and eastern Europe derives from its pull as a guardian of democratic values as well as from the force of it military might. NATO, the initial enlargement experience suggests, does not so much project or impose its values as it pulls others to its core, in the process encouraging the necessarily indigenous reforms required of NATO members. The concept of a "return to Europe" also suggests that, contrary to realist assumptions, identity—presumably informed by history, culture, values, and ideas—has influenced how the governments of central and eastern Europe have defined their interests and, consequently, how they have behaved both domestically and in their interactions with others.

Indeed, NATO leaders appear to have to have recognized that NATO's identity constitutes a key source of its influence with respect to the aspirant states, and they have unabashedly characterized the Alliance in terms of its values and, more broadly, Western civilization. In announcing his commitment to further enlargement in June 2001, for example, George W. Bush stressed that NATO is unique because its members share a common civilization and set of values. "Yalta," he declared, "did not ratify a natural divide: it divided a living civilization. The partition of Europe was not a fact of geography; it was an act of violence."[261] Recognizing the appeal of NATO's values even more explicitly, former NATO commander Wesley Clark said of the Alliance in his farewell address: "Together we have demonstrated that there is nothing stronger than the power of ideas...ideas of freedom, law and justice and that democratic peoples united in a vision of a common imperative form an irresistible and magnetic force which is transforming the nature of Europe."[262] Similarly, former Secretary General Solana suggested that NATO functions as a "magnetic pole," enabling it "to shape the nature of security in Europe."[263]

Emphasizing the link between NATO, democratic values, and Western civilization, sends a critical signal to prospective NATO members: To be identified as a member of the "West," you must actively embrace and implement its values. In effect, NATO leaders have used the concept of identity as a means of influencing how the states of central and eastern Europe conceive their interests and therefore interact with others. Arguably, the influence NATO appears to have achieved by virtue of its values and its identity also constitutes a good example of what Joseph Nye has termed "soft power": "the ability to attract through cultural and ideological appeal." Nye, in fact, has explicitly recognized the "Western democratic and humanitarian values that NATO was charged with defending in 1949" as "significant sources of soft power."[264]

Even NATO officials who are uncomfortable with the notion that NATO functions as a school for democracy are willing to argue that NATO's appeal and therefore its ability to influence others derives from the simple fact of its existence. Unlike the OSCE, NATO has "something to show to others."[265]   That something is a zone of peace and prosperity closely identified with liberal democratic values—a community of states that have *established* peace with each other.

Of course, it's also true that NATO has multiple identities. In many quarters, the Alliance is still regarded as more of a military than political organization. Yet, as NATO's own mission has evolved, so too, it seems, has its identity in the eyes its newest members. During the first phase of enlargement, many commentators argued that the aspirants wanted to join, not the "new NATO" but the "old NATO", which they equated with a firm security guarantee. This was perhaps particularly true of Poland, which for reasons of both history and geography still harbored fears of a military threat from Russia. NATO's transformation, however, has meant that the Alliance's focus has increasingly been directed outside NATO territory—a shift not lost on its newest members. Indeed, one Polish diplomat assigned to NATO observed that, contrary to Poland's expectations, the Allies did not focus on assisting its new members once they had acceded to the Alliance, but, instead, made it clear that the new members were expected to help those still outside the Alliance. Poland, it
was assumed, would share the knowledge and experience gained through its reform and accession process with others, especially Ukraine.[266]

At the same time, it appears that new members' and partners' perceptions of their own security interests may be changing. By virtually all accounts, the Czechs performed miserably during Kosovo, and their domestic public support for NATO actually dropped during the war.[267] While the Czech Republic may still not qualify as a model member of NATO, since 1999 it has participated actively in NATO's peacekeeping missions, and, according to a survey conducted in late 2000 by a Prague-based firm in consultation with the Rand Corporation, public support for NATO improved substantially after the war. Seventy-four percent of those polled responded that the Czech Republic should help to defend other members and forty-nine percent agreed that the Czechs should participate in peacekeeping operations.[268] The Czech Republic's 2001 national security strategy, which claims to be based on the "hypothesis of the indivisibility of security and on the universality of basic human rights and freedoms," also identifies the state's participation in "peace operations" as a strategic interest.[269]

Conclusion

In assessing NATO's capacity for democracy promotion, the relevant question is not whether the Alliance can create the impetus for democracy and respect for human rights in states where it would otherwise not exist. Clearly that impulse must be indigenous. The better question is whether NATO, along with other external actors, can reinforce and assist in concrete and useful ways the difficult process of political and economic reform in fledgling democracies. This study concludes that NATO does assist in this process, not simply by dangling the carrot of prospective membership in front of central and eastern Europeans, but also by actively assisting these states with the implementation of democratic principles and practices. That said, the "carrot" of NATO enlargement should not be underestimated. Realist skeptics of NATO's potential for democracy promotion have ignored the powerful effects of ideas and identity on how states perceive their own interests and thereby interact with each other. Indeed, NATO's own identity as an alliance that has built the political and military means to defend the democratic values its members hold in common appears to constitute an important part of its

appeal. The Alliance has used that appeal to promote its values as norms that should govern the entire Euro-Atlantic community, in the process furthering a sense of collective identity, underpinned by liberal democratic values.

Chapter Five: Security in a Post-September 11th World

During a speech he delivered in Warsaw, Poland in June 2001, George W. Bush put to rest the question of whether his administration would support further enlargement of NATO. Returning to the phrase his father had used over a decade earlier in characterizing NATO's new mission, Bush proclaimed that a Europe "whole and free" was "no longer a dream. It is the Europe that is rising around us. It is the work that you and I are called on to complete."[270] Europe could not be "whole and free," however, without the new democracies of central and eastern Europe. Like Bill Clinton before him, Bush appeared to conceive Europe and the space that could ultimately comprise NATO in terms of shared values rather than geography. "The future of every European nation must be determined by the progress of internal reform, not the interests of outside powers," he insisted. "Every European nation that struggles toward democracy and free markets and a strong civic culture must be welcomed into Europe's home." According to one former National Security Council staff member, although Bush offered no specific time line for enlargement during the Warsaw speech, his language was designed to inspire those states enrolled in the MAP to continue with reforms by signaling that the Prague enlargement would not be minimal. Nor would it be the last.[271]

Much as his predecessor had, Bush also asserted that NATO could help to erase Cold War divisions. "The Iron Curtain is no more," he concluded. "Now we plan and build the house of freedom—whose doors are open to all of Europe's peoples and whose windows look out to global challenges beyond."[272] NATO's mission, as Bush had characterized it was indeed a Europe "whole and free." Visiting Brussels in the Fall of 2002, Deputy National Security Adviser Stephen Hadley also cast enlargement in a way that was fully consistent with the rationale embraced by the Clinton administration.[273] NATO, together with the European Union, he declared, "is a critical instrument through which Europe will become whole, free and at peace for the first time in its history, and Russia will find a comfortable place in Europe for the first time in generations."[274]

In short, the Bush administration's rationale for enlargement appeared to rest, just as the

Clinton administration's had, on the notion that genuine peace could be constructed on the basis of shared democratic values. NATO's political rather than military dimension stood at the center of the enlargement case. As NATO commander Joseph Ralston put it: " NATO's overarching objective of opening up the Alliance to new members is to enhance stability in Europe as a whole, more than to expand NATO's military influence or capabilities or to alter the nature of its basic defense posture."[275] NATO Secretary General Lord Robertson had made essentially this same point in June 2001: "NATO enlargement is not about accumulating military capabilities against "the other side," he explained. "There is no 'other side' at the moment. The context of NATO enlargement today is about community building: about overcoming the divisions that still exist in Europe. It is about improving the security and stability of Europe as a whole."[276]

The Bush administration's public pronouncements regarding NATO also conveyed a strong sense that, historically and morally, enlargement was simply the right thing to do. Such sentiments were particularly evident in the language of the Warsaw speech. In planning NATO's enlargement, Bush had insisted, "no nation should be used as a pawn in the agendas of others. We will not trade away the fate of free European peoples. No more Munichs. No more Yaltas."[277] Undersecretary of State for Political Affairs Marc Grossman also suggested that continued enlargement was the only course consistent with NATO's core values. In his words: "Not to embrace countries that have overcome years of communist dictatorship and have proven their ability and willingness to contribute to our common security, would be to abandon the very principles that have been NATO's source of strength and vitality."[278] As one official who served on the National Security Staff during both the Clinton and George W. Bush administrations observed, Article 10 of the NATO Treaty made it difficult to discern grounds on which the aspirants might justifiably be excluded, so long as they were willing and able "to contribute to the security of the North Atlantic area."[279] Indeed, Bush's Warsaw speech had also included a line which seemed to hint that the new administration was inclined to support a substantial enlargement. In making preparations for the 2002 Prague summit, Bush told his audience, the NATO Allies should "not calculate how little we can get away with, but how much we can do to advance the cause of freedom."[280]

The speech served to allay earlier concerns that the new Bush administration might be less committed than its predecessor to the enlargement process and perhaps even NATO itself. Early indications of a unilateralist bent to the Bush foreign policy coupled with candidate Bush's disparaging remarks about "nation-building" during the 2000 campaign had helped to fuel such speculation. National Security Adviser Condoleeza Rice had also aroused concern in Europe regarding the administration's commitment to NATO by telling *The New York Times* during the campaign that a Bush administration would not support U.S. involvement in NATO peacekeeping in the Balkans.[281] Consequently, Bush's ringing endorsement of enlargement in Warsaw came as a surprise to many observers in both the United States and Europe who had been looking for some indication as to the sort of enlargement the Bush administration was willing to support.

From the beginning, however, there were small indications that Bush would carry forward the process begun by his predecessor. Notably, key members of his foreign policy team, including Rice, Hadley, and Secretary of State Colin Powell, were members of the U.S. Committee on NATO, a non-profit organization formed in 1996 to support enlargement at a time when Senate ratification was in doubt.[282] Even more significant was Bush's appointment of Daniel Fried to his National Security Council staff as Director for European and Eurasian Affairs. As a member of Bill Clinton's National Security Council staff and then U.S. ambassador to Poland from 1997 until 2000, Fried had been a strong proponent of NATO

enlargement. Bush's decision to appoint him to a key position within his own administration might be construed as evidence that the President was, from the beginning, at least somewhat sympathetic to the enlargement process.[283]   Not surprisingly, it was Fried who served as the principal author of Bush's Warsaw speech, which even some Defense and State Department officials privately characterized as "Clintonesque."[284]

The fact that many of the concerns that had featured prominently in the first enlargement debate had faded also bode well for a substantial enlargement at Prague. Concerns regarding both the cost of enlargement and the ability of NATO to function politically at nineteen members appeared to have been overblown once Hungary, Poland, and the Czech Republic had actually acceded to the Alliance.[285]   Moreover, a general consensus had emerged that NATO's open door policy, together with EU enlargement, had indeed inspired prospective members to continue with democratic reforms and resolve potential conflicts with neighboring states.[286]   Early predictions that enlargement would be disastrous for NATO-Russia relations also failed to materialize, although concerns about Russian reaction would continue to play a role in the enlargement debate well into 2001.[287]

Still a substantial enlargement was far from assured. Some commentators speculated that NATO might admit just one or two new members, probably Slovenia and perhaps Slovakia, assuming that Vladimir Meciar did not return to power.   Fears of antagonizing Russia worked to the disadvantage of the Baltic states, while Romania and Bulgaria were often perceived as lagging behind the others in terms of their domestic political reforms. The September 11th terrorist attacks in the United States, which occurred just months after Bush's Warsaw speech, also prompted speculation that enlargement would be slowed or perhaps removed from NATO's agenda altogether.

Ultimately, however, September 11th did not lead to an abandonment of the Prague enlargement. Within weeks, Secretary General Robertson was arguing that "September 11 had reinforced the logic of NATO enlargement." "We will not let the terrorist attack of last month derail our agenda," he insisted. "We will indeed have to broaden and adapt this agenda. But we will not jettison the fundamentals. Because the core of what we do made sense on September 10, and continues to make sense after September 11."[288]

Indeed, September 11th did not undermine the Bush administration's original case on behalf of enlargement. Speaking before the German Bundestag in May 2002, Bush used language that largely mirrored that of his Warsaw speech given almost a year earlier. "We must lay the foundation with a Europe that is whole and free and at peace for the first time in its history," he reiterated. "The dream of the centuries is close at hand."[289]   That same month, following a meeting of the North Atlantic Council, Colin Powell stated that, while no final decisions would be made until the Prague summit, the Allies remained "hopeful" that there would be a "robust round of enlargement at Prague."[290]

September 11th, in fact, appears to have enhanced prospects for a substantial enlargement. In its wake, Bush administration officials argued that "closer cooperation and integration between the United States and all the democracies of Europe" had only grown in importance.[291]   As Under Secretary of Defense for Policy Douglas Feith put it: "A Europe united on the basis of democratic principles, the rule of law, respect for individual rights and the other tenets of the Alliance will be better able to resist and defeat terrorist threats and other threats. The U.S. government believes that an enlarged Alliance that conducts joint defense and operational planning, promotes interoperability, and encourages realistic training exercises will be a more effective partner in answering global security challenges." [292]

The events of September 11th also served to ease tensions with Russia stemming from

NATO's 1999 war in Kosovo.[293] Indeed, as Timothy Garton Ash has observed, rather than making a halt or slowdown of NATO enlargement the price of his participation in the "war on terrorism," Russian President Vladimir Putin "used that support as a launch pad for a strategic campaign to have Russia accepted as a full member of the West, and of Europe."[294] Putin even went so far as to suggest to Robertson that, if NATO were to become more of a political organization and involve Russia more closely in alliance deliberations, he would mute his opposition to enlargement.[295] This dialogue—supported by British Prime Minister Tony Blair, in particular—ultimately paved the way for agreement on the creation of a new NATO-Russia Council in May 2002. The new institution, allowed Russia a seat at the table during NATO discussions of certain, specified issues, including terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.   Although the Council grew out of a genuine desire for improved NATO-Russia cooperation it was also, in the words of one NATO official, a means by which NATO could "sweeten the enlargement pill" for Putin.[296]

As Robertson observed during a December 2001 trip to Moscow, the events of September 11th were instrumental to this dramatic and unexpected turn in NATO-Russia relations. Noting the irony of the development, he even suggested that "Osama bin Laden was the midwife of an incredible new rapprochement. I don't think that in his wildest dreams this fanatical criminal would have thought that he would have ended forever the Cold War and brought NATO and Russia so closely together."[297] The new relationship also helped to overcome reservations held by some NATO members—especially Britain and Germany—regarding the possibility of extending invitations to the Baltic states at Prague.[298] Indeed, many of the Allies came to believe that it made sense to admit as many of the aspirants as possible while the Russians were in a cooperative mood. Otherwise, they risked stringing out the process, thereby ensuring that enlargement would remain an issue in NATO-Russia relations for the forseeable future.[299]   In short, to the extent that the events of September 11th provided the impetus for a new NATO-Russia relationship, they also removed one of the primary deterrents to a substantial enlargement.

At the same time, however, the Bush administration displayed little interest in actually using NATO militarily, despite the Alliance's unprecedented invocation of Article 5 on September 12th, 2001 and subsequent offers of assistance from Europe. As the United States prepared for a war in Afghanistan aimed at eliminating al Qaeda forces and the Taliban regime that had been harboring them, U.S. deputy secretary of state Paul Wolfowitz told NATO defense ministers in Brussels that the United States would look to "different coalitions in different parts of the world" and did not intend to rely on NATO structures.[300] U.S. Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld had also stated shortly after September 11th that "the mission will determine the coalition" and the "the coalition must not determine the mission."[301] Indeed, the lesson the Bush administration appears to have learned from the 1999 war in Kosovo—a war which highlighted the significant and growing military capabilities gap between the United States and Europe—was that NATO would be more of a decision-making nuisance than a source of true military assistance in the war in Afghanistan.   NATO had in 1999 adopted a Defense Capabilities Initiative designed to improve its military capabilities across the spectrum. Upon becoming Secretary General, Robertson had also repeatedly urged the Europeans to allocate more funds for defense. Despite those pleas, little progress had been achieved toward meeting the DCI's goals between 1999 and 2001.

Coupled with the decision to decline a role for NATO in Afghanistan, Bush's continued support for a substantial enlargement fueled speculation that he had already deemed NATO little more than a political organization like the OSCE and thus discounted concerns that the so-called

"big-bang" approach to enlargement would further dilute NATO's military capabilities.[302]   Some observers, including former Clinton administration officials, also expressed concern that, what they perceived to be a determination by the Bush administration that NATO was no longer militarily relevant, had led to a lowering of the bar with respect to the political and military criteria by which the aspirants were judged. The administration, in their view, had failed to take full advantage of the leverage associated with the enlargement process to encourage continued reform.[303]   Following the Prague summit, NATO scholar Sean Kay put it this way:

> The United States had a serious opportunity to use Prague as a major transformation summit, but in the end it failed to do so by not holding the invitees to serious measures of both established political, economic, and military criteria or demanding new criteria that fit into a more general concept of remolding NATO as a counter-terrorist institution.[304]

Such concerns stemmed in part from a widespread view that at least two of the three states issued invitations in 1997—namely, Hungary and the Czech Republic—had performed poorly upon their accession to NATO in 1999.[305]   Unlike the Czech Republic, Hungary performed reasonably well during the Kosovo conflict—particularly given the sizable Hungarian population in northern Serbia—but still has not fulfilled earlier pledges to restructure its military forces. Indeed, Robertson reportedly lectured Hungary's new defense minister, Ferenc Juhasz regarding Hungary's responsibilities during a courtesy call to Brussels prior to the Prague summit.[306]   A senior figure in European security quoted by Celeste Wallander in the November/December 2002 issue of *Foreign Affairs* even went so far as to suggest that Hungary had "won the prize for most disappointing new member of NATO, and against some competition."[307]   Such developments have generated concern that, once the new invitees are on board, NATO will lose much of its leverage over the reform process because it has no mechanism for suspending or expelling states that fail to live up to its political and military standards.

