THE ATLANTIC COUNCIL
OF THE UNITED STATES

CSIS | CENTER FOR STRATEGIC & INTERNATIONAL STUDIES

Alliance Reborn

An Atlantic Compact for the 21st Century

The Washington NATO Project

Daniel Hamilton, *Lead Author*
Charles Barry, Hans Binnendijk, Stephen Flanagan,
Julianne Smith, James Townsend, *Co-Authors*

February 2009

Atlantic Council of the United States
Center for Strategic and International Studies
Center for Technology and National Security Policy, NDU
Center for Transatlantic Relations, Johns Hopkins University SAIS

Table of Contents

Preface and Acknowledgments…….vi
Introduction…….viii
Executive Summary……....x

I. New World, New Partnership……1

Chapter 1
New World Rising……...3

Chapter 2
A 21st Century Transatlantic Partnership……7
A Partnership with Purpose
A Better Box of Tools

Chapter 3
Two Immediate Tests……15
The Strategic Priority of Afghanistan and Pakistan
Relations with Russia: Engagement and Resolve

II. A New NATO…….23

Chapter 4
NATO's Missions: Home and Away……....25
Where does NATO fit?
Home Missions
Away Missions

Chapter 5
What's Needed for NATO…….31
Carrying Out NATO Missions at Home
Carrying Out NATO Missions Away

Chapter 6
Internal NATO Reforms……49
Change the Way NATO Makes Decisions
Change the Way NATO Spends Money
Generate Appropriate Military Capabilities
Match Missions to Means
Rethink Functional and Geographic "Areas of Emphasis"
Conclusion……...59

Endnotes……..61
About the Authors……..65

Preface and Acknowledgements

In fall 2008 our four U.S. think tanks – the Atlantic Council of the United States; the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS); the Center for Technology and National Security Policy (CTNSP) at the National Defense University (NDU); and the Center for Transatlantic Relations (CTR) at Johns Hopkins University's Paul H. Nitze School of Advanced International Studies (SAIS) -launched the Washington NATO Project to spark debate before and after NATO's 60th anniversary summit in April, 2009.

The Washington NATO Project seeks to generate new ideas and thinking about the transatlantic community's role in a changing global security environment. Over the past five months we have solicited views on NATO's future from scores of current and former government officials and military leaders, legislators, think tank colleagues, scholars and other experts from both sides of the Atlantic. Four major conferences examined specific issues. The first conference, co-hosted by the Royal Netherlands Embassy and the SAIS Center for Transatlantic Relations (CTR), focused on the strategic environment and its implications for Alliance missions. The second conference, co-hosted by the Embassy of France and the Atlantic Council's Strategic Advisors Group, focused on institutions and processes. The third conference, held at NDU with the cooperation of the Embassy of Denmark, focused on capabilities. The final conference, co-hosted by the Embassy of the Federal Republic of Germany and CSIS, with support from the NATO Public Diplomacy Division and EADS, sought to bring the various strands together. This report draws on these consultations.

As we have engaged in these dialogues, it has become clear that a parallel effort is also required to rethink and reform the U.S.-EU relationship. We will produce a companion report on that vital partnership later this year.

We wish to thank those mentioned above for helping to sponsor our deliberations, and the many Europeans and Americans who engaged in the discussions. We also wish to thank the Norwegian Ministry of Defense. Support for the Atlantic Council's Strategic Advisors Group by General Brent Scowcroft and Ralph Crosby and Tom Enders from EADS/Airbus is also greatly appreciated. We are grateful to Espen Barth-Eide, Esther Brimmer, Fran Burwell, Camille Grand, Kenneth Huffman, Clarence Juhl, Andrzej Karkoszka, Franklin Kramer, Richard Kugler, Manuel Lafont Rapnouil, Julian Lindley-French, Leo Michel, Klaus Naumann, Diego Ruiz-Palmer, Simon Serfaty, Marten van Heuven, Alexander Vershbow and others who remain anonymous for helpful insights.

The views expressed, however, are our own and do not necessarily reflect those of our institutions, our sponsors, the U.S. government, or anyone else participating in our discussions. We do not claim to have found all the right answers. But we hope we have raised some of the right questions.

Introduction

We have an open but fleeting moment to forge a more effective Atlantic partnership. We must seize it now. European and North American allies have allowed their relations to become discordant, yet the times demand vigor and unity. Courageous decisions need to breathe new life and relevance into the Atlantic partnership, which must be recast to tackle a diverse range of serious challenges at home and abroad.

This vital task must be a top priority of the Obama Administration and its European counterparts. Together, the United States and its European allies must embed their mutual commitment of collective defense within a wider spectrum of collective security. They need to stretch their partnership and better connect their institutions. They are called to advance a new vision of Atlantic partnership, underpinned by decisive actions that will reform NATO, the U.S.-EU relationship, and other key areas of transatlantic endeavor.

This report has two purposes. First, it aspires to help chart the path of change ahead for the transatlantic partnership. Second, it makes specific recommendations for the future of NATO. A companion report on U.S.-EU partnership will be released later this year.

Sixty years after its founding, NATO's three-fold purpose remains: to provide for the collective defense of its members; to institutionalize the transatlantic link and offer a preeminent forum for allied deliberations on security and strategy; and to offer an umbrella of reassurance under which European nations can focus their security concerns on common challenges rather than on each other. Yet each of these elements is being questioned today.

In the past, the Alliance met its purpose by adjusting to changing strategic circumstances. Over four Cold War decades NATO protected the western half of the European continent from threats from its eastern half, while transforming relations among NATO members themselves and working to overcome the overall divisions of the continent. NATO's original military strategy evolved to complement the emergence of political détente. As the Cold War ended, NATO began, as did the European Union, to work toward a Europe whole, free and at peace with itself. After hesitation, missteps and great human tragedy in the Balkans, NATO intervened to stop bloodshed and ethnic cleansing, and to maintain the subsequent peace. It anchored central European countries into the Euro-Atlantic community; extended that vision to those in southeastern Europe prepared to build democracy, market economies and peaceful relations with their neighbors; and acted further on that vision to include other democracies from the Baltic to the Black Sea. The result has been the successive advance of democracy, security, human rights and free markets throughout most of the Euro-Atlantic region.[1]

After the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, NATO for the first time invoked its collective defense commitment, Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty, declaring the attacks on the United States to be an attack on all nations of the Alliance. Since then, NATO has engaged in Afghanistan and built additional partnerships to address the threat of terrorism and evolving challenges to Alliance security.

Each time new challenges have arisen, NATO nations have sought a fresh consensus on the changing strategic environment, and how to address it together, by crafting a guidance document, or "Strategic Concept," for the Alliance. Yet NATO's current Strategic Concept, its sixth over the past 60 years, was adopted in 1999 – before the September 11 assaults and anthrax attacks in the United States and major terrorist attacks in Europe, before transatlantic and intra-European dissonance over the invasion of Iraq, before Alliance engagement in Afghanistan, before additional waves of NATO and EU enlargement, before cyber attacks on Estonia, before the reappearance of an assertive Russia and the advent of many other recent global trends.

In light of these changes, and as NATO enters its seventh decade, reaching consensus on a new long term strategy should be of high priority, no less than achieving operational success in Afghanistan. The next concept, however, should go beyond providing direction to NATO as an institution. This time, the Alliance should rise to a higher plane, charting its future in ways that relate the security, prosperity and freedom of its people and its nations to the world as a whole. To symbolize this change, the next guidance document should be formulated as a broader Atlantic Compact.[2]

Work on a new approach should begin with the 2009 NATO Summit. At that meeting, Alliance leaders should affirm their central commitment to collective defense in the context of 21st century challenges, and launch an effort to prepare an Atlantic Compact that is more than a fine-sounding communiqué. If it is to be useful, an Atlantic Compact must reflect a firm, real-life political consensus between Americans, Canadians and their European allies on how their partnership is to function in the coming years. It should be guided by a small group of respected opinion leaders, who would solicit advice from parliaments, think tanks and experts. The Compact should speak directly to its essential audiences: the people of NATO, their partners and their potential adversaries. It must provide unambiguous direction for NATO roles at home and away. It should be more than a strategic concept for an institution, it should renew for a young century the historic covenant forged by the people of the North Atlantic. An Atlantic Compact offering political guidance and future direction for the transatlantic partnership can in turn offer a framework for a more focused and detailed strategic concept that provides guidance to Alliance military authorities regarding the forces and capabilities they must produce to support the overall approach.

This study is an earnest attempt to spark transatlantic debate on this vital topic.

Executive Summary

We have an open but fleeting moment to forge a more effective Atlantic partnership. We must seize it now. European and North American allies have allowed their relations to become discordant, yet the times demand vigor and unity. Courageous decisions need to be taken to breathe new life and relevance into the Atlantic partnership, which must be recast to tackle a diverse range of serious challenges at home and abroad.

Reaching consensus on long term strategy should be of high priority. Leaders should go beyond providing direction to NATO as such and move the debate to a higher level, charting the future of their partnership in an Atlantic Compact that relates the security, prosperity and freedom of their people and their nations to the world as a whole.

I. A 21st Century Atlantic Partnership

- With the Cold War over and new powers rising, some argue that the transatlantic partnership has had its day. We disagree. Our achievements may not always match our aspirations, but the body of common principles, norms, rules and procedures we have built and accumulated together – in essence, an *acquis Atlantique* -- affirms the basic expectations we have for ourselves and for each other.
- For 60 years this foundation has made the transatlantic relationship the world's transformative partnership. North America's relationship with Europe enables each of us to achieve goals together that neither can alone – for ourselves and for the world. This still distinguishes our relationship: when we agree, we are usually the core of any effective global coalition. When we disagree, no global coalition is likely to be very effective.
- Our partnership remains as vital as in the past, but now we must focus on a new agenda. Today's strategic environment is complex and unpredictable. North America and Europe still face the menace of terrorism and the potential for conflict between major states, but a host of different, unorthodox challenges also demands our urgent attention.
- These challenges require us to affirm our mutual defense commitment within a wider spectrum of security; to reposition our key institutions and mechanisms, particularly the U.S.-EU partnership and NATO; and to connect better with other partners.
- Five strategic priorities loom large. Together, Europe and North America must
    - surmount immediate economic challenges while positioning their economies for the future;
    - build transatlantic resilience – protect our connectedness, not just our territory;
    - address the full range of international security challenges we face together;
    - continue to work toward a Europe whole, free, and at peace with itself;
    - reinvigorate transatlantic efforts to preserve a habitable planet.

- In tackling this agenda, NATO is indispensable yet insufficient. A new U.S.-EU framework, anchored by a clause of mutual assistance, and other institutional innovations are needed. In a companion report we will address the U.S.-EU partnership in greater detail.

Two Immediate Tests

The Strategic Priority of Afghanistan and Pakistan

- Visions of a more effective, resilient partnership will be moot if allies fail to quell terrorism and turmoil in the Afghanistan-Pakistan borderlands. Afghanistan has become a crucible for the Alliance. NATO's credibility is on the line.
- We must be clear regarding the threat, our goal, and our strategy:
    - Terrorist threats to the United States and Europe directly linked to the Afghanistan-Pakistan borderlands present the most immediate acute danger to transatlantic security today.
    - Our goal is to prevent any attacks and ensure that this region never again serves as a base for such threats.
    - Our strategy must have various components:
        - greater understanding that NATO's engagement in Afghanistan follows from the Alliance's invocation of its Article 5 collective defense clause on September 12, 2001;
        - more effective, integrated international coordination, based on Afghan priorities and coupled with political engagement by local leaders;
        - a broader region-wide approach geared to stability in Pakistan and beyond.

Relations with Russia: Engagement and Resolve

- Western coherence and effectiveness is also hampered by divisions over Russia. The West should advance a dual track strategy with Moscow. The first track should set forth in concrete terms the potential benefits of more productive relations. The second track should make it clear that these relations cannot be based on intimidation or outdated notions of spheres of influence, but rather on respect for international law, the UN Charter and the Helsinki principles. NATO should be integral to both tracks.

II. A New NATO

In essence, a new NATO needs a better balance between home and away missions. Recognizing that it will be indispensable but not sufficient to meet current and future security challenges, the Alliance must stretch its missions, connect better with partners and, depending on specific contingencies, be prepared to be the leading actor, play a supporting role, or simply join a broader ensemble.

NATO's Missions: Home and Away

- NATO is busier than ever, but many see an Alliance adrift. A new consensus is needed on the challenges to our security and NATO's role in meeting them.
    - If NATO is to be better, not just bigger, we must transform its scope and strategic rationale in ways that are understood and sustained by parliaments and public opinion. We must change the nature of the Alliance's capabilities, the way it generates and deploys forces, the way it makes decisions, the way it spends money, and the way it works with others.
    - NATO needs a new balance between missions home and away. For the past 15 years the Alliance has been driven by the slogan "out of area or out of business." Today, NATO operates out of area, and it is in business. But it must also operate *in* area, or it is in trouble.
    - NATO today faces a related set of missions both home and away.
        - *At home*, it is called to
            - maintain deterrence and defense;
            - support efforts to strengthen societal resilience against threats to the transatlantic homeland;
            - contribute to a Europe that truly can be whole, free and at peace.
        - *Away*, it is called to
            - prevent and respond to crises;
            - participate in stability operations;
            - connect better with global partners to cover a broader range of capabilities.

    All these missions share five common requirements:

        - intensive debate to sustain public and parliamentary support;
        - improved capabilities that are deployable;
        - better synergy between NATO and partners;
        - better cooperation between civil and military authorities;
        - matching means to agreed missions.
- NATO remains the preeminent transatlantic institution for deterrence and defense. In all other areas, however, it is likely to take only a selective lead, play a supporting role or work within a larger network of institutions. Knowing where and when NATO can add value is critical to prioritizing resources and effort.

Home Missions

Deterrence and Defense. To strengthen Article 5 preparedness NATO nations should:

- ensure a fully capable NATO Response Force (NRF) available in and out of area;
- exercise appropriate reinforcement capabilities within the NATO area to improve capacities neglected over the past decade; such exercises should be fully transparent and sized appropriately;
- invest in essential infrastructure in appropriate allied nations (especially the newer allies) to receive NATO reinforcements, including the NRF;
- consider positioning additional NATO common assets, for instance the Alliance Ground Surveillance (AGS) system, in a new member state;
- consider the creation of another NATO multinational corps composed of new members in central Europe.