Bush administration officials deny that the White House lowered the bar on standards or engaged in a "policy of benign neglect" toward NATO.[308]   Still, it's clear that both the context and process surrounding enlargement had changed fundamentally since 1997 when Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic received their invitations. In part, the process of assessing the aspirants in 2002 differed from that employed in 1997 simply because of the introduction of the MAP, which drew heavily from lessons learned during the accession processes for Hungary, Poland, and the Czech Republic. As discussed in chapter four, the MAP did not alter the criteria against which the aspirants were judged or establish a formal acquis for NATO membership, but it did serve to make the evaluation process more structured and rigorous. However, both observers and individuals directly involved in the enlargement process feared that NATO risked losing leverage over the aspirants if they weren't rewarded for reforms achieved under the MAP. As one NATO staff member who had worked closely with the aspirants explained it, even though Slovakia, Bulgaria, and Romania might be deemed somewhat less prepared for membership than the other four aspirants, it would be extremely difficult to deny them invitations after "kissing and hugging them through three cycles of MAP."[309]   Indeed, an official attached to the Bulgarian delegation argued that, while enlargement was ultimately a political process, the aspirants would no longer take the MAP seriously if their progress failed to be recognized.[310]   James Goldgeier has also observed that, coupled with Robertson's June 2001 announcement that the "zero option" was off the table for Prague, the MAP "locked NATO into

a process by which turning new members away in 2002 would cast severe doubts on the Alliance's credibility."[311] NATO's new found cooperation with Russia not only lessened the fear that enlargement would antagonize the Russians; it also made it more difficult to exclude aspirants who had been working for three years to meet NATO's expectations under the MAP. As one NATO official acknowledged, to some aspirants it might appear as though "Russia is getting in through the back door and getting more benefits" than partner countries without having met any of NATO's political and economic standards.[312]

Moreover, while it was generally agreed that Albania and Macedonia were simply not ready for membership, it was difficult to argue that any of the remaining aspirants were appreciably more or less qualified than the others. While Romania and, particularly, Bulgaria were perceived as lagging behind Slovakia, Slovenia, and the Baltic states in terms of their political and economic reform process, none of the invitees stood apart from the others in terms of their qualifications to the degree that Hungary, Poland, and the Czech Republic had stood part from the other prospective members in 1997. In the 2001-2002 rankings of Freedom House, a well-known human rights/democracy monitoring organization, Slovenia, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, and Slovakia scored a 1+1 or 1+2 for political freedoms+civil liberties, putting them in line with present NATO members. Romania scored 2+2 and Bulgaria 1+2. The two other formal aspirants, Albania and Macedonia lagged further behind, both at 3+3.[313]

Finally, as one Pentagon official observed, the Bush administration was operating in an environment in which it was somewhat easier to take democracy in central and eastern Europe for granted than had been the case during the Clinton administration, when the region's future seemed quite uncertain.[314] By 2001, the region appeared solidly oriented toward the West. Still, U.S. Ambassador to NATO Nicholas Burns stressed the importance of the MAP criteria to U.S. assessments of the aspirants' qualifications for membership. "We are taking great care to make sure that the decision is based on such criteria as the applicants' military readiness, institutional strength and human rights record," he insisted. "We are not judging candidates on other issues like Iraq."[315]

However, it is also clear that, from the Bush administration's perspective, September 11th had changed the entire context for thinking about enlargement. Indeed, the United States' decision to push for invitations for seven of the then nine formal aspirants at Prague cannot be fully appreciated without first recognizing that the Bush administration had come to see both the enlargement question and NATO through a new lens. Ultimately, the United States evaluated the aspirants in light of their ability to contribute, not to the old NATO, but rather to a transformed NATO—one better prepared to address threats stemming from outside of Europe.

Although Prague had originally been billed as an enlargement summit, by the Fall of 2002 it had acquired a new label: the "transformation summit." Although enlargement remained an important component of the overall agenda, the attention shifted to the need to equip NATO militarily to respond to terrorism and weapons of mass destruction. Ultimately, the program for the summit comprised, not only the admission of new members, but also the need for "new partners" and "new capabilities."[316] The Bush administration's decision to decline a role for NATO in Afghanistan had made it virtually impossible for the Allies to ignore the capabilities problem at Prague.[317] As U.S. Ambassador to NATO R. Nicholas Burns explained the new agenda in a speech to the Konrad Adenauer Foundation in late May 2003,

> In the wake of the shocking events of September 11, 2001, the world changed and NATO had to change with it. We set out a year and a half ago to transform nearly everything about NATO so that it could help us meet the new and daunting threat

of terrorism and weapons of mass destruction. At November's Prague Summit, President Bush and the NATO Leadership agreed on an ambitious, even revolutionary, reform agenda. We worked to pivot the new NATO from its prior inward focus on threats within Europe to a new outward spotlight on the recent challenges to peace in the arc of countries from South and Central Asia to the Middle East and North Africa.[318]

The emphasis on capabilities at Prague, however, was not coincidental to the decisions made with respect to enlargement. Rather the attention devoted to developing new capabilities and confronting new threats altered the lens through which the aspirants were ultimately evaluated. Indeed, it's clear that factors external to the MAP program ultimately shaped the Bush administration's assessments of the aspirants. These factors included a willingness to contribute to the war on terrorism, a demonstrated appreciation for the transatlantic link, and to a more limited extent geo-political factors. Indeed, the evidence suggests that September 11th not only influenced the Bush administration's rationale for enlargement; it also influenced the behavior of the aspiring members.

The War Against Terrorism

As Jennifer Moroney of the defense consulting firm DFI International observed, the applications of the individual aspirants were, in practice, "measured against their willingness and ability to contribute to the War on Terrorism—requirements not explicitly found in the formal NATO Membership Action Plan (MAP)."[319] In particular, Romania and Bulgaria—the two invitees generally regarded as lagging furthest behind in terms of democratic development—appear to have recognized early on that engaging in ally-like behavior would improve their prospects for NATO membership. Both have been active participants in NATO's peacekeeping efforts and have contributed a variety of capabilities to the war on terrorism, including backfilling troops serving in NATO's SFOR and KFOR missions in the Balkans so that they could be deployed elsewhere.[320] Amongst other contributions, Bulgaria provided a nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons decontamination unit to the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) in Afghanistan as well as an airfield for refueling tankers.[321] For its part, Romania sent an elite group of about 400 troops known as the Red Scorpions, to Afghanistan, many of whom served alongside U.S. soldiers from the Army's 82nd airborne division at Kandahar.[322] Additionally, the government signed an agreement with the United States in October 2001, permitting U.S. troops to transit through Romanian territory or be stationed there short-term.[323] It also made its airbases and Black Sea ports available for use in a possible war with Iraq and reportedly offered to help U.S. airplanes refuel and transport troops and equipment.[324] Particularly indicative of Romania's desire to curry favor with the United States was its decision to sign a bi-lateral agreement specifying that Romania would not turn U.S. citizens over to the International Criminal Court—a move that provoked strong criticism from the EU, which Romania is also in line to join.[325]

Romania and Bulgaria were not the only aspirants to recognize and respond to new expectations. As Marc Grossman noted in testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee in late February 2002, in addition to maintaining their peacekeeping responsibilities, many of the aspirants had offered the United States "overflight rights, transit and basing

privileges, military and police forces, medical units and transport."[326] Latvia and Lithuania, for example, also backfilled SFOR and KFOR troops, and Lithuania sent its own forces to Afghanistan, as did Slovakia.[327] The Baltic states even sent troops to provide base security at a new allied air base at Manas in Kyrgyzstan.[328] In keeping with this record, Romania, Bulgaria, Lithuania and Estonia have all agreed since the Prague summit to send forces to Iraq.

Officials at both the U.S. State Department and the Pentagon observe that these initiatives reflected an understanding by the aspirants that, after September 11th, they would be "seen in a new optic."[329] A Romanian army major leading a group of approximately twenty soldiers assigned to protect U.S. Army doctors in Afghanistan captured well this recognition of the new expectations placed on them. "Romania's road to NATO crosses through Kandahar," he declared: "We are no longer consumers of security. We are now providers of security."[330] Indeed the United States had stressed in the months before Prague that new members must be producers and not just consumers of security. They would be expected to "add value to the alliance" as well as demonstrate a "lasting and assured commitment to democracy."[331] What quickly became clear was that "adding value" meant taking an active role in responding to the new threats on which the Bush administration now sought to focus NATO's attention.

The fact that many of the aspirants did ultimately make contributions to the war in Afghanistan, with an expectation that their efforts to demonstrate solidarity with the United States would be rewarded, ultimately strengthened prospects for a substantial enlargement at Prague. According to one U.S. official closely associated with the enlargement process, the so-called "big bang" approach to enlargement—issuing invitations to a substantial majority of the aspirants at once—was far from certain in June 2001 when Bush spoke in Warsaw, but "September 11th changed the way we looked at enlargement." "The war in Afghanistan, provided opportunities for some countries to show that they were capable of acting like allies."[332] U.S. officials also acknowledge that even the Pentagon, which had previously shown little enthusiasm for the enlargement process or even NATO, itself, began to look seriously at the various kinds of contributions the aspirants might be able to make to the war on terrorism.[333]

Moreover, those aspirants who had made such contributions fully expected to be rewarded for their efforts. From their perspective, the fact that they had behaved as "defacto allies" was highly relevant to any decisions surrounding the second round of enlargement.[334] To some degree, U.S. officials simply expected the kinds of contributions that the aspirants had made prior to Prague. One State Department official even offered that it would have been the "kiss of death" for them had they not behaved as they did. Yet, the evidence also suggests that both U.S. and NATO officials recognized possible costs associated with a minimal enlargement.[335] As General Ralston put it:

> We must consider the potential cost of not enlarging. The aspirant nations have
> put forth a strong effort in good faith toward becoming members, and have taken
> political positions in support of the Alliance in recent conflicts. Their elected
> officials have made membership an important part of their public agenda and
> sought to increase public support for NATO. From a military standpoint, the
> outstanding cooperation and support we have enjoyed in terms of troop
> contributions to ongoing operations and the use of infrastructure and transit rights
> could be jeopardized."[336]

Geostrategic Factors

At least for the United States, geostrategic considerations also became a factor at Prague.[337] Romania and Bulgaria provide a land link to NATO member Turkey as well as access to the Black Sea. With its Black Sea ports and proximity to Turkey and the Gulf region, Romania offered a new staging ground for dealing with new threats further east.[338] Indeed, Romania made its bases available to U.S. forces during the war in Iraq in 2003.[339] Moreover, the inclusion of Romania and Bulgaria in NATO creates a continuum from NATO to the Black Sea, the Caspian Sea and U.S. forces in Central Asia.[340]   Including both Romania and Bulgaria also puts NATO in a better position to reach out to Azerbaijan and Georgia, both of which have sought closer cooperation with NATO. Having Slovenia on board, along with Romania and Bulgaria, provides NATO with a foothold in the Balkans, a region that continues to be a source of insecurity due to ethnic tensions, organized crime, and its potential to serve as a haven for terrorists.[341] Just before the Prague summit, Bush even pronounced that Romania would become "NATO's spearhead in Europe."[342]   Morever, the United States is in the process of a realignment of U.S. military forces, which is likely to result in the opening or expansion of military bases further to the east in such places as Bulgaria and Kyrgyzstan. The realignment is intended to facilitate a quicker response to contemporary threats including terrorism and weapons of mass destruction.[343]

These strategic advantages, suggested one Western diplomat based in Sofia, offset concerns about the slow pace of democratic reforms and corruption, which he suggested could "be fixed later."[344] Robert Hunter, U.S. Ambassador to NATO during the Clinton administration, put it even more directly, telling the *Washington Post*: "People are going to hold their noses and swallow hard on Romania and Bulgaria."   Although the Clinton administration had not supported issuing invitations to Romania and Bulgaria in 1997, Hunter said that he too now supported their inclusion.[345]

Pro-Americanism

What might be described as enthusiastic support for the transatlantic link on the part of the aspirants also worked in their favor with the Bush administration after September 11th. Both NATO's newest members and the Prague invitees have tended to be more supportive than some other Alliance members of American foreign policy and more appreciative of the role of U.S. military power in Europe. As suggested earlier, for these states NATO's proven value lies in the institutional link it provides to the United States, whose military power they perceive as vital to the defense of the values for which NATO stands. Representatives to NATO from the region privately acknowledge that they are not confident of the ability of the European Union to provide security and remain skeptical regarding prospects for the European Security and Defense Identity.[346] A Polish official quoted by the *New York Times* just prior to Poland's accession to NATO made such sentiments explicit. "We want to be good Europeans," he explained. "But more than anyone except perhaps the British, we understand how important it is to keep the Americans involved in Europe."[347]

Consequently, it is also the central and east Europeans who have been most concerned about what they perceive to be a loss of interest in NATO by the Bush administration. Former Polish Foreign Minister Bronislaw Geremek, for example, told the European edition of *The Wall Street Journal* in November 2002: "I am convinced (from my visits to Washington) that NATO is becoming an institution of the past in the mind of American leaders. That is what we Europeans must combat."[348]   A diplomat attached to the Polish mission to NATO affirmed this concern, but also noted that the Bush administration had used it to its advantage.[349]   Indeed, it is

precisely such fears that have led central and eastern Europeans to make considerable efforts to show their solidarity with the United States, including allowing the United States to use their territory and airspace for training exercises with few restrictions.[350]

One of the most dramatic manifestations of this pro-American sentiment, however, followed the Prague summit in the form of two statements involving Iraq—both of them sympathetic to U.S. policy. The first was an open letter published in the *Wall Street Journal* in late January 2003. Signed by the leaders of Hungary, Poland, and the Czech Republic as well as EU members Spain, Portugal, Italy, the United Kingdom, and Denmark, the letter stressed that the U.S. and Europe "must remain united in insisting that [Saddam Hussein's] regime be disarmed."[351] The other was a statement issued by the ten members of the "Vilnius Group" following U.S. Secretary of State Colin Powell's presentation to the U.N. Security Council on February 5, 2002.[352] "Our countries understand the dangers posed by tyranny and the special responsibility of democracies to defend our shared values," the statement declared. "The trans-Atlantic community, of which we are a part, must stand together to face the threat posed by the nexus of terrorism and dictators with weapons of mass destruction."[353] The impetus for the two statements was a series of pronouncements by French President Jacques Chirac and German Chancellor Gerhard Schroeder indicating that they were not yet prepared to support military intervention in Iraq. Hence, both statements were widely interpreted as a sort of rebuke to Schroeder and Chirac for behaving as if they spoke for the whole of Europe.[354] Notably, the *Wall Street Journal* letter also came just days after Rumsfeld generated some consternation in Europe with a remark he made during a press briefing. When confronted with a question about European reluctance to support a war against Iraq, Rumsfeld retorted:

> You're thinking of Europe as Germany and France. I don't. I think that's old Europe. If you look at the entire NATO Europe today, the center of gravity is shifting to the east and there are a lot of new members. And if you just take the list of all the members of NATO and all those that have been invited in recently—what is it? Twenty-six, something like that?...You look at vast numbers of other countries in Europe. They're not with France and Germany on this, they're with the United States.[355]

Indeed, the Bush administration's awareness that the central and east Europeans have generally been appreciative of the role of American military power also increased the odds that seven of the nine aspirants would receive invitations at Prague. Fried and others within the administration had reportedly argued that the Prague enlargement could serve to give the United States staunch new supporters within NATO.[356] Bush himself said in a speech that he delivered during the Prague summit that one of the "advantages" of enlargement was that the "members recently added to NATO and those invited to join bring greater clarity to the purpose of our alliance, because they understand the lessons of the last century. Those with fresh memories of tyranny know the value of freedom."[357] As for the Prague aspirants, Bush said in an interview with Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty that the "love of freedom" they could contribute was "going to be really important—it'll had some vigor to the relationship in NATO."[358] Similarly, Rumsfeld remarked that both NATO's three newest members and the invitees brought a "spirit and enthusiasm" to NATO that were needed by the Alliance's other members.[359] Latvia's president Vaira Vike-Freiberga offered some evidence of that spirit in a particularly moving address at the Prague Summit. As she put it:

> Our people have been tested in the fires of history. They have been tempered by suffering and injustice. They know the meaning and value of liberty. They know that it is worth every effort to support it, to maintain it, to stand for it and to fight for it. We make a solemn pledge and a commitment here today, on this historic and solemn occasion, that we will strive to do our utmost to contribute not just to the strength of the Alliance but also to do whatever needs to be done to create a world where justice and liberty are available to all.[360]

Certainly, the aspirants were themselves aware that U.S. support was critical to their membership bids. One prospective member diplomat even remarked that this was particularly true after President Bush had put the world on notice that all states must take sides in the war against terrorism.

"Niche" Contributions

In terms of understanding the enlargement decisions, it is also relevant that September 11th revealed how ill-equipped NATO's current members were to address contemporary threats and to mobilize forces for "out-of-area" missions. "Many NATO members sent troops to Afghanistan," Robertson noted prior to the Prague Summit, "but for some Allies getting there and staying there proved to be embarrassingly difficult."[361]   To exclude the aspirants on the basis of their generally poor military capabilities when some were actually better equipped to address new threats than current members made little sense in the context of the Prague transformation. In fact, some of both NATO's newest members and the invitees had developed so-called "niche" capabilities that would, according to one senior U.S. General, put them in a position to make significant contributions to the war on terrorism.[362]   Perhaps the most frequently cited example of these capabilities is the first-rate chemical, biological, and nuclear defense capability of the Czech Republic. Indeed, the Czechs have pledged to create a mobile anti-chemical and antibacteriological warfare unit within NATO and possibly serve as the headquarters for a NATO weapons of mass destruction defense center.[363]

Such capabilities became more significant in the context of the agreement reached at Prague to develop a new NATO Response Force of approximately 20,000 soldiers drawn from throughout the Alliance, which can be deployed rapidly to anywhere in the world. Although NATO had previously resisted force specialization, the new force will to some extent depend upon "niche" contributions from member states. All NATO members will ultimately be expected to announce what capabilities they will make available for joint defense purposes. "The New NATO," Robertson explained just prior to the summit, " is going to be about countries who do different things, and do each of them well."[364]   Although the new invitees still have considerable work to do in the area of defense reform, the creation of the NATO Response Force provides them with an opportunity to make valuable contributions as NATO works to transform its military dimension. As U.S. Ambassador to NATO, Nicholas Burns put it: "Not every ally can do everything, but every ally, whether big or small, can contribute something."[365]   It is also notable that, while the defense expenditures of some current NATO members have actually fallen below the 2% of GDP expected of MAP members, some of the invitees have been spending above this level. For example, as of August 2002, Bulgarian had been allocating 2.8% of its GDP to defense while Romania had been spending 2.4% of GDP.[366] No doubt this trend too reflected favorably on some aspirants.

In short, the Bush administration appeared inclined toward a robust enlargement even

before September 11[th,] but the events of that day led the United States to view the enlargement question from a new perspective—one from which military capabilities and political solidarity took on greater importance. As Radio Free Europe analyst Jeremy Bransten explained it:

> Bush presaged NATO's broad second wave of expansion in a Warsaw speech in June 2001, when he called for erasing the old dividing lines in Europe. But the catalyst for going ahead with the plan can be found in the 11 September attacks against the United States, which prompted Washington to seek and reward committed allies.[367]

Ambassador Burns also observed that the key question after September 11th was no longer whether NATO could defend new members, as it had been in 1997, but rather the value the invitees could add to a new NATO. As he put it: The "new, more modern argument for enlargement is it will give us seven new allies with whom to fight and keep the peace in Europe and beyond."[368]

None of the above should be read to suggest that the MAP criteria are no longer relevant or that the Bush administration's original case for enlargement—the notion that stability could be constructed on the basis of shared democratic values—has been dismissed. In fact, even though the decision to take in seven of the nine aspirants had reportedly been made by September 2002, NATO put off making any informal announcements until just before the Prague summit in order to keep maximum pressure on the aspirants to continue with reforms. As Thomas Szayna has noted, throughout the period preceding the Prague summit, policymakers were "loath to make clear the 'who' and 'when' because the success of the process of enlargement depends on keeping an incentive system in place; and the incentive system would be less effective if the choices of 'who' and 'when' were known well in advance."[369] The Allies had apparently agreed that they would not even open the subject for debate prior to their May 2002 summit in Reykjavik so that, there would be time, in the words of one NATO staff member, to "put the hammer on them [the aspirants]."[370] There is also little doubt that NATO would have again refused Slovakia an invitation if the Fall 2002 elections had produced another government led by Vladimir Meciar, whose democratic credentials had been found severely wanting in 1997. As noted earlier, U.S. and other NATO officials repeatedly warned the Slovaks throughout 2002 that the results of the Fall 2002 elections could determine whether Slovakia received an invitation at Prague to join NATO.[371] Ultimately, however, a consensus appears to have emerged among the Allies that all of the invitees had achieved significant reforms through the MAP process and were committed to addressing remaining difficulties, including corruption.[372] Moreover, the invitees, who will remain in the MAP program until their accession, will be expected to participate in a fifth round of that process and work toward completion of the reforms detailed in their individual timetables.

It should also be emphasized that, despite the increased attention paid to military capabilities at the Prague summit, the enlargement decisions were ultimately political decisions based on political rather than military factors. Although some of the invitees were in a position to provide modest geostrategic advantages to the Alliance, none was in a position to offer the United States truly valuable military capabilities. As the United States demonstrated in Iraq, what it currently values amongst the Allies is not necessarily military power, but rather political support.

The evidence also suggests that the commitment former President Bush made in 1989 to a Europe "whole and free" remains alive and well. Although that vision has yet to be thoroughly

fulfilled, the notion that security can be constructed on the basis of shared democratic values continues to hold powerful appeal. "We can't assume that European history has stopped," remarked one State Department official, who affirmed that the rationale for enlargement that President Bush espoused in the Warsaw speech still made sense in a post-September 11th world. However, this same official then quickly added that, in the aftermath of September 11th, achieving a Europe whole and free was "no longer enough."[373]

Indeed, while the tendency within NATO during the 1990s was toward thinking about security in largely political terms, the events of September 11th and a growing awareness of new threats stemming from outside Europe triggered a shift in the other direction—toward a greater emphasis on military capabilities. Bush may already have been more predisposed to thinking about security in military terms than his predecessor, but September 11 accelerated this shift which ultimately influenced, not only the agenda for the Prague summit, but also the yardstick against which the aspirants would be judged. If it was not sufficient that Europe be "whole and free," the Prague summit could no longer be simply about enlargement.

Ultimately, the Prague agenda included, not only new members, but also new partners and capabilities. In addition to endorsing the creation of a NATO Response Force, the Allies agreed to again address the capabilities commitments made, but not fulfilled in the 1999 DCI. The Prague Capabilities Commitment actually serves to reduce the number of commitments by identifying priority categories in which improvements need to be made. These include strategic airlift; air-to-air refueling; defense against chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons; precision-guided weapons; deployable command-and-control and communications capabilities; and deployable combat support.[374]

At Prague, NATO also made an effort to strengthen its partnerships through a Comprehensive Review of the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council and Partnership for Peace. In part, the impetus for the review was a concern that once the seven invitees actually accede to NATO, the EAPC and PfP will become somewhat stratified. The remaining non-NATO members in these institutions will constitute two very different groups—the EU neutrals who are full-fledged liberal democracies and the Central Asian and Caucuses states, which have not made or fully consolidated all necessary democratic reforms and are not members of the MAP. One important outcome of the review was a decision to focus EAPC discussions to a greater degree on security concerns shared by NATO and its Partners and to create issue-specific, result-orientated mechanisms for addressing such concerns, including terrorism.[375] As a first step in this direction, the Allies adopted a Partnership Action Plan Against Terrorism aimed at assisting and facilitating cooperation among EAPC states in fighting terrorism in ways consistent with their commitment "to the protection and promotion of fundamental freedoms and human rights, as well as the rule of law."[376] Notably NATO's Mediterranean Dialogue partners have also been invited to participate in the plan.

To some degree, the merits of EAPC/PfP activities involving the Central Asian and Caucuses states has been evidenced by the cooperation received by the United States as its troops moved into the region following September 11th. NATO diplomatic staff also observe that PfP made U.S. involvement in the region more palatable to both Russia and China. Indeed, the arrival of NATO members troops in Central Asia has even prompted a low-level dialogue between NATO and China.

September 11th also served to reinvigorate NATO's partnerships with both Russia and Ukraine. Russia's expressed interest in a more cooperative relationship with NATO in late 2001 ultimately led to an agreement in Rome on May 28, 2002, establishing the NATO-Russia Council, which allows for identified areas of mutual interest to NATO and Russia to be

discussed with Russia in a "NATO at 20" format. These areas include terrorism, crisis management, non-proliferation, arms control and confidence-building measures, theater missile defense, search and rescue at sea, military-to-military cooperation and defense reform, and civil emergences.[377] Improved relations with Russia have also made it possible for Ukraine to move closer to NATO. Indeed, Ukraine has now publicly declared its desire to join NATO, although it has yet to be accepted into the MAP process, largely due to continued concern about Ukraine's lack of political reform under President Leonid Kuchma. Finally, since September 11th NATO has also made a concerted effort to upgrade cooperation with its Mediterranean Dialogue Partners. NATO has increased the opportunities for dialogue with these states, including holding expert meetings on terrorism. It has also worked to increase opportunities for cooperative activities, including participation in PfP activities.

The "Out-of-Area" Debate

The Prague summit also affirmed a resolution of the "out-of-area" debate, which dated back to the early 1990s when U.S. Senator Richard Lugar argued that NATO had to go "out of area or out of business." The Clinton administration had agreed, arguing that NATO should play a role in addressing common interests outside of Europe, including stemming the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, terrorism, and preventing disruptions to the flow of oil. However, the administration failed to persuade its European allies, who resisted efforts to turn NATO into a global alliance.[378] September 11th forced a resolution to this debate by demonstrating that in the 21st century perhaps the greatest threats to NATO territory and values would stem from outside of Europe. During a foreign ministers' meeting at Helsinki in May 2002, the Allies reached agreement that "NATO must be able to field forces that can move quickly to wherever they are needed, sustain operations over distance and time, and achieve their objectives...so that NATO can more effectively respond collectively to any threat of aggression against a member state."[379] The new security environment, Robertson subsequently observed "does not afford us the luxury of fighting theoretical battles about what is 'in' and what is 'out-of-area.' We will have to look at threats functionally, not geographically. We will have to be able to act wherever our security and the safety of our people demand action."[380] The Allies affirmed this decision at Prague, stating in their final summit declaration: "In order to carry out the full range of its missions, NATO must be able to field forces that can move quickly to wherever they are needed, upon decision by the North Atlantic Council, to sustain operations over distance and time, including in an environment where they might be faced with nuclear, biological, and chemical threats, and to achieve their objectives."[381]

True confirmation that this debate had been resolved came on April 16, 2003 when NATO agreed to take command of the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) in Afghanistan, which has been under the command of several NATO members since its inception following the war in Afghanistan, but had not formally been a NATO operation. Additionally, NATO agreed on May 21, 2003 to assist Poland in commanding a peacekeeping force in central Iraq. The Bush administration had requested that Poland, which had also contributed troops to the war effort, take responsibility for a sector in Iraq that lies in between the sectors to be managed by American and British troops. Although this mission will ultimately be under Polish rather than NATO command, the Alliance could conceivably follow the Afghan model and ultimately take on more responsibility in Iraq as well. And, while France initially resisted the ISAF decision and may still not be comfortable with the precedent that has been set, it will be difficult for NATO to step back from this new out-of-area role in the future.

NATO's decision to assist a member state—in this case Poland—rather than take on the mission as an alliance, does, however, raise the possibility that NATO will become a sort of "toolbox" for "coalitions of the willing" and no longer function as a true alliance.[382] Indeed, Josef Joffe had written as early as September 2002 that the NATO "dedicated to the Three Musketeers' principle of 'all for one, and one for all' is being replaced by 'NATO II'...a collection of nation-states from which Washington draws coalition partners ad hoc."[383] Given the way it managed the war in Afghanistan, the Bush administration might seem a likely advocate for this model. However, Ambassador Burns has suggested that such thinking "does a great disservice to the effort to make NATO more responsive to the security needs of its members and to a changing international security environment." He also reiterated a statement by U.S. Secretary of State Colin Powell that "in some instances we will operate as an alliance, in some as a member of a coalition of the willing."[384] Perhaps even more significantly, Burns called NATO's decision to assist the Poles a "first step" and offered that in the near future, the United States might "ask NATO to play a larger role."[385]

Post-Prague Tensions

Although Prague affirmed, at least rhetorically, that NATO remains committed to the vision of a more democratic and unified Europe as well as to improving Alliance military capabilities, post-Prague developments raise questions about Alliance solidarity and therefore the strength of NATO's political dimension. Tensions created by the Bush administration's determination to go to war with Iraq even in the absence of French and German support constituted a rift within NATO, but no event cast greater doubt on NATO's continued relevance than the decision by France, Germany, and Belgium to block preparations for the defense of Turkey in February 2003. Their refusal held even after Turkey invoked Article 4, which allows any member state that believes its security to be threatened to call for immediate consultation among the Allies. Although the matter was ultimately resolved by moving the decision to the Defense Planning Committee, where France does not have a vote, the crisis raised serious questions about the strength of NATO's Article 5 security guarantee—the bedrock of all Alliance commitments. The American ambassador even went so far as to suggest that the event constituted a "near death" experience for NATO.[386] He also personally assured the Prague invitees that the United States was absolutely committed to Article 5. Representatives from both NATO's newest member states and the invitees affirm that the event was cause for real concern.[387] It also served to prompt a new flurry of predictions of NATO's imminent demise, reminiscent of much of the commentary surrounding NATO's future in the early 1990s.[388]

Importantly, the divide within NATO that was revealed by the tensions over Iraq is one that exists within Europe itself as was demonstrated by the statements of "eight" and "ten" issued in early 2003 supporting U.S. policy with regard to Iraq. Following the release of those statements, French President Jacques Chirac proved unable to hide his irritation over this challenge to French and German leadership in Europe. He declared the central and eastern European states "not very well behaved" and suggested that "they missed an opportunity to keep quiet." Chirac even went so far as to say that if Romania and Bulgaria had "wanted to diminish their chances of joining Europe, they could not have found a better way."   The reaction of the central and eastern Europeans who had signed these letters only further highlighted the divisions over Europe's future and the importance of the transatlantic relationship. Polish Foreign Minister Wiodzimierz Cimoszewicz was quoted by the *Wall Street Journal* to have said: "There will be no division in Europe into better and worse members states, into moms, dads, and

children not mature enough to be treated as partners. Nor will there be countries who are
allowed to say more than others." Hungarian Foreign Minister Laszlo Kovacs retorted that his
"good manners" did not allow him to comment on Chirac's statement.[389] The entire episode
seemed to lend credence to Rumsfeld's rather undiplomatic division of the continent into "new
Europe" and "old Europe," a remark that was actually greeted with pleasure in parts of "new
Europe." Taking his cue from Rumsfeld's statement and pointing to Chirac's own ill-considered
remarks, Former Estonian prime minister Mart Laar wrote in the *Wall Street Journal* that "deep
divisions in Old Europe" were to blame for the crisis over Turkey. Of "new Europe," he said:

> These countries...bring a different historical perspective to the EU and NATO.
> They experienced not only a short Nazi occupation but a much longer communist
> one. Words such as 'freedom' or 'democracy' have real meaning in my part of
> the world. To survive and overthrow dictatorship, people here had to stand by
> values—even if sometimes that meant hiding them deeply inside yourself. As a
> result, the Central and Eastern Europe approach to foreign policy is today based
> more on values than that of Western Europe. They are more receptive to 'moral
> arguments' on Iraq and a host of other issues and less understanding of "European
> Realpolitik."[390]

A summit called by Belgium, France, Germany, and Luxembourg in late April 2003 to discuss
defense cooperation was also widely interpreted as an effort to undermine the transatlantic
relationship and counterbalance U.S. power. During the meeting—which was derisively termed
the "bonbon" or "praline" summit—the four discussed the need for a European Defense and
Security Union that would ultimately be independent of NATO.[391]

Arguably, however, the Bush administration is also guilty of exploiting tensions within
Europe to its advantage in a way that could conceivably undermine NATO's political
solidarity.[392] Indeed, diplomats from NATO's invitees concede that they have felt torn between
the EU and NATO, in ways that they had not forseen and do not appreciate. As one noted,
NATO and EU membership were understood to be one goal, premised on the coherence of the
Western community.   Indeed, the Bush administration has been accused of pursuing its own
"divide and rule" strategy in Europe. For example, citing the Bush administration's 2002
national security strategy, which states that the U.S. "must build and maintain [U.S.] defenses
beyond challenge," Philip Stephens suggested in the *Financial Times* that, from the
administration's perspective, a divided Europe cannot challenge U.S. power as a cohesive one
could. In his words: "Among the most important geopolitical shifts of the past two years has
been the U.S. administration's judgment that its interest now lies in dividing rather than uniting
Europe. Among the most depressing has been the way European governments have colluded in
the fracturing of the continent."[393] The Bush administration might not actually be seeking a
divided Europe as Stephen's implies, but remarks that seem to preference certain parts of Europe
over others do not seem in keeping with Bush's claim to support a Europe whole and free. There
is also considerable irony in the fact that an important factor in explaining the Prague
enlargement; namely, central and east European solidarity with the United States, might
ultimately serve to weaken NATO by diminishing the cohesiveness of the transatlantic
community. Indeed, concerns about an erosion of NATO's political solidarity prompted a group
of prominent academics and policymakers from both sides of the Atlantic to issue a statement in
May 2003 calling on both Americans and Europeans to work together towards a common agenda
that would include the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, Iran, terrorism, and weapons of mass

destruction. They pointedly rejected talk attributed to administration officials of "punishing" those who were at odds with the United States over how to deal with Iraq. As they put it: A rejuvenation of transatlantic cooperation requires changes on both sides. Americans need to understand that policies intended to divide Europe are not conducive to healthy and constructive transatlantic relations. By the same token, the Europeans will not be able to pursue an ever-closer Union if they seek to build up Europe as a counterweight to the U.S."[394] Moreover, the NATO enlargement experience suggests that the states of central and eastern Europe have placed particular value on NATO membership because it offers both an institutional link to the United States and a return to Europe, not estrangement from it.