Transatlantic Resilience. NATO is likely to be a supporting player in more robust overall efforts at both homeland and societal security in the North Atlantic space, to include:

- guarding the approaches;
- enhancing early-warning and air/missile defenses;
- improving counterterrorism activities;
- strengthening transatlantic capabilities for managing the consequences of terrorist attacks or large-scale natural disasters;
- cyberdefense;
- biodefense;
- political consultations on energy security;
- incorporating transatlantic resilience into the NATO Strategic Concept.

Europe Whole, Free and at Peace. NATO allies have an interest in consolidating the democratic transformation of Europe by working with others to extend as far as possible across the European continent the space of integrated security where war simply does not happen. Yet the situation today is different, and in many ways more difficult, than at the end of the Cold War. The West must keep its door open to the countries of wider Europe. NATO governments must remain firm on the 2008 Bucharest Summit's commitments to Georgia and Ukraine and to follow through on subsequent pledges of further assistance to both countries in implementing needed political and defense reforms. NATO and the EU should work with the states in the region, including through invigorated efforts at "forward resilience," to create conditions by which ever closer relations can be possible and the question of integration, while controversial today, can be posed more positively in the future.

Away Missions

Crisis Prevention and Response. If the Alliance is to continue to play an effective role in this field, it needs a deeper pool of forces that are capable, deployable and sustainable. Maintaining the operational effectiveness of the NRF is essential to NATO's credibility and should not be beyond the means of allied governments. Yet allies are stretched thin, and there is no easy fix. Either defense budgets must be increased for personnel, training and equipment or spending on existing force structure and unnecessary command structure and bureaucracy must be re-mixed to prioritize deployable forces and force multipliers such as Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance (ISR) platforms and helicopters.

Stability and Reconstruction Operations. Although many capabilities to conduct these operations exist within the European Union, NATO and the Partnership for Peace, they are not organized into deployable assets. Consideration should be given to the creation of a NATO Stabilization and Reconstruction Force (SRF), an integrated, multinational security support component that would organize, train and equip to engage in post-conflict operations, in a manner compatible with EU efforts.

Better Connections with Others: NATO's effectiveness depends on solid partnerships. NATO should establish a truly strategic partnership with the European Union and meaningful partnerships with the UN, the OSCE and the African Union; it should establish an Assistant Secretary General for Partnership to improve current partnerships and operationalize the Comprehensive Approach.

Internal Reforms

Change the Way NATO Makes Decisions

- Apply the consensus rule only in the North Atlantic Council (NAC) and when voting on funding in budget committees.
- Develop an opt-out option for nations whereby they can join consensus in the NAC on an operation but choose not to participate; in such cases they would not participate in operational decisions.
- Delegate authority to the Secretary General for internal matters.
- Merge the NATO International Staff and International Military Staff.
- Revamp the NATO Military Committee.

Change the Way NATO Spends Money

- Use NATO's "Peacetime Establishment" review to cut static command structure and outmoded NATO agencies or field activities, and redirect savings to mission support.
- Expand use of common funds to cover some costs of participating in NATO missions.
- Expand use of common funds to procure common equipment for operations.

- Coordinate procurement with the European Union to fill shortfalls in common capabilities.
- Create a NATO-EU working group, including defense industry representatives, to build a strong, complementary transatlantic defense industrial base.

Create a streamlined three-level Command Structure

Strategic:

- Allied Command Operations (ACO), with an American Supreme Commander (as currently structured);
- Allied Command Transformation (ACT), with a European Supreme Commander and two Deputies, one charged with defense planning and acquisition, the other (U.S. dual-hatted as Deputy Commander of U.S. JFCOM) with transformation.
- ACT's duties would also include doctrine and training for the comprehensive approach and transatlantic resilience and defense.

Operational:

Three Joint Force Command (JFC) headquarters in Brunssum, the Netherlands; Naples, Italy; and Lisbon, Portugal. Each JFC should be able to deploy a robust Joint Task Force. There should be at least two Combined Air Operations Centers (CAOC) with a deployable CAOC capability.

Deployable:

Three joint deployable HQs, replacing most or all of the current six fixed component commands. If additional HQs are needed, they might be sourced from High Readiness Force HQs already in existence in some allied nations.

- ➢ Potential savings from cuts in command structure would be used by NATO to help procure common items for deployment.

Generate Appropriate Military Capabilities

Deployable Conventional Forces. Forces that cannot deploy are of little use for missions home or away. Allies must be able to deploy

- light and heavy armored forces;
- initial intervention forces, including the NATO Response Force (NRF);
- special operations and stabilization forces - increasingly needed yet currently inadequate for the length and unique nature of modern military operations.

Force Enablers. Three multipliers should be approved for common funding:

- Strategic and Theater Lift - including aerial refueling and transport helicopters;
- Network Enabled Command, Control and Communications (C3);
- Interoperable Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance (ISR) platforms.

Missile Defense. This has emerged as a potentially important requirement for future deterrence against missile threats from Iran and possibly other countries. Should transatlantic diplomacy succeed in stopping Iranian acquisition of nuclear weapons, radar and interceptor deployment may not be necessary. Yet current U.S. and allied efforts should continue now for two reasons. First, such efforts are prudent given the lead time necessary for deployment. Second, should diplomacy fail and Tehran acquire nuclear weapons capability, a defensive response is likely to be a more palatable and effective option than an offensive military response. As diplomatic efforts are reinvigorated, the Alliance needs to

- follow through on its Bucharest commitments to explore how planned U.S. missile defense sites in Europe could be integrated into current NATO plans;
- develop options for a comprehensive missile defense architecture to extend coverage to all allied territory and populations not otherwise covered by the U.S. system;
- work with the United States for Russian participation.

Nuclear Forces. We support the long-term goal of a world without nuclear weapons. None of our considerations contradict initiatives such as Global Zero. When it comes to practical implementation, however, it is important to keep the following in mind:

- Historically, the presence of U.S. nuclear weapons in Europe has been a preeminent symbol coupling European and North American security. For this reason, a unilateral U.S. decision to withdraw its nuclear weapons could be seen in Europe as a U.S. effort to decouple its security from that of its allies and thus question the very premise of the Atlantic Alliance.
- If such a step is to be considered, the initiative should come from Europe. If European allies are confident that European and North American security is sufficiently coupled to no longer require the presence of U.S. nuclear weapons in Europe, the U.S. is unlikely to object to their removal.
- When addressing the question, allies should also consider future requirements and keep in mind that once such forces are withdrawn, it will be all but impossible politically to return them.
- If reductions or eliminations are considered, allies should seek equivalent steps by Russia.

Match Missions to Means

NATO cannot expect any growth in resource availability. It must enhance and augment capabilities from the same resources and redouble efforts to cut spending on questionable static command structure or NATO agency/field activities that can no longer be justified as nations face budget pressures. NATO should:

- develop a new approach to how operations are funded and essential capabilities are fielded;
- increase the deployability, and thus the usability of its overall force, including its 12,500-strong formal command structure, little of which is deployable;

- look for capabilities where some members agree to pool assets, such as the C-17 consortium initiative among 12 members and partners;
- increase the number of multinational units comprised of national forces, including niche forces;
- establish a NATO-EU working group to flesh out and implement the Comprehensive Approach;
- establish an industry/NATO/EU group to collaborate on procurement of common items;
- press allies to shift defense budget spending away from personnel and infrastructure to investment, training, and readiness.