NATO: A Political and Military Alliance

The Bush administration must also recognize that military capabilities alone cannot sustain an alliance that was predicated on a commitment to European integration and shared values, and which has traditionally operated on the basis of consensus. Indeed, NATO's political and military dimensions cannot be divorced from one another. During the 1990s as the Allies sought to enhance NATO's political dimension, they clearly neglected the Alliance's military capabilities, as evidenced by the Europeans' failure to meet their obligations under the Defense Capabilities Initiative approved in 1999. As a result many commentators had already deemed NATO little more than a political forum much like the OSCE. However, NATO cannot hang together politically in the absence of competent military capabilities to which all members contribute. As Robertson has stated repeatedly, those capabilities remain part of the "political glue" that holds the Alliance together. In his words:

> The importance of addressing the capability gap cannot be overstated. NATO works politically because it can work militarily. All Allies consult in NATO, and work for consensus, because burden and costs are shared once the decision is taken." "Preserving that level of daily, substantive consultation—which, in a transatlantic context occurs only in NATO—requires that all Allies on both sides of the Atlantic, continue to pull their weight.[395]

Moreover, the enlargement experience suggests that part of NATO's appeal to prospective members and therefore a key component of its leverage over their domestic and foreign policy reforms is the perception that NATO is an alliance committed to defending its values with force if necessary. Polish Foreign Minister Bronislaw Geremek made this link explicit in December 1997 when he explained that Poland had chosen to join NATO because it "is an alliance which has managed to put its immense military might in service of fundamental values and principles that we share. NATO can make Europe safe for democracy. No other organization can make Europe safe for democracy."[396]   Indeed, Robert Kagan also notes that central and eastern Europeans "have an entirely different history than their Western European neighbors, a historically rooted fear of Russian power and consequently a more American view of the Hobbesian realities."[397]   In short, a NATO that lacks competent military capabilities or a solid commitment from the United States will not hold the same appeal in the eyes of those recently invited or those who still wish to join the Alliance.

At the same time, NATO's political dimension must also be nurtured. As Strobe Talbott wrote just before the Prague Summit, "NATO's military and political functions have always been intertwined....even at its inception NATO was about more than just banding together

against a common enemy; it was also about creating, consolidating, and expanding a zone of safety within which common values and cooperative institutions could prosper."[398] Preserving the political integrity of the Alliance while consolidating the most recent round of enlargement and strengthening NATO's partnerships poses numerous challenges, however. One concern mentioned in chapter four is that once the new invitees are on board, NATO will have little influence over the direction of their political, economic, and military reforms. Charles Gati, for example, has argued that strong nationalist sentiments in central and eastern Europe have undermined the region's commitment to the rule of law and tolerance. Pointing to a serious and growing corruption problem in the region, he cites a study by Transparency International, which gives Romania the distinction of having the worst corruption problem followed by Latvia, Slovenia, Bulgaria, and the Czech Republic." "Unless an appropriate method is found to discipline members for their misdeeds," Gati says, "the utility of NATO as an instrument of Western influence in Central and Eastern Europe will begin to diminish the very moment these new applicants become members."[399] Celeste Wallander has also argued that trends in the region are cause for concern because NATO's effectiveness depends on the fact that "it is a political security community of countries with common values and democratic institutions." "Dilute NATO's political coherence," she says "and the result will be a one-dimensional traditional military alliance that cannot operate effectively."[400] Wallander therefore recommends that NATO "amend the North Atlantic Treaty to allow for sanction, suspension, or even expulsion of backsliding members."[401] In ratifying the Prague enlargement in 2003, the U.S. Senate also asked that NATO consider such an amendment.

Indeed, Wallander and others are right to be concerned. The fact that NATO is not simply a military alliance but also a political organization grounded on the values enshrined in its preamble—"democracy, individual liberty and the rule of law"—is a key source of its appeal and therefore its leverage over prospective members. Presently, that appeal appears strong. As Robert Kaiser observed just prior to the Prague summit, NATO "has become the club of choice from one end of Europe to the other...For Central and Eastern Europeans, NATO is the happening place to be...More practically, it is the entrance hall to the Western world...."[402] Robertson also took note of NATO's continuing appeal just prior to the Prague summit.

> We may sometimes think that the transatlantic relationship is in disarray. But there are those outside NATO who would be only too willing to join that 'disarray.' Indeed, those who are on the outside looking in may sometimes have a better appreciation for the fundamental truth that we ourselves, on the inside, seem to miss occasionally: that this Alliance is a most precious achievement, a strategic asset of tremendous value.[403]

The Allies must, however, take care to honor their shared values as the linchpin of their political solidarity. That means taking seriously the MAP process and holding new members to account for reforms promised.

As NATO prepares for further enlargement and continues its efforts to build a zone of cooperation that extends beyond its borders, the Allies will also need to think seriously about how to enhance their partnerships while preserving NATO's unique character as a community rooted in shared democratic values. To some extent, NATO's efforts to reach out well beyond the core of democracies that comprise NATO and develop new partnerships with, not only Russia, but also Ukraine and the Central Asian and Caucasus states reflect a determination that "cooperative security" is possible in the absence of shared values. Yet close cooperation with

states that do not share NATO's values and with whom shared interests might therefore be fleeting could pose risks to the integrity of NATO's political mission. Indeed, the Bush administration has already come under criticism for allegedly not taking advantage of close military cooperation in Central Asia since September 11th to push for more democratic reforms. Moreover, at least one member of NATO's international staff acknowledged that cooperative security was qualitatively different from security encompassing shared values and therefore fell short of NATO's larger aim. At NATO, he offered, "we all believe in the democratic peace."

Perhaps the most difficult issue is what sort of cooperation NATO can expect to sustain with Russia, particularly given ongoing concerns regarding human rights abuse in Chechnya. Both the establishment of the PJC in 1997 and the NATO-Russia Council in 2002 were also surrounded by concerns that NATO's political integrity could be jeopardized if Russia acquired too much influence via these arrangements. As Timothy Garton Ash has suggested, Putin's efforts to draw Russia closer to NATO present the West with the difficult question "of how far we should compromise our own standards in order to encourage Russia's admirable impulse toward greater cooperation with the rest of Europe."[404]

A related issue is the question of whether NATO should ultimately be open to a democratic Russia. During a gathering in Bratislava of the Vilnius group several weeks before the 2001 NATO summit in Brussels, Czech President Vaclav Havel suggested that NATO should expand to include the territory "from Alaska in the West to Tallinn in the east"—the area he perceived, geographically and culturally, to comprise "the West."[405] At the same time, however, he has intimated in not so subtle terms that Russia does not belong in NATO because NATO is an alliance of Western civilization of which Russia is not a part. Havel also cautioned during the Bratislava speech that "a somewhat desperate effort to integrate everybody at all costs could finally lead to nothing but confusion and ruin."[406] Similarly, Henry Kissinger has written that Russia is not a wholly European power and thus has interests that are not necessarily consistent with NATO objectives. Opening NATO to Russia, Kissinger concluded in 1997, would "dilute the Alliance to the point of irrelevance."[407]

Conclusion

The Prague enlargement suggests that, while NATO remains committed to a Europe whole and free, that alone will not buy security in an age in which terrorism and weapons of mass destruction constitute a growing danger. However, as NATO transforms itself again to better respond to new external threats, the goal of maintaining and expanding what former U.S. Ambassador to NATO Robert Hunter has termed the European civil space must not be neglected. NATO's experiences in Bosnia, Kosovo, and more recently Macedonia serve as reminders that threats to security can still stem from inside as well as outside of Europe. Ethnic and religious conflicts, failed states, and economic instability among other problems create fertile ground for organized crime, terrorist groups, and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. As EAPC foreign ministers recognized during their Madrid meeting in early June 2003, "domestic stability, based on democratic institutions and respect for human rights, is a key condition of lasting international stability and security and an important factor in the success of the fight against terrorism."[408] Indeed, a Europe whole and free may no longer be enough, but it will prove essential if the Allies are to successfully combat threats to their peoples, territory, and values emanating from outside of Europe.

Chapter 6: Conclusion

The Prague Summit may have turned NATO's attention to the need for new military capabilities and an approach to security that is less focused inward on Europe, but it did not signal an abandonment of the mission NATO embraced in 1990; namely, the construction of a Europe whole and free. The summit, did, however, confirm that this mission cannot be an end in itself. Indeed, the United States ultimately came to view the Prague enlargement as an opportunity, not only to enlarge the "pacific federation," but also to enlarge the core of allies with which to address threats increasingly stemming from outside of Europe.

Of course, Europe is not yet whole and free, but NATO has made remarkable strides toward that goal since the former President Bush first articulated it in 1989. As of 1990, NATO had no grand strategy for achieving its new political mission. Yet, over the past decade it has gradually developed a variety of essentially political tools, including but not limited to enlargement, with which to pursue a more united and democratic Europe. New institutions, new partners, and new peacekeeping missions in the Balkans have all played a role in this endeavor. Today, as Robertson noted following the Madrid Foreign Ministers' meeting in June 2003, "NATO is at the centre of a historically unprecedented web of partnerships all forging peace and stability in the Euro-Atlantic area."[409] It's also true that, despite NATO's lack of a grand strategy, virtually all of the Alliance's new initiatives have taken their cue from the values enshrined in the preamble to the original NATO treaty: democracy, individual liberty, and the rule of law. They have indeed served "as both an anchor and a course to navigate for the future" as President Bush suggested they should in the waning days of the Cold War.

Indeed, this study concludes that the new security order whose essence Bush attempted to capture with the phrase "Europe whole and free" depended on the triumph of liberal democratic values throughout the whole of Europe. It required that NATO succeed in promoting its values outside NATO territory. Security would no longer rest upon the maintenance of a balance of power, but rather on a core of shared values—above all, respect for the rights of the individual.

As was perhaps best demonstrated by NATO's war in Kosovo, this new conception of security not only encompasses the rights of the individual; it ultimately preferences the sovereignty of the individual over that of the state.

NATO's post-Cold War conception of security also represents a departure from the past in that it is essentially a pro-active rather than reactive approach, as evidenced by the numerous references of NATO's leaders to "building" and "constructing" security. To a significant degree, NATO's new political mission is contingent upon constructivist assumptions that states' interests are not wholly material, but can be shaped or actually constituted by ideas. Indeed, Solana's statement that "security in the 21st century is what we make of it" cannot help but remind one of Alexander Wendt's oft-quoted phrase: "anarchy is what states makes of it."[410] The very notion that security can be constructed or understood in terms of a specific set of ideas or values presumes that states' interactions with each other are governed, not simply by structure, but also by perceptions that states have of each other, which are based at least in part on identities and ideas. Indeed, one lesson of the enlargement experience is that ideas and identity constitute powerful forces of which NATO has taken full advantage in prescribing its values as norms that should govern the whole of Europe. Promises of security guarantees are undoubtedly an attractive "carrot" that contributes to the lure of NATO, but the desire to be identified as part of the West has also carried formidable appeal. Moreover, the record suggests that NATO is attractive, not simply because it has been recognized as a formidable military alliance, but also because it has committed its military power to the service of shared values.

It might also be said that the Prague enlargement confirmed the essentially political nature of NATO. The decisions made at both Madrid in 1997 and Prague in 2002 were ultimately based largely on political rather than military criteria and made for political reasons. Perhaps the single most important factor shaping the Prague enlargement was the political solidarity demonstrated by the invitees, especially after September 11th. That said, the Prague Summit also highlighted the fact that defending NATO territory and values cannot be a purely political task. As threats increasingly stem from outside of Europe, the Allies will also need to develop a more global perspective. It is self-evident that Europe whole and free has been a Europe-centered mission.

At the same time, it should be noted that this mission has always been premised on a belief that the Allies could not be secure if instability and chaos reigned on NATO's periphery. This assumption was perhaps most evident in NATO's decision to take on new peacekeeping missions in Bosnia and Kosovo, but it also drove the Alliance's early efforts to reach out to the states of central and eastern Europe in the hope of guiding the changes taking place in the region in a direction that was consistent with NATO's own interests and values. NATO's decisions to take responsibility for ISAF in Afghanistan and to assist Poland in Iraq might even be seen as a logical extension of these earlier initiatives as well as a recognition of the increasing permeability of state borders in an ever more globalized world. Moreover, having successfully stabilized much of Europe in cooperation with its partner institutions, NATO is now better positioned to take on new missions outside of Europe. Indeed, amidst the continued proclamations of NATO's irrelevance, the Alliance has also recently earned recognition as the "only organization that is capable of meeting complex and simultaneous crises." As the German newspaper *Die Welt* put it in early June 2003:

> It was NATO that created stability in the Balkans, which was devastated by civil wars. It was the alliance that paved the way for a gradual takeover of the stabilizing missions by the European Union. In the case of Afghanistan, NATO

proved to be the only organization that is in a position to plan and carry out multinational operations over a longer period. It is the logical consequence that the alliance will take on this task also in Iraq.[411]

NATO's critics, however, appear not to have been paying much attention or not to have recognized the importance of these missions. In proclaiming NATO to be "irrelevant" in May 2003, Robert Levine conceded that the Alliance did "provide useful if minor functions in military planning and training." To describe NATO's engagements in the Balkans and now Afghanistan as "minor," is to ignore the realities of a post-Cold War world in which the vast majority of conflicts have been intra-state and in which failed states are increasingly recognized as magnets for terrorists and a host of other potential security threats. As Richard Lugar wrote in 2003:

> We have seen the consequences of allowing failed states such as Afghanistan and Somalia to fester. Successful 'nation-building' must be an important objective for U.S. policymakers and their NATO partners. Iraq and Afghanistan must serve as models of how to make a sustained commitment to peace as part of the broader war on terror. Rehabilitating chaotic states is a complicated and uncertain business. At a minimum, it will require a broad range of military and peacekeeping skills, international legitimacy and more resources than the U.S. can comfortably muster alone. In short, this vital endeavor will require NATO if it is to have the best chance of success.[412]

Indeed, NATO not only recognizes that internal conflicts now constitute a principal threat to international peace and security, it, unlike the U.N. which remains mired in disputes over the nature of sovereignty, has demonstrated that it is capable of doing something about them.

Endnotes

[1] The White House, Office of the Press Secretary, "Remarks by the President in Address to Faculty and Students of Warsaw University," Warsaw, Poland, June 15, 2001 (http:/www.whitehouse.gov/new/releases/2001/06/20010615-1.html)

[2] Declaration on a Transformed North Atlantic Alliance (The London Declaration), July 6, 1990 (http://www.nato.int/docu/basictext/b900706a.htm)

[3] James Baker, "A New Europe, A New Atlanticism: Architecture for a New Era," U.S. Department of State, *Current Policy* No. 1233, December 12, 1989, p. 2.

[4] Former U.S. National Security Advisor Brent Scowcroft notes that then Soviet Foreign Minister Shevardnadze had repeatedly stressed to U.S. Secretary of State James Baker that the declaration issued at the 1990 London summit would be critical to selling German sovereignty and NATO membership to the Soviets. Former President George Bush also recounts that in the spring of 1990 he told French President Mitterand, who worried that any expansion of NATO's role constituted a threat to the emerging European Union, that he "could not keep the United States in Europe if NATO did not adapt to a new role." See George W. Bush and Brent Scowcroft, *A World Transformed* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1998), pp. 264-268.

[5] The Allies had already articulated their belief that arms control alone was not a sufficient basis for "genuine peace" during a meeting in Brussels in March 1998. Such a peace they asserted "must be firmly based on full respect for fundamental rights." See Declaration of the NATO Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council, Brussels, March 2-3 1988 (http://www.nato.int/docu/basictxtb890529b.htm)

[6] Declaration of the NATO Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council (the 40th anniversary of the Alliance), Brussels, May 29-30, 1989

(http://www.nato.int/docu/basictxtb890529a.htm)

[7]Declaration on a Transformed North Atlantic Alliance (The London Declaration).

[8]1991 (Rome) Strategic Concept. (http://www.nato.int/docu/comm/49-95/c9111107a.htm)

[9]During a meeting in Turnberry (United Kingdom) in early June 1990, the North Atlantic Council had declared that it was time to "extend to the Soviet Union and to all other European countries the hand of friendship and cooperation." See John Borawski and Thomas Durell Young, *NATO After 2000: The Future of the Euro-Atlantic Alliance* (Praeger, 2001), pp. 60-61.

[10]Quoted in David S. Yost, *NATO Transformed: The Alliances New Roles in International Security* (Washington, D.C.: United States Institute of Peace Press, 1998), p. 101.

[11]Declaration of NATO Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council, Brussels, May 29-30, 1989.

[12]See Ian Q.R. Thomas, The Promise of Alliance: NATO and the Political Imagination, (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 1997), p. 145.

[13]Lord Robertson, Speech at NATO Parliamentary Assembly, Amsterdam, November 15, 1999.

[14] Author interview, NATO Headquarters, Brussels, December 2001.

[15]Both Havel and Walesa had appealed to President Clinton during the opening of the Holocaust Museum in Washington, D.C. in 1993 to open NATO's door to new members.

[16]See "Partnership for Peace (PfP)," NATO Basic Fact Sheet, no. 9 March 1996 (http://www.nato.int)

[17]For more information see "The Alliance's Mediterranean Dialogue," NATO Fact Sheet, May 28, 2002 ((http://www.nato.int/docu/facts/2000/med-dia.htm)

[18]U.S. Mission to NATO, Report to Congress on Enlargement of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization: Rationale, Benefits, Costs and Implications—Executive Summary, 24 February 1997.

[19]U.S. Department of State, NATO Enlargement Fact Sheet. See also Madeleine Albright, "Enlarging NATO," *The Economist* (February 15, 1997): p. 22.

[20]See Madeleine Albright, "NATO Expansion: Beginning the Process of Advice and Consent," Statement before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Department of State *Dispatch*, October 17, 1997, p. 31. See also "Excerpts from Speech: Binding Broader Europe," *The New York Times*, January 10, 1994, p. A4.