Rethink Functional and Geographic "Areas of Emphasis."

For good reasons the Alliance has resisted 'divisions of labor' in the past. Yet persistently low defense investments create serious gaps that cannot be closed in the near term. Coordination along both functional and geographic lines may thus be wise, with central organizing principles and procedures.

- Functional areas of emphasis should be explored along the lines of stability operations forces, special operations forces and major combat forces.
- A geographic view might look at NATO and EU regions of emphasis. For example, NATO is responsible for collective defense of allied territory as well as operations in south Asia, particularly Afghanistan. The European Union has taken the lead on most crisis response operations in Africa and is assuming more and more missions in the Balkans outside NATO territory.
- Neither functional nor geographic roles should be considered exclusive domains. Rather these should be regarded as lead and support domains, so that transatlantic partners reinforce each other with an array of capabilities.

I.
New World, New Partnership

Chapter 1
New World Rising

"...An old world is collapsing and a new world arising;
we have better eyes for the collapse than for the rise,
for the old one is the world we know."

-- John Updike

It is urgent that we renew and reform the transatlantic partnership, for the world we have known is fading. A new world is rising, uncertain, indeterminate, yet forming fast.

There is much that is positive about this transformation. For the first time in human history, most people on this planet live under governments of their own choosing. Revolutions in science, technology, transportation and communications are improving lives and freeing minds. A rising global middle class is creating major new opportunities. More people have been lifted out of poverty in the last twenty years than in all of human history. The Great Powers are at peace.

Overall, more people in more parts of the world have benefited from these dramatic changes. Gains, however, have not been shared evenly. For too many, change has simply meant disruption and uncertainty. Around the world there is great concern about the impact of corrosive regional, ethnic, and religious conflicts; the rise of terrorism and organized crime; migration flows provoked by poverty, population growth, environmental change or insecurity; the accelerating proliferation of mass destruction capacities; the spread of pandemics; increasing resource scarcity, particularly energy and water; environmental degradation and the effects of climate change.

Moreover, the potential of our young century has been stunted by the deepest recession in generations. While the United States and Europe still account for more than 60 percent of the global economy, the financial crisis and attendant recession have greatly damaged Western capacities. In 2009, for the first time in history, the world's emerging economies are forecast to provide 100 percent of global economic growth. Within the next 10 to 15 years, they are expected to generate more than half of the world's output. Yet they too have been hurt by the financial crisis. Developing countries have seen foreign capital dry up, export markets shrivel, and currencies, banks and stock markets weaken.

Despite the global downturn, growing connections between continents will continue to exert a powerful influence on the evolving international order. Globalization has brought large gains in trade and capital flows, greater technological diffusion and higher economic growth. But it has not brought geopolitics or ideological struggles to an end. Rather, darker forces, including terrorism, organized crime, and radical ideologies - particularly the jihadist vision of ridding the Muslim world of Western influence and corrupt regimes, and restoring the Caliphate - will continue to exacerbate regional tensions and transnational threats and fuel competition and instability. Moreover, the technology and knowledge to make and deliver agents of mass destruction is proliferating

among some of the most ruthless factions and regimes on earth. The ability of individuals and groups to employ destructive power will continue, as governments struggle to meet the challenge of stateless networks that move freely across borders.

The world's most devastating agent of mass destruction – infectious disease – is moving from the hands of Mother Nature to the hands of man. Stunning scientific advances are enhancing biology's dual-use potential for beneficence or malevolence. Biological techniques available today permit rapid synthesis of large viruses from non-living parts. This will help researchers seeking new drugs and vaccines. But it also puts the synthesis of viruses such as smallpox within the reach of thousands of laboratories worldwide.

The age of engineered biological weapons is neither science fiction nor a suspense thriller. It is here, today. The world is on the cusp of exponential change in the power of bioagents and their accessibility to state and non-state actors. The absence of available medical countermeasures (medicines, vaccines and diagnostic tests) and the inadequacies of health information and distribution systems will limit most nations' capacities to deal with large-scale epidemics. Current systems to manage epidemics were stretched to the limit by SARS and other natural outbreaks, and are wholly inadequate for the unique challenges of bioterrorism. Efforts to adopt nuclear nonproliferation regimes to the biological realm have been fraught with difficulties and are of questionable merit.[3]

While most threats to peace and stability today remain regionally rooted, in an increasingly interconnected world conflicts that once might have remained local disputes can now have global impact. In this context, problems of governance have become a central national security dilemma. Unstable and ungoverned regions of the world, or governance that breaks when challenged, pose dangers for neighbors and can become the setting for broader problems of terrorism, migration, poverty and despair.

The broader Middle East, stretching to southwest Asia, remains the region of the world where unsettled relationships, religious and territorial conflicts, impoverished societies, fragile and intolerant regimes and deadly combinations of technology and terror brew and bubble on top of one vast energy field upon which global prosperity depends. Choices made here could determine the shape of the 21st century – whether agents of mass destruction will be unleashed upon mass populations; whether the oil and gas fields of the Caucasus and Central Asia can become reliable energy sources; whether catastrophic terrorism can be prevented; whether Russia's borderlands can become stable and secure democracies; whether Israel and its neighbors can live in peace; whether millions of people can be lifted from pervasive poverty and hopelessness; and whether the great religions of the world can flourish together. A number of significant, interrelated trends will continue to affect alliance security: Sunni-Shia conflicts and Islamist violence; Israeli-Palestinian tensions; Iraq's precarious transition as U.S. and coalition forces withdraw; Iranian efforts to assert regional influence and develop nuclear weapons; and sustained insurgencies in Afghanistan and Pakistan that offer safe harbor to terrorists.

Central Asia has become a focal point for competition over energy resources, and Russia and China could intensify their efforts to gain influence in the region. Leadership

transition will test key regional powers, and could trigger regime failure and instability, opening doors to clan, tribal, and regional rivalries that may transcend state borders and lead to turmoil and violence. Significant and protracted instability could become the defining characteristic of Central Asia, including failed and failing states; radical Islamic movements; organized crime; and trafficking in weapons, WMD materials, and narcotics.

Rising China, India and Indonesia will reshape power dynamics in Asia and beyond. Japan remains a major world player, but domestic political differences have prevented it from shouldering additional burdens to enhance global security commensurate with its position. China is on track to become the world's second largest economy, the world's largest importer of resources, the world's biggest polluter, and a leading military power. Yet it faces significant domestic challenges, including environmental degradation, AIDS, and the prospect of wider social unrest if economic growth falters or problems in governance, social welfare, and regional development cannot be overcome. India is likely to continue to enjoy economic growth, develop its military, and seek to establish itself as a major independent power, even as rivalry persists with Pakistan. Burgeoning Indonesia is grappling with secessionist challenges and the spread of Islamist fundamentalism. An unpredictable North Korea will require significant international attention.

Sub-Saharan Africa continues to be a major global supplier of oil, gas, and other commodities, yet remains vulnerable to HIV/AIDS, economic disruption, population stresses, civil conflict, corruption and failed governance. Many states lack the capacity to break up terror cells, thwart trafficking in arms, drugs or people, or provide domestic security. The Darfur crisis is a tragic reminder of the potential for local strife to affect millions. While Africans are assuming more of their own security responsibilities, Europeans and Americans are called on to provide emergency assistance, deploy and train peacekeepers, and mediate disputes.

Despite the rise of Brazil and broadening commercial relations with Asia and Europe, Latin America has yet to add its potential to broader transatlantic partnership. Some areas in this region continue to be among the most violent in the world, due to the activities of drug trafficking organizations, criminal cartels, and persistent weaknesses in governance and the rule of law.

Resource issues are gaining in prominence as energy, water, and food pressures grow. The concentration of energy resources under state control and/or in regions of instability, together with rapidly changing resource distribution patterns, increasing demand and decreasing reserves will continue to challenge all consuming countries. Lack of access to stable water supplies is reaching critical proportions, particularly for agriculture, and rapid urbanization is exacerbating the problem. The World Bank estimates that demand for food will rise by 50 percent by 2030.[4]

Climate change is expected to exacerbate resource scarcities, prompting greater humanitarian crises, large-scale migration of people, instability, and conflict. Although the impact of climate change will vary, a number of regions are already suffering harmful effects, particularly water scarcity, storm intensity and loss of agricultural production.

The International Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) estimates that by 2020, up to 250 million Africans could face starvation and malnutrition due to lack of fresh water supplies, lower crop yields, and drought. The IPCC also warns that mega-delta regions throughout Asia will face huge geopolitical challenges from climate-induced migration.

One immediate strategic consequence of climate change in the next few years is likely to be an increasingly ice-free summertime Arctic, which will open up vast energy and mineral resources yet pose considerable environmental, legal and geostrategic challenges. The U.S. Geological Survey estimates that at least 25 percent of the world's remaining oil and gas resources lie north of the Arctic Circle. Although the circumpolar states share a common interest in addressing environmental vulnerabilities as they exploit these resources, unresolved jurisdictional claims could result in greater tensions. Moreover, a host of new players could join the mix, since world shipping could also be transformed: the Northern Sea Route between the North Atlantic and the North Pacific is about 5,000 nautical miles shorter – a week's sailing time -- than a trip via the Suez Canal.

Chapter 2

A 21st Century Transatlantic Partnership

The new world rising underscores how the challenges facing Europeans and Americans have changed since the end of the Cold War. We are used to associating historic change with significant dates and catalytic events. Even today, the fall of the Berlin Wall on November 9, 1989 remains the most potent symbol of the attraction and power of open societies. Yet when walls come down for families and friends they also can come down for hatred, prejudice and new forms of competition. There is no more vivid example than the tragic attacks of September 11, 2001.[5]

The changes we are experiencing today are no less historic. They are perhaps less vivid in the popular mind because they cannot be tied to one symbolic event, but emanate from the billions of individual decisions made around the globe every day. Yet the consequences of those choices are no less dramatic for our welfare. We no longer face a singular threat to our security, nor can we afford to subsume diverse dangers under simplistic slogans such as the Global War on Terror. We still face the potential for conflict between major states. We will perhaps always face the menace of terrorism. But today a host of unorthodox challenges also demands our urgent attention.

Two broad themes emerge from our assessment. First, the global has become local. Our well-being is increasingly influenced by international flows of people, money and weapons, goods and services, technology, toxins and terror, drugs and disease. We characterize these phenomena as "global," but their impact is local. They are unprecedented in their range, scope and speed. They offer untold opportunities and terrible dangers. They are impersonal forces with very personal consequences. As a result, “human” security has become integral to “national” security.

The networked nature of modern societies should prompt reconsideration of what, exactly, needs protecting in today’s world. Traditional strategies focused on securing territory. Yet what do cyber hackers, energy cartels and al-Qaeda have in common? They are networks that prey on other networks - the interconnected arteries and nodes of vulnerability that accompany the free flow of people, ideas, energy, money, goods and services, and the complex interdependent systems on which free societies depend. It is our complete reliance on such networks, matched with their susceptibility to catastrophic disruption, which makes them such tempting targets. In the 21st century, we are called to protect our connectedness, not just our territory.[6] A transformative approach to security should supplement the traditional focus on the security of territory with more energetic efforts to protect the critical functions of societies, and the manifold connections those societies have with others.

Second, the local has become global. For many of our citizens the new world has meant disruption and insecurity. They worry that a job gained abroad means a job lost at home, that their hard-won prosperity could simply slip away. They are anxious about the pace of

global change, about their livelihoods, about their future. They worry that their ways of life are at the mercy of distant events. These concerns are real, widespread, and legitimate. Yet domestic renewal cannot come at the expense of our international engagement. The affairs of the world have become too deeply entrenched in our domestic lives for us to ignore global developments while we concentrate on problems at home. Domestic renewal, in fact, requires our active international engagement – together.

Some argue that with the Cold War over and new powers rising, the transatlantic partnership has had its day, that the values and interests of Europeans and Americans have diverged, and that many of our institutions are of little relevance to today's global challenges. We disagree. Our partnership remains as vital as in the past, but now we must focus on a new agenda. The new world rising offers us both necessity and opportunity to reposition our partnership to meet 21st century challenges, and to improve the institutions and tools at our disposal.

In recent years, Europeans and Americans have differed on the nature of some of these challenges and how best to confront them. Differences of perspective and policy can be powerful. But the history of European-American relations has often been the history of difference. Merely asserting difference or reciting lists of tough issues does not make the case for estrangement. It makes the case for better leadership.

Moreover, that which has driven us apart has rarely overshadowed that which keeps us together: basic principles of democracy, liberty, human rights, nondiscrimination and the rule of law; mutual peace and security; open, rules-based markets; and an open door to those who choose to abide by these principles and add their strength to ours -- all underpinned by deep security and economic linkages and an intensity of cooperation without parallel anywhere on earth. At times, each side of the Atlantic has honored these principles in the breach. Our achievements do not always match our aspirations. But the body of common principles, norms, rules and procedures we have built and accumulated together – in essence, an *acquis Atlantique* -- affirms the basic expectations we have for ourselves and for each other.[7] It offers a unique foundation on which to build.

For sixty years this foundation has made the transatlantic relationship the world's transformative partnership. North America's relationship with Europe enables each of us to achieve goals together that neither can alone – for ourselves and for the world. This still distinguishes our relationship: when we agree, we are usually the core of any effective global coalition. When we disagree, no global coalition is likely to be very effective.

In short, transatlantic partnership remains indispensable if we are to tackle effectively the challenges we face. But unless we address the deep changes that have altered the context of our relationship, and unless we develop common strategies to advance the broadened range of interests we share, we are less likely to harness transatlantic potential to achieve our wider goals and more likely to hold each other back.

Skeptics point to the relative decline of North America and Europe in terms of global population trends or the world economy. Yet those trends underscore the need to deepen, not dilute, transatlantic cooperation. A weaker transatlantic bond would render Americans and Europeans less safe, less prosperous, and less able to advance our ideals and interests in the wider world.