[21]Sean Kay, "NATO Enlargement: Policy, Process, and Implications." in Andrew A. Michta (ed.), *America's New Allies: Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic in NATO* (Seattle, WA and London: University of Washington Press, 1999), p. 170.

[22]See the *Study on NATO Enlargement*, Brussels, 3 September 1995 (http://www.nato.int/docu/basictxt/enl-9501.htm).

[23]U.S. Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, Report on Human Rights and the Process of NATO Enlargement, June 1997, p. 7.

[24]Author interview, Washington, DC, May 2002.

[25]See, for example, James M. Goldgeier, "Not When but Who," *NATO Review*, Spring 2002 (http://www.nato.int/docu/review/2002/issue1/art2.html).

[26]Quoted in William Drozdiak, "Growing Pains at a New NATO," *International Herald Tribune*, July 11, 1997.

[27]See for example, Vaclav Havel, "NATO's Quality of Life," *The New York Times*, May 13, 1997.

[28]See Samuel Huntington, *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1996), p. 309.

[29]Henry Kissinger, "Old Allies Face New Dilemmas," *Courier-Mail*, April 14, 2003.

[30]See Charles Kupchan, "The Last Days of the Atlantic Alliance," *Financial Times*, November 18, 2002.

[31]Robert Kagan, *Of Paradise and Power: America and Europe in the New World Order*, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2003, p. 3. For the *Policy Review* version of this essay, see Robert Kagan, "Power and Weakness," *Policy Review*, No. 113 (June 2002).

[32] John J. Mearsheimer, "Back to the Future: Instability in Europe after the Cold War," *International Security*, 15, No. 1 (Summer 1990), p. 52

[33]Ibid. Mearsheimer did, however, note that there was "considerable support within NATO's higher circles, including the Bush administration, for maintaining NATO beyond the Cold War."

[34]Owen Harries, "The Collapse of the West," *Foreign Affairs*, 72, No. 4 (September/October 1993), p. 41.

[35]Robert A. Levine, "NATO is Irrelevant: A Bureacracy Whose Time Has Passed," *International Herald Tribune*, May 24, 2003.

[36]Kupchan, "The Last Days of the Atlantic Alliance."

[37]John Duffield, "NATO's Function After the Cold War," *Political Science Quarterly*, 109, No. 5 (Winter 1994/95), p. 767.

[38]Rob deWijk, "Towards a New Political Strategy for NATO," *NATO Review*, 2 (Summer 1998), p. 15.

[39]Robert McCalla, "NATO's Persistence," *International Organization*, 50, No. 3, (Summer 1995), pp. 445-475.

[40]Robert O. Keohane, "Reponse to 'Back to the Future'," in *The New Shape of World Politics: Contending Paradigms in International Relations* (New York: Foreign Affairs, 1997), p. 159-160.

[41]John M. Owen, "How Liberalism Produces Democratic Peace," *International Security*, 19, No. 2 (Fall 1994), pp. 87-125.

[42]Michael W. Doyle, "Kant, Liberal Legacies, and Foreign Affairs, Part 2," *Philosophy & Public Affairs*, 12, No. 4 (Fall 1983), pp. 323-353.

[43]Thomas Risse Kappen, *Cooperation Among Democracies: The European Influence on U.S. Foreign Policy* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1995, p. 33.

[44]Karl W. Deutsch, *Political Community and the North Atlantic Area: International Organization in Light of Historical Experience* (Princeton: Princeton University Press), p. 4-5

[45]Ibid., p. 9.

[46]Risse-Kappen, *Cooperation Among Democracies*, p. 9.

[47]Thomas Risse-Kappen, "Collective Identity in a Democratic Community: The Case of NATO" in *The Culture of National Security*, Peter Katzenstein, ed. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1996), pp. 372-378.

[48]Madeleine K. Albright, Statement before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Washington, DC, October 7, 1997.

[49]Ronald D. Asmus, *Opening NATO's Door: How the Alliance Remade Itself for a New Era* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2002), p. 303.

[50]Quoted in Thomas, *The Promise of Alliance*, p. 33.

[51]Sean Kay, *NATO and the Future of European Security*, (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, Publishers, Inc., 1998) p. 16.

[52]Ibid., p. 31-32

[53]Vaclav Havel, "NATO"s Quality of Life." *The New York Times*, May 13, 1997.

[54]Samuel Huntington, *The Clash of Civilization and the Remaking of World Order*, p. 307. Interestingly, the notion of NATO as a community that preceded the onset of the Cold War has also been used to delineate the borders of enlarged NATO. Vaclav Havel, when confronted with the question of whether NATO should be open to Russia, has expressed firm opposition by intimating in not so subtle terms that Russia does not belong in NATO because it is an alliance of Western civilization of which Russia is not a member. As he has put it: "It is true that a part of

Russia lies in Europe and that Russia's spiritual wealth has always had a pronounced influence on the rest of Europe and vice versa. But this does not mean that Russia should simply be included in the region that we call the West. Not because it [was] in any way inferior, but simply because the modern restructuring of the world, based on cooperation among various clearly delimited regions or historically determined entities, would thus lose meaning." See *RFE/RL Newsline*, 5, No. 93, Part II, (May 16, 2001).

[55]55. Jamie Shea, *NATO 2000: A Political Agenda for a Political Alliance*, ed. Nicholas Sherwen, Brassey's Atlantic Commentaries (Brassey's (UK), 1990), p. 2.

[56]See U.S. Policy Toward NATO Enlargement, Hearing before the House Committee on International Relations, 104th Cong., 2nd sess., June 20, 1996, p. 37.

[57]Yost, *NATO Transformed*, p. 51.

[58]The North Atlantic Treaty, Washington, D.C., April 4, 1949 (http://www.nato.int/docu/basictxt/treaty.htm)

[59]Kay, *NATO and the Future of European Security*, p. 33

[60]Yost, *NATO Transformed*, p. 35-36.

[61]See "The Future Tasks of the Alliance ("The Harmel Report"), Brussels, December 13-14, 1967 (http://www.nato.int/docu/basictxt/b671213a.htm).

[62]Text of the Report of the Committee of Three on Non-Military Cooperation in NATO," December 1956 (http://www.nato.int/docu/basictxt/treaty.htm)

[63]See Shea, *NATO 2000*, pp. 60-61 and pp. 64-65.

[64]The Alliances's Strategic Concept (1999), Approved by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council, Washington, D.C., April 23-24, 1999. (http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/1999/p99-065e.htm)

[65]Specifically Mearsheimer attributes stability on the European continent to three factors: "the bipolar distribution of military power on the Continent; the rough military equality between the two states comprising the two poles in Europe, the United State and the Soviet Union; and the fact that each superpower was armed with a large nuclear arsenal." See Mearsheimer, "Back to the Future."

[66]Richard Holbrooke, "America, A European Power," *Foreign Affairs*, 74, no. 2 (March/April 1995), p. 41-42

[67]William E. Odom, "NATO's Expansion: why the critics are wrong," *The National Interest*, No. 39 (Spring 1995), pp. 38-49.

[68]Mearsheimer, "Back to the Future," p.6.

[69]Risse-Kappen, *Cooperation Among Democracies*.

[70]Javier Solana, "NATO in the 21st Century: An Agenda for the Washington Summit," *Congressional Digest* (April 1999): pp. 104-106.

[71]See CRS Report for Congress, NATO's Evolving Role and Missions, March 13, 1998 (http://www.senate.gov/~dpc/crs/reports/pdf/97-708.pdf)

[72]See, for example, Risse-Kappen, *Cooperation Among Democracies*, p. 34.

[73]Alexander Wendt, *Social Theory of International Politics*, (Cambridge University Press, 1999), p. 114 and 135.

[74]John Gerard Ruggie, "What Makes the World Hang Together? Neo-utilitarianism and the Social Constructivist Challenge," *International Organization*, 52, No. 4 (Autumn 1998), p. 879.

[75] *The Responsibility to Protect*, Report of the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (Ottawa, Canada: The International Development Research Centre, December 2001), p. xi. The independent commission was created at the initiative of the Canadian government but the commissioners were chosen so as to reflect a broad range of country perspectives. The commission's mandate was "to build a broader understanding of the problem of reconciling intervention for human protection purposes and sovereignty." See page 2 of the report for further information on the commission.

[76]75.See Richard Falk, *Human Rights Horizons: The Pursuit of Justice in a Globalizing World* (New York: Routledge, 2000), p. 217.

[77]See, for example, Michael J. Glennon, "The New Interventionism," *Foreign Affairs*, vol. 78, no. 3 (May/June 1999), pp. 2-7

[78]Martha Finnemore and Kathryn Sikkink, "International Norm Dynamics and Political Change," *International Organization*, 52, No. 4, (Autumn 1998), p.895.

[79]Joseph S. Nye, Jr. and John D. Donahue, eds., *Governance in a Globalizing World* (Brookings Institution Press, 2001), p. 25. Finnemore and Sikkink also suggest that some norms are better candidates for internationalization than others and that this can result from the quality of the states promoting the norm. They argue that "norms held by states widely viewed as successful and desirable models are thus likely to become prominent and diffuse." Finnemore and Sikkink, "International Norm Dynamics and Political Change," p. 906.

[80]See Michael Mandelbaum, "A Perfect Failure: NATO's War Against Yugoslavia," *Foreign Affairs*, 78, No. 3 (May/June 1995), pp. 3-5.

[81]Michael Mandelbaum, "Preserving the New Peace: The Case Against NATO Expansion," *Foreign Affairs*, 74, no. 3 (May/June 1995), p. 10.

[82]See, for example, Christopher Layne, "Why Die for Gdansk? NATO Enlargement and

America Security Interests," p. 58.   See also Karl Heinz-Kamp, "The Folly of Rapid NATO Expansion," *Foreign Policy* (Spring 1995) and Michael Mandelbaum, *The Dawn of Peace in Europe* (New York: The Twentieth Century Fund Press, 1996).

[83]Layne, "Why Die for Gdansk?," p. 58.

[84]George Kennan, "NATO: A Fateful Error," *The New York Times*, February 2, 1997. For similar arguments see also Michael Mandelbaum, see Mandelbaum, "Preserving the Peace," p. 11 and Owen Harries, "The Collapse of 'the West',"p. 42.

[85]Michael Mandelbaum, "NATO Expansion: A Bridge to the Nineteenth Century," (Eisenhower Institute's Center for Political and Strategic Studies, June 1997). (http://www.eisenhowerinstitute.org/programs/globalpartnerships/securityandterrorism/coalition/ usandnato/Mandelbaum.htm)

[86]Mandelbaum, *The Dawn of Peace in Europe*, p. 51.

[87]Dan Reiter, "Why NATO Enlargement Does Not Spread Democracy," *International Security*, 25, no. 4 (2001), p.59-60.

[88]Ibid., p. 50.

[89]See, for example, Michael Mandelbaum, *The Dawn of Peace in Europe*, p. 49.

[90]Reiter, "Why NATO Enlargement Does Not Spread Democracy," p. 56-57.

[91]Mandelbaum, *The Dawn of Peace in Europe*, p. 49. For similar arguments, see also Layne, "Why Die for Gdansk?," p. 58 and Joseph Coffey, *The Future Role of NATO*, (Foreign Policy Association, 1997), pp. 11-12.

[92]Javier Solana, "An Alliance Fit for the 21st Century," *NATO Review*, 47, No. 3 (Autumn 1999), p. 3.

[93]Ibid.

[94]See, for example, Thomas Risse-Kappen, *Cooperation Among Democracies*, p. 9.

[95]George Bush, "Security Strategy for the 1990s," Address at the US Coast Guard Academy, May 24, 1989, U.S. Department of State, *Current Policy* No. 1178.

[96]George Bush, "Proposals for a Free and Peaceful Europe," Speech at Mainz, Federal Republic of Germany, May 31, 1989, U.S. Department of State, *Current Policy* No. 1179, p. 2.   Ian Thomas has observed that "the intent of the rhetoric of common values was to counter the Gorbachev challenge. His notion of a common European home disturbed allied leaders: the region from the Atlantic to the Urals did not seem to include a place for the United States and Canada." See Ian Thomas, *The Promise of Alliance*, p. 147.

[97]James Baker, "A New Europe, A New Atlanticism: Architecture for a New Era," p.2.

[98]George Bush, "Proposals for a Free and Peaceful Europe."

[99]Declaration of the NATO Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council, Brussels, May 1989.

[100]U.S. Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, *Document of the Copenhagen Meeting of the Conference on the Human Dimension of the CSCE*, Washington, DC, 1990, p. 102.

[101]Thomas Buergenthal, "Copenhagen: A Democratic Manifesto," *World Affairs*, 153, No. 1 (Summer 1990), pp. 6-7.

[102]During the 1990 NATO summit in London, the Allies had also called upon the CSCE to hold another summit at which members would issue a further endorsement of democratic principles and processes.

[103]CSCE, Charter of Paris for a New Europe, November 19-21, 1990 (http://www.osce.org/docs/english/1990-1999/summits/paris90e.htm.

[104]Robert Hunter, "Enlargement: Part of a Strategy for Projecting Stability into Central Europe," *NATO Review*, 43, No. 3 (May 1995), pp.3-8.

[105]Timothy Garton Ash, "Europe's Endangered Liberal Order," *Foreign Affairs*, 77, No. 2 (March/April 1998), p. 64.

[106]1991 (Rome) Strategic Concept (http://www.nato/int/docu/comm/49-95/c9111107a.htm)

[107]Final Communique of the Ministerial meeting of the North Atlantic Council (including the Oslo decision on NATO support for peacekeeping activities under the responsibility of the OSCE), Oslo, June 4, 1992 (http://www.nato.int/docu/basictxt/b920604a.htm). Meeting in Petersberg, Germany that same month, Western European Union (EU) states agreed to deploy military units of WEU member states for "humanitarian and rescue tasks, peacekeeping tasks, tasks of combat forces in crisis management, including peacemaking" on the basis of a mandate from the CSCE or the U.N. Security Council.

[108]Rob de Wijk, *NATO on the Brink of the New Millennium: The Battle for Consensus*, Brassey's Atlantic Commentaries (Brassey's 1997), p. 55.

[109]Final Communique of the Ministerial meeting of the North Atlantic Council, (including decisions on NATO support for peace keeping operations under the responsibility of the U.N. Security Council), Brussels, December 17, 1992 (http://www.nato.int/docu/basictxt/b921217a.htm)

[110]Final Communique of the Ministerial meeting of the North Atlantic Council, Oslo, June 4, 1992.

[111]The Alliance's (1999) Strategic Concept.

[112] Anthony Lake, "From Containment to Enlargement," Address at the School of Advanced International Studies, Johns Hopkins University, Washington, DC, September 21, 1993, U.S. Department of State *Dispatch*, 4, No. 39 (September 27, 1993), p. 659.

[113] James Goldgeier, *Not Whether But When: The U.S. Decision to Enlarge NATO* (Washington: Brookings Institute Press, 1999), p. 9.

[114] U.S. Mission to NATO, Report to Congress on the Enlargement of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization: Rationale, Benefits, Costs and Implications—Executive Summary, February 24, 1997.

[115] "Excerpts from Speech: Binding Broader Europe," *The New York Times*, January 10, 1994, p. A4.

[116] See the Study on NATO Enlargement, Brussels, September 3, 1995 (http://www.nato/int/docu/basictxt/enl-9501.htm.

[117] The Washington Declaration, April 23-24,1999. Available in *The Reader's Guide to the NATO Summit in Washington*, (NATO Office of Information and Press, 1999), pp. 11-12.

[118] Steven Erlanger, "Pressure on NATO to Expand," *The New York Times*, February 9, 1996.

[119] See "Strengthening Transatlantic Security: A U.S. Strategy for the 21st Century,". In Berlin in December 1989 U.S. Secretary of State Baker had also remarked that there was no single institution, including NATO, capable of achieving a Europe "whole and free." See Stephen J. Flanagan, "NATO and Central and Eastern Europe: From Liaison to Security Partnership," *The Washington Quarterly* (Spring 1992), p.142. More recently the 1999 OSCE's Instanbul Charter has also recognized that "the risks and challenges we face today cannot be met by a single state or organization." See OSCE, The Charter for European Security (The Istanbul Charter), November 18-19 (http://www.OSCE.org/docs/english/1990-1999/summits/istachart99e.htm)

[120] The Alliances's (1999) Strategic Concept.

[121] Partnership for Peace: Framework Document, January 10-11, 1994.

[122] Quoted in Yost, *NATO Transformed*, p. 177.

[123] Ibid., p. 93.

[124] The creation of the NATO-Russia Permanent Joint Council, which has since been replaced by the NATO-Russia Council, was designed in part to make the first round of enlargement announced in 1997 more palatable to Russia.

[125] Author interview, NATO Headquarters, Brussels, December 2001.

[126] See Partnership Action Plan against Terrorism, Prague, November 22, 2002. (http://www.nato.int/docu/basictxt/b021122e.htm)

[127] The Washington Declaration, April 23-24, 1999.

[128] For further information on CCMS see http://www.nato.int/ccms.

[129] John Gerard Ruggie, *Winning the Peace: America and World Order in the New Era* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1996), p. 85. Interestingly, Deutsch suggested that we should "beware of considering NATO as a purely military alliance" and that policymakers working toward integration "should be looking beyond the glare of the Soviet headlights and into the dark area behind, at a future time when the Soviet threat may not furnish the cohesive force which it did in 1949. They should look within NATO for signs of binding forces that may have appeared since the organization began. Planners might find that they could move ahead more vigorously if they dropped what may be a tacit assumption that both the danger of an East-West war and the opportunity for integrating the North Atlantic area will disappear at the same moment." See Deutsch, 191.

[130] See the Washington Declaration, April 23-24, 1999.