At the same time, our partnership, while indispensable, is also insufficient to deal with many of the challenges we face. Only by banding together with others are we likely to advance our values, protect our interests, and extend our influence.

Once again, the United States and Europe are called to tune their partnership to new times and to a diverse and dangerous set of challenges. Many of those challenges range far beyond the North Atlantic, but they can have very direct consequences for every citizen, right at home. If the U.S.-European alliance is to be rebuilt, two challenges must be met. The first is to provide the tone and purpose that can reinvigorate our partnership. The second is to give ourselves the appropriate tools to advance a common agenda.

A Partnership with Purpose

The year 2009 offers an unusual opportunity to reconcile Europe's grand experiment of integration with a reorientation and strategic transformation of transatlantic relations to create a new model: a resilient Atlantic partnership that is more effective at enhancing our prosperity; protecting our societies; advancing our values, and working with others to forge global responses to global challenges.[8] Five transatlantic priorities loom large.

First, we must tackle immediate economic challenges while positioning our economies for the future. Few issues are likely to shape European-American relations over the next few years as much as the global economic crisis. This epochal event has erased any doubt about how interconnected the transatlantic economy has become. The deeper and more prolonged the recession, the greater the risks of inward, insular policies on both sides of the Atlantic. Our common challenge is to show our citizens and millions around the world that it is possible to reap globalization's benefits while making its costs bearable to those most adversely affected, without succumbing to protectionist temptations. This requires more than large dollops of fiscal and monetary stimuli. Bolder thinking and action are needed.

To paraphrase an old Chinese adage, "a crisis is a terrible thing to waste." Economic recessions are invitations to change, to develop new ideas. The present economic climate is ripe for change and provides an ideal opportunity for the United States and Europe to work jointly on such large scale initiatives as energy security, sustainable economic development and global climate change. Innovation in these areas could generate new long-term avenues of growth and prosperity.

Europe and North America are better positioned than most other economies to break the link between the generation of wealth and the consumption of resources. Rapidly rising

economies are all growing in a world economy premised on extensive use of oil and gas and intensive use of resources. That approach is untenable for a global economy of 6 billion people. Breaking this link is an historic challenge – a chance to move toward entirely different patterns of consumption and competitiveness. Transatlantic cooperation and innovation could lead the way.

Over the next two decades, the prospect of a shift in the global economic balance is very real. But a number of big emerging markets do not share some of the core principles or basic mechanisms that underpin open rules-based commerce. Even though the credibility of the United States and Europe has been damaged on this score, no plausible alternative to Western-style global economic leadership is in sight, and the rapidly emerging economies have also been swamped by the global crisis. Moreover, the transatlantic economy remains very strong on a secular and structural basis, generating $3.75 trillion in total commercial sales a year and employing up to 14 million workers in mutually "onshored" jobs on both sides of the Atlantic.[9] Instead of spending significant political capital on transatlantic disputes over bananas, beef and state aid to industry, eking out marginal advantages through preferential trade arrangements with tiny markets, or being tempted into beggar-thy-neighbor approaches to import surges from countries such as China, Europe and the United States could invest in new forms of transatlantic collaboration that would make them true pathfinders of the global economy – essentially to reposition the West as it works to integrate others into mechanisms of global good governance

Our second task is to build societal resilience – together. Homeland security may begin at home, but in an age of potentially catastrophic terrorism and networked threats, no nation is alone. If Europeans and Americans are to be safer, individual national efforts must be aligned with more effective transatlantic cooperation. There have been some promising beginnings, but they have been ad hoc, low-priority achievements rather than integrated elements of a comprehensive approach.

Biosecurity is perhaps the most dramatic example of the changing challenges we face. Bioterrorism is a first-order strategic threat to the transatlantic community, and yet neither our health nor our security systems are prepared for intentional attacks of infectious disease. Homeland security policies that focus on guards, gates and guns have little relevance to this type of challenge. A bioterrorist attack in Europe or North America is more likely than, and could be as consequential as, a nuclear attack, but requires a different set of national and international responses. Unless we forge new health security alliances and take other measures, an attack of mass lethality is not a matter of whether, but when. A great challenge of our century is to prevent the deliberate use of disease as a weapon from killing millions, destabilizing economies and disrupting societies. The grand security opportunity of our century is to eliminate massively lethal epidemics of infectious disease by ensuring that biodefense – humankind's ageless struggle to prevent and defeat disease – is far more potent than attempts to create and deploy bio agents of mass lethality.[10]

This example underscores the need for the United States, Canada and their European partners to advance a multidimensional strategy of societal resilience that goes beyond "homeland" security and relies not just on traditional tools but also on new forms of diplomatic, intelligence, counterterrorism, financial, economic and law enforcement cooperation; customs, air and seaport security; equivalent standards for data protection and information exchange; biodefense and critical infrastructure protection. It needs to begin with the transatlantic community, not only because European societies are so inextricably intertwined, but because no two continents are as deeply connected as those on either side of the North Atlantic. Our ultimate goal should be a resilient Euro-Atlantic area of freedom, security and justice that balances mobility and civil liberties with societal security.[11]

Such efforts, in turn, can serve as the core of more effective global measures. Europeans and Americans share a keen interest in building the societal resilience of other nations, since strong homeland security efforts in one country may mean little if neighboring systems are weak. In fact, 20th century concepts of "forward defense" should be supplemented by the broader notion of "forward resilience." Elements of this initiative will need to be conducted bilaterally, and much of it through invigorated channels between North America and the European Union, but other mechanisms and organizations, including NATO, can offer support in specific areas, as outlined later in this report.

Third, we must deal with the full range of international security challenges that face us together. Many of those challenges are in southwest Asia and the broader Middle East. Today, our security is being defended at the Hindu Kush, not the Fulda Gap. The main threat to European and American citizens emanates from turmoil and terrorism in Afghanistan and the tribal areas of Pakistan. (This issue is addressed in the next section.) Closer transatlantic cooperation is not only essential if we are to prevent Iran from developing nuclear weapons, it will be even more essential in crafting an extended deterrence regime in the Persian Gulf/Middle East if Iran does in fact acquire such weapons. Solutions to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and civil instability in Lebanon depend first and foremost on the people of the region. But transatlantic cooperation is essential to establish a new roadmap for peace, keep the process on track, offer assistance and humanitarian support, and facilitate new forms of regional diplomacy. Stronger support also needs to be given to Algeria, Morocco and Tunisia in their efforts to reform and contain radical Islamists.[12]

This agenda also includes Iraq. Although many Europeans opposed the U.S./UK-led invasion, Europe has an interest in a secure, stable and unified Iraq. Europeans should now work with Baghdad and Washington to increase EU engagement, from financial assistance, trade, investment and training for police and judges, to engagement with political parties, election monitoring, and diplomatic efforts to provide a regional framework conducive to Iraq's peaceful development.