[131] *The Charter for European Security.*

[132] OSCE, The Charter for European Security (The Instanbul Charter), November 18-19 (http://www.OSCE.org/docs/english/1990-1999/summits/istachart99e.htm).

[133] Havel, "NATO's Quality of Life." Havel also chided the West for not moving quickly enough to consolidate a liberal order in Europe. As he put it before the OSCE summit in Budapest in December 1994: "Many countries that shook off their totalitarian regimes still feel insufficiently anchored in the community of democratic states. They are often disappointed by the reluctance with which that community has opened its arms to them. The demons we thought had been driven forever from the minds of people and nations are rousing themselves again." See Vaclav Havel, "A New European Order?," *The New York Review of Books*, March 2, 1995.

[134] The OSCE's Istanbul Charter states: "It has become more obvious that threats to our security can stem from conflicts within states as well as from conflicts between states. We have experienced conflicts which have often resulted from flagrant violations of OSCE norms and principles...In this decade it has become clear that all such conflicts can represent a threat to the security of all OSCE participating States." See the *Charter for European Security.*

[135] See, for example, Barry Buzan, Morten Kelstrup, Pierre Lemaitre, Elzbieta Tromer, and Ole Waever, *The European Security Order Recast: Scenarios for the Post-Cold War Era* (London: Pinter Publishers, 1990) p. 3. See also Edward Newman, "Human Security and Constructivism," *International Studies Perspectives*, 2, No. 3 (August 2001), p. 239. As Newman explains it, "'human security' seeks to place the individual—or people collectively—as the referent of security, rather than, although not necessarily in opposition to, institutions such as territory and state sovereignty."

[136] Lloyd Axworthy, 'NATO's New Security Vocation', *NATO Review*, 47, No. 4 (Winter 1999) p. 9.

[137] Ibid.

[138] The Washington Declaration, April 23-24, 1999.

[139] U.S. Department of Defense, *Strengthening Transatlantic Security: A U.S. Strategy for the 21st Century*, (December 2000), p. 38.

[140] Richard Cohen, 'From Individual Security to International Stability,' in Richard Cohen and Michael Mihalka, 'Cooperative Security: New Horizons for International Order', The Marshall Center Papers, No. 3, pp.7-8.

[141] Tony Blair, "Doctrine of the International Community," (The "Blair Doctrine"), Speech before the Chicago Economic Club, April 22, 1999 (available at *Online Newshour*, http://www.pbs.org/newshour/international/jan-june99/blair_doctrine4-23.html)

[142] Lloyd Axworthy, Notes from an address by the Honourable Lloyd Axworthy, Minister of Foreign Affairs to the Permanent Council of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, Vienna, October 22, 1998.

[143] Axworthy, 'NATO's New Security Vocation', p. 11.

[144] deWijk, *NATO on the Brink of the New Millennium*, p. 54.

[145] Boutros Boutros-Ghali, *An Agenda for Democratization*, (United Nations, 1996) p. 6.

[146] *Charter for European Security.*

[147] Kofi Annan, Nobel Lecture, Oslo, December 10, 2001 (available at http://www.nobel.se/peace/laureates/2001/annan-lecture.html)

[148] See Commission on Human Rights Resolution 1999/57, Released by the Commission on Human Rights, United Nations, New York, 27 April 1999

[149] For one example of the growing willingness to label democracy as a human right, see Thomas Franck, 'The Emerging Right to Democratic Governance', *American Journal of International Law,* 86 (January 1992), pp.46-91. In this oft-cited article Franck argued that democratic government was increasingly being recognized by the international community as the only form of legitimate government and a "requirement of international law".

[150] Thomas Risse in *The Third Force: The Rise of Transnational Civil Society*, Ann M. Florini, ed., (Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and Japan Center for International Exchange), 2000, p. 178.

[151] Ronald Reagan. 'Promoting Democracy and Peace', Speech before the British Parliament, London, 8 June 1982.

[152] Asmus, *Opening NATO's Door*, p. 290-291.

[153] Robertson, "International Citizenship," Speech in Skopje, Macedonia, September 2001 (http://www.nato.int/docu/speech/sp2001.htm)

[154] Volker Ruhe, "Shaping Euro-Atlantic Policies: A Grand Strategy for a New Era," *Survival,* 35, no. 2 (Summer 1993), p. 134.

[155] Cohen, "From Individual Security to International Stability," p. 8.

[156] Quoted in Ove Bring, "Should NATO Take the Lead in Formulating a Doctrine on Humanitarian Intervention," *NATO Review*, 47, No. 3 (Autumn 1999), pp. 24-27.

[157] Kofi Annan, "Two Concepts of Sovereignty," *The Economist*, September 18, 1999, pp. 49-50.

[158] Vaclav Havel, Address to the Senate and the House of Commons of the Parliament of Canada in William Joseph Buckley, ed., *Kosovo: Contending Voices on Balkan Interventions* (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2000, p. 245.

[159] See, for example, Michael J. Glennon, "The New Interventionism," pp. 2-7.

[160] Keohane and Nye in *Governance in a Globalizing World*, p. 25.

[161] See, for example, *A World at Peace: Common Security in the Twenty-first Century*, (Stockholm: Palme Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues, April 1989).

[162] Stanley Hoffman, *World Disorders: Troubled Peace in the Post-Cold War Era* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 1998), p.156.

[163] Neil Winn, "Europe: Old Institutions, New Challenges," in *International Security in a Global Age: Securing the Twenty-first Century*, Clive Jones and Caroline Kennedy-Pipe (Portland, Oregon: Frank Cass Publishers, 2000), p. 92-93.

[164] Both Richard Falk and Adam Roberts suggest that shame for past inaction played a significant role in NATO's decision to intervene in Kosovo. As Falk puts it, "the acknowledgment of moral guilt by leading governments in relation to these severe instances of ethnic strife in the early 1990s, especially in the setting of former Yugoslavia made it politically unacceptable to wait on the sidelines while a new tragedy unfolded in Kosovo. This consideration was strengthened by the extremely dirty hands of the West resulting from its earlier willingness to strike a Faustian bargain with Milosevic as a helpful means of finding a diplomatic solution to the Bosnian War at Dayton in 1995." See Richard Falk "'Humanitarian Wars', Realist Geopolitics and Genocidal Practices: 'Saving the Kosovars'" in *The Kosovo Tragedy: The Human Rights Dimensions*, Ken Booth, ed.,(Portland, Oregon: Frank Cass, 2001), p. 329. See also Adam Roberts, "NATO's 'Humanitarian War'," *Survival*, 41, No. 3 (Autumn, 1999), p. 104.

[165] See, for example, Nicholas J. Wheeler, "Reflections on the Legality and Legitimacy of NATO's Intervention in Kosovo" in *The Kosovo Tragedy,* p. 145.

[166] Roberts, "NATO's Humanitarian War," p. 106-107.

[167] Falk, "Humanitarian Wars, Realist Geopolitics and Genocidal Practices," in *The Kosovo Tragedy*, p. 332.

[168] Robertson offered both legal and moral justifications for NATO's action in Kosovo in his speech before the Institut de Relations Internationales et Strategiques in Paris in May 2000. See Robertson, "Law, Morality, and the Use of Force."

[169] Statement on Kosovo, Issued by the heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council, Washington, D.C., April 23-24, 1999.

[170] Blair, "Doctrine of the International Community." Similarly, the Canadian Ambassador stated that "humanitarian considerations underpin our action. We cannot simply stand by while innocents are murdered, an entire population is displaced, villages are burned." Quoted in Wheeler, "Reflections on the Legality and Legitimacy of NATO's Intervention in Kosovo," *The Kosovo Tragedy*, p. 153.

[171] Blair, "Doctrine of the International Community."

[172] Richard Falk among many others has argued that the "viability of NATO depended upon quickly finding a new raison d'etre." Falk, "Humanitarian Wars, Realist Geopolitics and Genocidal Practices," in *The Kosovo Tragedy*, p. 329

[173] Javier Solana, "Fresh Cause for Hope at the Opening of the New Century," in William Joseph Buckley (ed.), *Kosovo: Contending Voices on Balkan Interventions* (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm B. Eerdmans Publishing Col, 2000), p. 255. NATO Secretary General Lord Robertson later justified the intervention in similar terms. "This issue goes to the heart of our morality," he asserted. "If we had allowed this ethnic cleansing to go unanswered, we would have fatally undermined the basis of the Euro-Atlantic Community we are trying to build, as we enter the 21st century." See Lord Robertson, "Law, Morality and the Use of Force," Speech at the Institut de Relations Internationales et Strategiques, Paris.

[174] William Jefferson Clinton, "A Just and Necessary War," *The New York Times*, 23 May 1999.

[175] Madeline Albright, "A New NATO for a New Century," Remarks at the Brookings Institution, April 6, 1999 in U.S. Department of State *Dispatch*, vol. 10, No. 3 (April 1999), p. 7.

[176] See Madeleine Albright, "U.S. and NATO Policy Toward the Crisis in Kosovo," Testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, 20 April 1999 in U.S. Department of State *Dispatch*, 10, No. 4 (May 1999) p. 6.

[177] Tony Blair, "Doctrine of the International Community." In addition to asking whether national interests were involved, Blair suggested that NATO should address four other questions in making determinations about whether to intervene: "First are we sure of our case?....Second, have we exhausted all diplomatic options?...Third, on the basis of a practical assessment of the situation are there military operations we can sensibly and prudently undertake? Fourth, are we prepared for the long term?"

[178] Author interviews, NATO Headquarters, Brussels, December 2001.

[179] Roberts, "NATO's Humanitarian War," p. 120.

[180] Statement on Kosovo, Issued by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Washington, D.C., 23-4 April 1999.

[181] Javier Solana, "A Defining Moment for NATO: The Washington Summit Decisions and the Kosovo Crisis," *NATO Review*, 47, No. 2 (Summer 1999) p. 8. During a press conference in Brussels on 20 April 1999, Solana had also asserted that NATO 'actually defends' the values it proclaims. 'This', he said, 'is why we had a responsibility to act in Kosovo and that is why we have done so'. See Javier Solana, Press Conference, Brussels, 20 April 1999 (http://www.NATO.int).

[182] Robertson, "Law, Morality, and the Use of Force."

[183] During a news conference in Montenegro Robinson said: "If civilian lives are lost, that certainly hasn't achieved a humanitarian objective." "World Europe: Robinson Attacks NATO Campaign," *BBC News Online Network*, May 9, 1999 (http://news.bbc.co.uk).

[184] "Civilian Deaths in the NATO Air Campaign," *Human Rights Watch Report*, 12, No. 1, February 2000 (available at http://www.hrw.org)

[185] Zbigniew Brzezkinski, "NATO Must Stop Russia's Power Play," *The Wall Street Journal*, June 14, 1999 in *Kosovo: Contending Voices on Balkan Interventions*, pp. 326-327. Brzezinski further stated: "Just consider how the public would feel if some policemen, reacting to thugs throwing children in a swift river, confined themselves to merely arresting the thugs, on the grounds that any attempt at rescue might risk a policeman's life. Gloating over the ultimate 'score' of 5,000 Serbs killed to zero Americans simply reinforces the global perception of a troubling moral standard." Similarly, Neil Winn observed that this reluctance to risk casualties certainly invited "the question of whether the Alliance was willing to 'elevate' human rights only at a limited cost to its members." See Neil Winn, "Europe: Old Institutions, New Challenges," in *International Security in a Global Age: Securing the Twenty-first Century*, p. 93.

[186] Javier Solana, "An Alliance Fit For the 21st Century," p. 3.

[187] Dan Reiter, "Why NATO Enlargement Does Not Spread Democracy," *p. 41.*

[188] Robertson, "International Citizenship."

[189] U.S. Department of State, NATO Enlargement Fact Sheet. See also Madeleine Albright, "Enlarging NATO," *The Economist*, (February 15, 1997): 22.

[190] Reiter, "Why NATO Enlargement Does Not Spread Democracy," pp. 59-60.

[191] Importantly, the liberal security order NATO envisions is built on a shared commitment to liberal values, not simply the establishment of electoral or majoritarian democracy.

[192] See, for example, Larry Diamond, *Developing Democracy: Toward Consolidation*, (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999).

[193] See, for example, the work of Thomas Carothers, including: *Aiding Democracy Abroad: The Learning Curve*, (Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1999).

[194] See for example, Mary Kaldor and Ivan Vejvoda, *Democratization in Central and Eastern Europe*, ed., (London: Pinter, 1999), p. 9. Kaldor and Vejvoda cite the lack of a rights based culture in Central and Eastern Europe as one obstacle to democ ratization. As they put it: "The legacy of social guarantees under communism has left an inclination to view human rights as equated not with individual, civic and political rights, but largely with economic and social rights..." This lack of experience with individual rights, in their view, has led to discrimination against minorities.

[195] Steven Woehrel, Julie Kim, and Carl Ek, *NATO Applicant States: A Status Report*, Congressional Research Service Report to Congress, February 7, 2000. The report was requested by Senator William Roth and "contains brief assessments of the NATO applicants' qualifications, compared to those of Poland, The Czech Republic and Hungary."

[196] Jeffrey Simon, *NATO Enlargement and Central Europe: A Study in Civil-Military Relations* (National Defense University Press, 1996), p. 313. The Visegrad states consist of Hungary, Poland, Slovakia and the Czech Republic. The group acquired its name from the town of Visegrad Hungary, the site where the presidents of Hungary, Poland, and Czechoslovakia first met in February 1991.

[197] Jane Perlez, "With Promises, Promises, NATO Moves the East," *The New York Times*, April 26, 1998, p. A16. See also *Meeting the Challenges of Post-Cold War World: NATO Enlargement and U.S.-Russia Relations. A Report to the Committee on Foreign Relations*, submitted by Joseph R. Biden Jr. in *The Debate on NATO Enlargement*, Hearings before the Committee on Foreign Relations, 105th Cong., 1st sess., October/November 1997, p. 353.

[198] For a discussion of the need to educate civilian officials on defense matters, see Charlie Rose, "Democratic Control of the Armed Forces: A Parliamentary Role in Partnership for Peace," *NATO Review* (web edition) 42, no. 5,(October 1995): 15-19. See also Woehrel, Kim, and Ek, *NATO Applicant States: A Status Report*. The Congressional Research Service report notes that in several prospective member states, including Bulgaria and Macedonia, "civilian expertise in defense budget and other security issues in parliament is considered to be weaker than in Poland, Hungary, or the Czech Republic."

[199] The *Study on NATO Enlargement* (September 1995) is available at http://www.nato.int.

[200] William J. Perry, "The Enduring Dynamic Relationship That is NATO," *Defense Viewpoint*, 10, no. 9 (1995), Remarks to the Wehrkunde, Munich Conference on Security Policy, February 5, 1995 (Available at http://www.defenselink.mil/speeches/1995/s19950205-perry.html).

[201] Representatives from Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, and Slovenia participated in the 1997 hearing. U.S. Commission on

Security and Cooperation in Europe, *Report on Human Rights and the Process of NATO Enlargement*, June 1997.

[202] RFE/RL *Newsline*, 6, no. 3, Part II, (January 7, 2002).

[203] Jane Perlez, "With Promises, Promises, NATO Moves the East," p. A16.

[204] Membership Action Plan (MAP) Press Release NAC-S(99)66, 24 April 1999 (available at http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/1999/p99-066e.htm).

[205] Many scholars believe that the feedback the current MAP states receive with respect to their preparations for NATO is much more critical than the feedback NATO's three newest members received. See, for example, Jiri Sedivy, "The Puzzle of NATO Enlargement," *Contemporary Security Policy*, 22, No. 2 (August 2001), p. 3.

[206] Author interviews, NATO Headquarters, Brussels, December 2001

[207] See, for example, the testimony of representatives from Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, and Slovenia during a 1997 hearing before the U.S. Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe. See U.S. Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, *Report on Human Rights and the Process of NATO Enlargement*, June 1997.

[208] For further discussion regarding NATO's impact on political reform and regional cooperation in Central and Eastern Europe, see Thomas S. Szayna, *NATO Enlargement, 2000-2015*: *Determinants and Implication for Defense Planning and Shaping*, Rand Corporation (available at http://www.rand.org/publications/MR/MR1243). See especially pp. 20-21.

[209] Author interviews, NATO Headquarters, Brussels, May 2003.

[210] Prague Summit Declaration, Press Communique PR/CP (2002)127, Issued by the Head of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Prague, November 21, 2002..

[211] Author interviews, NATO Headquarters, Brussels, May 2003.

[212] Author interview, NATO Headquarters, Brussels, May 2003.

[213] "Ukrainian Peacekeeping, NATO Membership Unrelated-U.S. Envoy," Interfax/BBC Monitoring, June 5, 2003.

[214] Hungary and Romania also supported each others inclusion in the first phase of enlargement and have established a joint peacekeeping battalion.

[215] For discussion of the significance of these various examples of regional rapprochement, see Elizabeth Pond, *The Rebirth of Europe* (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 1999), p. 14, and especially 74-77.

[216]Craig R. Whitney, "Germans and Czechs Try to Heal Hatreds of the Nazi Era," *The New York Times*, January 22, 1997. At the time of the declaration, Germany pledged that it would work to facilitate the Czech Republic's entry into both the European Union and NATO.

[217]Pond, *The Rebirth of Europe*, pp. 76-77. See also *The Debate on NATO Enlargement*, Hearings before the Committee on Foreign Relations, 105th Cong., 1st sess., October/November 1997, 300. During his visit to Warsaw in June 2001, President George W. Bush thanked Poland for "acting as a bridge to the new democracies of Europe and a champion of the interests and security of [its] neighbors such as the Baltic states, Ukraine, and Slovakia." See "Remarks by the President in Address to Faculty and Students of Warsaw University," June 15, 2001.

[218]Perlez, "With Promises, Promises, NATO Moves the East," *The New York Times*, April 26, 1998, p. A16.

[219]See *RFE/RL Newsline*, January 6, 1999 and "Visegrad Countries Call for Rapid Entry of Slovakia into NATO," *Central Europe Online*, January 20, 2001 (Accessed at http://www.centraleurope.com). See U.S. Department of Defense, Strengthening Transatlantic Security: A U.S. Strategy for the 21st Century, (December 2000), 38.

[220]Stephen J. Blank, *Prague, NATO and European Security*, (U.S. Army War College, Strategic Studies Institute, April 17, 1996), 4-5.

[221]Madeleine Albright, "NATO Enlargement: Advancing America's Strategic Interests," Statement before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, February 2, 1998 in Department of State *Dispatch*, 9, no. 2 (March 1998), 14.

[222]Quoted in Pond, *The Rebirth of Europe*, p. 74.

[223]Reiter, Why NATO Enlargment Does Not Spread Democracy," p. 50.

[224]Pond, *The Rebirth of Europe*, pp. 74-76.

[225]Progress in resolving regional disputes, however, is not confined to NATO applicant states. Poland has made considerable strides in improving its relations with Ukraine. In fact, both Poland and Romania have signed agreements with Ukraine resolving border disputes.

[226]Woehrel, Kim, and Ek, *NATO Applicant States: A Status Report*

[227]Ronald H. Linden, "Putting on Their Sunday Best: Romania, Hungary, and the Puzzle of Peace," *International Studies Quarterly*, 44, no. 1 (March 2000): 136.

[228]John Tagliabue, "Bulgarians Bet Future on a Link to NATO," *The New York Times*, May 12, 1999, p. A12. During a visit to Sofia in November 1999, Bill Clinton thanked Bulgaria for supporting the NATO campaign in Kosovo—in part by opening its airspace to NATO for bombing missions—and held out the possibility of NATO membership for Bulgaria in the future. See Marc Lacey, "A Grateful Clinton Offers Encouragement to Bulgaria," *The New York Times*, November 23, 1999.

[229] Francis X. Clines, "NATO's Next Applicants Preen, Jostle and Hope," *The New York Times*, April 25, 1999.

[230] "Polish, Bulgarian Defense Ministers Sign Agreement," *Central Europe Online*, October 13, 2000 (Accessed at http://www.centraleurope.com/news.php3?id=209208).

[231] *RFE/RL Newsline*, 5, no. 84, Part II, (May 2, 2001).

[232] "Havel, Dzurinda Discuss NATO, Czech-Slovak KFOR Unit," *Czech News Agency*, May 29, 2001 (Available through Lexis-Nexis).

[233] *RFE/RL Newsline*, 5, no. 115, Part II, (June 15, 2001).

[234] Lord Robertson, "NATO's Challenges: Illusions and Realities," Speech at the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations, 19 June 2001.

[235] For example, citing the Cold War case studies of Turkey, Spain, Portugal, and Greece, Reiter writes: "Overall, the cases provide almost no evidence that NATO membership significantly promoted democracy: The transgovernmental effects on civil-military relations were uneven, the stick of NATO ejection was never applied to members that reverted to autocracy, and in the instance of NATO entry there is no evidence of the NATO carrot spurring democratization." Reiter, "Why NATO Enlargement Does Not Promote Democracy," pp. 56-57.

[236] The Washington Declaration, April 23-24, 1999.

[237] See, for example, Thomas S. Szayna, "The Czech Republic," in Andrew A. Michta, ed., *America's New Allies: Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic in NATO,* (University of Washington Press, 1999), p. 117.

[238] Petr Lunak, "Security for Eastern Europe: the European Option," *World Policy Journal*, 11, No. 3, Fall 1994, p. 128.

[239] Bronislaw Geremek, Address on occasion of the accession protocols to the North Atlantic Treaty, December 16, 1997.

[240] Vaclav Havel, "A Chance to Stop Exporting Wars and Violence," *Transitions*, (December 1997), p. 17.

[241] Aleksander Kwasniewski, "Isolationism is an Anachronism," *Transitions*, (December 1997), p. 23.

[242] Steven Erlanger, "3 Fragments of Soviet Realm Joining NATO's Ranks," *The New York Times*, March 12, 1999.

[243] In the case of the Cold War, Brzezinski offers the examples of France's reconciliation with Germany as well as France and Britain's ultimate acceptance of German reunification.

[244] Zbigniew Brzezinski, "NATO: The Dilemmas of Expansion," *The National Interest*, No. 53

(Fall 1998), p.13.

[245] Linden, "Putting on their Sunday Best," p. 126.

[246] Feedback takes place in part during annual 19+1 meetings of the North Atlantic Council. See Factsheet on NATO's Membership Action Plan, April 20, 2000. See also Membership Action Plan, Press Release NAC-S(99), April 24, 1999. (Both available at http://www.nato.int.)

[247] U.S. Department of State Annual Report to Congress on PFP, July 29, 1997. See also Robert Kennedy, "Educating Leaders for the 21st Century—A Snapshot of the Marshall Center for Security Studies," *NATO Review*, 46, No. 4, pp. 28-29. For more information on the Marshall Center's activities see the Marshall Center's website at http://www.marshallcenter.org.

[248] Dana Priest, "U.S.-Run Center Helps Shape Future Leaders," *The Washington Post*, December 14, 1998, p. A29.

[249] Author interviews, NATO Headquarters, Brussels, December 2001.

[250] Igor Lukes, "Central Europe Has Joined NATO: The Continuing Search for a More Perfect Habsburg Empire," *SAIS Review*, 19, p. No. 2 (Summer-Fall 1999), p. 51.

[251] Zdenek Kavan and Martin Palous, "Democracy in the Czech Republic," in Kaldor and Vejvoda, pp. 78-79.

[252] Martha Finnemore and Kathryn Sikkink define "norm entrepreneurs" as those who "attempt to convince a critical mass of states (norm leaders) to embrace new norms." See Martha Finnemore and Kathryn Sikkink, "International Norm Dynamics and Political Change," *International Organization*, vol. 52, no. 4 (Autumn 1998), p. 895.

[253] Peter J. Katzenstein, "Introduction: Alternative Perspectives on National Security," in *The Culture of National Security*, p. 5.

[254] Szayna, *NATO Enlargement, 2000-2015*, pp. 9 and 15. This study also notes that NATO's current strategy for enlargement "represents a complete switch from the way NATO enlarged during the Cold War."

[255] Central and East Europeans tend to view the Cold War period as one marked by an artificial separation from the West and subjugation by an alien power and culture. See, for example, Czech author Milan Kundera's well-known essay, "The Tragedy of Central Europe," in Gale Stokes, ed. *From Stalinism to Pluralism: A Documentary History of Eastern Europe Since 1945*, 2nd ed., (Oxford University Press, 1996).

[256] Address by Polish Foreign Minister Geremek on the occasion of the protocols to the North Atlantic Treaty on the accession of Poland, the Czech Republic, and Hungary, Brussels, December 16, 1997.

[257] "Poland, Hungary, Czech Republic Formally Join NATO," *The New York Times,* March 12,

1999.

[258] John Gerard Ruggie, *Winning the Peace: America and World Order in the New Era*, p. 85.

[259] Arpad Goncz, "The Least Expensive Way to Guarantee Security," *Transitions*, (December 1997), p. 9.

[260] Lord Robertson, "NATO Challenges: Illusions and Realities," Speech at Chicago Council on Foreign Relations, 19 June 2001 (Available at http://www.nato.int)

[261] "Text: Bush in Poland," *The Washington Post* (web edition), June 15, 2000.

[262] "NATO's Clark Hands Over Alliance Military Command," *Central Europe Online*, May 4, 2000 (Accessed at http://www.centraleurope.com).

[263] Pond, *The Rebirth of Europe*, p. 82.

[264] See Joseph S. Nye., Jr. "Redefining NATO's Mission in the Information Age," *NATO Review*, 47, no. 4 (Winter 1999): 12. Nye has also used the term "co-optive power" to describe the ability to get others "to want what you want." See Joseph S. Nye, Jr., *Bound to Lead: The Changing Nature of American Power*, (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1990), p. 32. See also Robert O. Keohane and Joseph S. Nye, Jr., "Power and Interdependence in the Information Age," *Foreign Affairs*, 77, no. 5 (September/October 1998), p. 86.

[265] Author interview, NATO Headquarters, Brussels, December 2001.

[266] Author interview, NATO Headquarters, Brussels, December 2001

[267] Somewhat ironically, the Czechs were perhaps ill-prepared for Kosovo, which occurred almost immediately following their accession to NATO, because so much attention had been devoted to NATO's political dimension. Jiri Sedivy has noted that "during the pre-accession debates NATO was presented not primarily as a war machine with a substantial out-of-area outlook, but as a traditional territorial defence alliance, as a community of shared ('Euroatlantic') values, as a safeguard of democracy and internal stability and as a means of attracting foreign investors." See Jiri Sedivy, "Are the Czechs Out?," *Newsbrief*, 19, no. 6, The Royal United Services Institute, London, June 1999, pp. 43-45.

[268] *The International Position and Security of the Czech Republic: Czech Perceptions Toward Security, Defense and NATO*, Gabal, Analysis & Consulting, Prague, November/December 2000. (available at http://www.gac.cz)

[269] Security Strategy of the Czech Republic, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Czech Republic, 2001, pp. 4, 8.

[270] George W. Bush, "Remarks by the President in an Address to Faculty and Students of Warsaw University."

[271] Author interview with former National Security Council staff member, Washington, D.C.,

May, 2002.

[272] George W. Bush, "Remarks by the President in an Address to Faculty and Students of Warsaw University."

[273] On the issue of continuity between the Clinton and George W. Bush rationales for enlargement, see Philip Gordon and James Steinberg, "NATO Enlargement: Moving Forward," Brookings Policy Brief, No. 90 (December 2001) p. 2. (http://www.brookings.edu)

[274] Robert G. Kaiser, "The Alliance that Lost its Purpose is Europe's Most Popular Club," *Washington Post*, November 17, 2002, p. B1.

[275] Joseph W. Ralston, "Successfully Managing NATO Enlargement," in U.S. Department of State, *U.S. Foreign Policy Agenda*, 7, No. 1 (March 2002), p. 20.

[276] Lord Robertson, "NATO's Challenges: Illusions and Realities," Address before the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations," June 19, 2001 (http://www.nato/int/docu/speech/2001/s5010619b.htm)

[277] George W. Bush, "Remarks by the President in an Address to Faculty and Students of Warsaw University."

[278] Marc Grossman, "21st Century NATO: New Capabilities, New Members, New Relationships," U.S. Department of State, *U.S. Foreign Policy Agenda*, 7, No. 1 (March 2002), p.8.

[279] Author interview with former National Security Council staff member, Washington, D.C. May 2002. Article 10 of the North Atlantic Treaty states in part: "The Parties may, by unanimous agreement, invite any other European State in a position to further the principles of this Treaty and to contribute to the security of the North Atlantic area to accede to this Treaty." See The North Atlantic Treaty, April 4, 1949 (http://www.nato.int).

[280] Remarks by the President in Address to Faculty and Students of Warsaw University, Warsaw, Poland, The White House, Office of the Press Secretary, June 15, 2001 (http://www.whitehouse.gov/new/releases/2001/06/20010615-1.html) Two days earlier during the NATO summit, Bush told the NAC that "based on the aspirants' progress to date," he was confident that they would be "able to launch the next round of enlargement" in Prague. See "Excerpted Remarks to the North Atlantic Council" at the meeting of the North Atlantic Council, NATO Headquarters, Brussels, June 13, 2001 (http://www.nato.int)

[281] Michael R. Gordon, "The 2000 Campaign: The Military; Bush Would Stop U.S. Peacekeeping in Balkan Fights," *The New York Times*, October 21, 2000.

[282] Author interview with Bruce Jackson, chair of the U.S. Committee on NATO, Washington, D.C., May 2002.

[283] Author interviews with former Department of State officials and National Security Council staff members, Washington, D.C., May 2002.

[284] Author interviews with Department of State and Defense officials, Washington, D.C., May 2002.

[285] See, for example, James Goldgeier, "Not When but Who."

[286] See, for example, Elizabeth Pond, *The Rebirth of Europe*.

[287] See, for example, George Kennan, "NATO: A Fateful Error," *The New York Times*, February 2, 1997. See also Michael Mandelbaum, Preserving the New Peace: The Case Against NATO Expansion," *Foreign Affairs*, 74, no. 3, (May/June 1995).

[288] 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, D.C., October 10, 2001.

[289] "President Bush Thanks Germany for Support Against Terror," Remarks by the President to a Special Session of the German Bundestag, Berlin, Germany, May 23, 2002. (http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/05/print/20020523-2.html)

[290] Transcript of Press Conference by U.S. Secretary of State, Colin L. Powell following the meeting of the North Atlantic Council, Reykjavik, Iceland, May 14, 2002.

[291] Grossman, "21st Century NATO," p. 8.

[292] Douglas J. Feith, "NATO's Transformation: Securing Freedom for Future Generations," in U.S. Department of State, *U.S. Foreign Policy Agenda*, 7, no. 1 (March 2002), p.17.

[293] It's worth noting that the Bush administration never seemed inclined to exclude the Baltic states due to fears of antagonizing Russia. Rather, Bush said repeatedly that no state would be left out on grounds of its history or geography. See "Eastern Europeans Urge NATO to Include Them," *The New York Times*, May 12, 2001. Czech President Vaclav Havel had also argued in May 2001 that there was no need to approach Russia on tiptoe with respect to the Baltic states. Failing to admit the Baltic states, he argued, would amount to "yielding to some geopolitical or geostrategical interests of Russia." See "Czech President Calls for NATO From Alaska to Tallinn" and "NATO Must Not Include Russia Itself, but Must Include the Baltic States," *RFE/RL Newsline*, 5, no. 91, Part II, (May 14, 2001).

[294] Timothy Garton Ash, "A New War Reshapes Old Alliances," *The New York Times*, October 12, 2001.

[295] Philip H.Gordon and James B. Steinberg, "NATO Enlargement: Moving Forward," Policy Brief #90, The Brookings Institution, November 2001. Both Russian Defense Minister Sergei Ivanov and Putin made clear their desire for a closer relationship with NATO during meetings in Brussels with Robertson in late September. See Christopher Walker, "NATO in the Wake of 11 September," *RFE/RL Newsline*, 5, no. 189, Part II, (October 5, 2001).

[296] Author interview with NATO staff member, Brussels, December 2001. Similarly, the creation of the NATO-Russia Permanent Joint Council (PJC) in 1997 made NATO's first round of

enlargement more palatable for Russia.

[297] Jeremy Bransten, "2002 in Review: Seven New Members End 'False Balance of Fear'," RFE/RL, December 12, 2002 (http://www.rferl.org/nca/features/2002/12/12122002184027.asp)

[298] Author interview with State Department official, Washington, D.C. May 2002. See also Robert G. Kaiser, "NATO Ready to Invite in Seven from Eastern Europe," *Washington Post*, September 26, 2002. P. A1.

[299] Author interview, NATO Headquarters, Brussels, December 2001.

[300] Philip H. Gordon, "NATO After 11 September," *Survival*, 43, No. 4 (Winter 2000-02).

[301] Jeremy Bransten, "2002 in Review: Seven New Members End 'False Balance of Fear'," *RFE/RL Newsline*, December 12, 2002 (http://www.rferl.org/nca/features/2002/12/12122002184027.asp)

[302] See, for example, Strobe Talbot, "From Prague to Baghdad: NATO at Risk," *Foreign Affairs*, 81, No. 6 (November/December 2002) p. 56. See also Michael Adler, "NATO Stresses Western Values as Much as Military Might," *Agence France-Presse*, November 24, 2002. Thomas Friedman, a long-time opponent of NATO enlargement, also expressed this view in a column in *The New York Times* shortly before the Prague summit. He no longer had objections to enlargement, he wrote, because "as we already saw in the Afghan war, most NATO countries have fallen so far behind the U.S. in their defense spending and modernization, they really can't fight alongside anymore of us anyway. So what the heck, let's invite everybody in." See Thomas L. Friedman, "The New Club NATO," *The New York Times*, November 17, 2002.

[303] Author interviews with former Clinton administration officials, Washington, D.C., May 2002.

[304] See Sean Kay, "The Prague Summit: Beginning or End for NATO," The Eisenhower Institute, December 2002 (http://eisenhowerinstitute.org/commentary/kayoped4.htm)

[305] Author interviews, NATO Headquarters, Brussels, December 2002.

[306] As Juhasz recounted the conversation, Robertson told him: "You do not have any time [to fulfill military pledges]. If you don't do this you are in trouble." See Keith B. Richburg, "NATO Tells Hungary to Modernize Its Military, *Washington Post*, November 3, 2002, p. A22.

[307] Celeste Wallander, "NATO's Price: Shape Up or Ship Out," *Foreign Affairs*, 81, No. 6 (November/December 2002), p. 5.

[308] Author interviews, Washington, D.C., May 2002.

[309] Author interview, NATO Headquarters, Brussels, December 2001.

[310] Author interview, NATO Headquarters, Brussels, December 2001.

[311] Goldgeier, "Not When, but Whom." A report issued by the Atlantic Council in April 2001

similarly concluded: "Having repeatedly assured the nine aspirant countries that the latest wave of enlargement will not be the last, the Alliance cannot, even if it wished to, renege on that commitment without severely damaging its credibility." See "Permanent Alliance? NATO's Prague Summit and Beyond," Atlantic Council Policy Paper, April 2001, pp. 16-17.