These examples highlight the need to redouble our efforts to halt proliferation of agents of mass destruction. We can begin by reaffirming our support for the Nuclear Non-

proliferation Treaty (NPT), the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC), Biological Weapons Convention (BWC) and related efforts, and offer deep cuts in strategic offensive forces. Yet today's non-proliferation and disarmament framework has become both insufficient and inadequate. As we have argued, biosecurity is a unique challenge that requires its own set of responses, not approaches derived from the nuclear world. Nations look to the World Health Organization, although in the words of former WHO Director General Gro Harlem Brundtland, "the WHO has all the resources of a medium-sized hospital in England."[13] In addition, more states are seeking nuclear capacity, and nuclear know-how is becoming increasingly accessible. The 2010 NPT Review Conference will be a key opportunity to strengthen the Treaty's provisions. We should support a nuclear fuel bank, so that the nuclear fuel cycle is under strong international oversight and control, and explore further development of the Proliferation Security Initiative (PSI) and better intelligence-sharing.

Fourth, despite the historic progress made to extend democratic stability on the European continent, Europe is not yet whole, not yet wholly free, and not yet wholly at peace. Wider Europe beyond the European Union and NATO is still beset with historical animosities and multiple crises on or near its borders, including a number of festering conflicts that in some way affect all the countries of the region. The United States and its European allies share an interest in extending the space of democratic stability where war simply does not happen. They also share an interest in a confident, capable, outward-looking Europe, not one so best by turmoil or so focused on instability along its Eastern and Balkan peripheries that it cannot play a broader role. Successes in this region – more effective democratic governance grounded in the rule of law, progress against corruption and trafficking, peaceful resolution of conflicts, secure energy production and transit, more confident and prosperous market economies – could resonate significantly across the post-Soviet space and into the broader Middle East. Failure to deal with the region's problems risks destabilizing competition and confrontation among regional and external actors, festering separatist conflicts, greater transnational challenges and dysfunctional energy markets, the negative consequences of which could also spill into Europe, Eurasia and the Middle East. The ability of countries in the region to deal with these issues, and the willingness and ability of Europe and the United States to work with them and with Russia to address these problems, could determine not only where Europe ends, but what it represents.[14]

The fifth priority is a renewed effort to preserve a habitable planet, including improving the human condition of those most impoverished and distressed. For decades we applied our best strategic thinking to deterrence and containment. Today, there is a clear need to apply that sort of thinking to the strategic challenges posed by humankind's impact on our earth. How we tackle the related issues of climate change, energy efficiency, resource scarcity and human development will determine whether we will live securely in the world of tomorrow.

Recent decades have brought unparalleled progress and prosperity for many parts of the world. But billions of people have been left behind. Helping them break the cycle of poverty and despair is not only the right thing to do, it is clearly in our interest. These

impoverished regions can be unstable, volatile, and dangerous and can represent great threats to America, Europe, and the world. We must work with the people of these regions to promote sustainable economic growth, better health, good governance and greater human security.

Large-scale human disasters burden much of today's world. Humanitarian crises are immediate; often they are manmade. We must try not only to react to them but also to prevent them. If we do, we can save lives and money. If we can improve the collective machinery to carry out humanitarian actions, we may be able to avoid a choice between intervening militarily and turning away in the face of massive human tragedy.

A Better Box of Tools

This is a daunting and wide-ranging agenda, and close transatlantic coordination will be essential to harness hard and soft power capabilities and project and deploy them at distance, including within the North Atlantic space; to include interior, finance, justice, health, development and other agencies more systematically in our work; to ensure that our institutions work synergistically; and to match our missions to our means.

Unfortunately, our instruments are out of tune with the times. There is a growing mismatch between the nature of our challenges, the capacity of our institutions, and the tools at our disposal. Ad hoc responses are the result, as we have seen with Afghanistan, Iran and Darfur, and with energy security, SARS, and financial turbulence.

Optimal performance, of course, will never be easy for a partnership composed of two continents, many diverse countries and a constellation of institutions. Yet we can do better.

This new agenda will require new patterns of cooperation between the United States, Europe, and other partners to improve our mechanisms of global governance, such as the UN and its specialized agencies, the G8, the G20, and international financial, health and humanitarian institutions. There is a growing mismatch between the scope and scale of global challenges and the ability of global mechanisms to deal with them. We need to consider new forms of governance at the global level, and integrate rising powers and new actors in ways that give them a stake in the system, based on principles of good governance. If we expect rising powers to respect those principles, we must commit to them ourselves.

Our ability to get the global financial and economic architecture right will certainly help us deal with our security challenges, and any discussion of NATO must also take account of other international institutions, particularly the UN and the European Union. Since our report is focused on NATO, we do not address global governance issues in detail, except to note that our recommendations are premised on the need for the United States and the European Union to strengthen their relationship.

NATO is the institutional expression of the transatlantic link. It remains essential to coping with many of the challenges facing Europe and North America today. There is no equivalent U.S. link with the European Union, however, even though the European Union is the most important organization in the world to which the United States does not belong, and will be America's essential partner in many of the strategic areas sketched out above. If we are to advance a more effective transatlantic partnership, including a reformed NATO, we must build a stronger U.S.-EU relationship.

The European Union, of course, is a work in progress, with uneven capacities. How the European Union structures itself is a matter primarily for Europeans. Yet Washington should make it clear that however EU members organize themselves, the United States supports a more capable European Union that can act as a counterpart, not a counterweight. The U.S.-EU strategic partnership should evolve as "Europe" itself evolves, and in ways that support the transatlantic link expressed through NATO.

We intend to issue a companion paper proposing specific ways that U.S.-EU partnership can be transformed. Yet one specific suggestion is warranted in this report. We propose that the United States and the European Union develop a new framework for cooperation that moves beyond current arrangements, which are badly outdated and often ineffective. The president framework was agreed in 1995 during Spain's EU Presidency. We recommend that a new agreement be prepared for signing in spring 2010, during another Spanish Presidency. It should set forth an updated framework that undergirds strategic cooperation with a recommitment to shared values. It should express what we stand for, and why we stand together. Most importantly, it should be anchored by a clause of mutual assistance whereby the United States and the European Union declare that they shall consult together if one of them is the victim of a terrorist attack, or a natural or man-made disaster, and will offer assistance as deemed necessary.[15]

Other institutional innovations have been suggested that we could support.[16] Regardless of the specific mechanisms, the transatlantic community needs a framework that accommodates the evolution of the European Union, affirms the importance of NATO, the OSCE, and the Council of Europe, and addresses our strategic challenges. We must seize the opportunity to rebuild a sense of common cause and reposition our partnership before the fluid trends of the moment harden into something not to our liking.

Our agenda is ambitious. It cannot be accomplished overnight. But if the effort is launched and sustained, progress can be made in ways that will have steady cumulative effects. If our plan is to succeed, it must be anchored in more than lofty rhetoric. And NATO, the embodiment of our alliance, must be a central element in this transformation.

Chapter 3

Two Immediate Tests

Discussion of an Atlantic Compact and a new NATO will be moot if the Alliance stumbles in Afghanistan or is unable to devise a common approach to Russia. While these two challenges are considerably different, each poses an immediate test for Western cohesion.

The Strategic Priority of Afghanistan and Pakistan

The mounting number of thwarted plots and terrorist attacks in the United States and Europe that emanate from the Afghanistan-Pakistan border regions presents the most immediate acute threat to transatlantic security.[17] The September 11 attacks on the United States were masterminded from Afghanistan and carried out largely by individuals living in Europe. Western security forces have stopped other potentially catastrophic schemes planned for Europe and North America before they could be executed. Al-Qaeda leaders such as Osama bin Laden and Ayman al-Zawahiri, who are actively plotting further attacks, are most likely operating from the Afghan-Pakistani border region.