[312] Author interview, NATO Headquarters, Brussels, December 2001.

[313] See Freedom House, *Freedom in the World 2002* (http://www.freedomhouse.org/research/freeworld/2002/web.pdf)

[314] Author interview with Department of Defense official, Washington, D.C., May 2002.

[315] Nicholas Kralev, "NATO Candidates Aim to Please U.S., Europe," *Washington Times*, September 13, 2002.

[316] Marc Grossman, "21st Century NATO: New Capabilities, New Members, New Relationships," p. 7-8.

[317] In the words of Washington Post reporter Robert Kaiser, the decision to ignore NATO's offers of assistance "sent a shiver through the alliance." See Kaiser, "The Alliance that Lost Its Purpose."

[318] R. Nicholas Burns, "The New NATO: Healing the Rift," Speech to the Konrad Adenauer Foundation, May 27, 2003.

[319] See also Jennifer D.P. Moroney, "Enlarging NATO's MAP: An Expanded Membership Action Plan Can Guide Aspirants' Contributions to the War on Terrorism," DFI International Government Services, Current Defense Analyses, no. 5, (August 2002). Moroney noted that none of the nine aspirants fully met NATO's formal membership criteria, especially in the areas of defense and economic reform, and restructuring. She also argued that the first two cycles of the MAP had "shown that the military capabilities of all nine aspirants are substantially weaker than those of the Czech Republic, Hungary, and Poland at the time they were invited to join NATO in 1997."

[320] Ibid.

[321] Ibid.

[322] Patrick Quinn, "Romanian Forces in Kandahar Helping to Join NATO" *Associated Press*, November 14, 2002. The Red Scorpions had also participated in peacekeeping operations in Albania, Bosnia, and Kosovo through NATO's Partnership for Peace. See also Vladimir Socor, "Two Aspirant Aspirants Assume Strategic Roles," *Wall Street Journal*, August 23, 2002.

[323] "Romanian Premier Signs Agreement on Short-Term Stationing of U.S. Troops in Romania." *RFE/RL Newsline*, 5, No. 207, Part II, (October 31, 2001).

[324] See Kaiser, "NATO Ready to Invite in Seven From Eastern Europe," See also Daniela Tuchel,

"Romania Battles Extremists: Bucharest Hopes Its Firm Support for U.S. action in Iraq and Strong Stands Against Suspected Extremist Groups Will Ease its Path Into NATO," Institute for War & Peace Reporting, London, August 28, 2002 (http://www.lwpr.net/index.pl?archive/bcr2/bcr2200208274 eng.text.)

[325] Radu Marinas "Romania Offers Bases for U.S. Strikes on Iraq," *Reuters*, October 1, 2002.

[326] Grossman, "21st Century NATO."   Feith also observed in February 2002 that seven of the nine aspirants had "made force contributions to the NATO operations in Bosnia" and had "shown much-appreciated solidarity with the United States—through their contributions to Operation Enduring Freedom." Douglas Feith, "NATO's Transformation: Securing Freedom for Future Generations," p. 17.

[327] "Lithuania to Send up to 40 Soldiers to Afghanistan," *Agence France-Presse*, September 1, 2002. Moroney, "Enlarging NATO's MAP."

[328] Kaiser, "NATO Ready to Invite Seven From Eastern Europe."

[329] Author interviews with Department of State and Defense officials, Washington, D.C., May 2002.

[330] Quinn, "Romanian Forces in Kandahar Helping to Join NATO."

[331] Ambassador R. Nicholas Burns, "To Prague and Beyond: NATO's Future in a Changed World," Graduation Address, The NATO Defense College, Rome, February 8, 2002.

[332] Kaiser, "NATO Ready to Invite Seven From Eastern Europe."

[333] Author interviews with U.S. Department of State and Defense officials, Washington, D.C, May 2002.

[334] Author interview, NATO Headquarters, Brussels, December 2001.

[335] Author interview with U.S. Department of State official, Washington, D.C., May 2002.

[336] Ralston, "Successfully Managing NATO Enlargement," p. 18.

[337] Moroney, "Enlarging NATO's MAP."

[338] Elisabeth Bumiller, "Bush Appeals to New Allies on Iraq Plans," *The New York Times*, November 24, 2002.

[339] For example, the United States based about 1,000 troops at a Romanian air base near the port of Constanta, which was described by a U.S. officials as an "air-bridge for equipment and personnel going to CENTCOM.

[340] See, for example, Socor, "Two Aspirant Aspirants Assume Strategic Roles."

[341] John Chalmers, "Enlargement Could Just Make NATO's Problems Worse," *Reuters*, September 1, 2002.

[342] *RFE/RL Newsline*, 6, No. 217, Part II, (November 19, 2002).

[343] See, for example, Vernon Loeb, "New Bases Reflect Shift in Military," *Washington Post*, June 9, 2003, p. A1.

[344] Dina Kyriakidou, "NATO Means More than War Games for Balkan Candidates," *Reuters*, November 11, 2002.

[345] Kaiser, "NATO Ready to Invite in Seven from Eastern Europe."

[346] Author interviews, NATO Headquarters, Brussels, December 2001.

[347] Steven Erlanger, "3 Fragments of Soviet Realm Joining NATO's Ranks, *The New York Times*, March 12, 1999. More recently, Robert Kaiser of the *New York Times* noted that an American traveling through Europe would "be struck by the fervid pro-Americanism of the region." He also quotes former Polish dissident Adam Michnik as having said that "Poland is the most pro-American country in the world—much more pro-American than America." Kaiser, "The Alliance that Lost Its Purpose is Europe's Most Popular Club"

[348] Frederick S. Kempe, "New Europe's Hope for NATO," *Wall Street Journal Europe*, November 28, 2002.

[349] Author interview, NATO Headquarters, Brussels, May 2003.

[350] See, for example, Elizabeth Williamson, "Poland Cashes in by Renting Battlefields for War Games," *Wall Street Journal Europe*, December 16, 2002

[351] Jose Maria Aznar, Jose-Manuel Durao Barroso, Silvio Berlusconi, Tony Blair, Vaclav Havel, Peter Medgyessy, Leszek Miller, and Anders Fogh Rasmussen, "United We Stand," *Wall Street Journal*, January 29, 2003.

[352] The Vilnius Group currently comprises Slovenia, Slovakia, Romania, Bulgaria, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Albania, Macedonia, and Croatia. The group minus Croatia had first met in May 2000 in Vilnius, where they called upon NATO to fulfill its promise of a Europe "whole and free" and promised political and practical cooperation among themselves in preparation for NATO membership. Croatia joined the group in Bratislava in May 2001, making it the "Vilnius 10."

[353] Statement of the Vilnius Group Countries in response to the presentation by the United States Secretary of State to the United Nations Security Council concerning Iraq, by the Foreign Ministers of Albania, Bulgaria, Croatia, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Macedonia, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia, February 5, 2003, *NATO Enlargement Daily Brief,* February 5, 2003.

[354] Alan Cowell, "A Pledge of Assistance for Bush from 8 European Leaders," *The New York*

Times, January 30, 2003

[355] "Secretary Rumsfeld Briefs at the Foreign Press Center: News Transcript," U.S. Department of State, Defenselink, January 22, 2003 (http://www.defenselink.mil/news/Jan2003/t01232003_t0122sdfpc.html)

[356] Kaiser, "NATO Ready to Invite in Seven from Europe."

[357] "Bush's Speech on NATO Enlargement," *The New York Times*, November 21, 2002. Like Bush, Czech President Vaclav Havel has not been afraid to use the term "evil" in speaking of Saddam Hussein or to suggest that evil "should be combated in its germinal stages rather than its developed form." See Jackson Diehl, "The Havel Test for Iraq," *Washington Post*, December 2002. For example, during a meeting in Washington with Bush in September 2002, Havel suggested that NATO needs "to re-identify itself, to find its new identity in this very changed world. And especially now, after [the] 11th of September," he said, " I think there is a lot of a new kind of evil in this world and it is necessary to face this evil and to face all who support it." Joseph Curl, "Havel Wants NATO to Target 'New' Evil," *Washington Times*, September 2002.

[358] See Jeffrey Donovan, "Transcript of RFE/RL's Exclusive Interview with President Bush." Elisabeth Bumiller of *The New York Times* also noted that Bush had been known to say that he had better relations with the little countries of Europe than the big ones. See Elisabeth Bumiller, "From Bush, A Big 'Aciu' From Eastern Europe," *The New York Times*, November 25, 2002.

[359] Jim Garamone, "Seven Nations Bring Capabilities-Enthusiasm Mix to North Atlantic Alliance," *American Forces Press Service*, November 23, 2002

[360] Address by Vaira Vike-Freiberg, President of the Republic of Latvia in *Prague Summit 2002: Selected Documents and Statements*, (NATO Public Diplomacy Division, 2003), pp. 38-39.

[361] Lord Robertson, "Towards the Prague Summit," Speech at the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, Istanbul, November 15, 2002. Robertson has argued repeatedly that the Allies face new threats and must acquire the capabilities to deal with them. He has predicted more instability ahead in the Caucasus, Central Asia, Northern Africa and the Middle East, as well as the possibility for spillover of this instability, more terrorism (of a fanatical variety), more failed states, and more proliferation. Lord Robertson, "NATO: A Vision for 2012," Speech at the NATO/GMFUS Conference, Brussels, October 3, 2002.

[362] "NATO Members-To-Be Can Help in Anti-Terror War: U.S. Military Chief," *Agence France-Presse*, December 5, 2002.

[363] See "Czech Republic to Propose Mobile Antichemical Unit Within NATO," *RFE/RL Newsline*, 6, No. 217, Part II (November 19, 2002) and "Czechs Close to Receiving NATO Chem/Bio Defense Training Center," *CTK*, December 19, 2002

[364] Keith B. Richburg, "Czechs Become Model for the New NATO, *Washington Post*, November 3, 2002, p. A22. In February 2002, Robertson had said that he was again sounding his "clarion call of 'capabilities, capabilities, capabilities,'" but he added that his inclination for the Prague

summit was "to refocus on a much smaller number of absolutely critical capabilities and to commit nations to acquiring them." See Lord Robertson, "A Renewed Transatlantic Security Partnership in the Aftermath of 11 September," Remarks at the European Parliament Conference, February 19, 2002.

[365] Robert G. Kaiser and Keith B. Richburg, 'NATO Looking Ahead to a Mission Makeover," *Washington Post*, November 5, 2002.

[366] Socor, "Two Aspirant Aspirants Assume Strategic Roles." See also Szayna, "NATO Enlargement: Forecasting the 'Who' and 'When.'"

[367] Bransten, "2002 in Review: Seven New NATO Members End 'False Balance of Fear'."

[368] Burns, Remarks For the Konrad Adenauer, Foundation, May 27, 2003.

[369] The target goal of 2% growth in aspirants' defense budgets was based on the median defense expenditure in Europe per year. See Szayna, "NATO Enlargement: Forecasting the 'Who' and 'When'," p. 31-32.

[370] Author interview, NATO Headquarters, Brussels, December 2002

[371] For example, U.S. Ambassador to Slovakia Ronald Weiser warned in January 2002 that "the forming of the future government will influence whether Slovakia gets an invitation [to join NATO] or not. In 1998 Slovakia had a government that had different values than the alliance. If the situation repeats itself, there will not be an invitation." "Slovak Opponents Incredulous as Meciar Declares Affinity for NATO, EU, While U.S. Ambassador Warns of Isolation if Elections Usher in Non-NATO Values." *RFE/RL Newsline*, 6, No. 3, Part II, (January 7, 2002).

[372] Author interviews, NATO Headquarters, Brussels, May 2003. NATO diplomats note that the desire to attract foreign investors also provide incentives for the invitees to continue with reforms.

[373] Author interview with Department of State, Washington, D.C., May 2002.

[374] See Ahto Lobjakas, "NATO: Members Commit Themselves----Again—To Modernization," Radio Free Europe, Radio Liberty, November 2002 (http://www.rferl.org/nca/features/2002/11/21112002162242.asp.)

[375] See Report on the Comprehensive Review of the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council and Partnership for Peace, Prague, November 21, 2002 (http://www.nato.int/docu/basictxt/b021121a.htm)

[376] See Partnership Action Plan Against Terrorism, Prague, November 22, 2002 (http://www.nato.int/docu/basictxt/b021122e.htm)

[377] See NATO-Russia Relations: A New Quality, Declaration by Heads of State and Government of NATO Member States and the Russian Federation, Rome, May 28, 2002

(http://www.nato.int/docu/basictxt/b020528e.htm)

[378] See, for example, Warren Christopher, "NATO's True Mission," *The New York Times*, October 21, 1997, p. A21. See also Craig R. Whitney, "NATO at 50: With Nations at Odds, Is it a Misalliance?," *The New York Times*, February 15, 1999, p. A7.

[379] Final Communique, Ministers' Meeting of the North Atlantic Council held in Reykjavik, Press Release M-NAC-1(2002)59, May 14, 2001 (http://www.nato.int/docu/pr2002/p02-059e.htm)

[380] Lord Robertson, "NATO: A Vision for 2012," Speech at GMFUS Conference, Brussels, October 3, 2002 (http://www.nato.int/docu/speech/2002/s021003a.htm)

[381] Prague Summit Declaration, Press Communique PR/CP (2002) 127, Issued by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Prague, November 21, 2002.

[382] See, for example, Michael Ruhle, "NATO After Prague: Learning the Lessons of 9/11," *Parameters*, Summer 2003, pp. 89-97.

[383] Josef Joffe, "The Alliance is Dead, Long Live the Alliance," *The New York Times*, September 29, 2002.

[384] Burns, Remarks for the Konrad Adenauer Foundation.

[385] "U.S. May Ask NATO To Play Bigger Iraq Role," Reuters, May 27, 2003.

[386] R. Nicholas Burns, "NATO has Adapted: An Alliance with a New Mission," *International Herald Tribune*, May 24, 2003.

[387] Author interviews, NATO Headquarters, Brussels, May 2003. Representatives from two invitees missions do, however, point to a positive side of the dispute: It demonstrated that in NATO even small states have a voice.

[388] See, for example, Charles Kupchan, "The Last Days of the Atlantic Alliance," *Financial Times*, November 18, 2002.

[389] "Chirac's Rant, " *The Wall Street Journal*, February 19, 2003.

[390] Mart Laar, "New Europe Won't Keep Quiet Until All Europe is New," *The Wall Street Journal*, February 19, 2003.

[391] See, for example, Jean-Michel Stoullig, Agence France Presse, May 3, 2002.

[392] See, for example, Patrick E. Tyler, "New Analysis: Cracks in NATO Alliance," *The New York Times*, February 12, 2003.

[393] Philip Stephens, "A Divide Europe will be Easy for America to Rule," *Financial Times*, May 23, 2003.

[394]"Declaration on Transatlantic Relations: How to Overcome the Divisions," May, 2003 (http://www.cer.org.uk)

[395]"Euro-Atlantic Security One Year After 11 September," Speech by NATO, Secretary General Lord Robertson, IFRI-Paris, September 12, 2002.

[396]Bronislaw Geremek, Address on occasion of the accession protocols to the North Atlantic Treaty, December 16, 1997.

[397]Kagan, *Of Paradise and Power*, p. 6.

[398]Strobe Talbot, "From Prague to Baghdad," pp. 49-50.

[399]Gati, "All That NATO Can Be," p. 80-83.

[400]Celeste Wallander, "NATO's Price: Shape Up or Ship Out," p. 2.

[401]Ibid., p. 3.

[402]Robert J. Kaiser, "The Alliance that Lost its Purpose is Europe's Most Popular Club."

[403]Lord Robertson, "The Summit Ahead: Accession, Transformation, Capabilities," Speech at the "Welt an Sonntag Forum, Berlin, November 4, 2002.

[404]Timothy Garton Ash, "A New War Reshapes Old Alliances," *The New York Times*, October 12, 2001.

[405]"Czech President Call for NATO "From Alaska to Tallinn," *RFE/RL Newsline*, 5, No. 91, Part II, (May 14, 2001.)

[406]"Czech President Says Space for Future NATO between Alaska, Tallinn," *CTK News Agency*, Prague, 11 May 2001 (available through Lexis-Nexis). Havel has also suggested on several occasions that Russia distrusts NATO because it suffers from a sort of identity crisis. "Russia, he says, must finally realize that NATO's mission poses no threat to it and that if NATO moves closer to Russia's borders, it brings closer stability, security, democracy and an advanced political culture, which is obviously in Russia's essential interest." See *RFE/RL Newsline,* 5, No. 93, Part II, (May 16, 2001). Havel later suggested that any attempt to integrate Russia into NATO would hurt the identity of the Alliance and turn it into "just another boundless institution, a new OSCE or a new U.N." See "Czech President Does Not Consider Russia to be a Viable Candidate," *RFE/RL Newsline*, vol. 5, no. 224, Part II (28 November 2001).

[407]Henry Kissinger, "NATO: Make it Strong, Make it Larger," *The Washington Post*, January 14, 1997, A15.

[408]NATO Press Release, "Chairman's Summary of the Meeting of the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council in Foreign Minister's Session, Madrid," June 4, 2003.

[409]Statement by Lord Robertson at the Press Conference following the Meeting of the North

Atlantic Council at the Level of Foreign Ministers, Madrid, June 3, 2003.

[410] Alexander Wendt, "Anarchy is What States Make of It: The Social Construction of Politics," *International Organization*, 46, No. 2 (Spring 1992), pp. 391-425.

[411] *Die Welt* /BBC Monitoring, June 4, 2003.

[412] Richard Lugar, "Nation-Building is a Role for NATO," *Financial Times*, May 29, 2003