North America and Europe share a fundamental interest in preventing such attacks and ensuring that Afghanistan and the tribal areas of Pakistan never again serve as a base for terrorism. If the situation in Afghanistan continues to deteriorate, terrorist networks will be able to operate there again with relative impunity, posing a direct threat to the European and North American homelands and to neighboring Pakistan. Instability in nuclear-armed Pakistan, in turn, would pose a severe threat to the region and the world.

The costs and risks of failing to stabilize Afghanistan and Pakistan are significant for the United States and Europe, and the increasing level of violence in both countries warrants an urgent response. The threat is clear and present – for Europeans and Americans. A comprehensive regional strategy is needed if either country is to be stable and capable of securing its own borders.

Afghanistan is NATO's first-ever ground combat operation. It is not a war of choice; it is a war of necessity. It is supported by every conceivable avenue of international and multilateral legitimacy. The initial U.S. military operation was successful and the Afghan people welcomed NATO's subsequent intervention. Before long, however, the Alliance and its partners on the ground began making mistakes that still haunt the mission today. For one, NATO opted to conduct its mission on the cheap. The number of U.S. troops per capita in Afghanistan has been significantly smaller than in almost every nation-building effort since World War II. This "light footprint" has been a strategic mistake.

Those NATO troops that are in Afghanistan face two challenges: many lack operational and tactical lift, preventing them from moving from one region to another; and others operate under national caveats that dictate when, where and how they can be deployed. Not all caveats are declared in advance, complicating planning and operations. As a

result, tactical commanders spend more time thinking about what they cannot do than what they can.

In addition, the resource costs of the NATO operation (ISAF) are taking a heavy toll on several European troop contributor nations. Under standard NATO practice, nations must absorb the lion's share of costs associated with their participation in operations. This is a particular disincentive to allies who have the political will to sustain or increase troop contributions in the most demanding missions but lack resources to do so. Several allies, however, are resisting proposals to increase NATO's common funding for operations or to acquire more collective assets. Some seem unwilling to improve capabilities, fearing they might be called upon to use them. Others, faced with low and relatively stagnant defense budgets, probably worry that greater NATO common funding would come at the expense of their national programs.

Finally, NATO's difficulties in Afghanistan are taking a toll on the overall credibility of the Alliance. Growing doubts about Allied political resolve and military capacity to sustain expeditionary operations in Afghanistan are also eroding the credibility of the Alliance's core mission of collective defense in the minds of opinion leaders in some allied countries. The result is a scramble for bilateral security assurances from Washington, which only serves further to undermine NATO's credibility and mutual defense commitments.

Afghanistan has become a crucible for the transatlantic alliance. NATO's credibility is on the line. The pressure on nations to meet their force requirements has exposed fissures between allies; some feel they are carrying the combat burden while others get off lightly. Moreover, most Europeans do not believe the United States or NATO has a strategy to succeed in Afghanistan, and are thus reluctant to take the political risks involved in doing more. Capability shortfalls and force generation problems are casting doubt on Alliance staying power. If demonstrable progress is not evident soon, it will be difficult for several allies to sustain their engagement.

Failure in Afghanistan – on the heels of divisions over Iraq -- would be devastating. Discussions of NATO's strategic vision will be moot if allies stumble in Afghanistan. An earnest and rapid transatlantic reassessment is needed to create realistic goals, a common, comprehensive approach, a regional policy, and sustained public support.

Unfortunately, recognition of the risk of failure is not shared across the Atlantic. Without such a shared understanding, a more cohesive, determined approach will remain elusive. Although NATO invoked its mutual defense clause – Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty – for the first time on September 12, 2001 in response to the September 11 attacks plotted from Afghanistan, NATO's engagement in Afghanistan has not been formally designated as an Article 5 mission. Yet it is critical to generate greater understanding among parliamentarians and publics that NATO's engagement in Afghanistan follows from the invocation of Article 5. European efforts in Afghanistan are necessary not as a gesture of support for Americans, but because Europeans are directly threatened as well.

The central objective of our effort must be to create an environment in which Afghans are able to exorcise terrorists and govern themselves. Successful counterinsurgency efforts hinge on the competence of local security forces, not international ones. Much greater effort needs to be invested in the generation, organization, training and recruitment of gendarmerie or carabinieri types of police forces. Strong and capable Afghan security forces are critical for Afghanistan's stability. Until this is achieved, international forces will be needed in Afghanistan.

There can, however, be no security in Afghanistan without successful civil reconstruction, and great challenges remain: the opium economy, endemic corruption, weak governance. NATO offers the essential framework for our military efforts, but it is not equipped to advance the range of civil efforts, from economic development to police and judiciary training to voter registration, that will ultimately determine success.

Afghanistan offers compelling evidence of the need for a Comprehensive Approach that brings both civil and military capabilities to bear, across the range of international institutions, on the full range of problems inherent in dealing with conflict in a failed or failing state. Yet current military and civil structures are a shaky patchwork.

A central requirement is more effective and integrated coordination among NATO, the European Union and the UN, preferably through each organization's senior civilian representative on the ground, working alongside U.S. and NATO military leaders, and in accordance with the Afghan government's priorities, should be central. In line with the Declaration of the June, 2008 Paris Conference, the Afghanistan Compact needs to be extended, expanded and properly funded, with an emphasis on better promotion of good governance. The new strategy should distinguish between al-Qaeda, which is an international terrorist organization, and different elements within the Taliban. The new approach should encourage practical arrangements with tribal leaders willing to join a new political process and exclude terrorists and insurgents from their territory.

The conflict, however, cannot be won in Afghanistan alone, because the Afghan government is challenged by the fundamentalist insurgency operating out of sanctuaries in Pakistan. And the war cannot be won militarily inside Pakistan, at least not by U.S. or NATO troops. So while an inadequate NATO response inside Afghanistan may lose the war, only much broader efforts on a region-wide basis can win it. The terrorist attacks in Mumbai offer the latest evidence that insecurity in the region will only provide a staging ground for threats to allies both in the region and in Europe and North America. Successful Western engagement must therefore also include efforts with all of Afghanistan's neighbors, especially Pakistan. We must encourage and support Pakistan in a campaign against Taliban and al-Qaeda extremists. These efforts must be supplemented by greater international support for development of Pakistan's Pashtun areas, which are a root source of extremism. We should also encourage both Afghanistan and India to reduce activities that exacerbate Pakistani security concerns; engage India and Pakistan in identifying the perpetrators of the Mumbai terrorist attacks; and broker discussions between Afghanistan and Pakistan over their own border dispute.

Relations with Russia: Engagement and Resolve

Vladimir Putin has transformed Russia from a relatively weak, partially democratic country into an authoritarian, mercantilist system. Strengthened by Russia's resource wealth, the Kremlin has wielded political, economic and energy power and employed military force to intimidate its neighbors, assert a self-proclaimed right to "privileged interests" throughout eastern Europe and the post-Soviet space, attempt strategic control over key energy transportation corridors, and establish itself as an independent Eurasian power. Russia's assault on Georgia in August, 2008 was an audacious show of contempt for post-Soviet realities.[18]

Strong domestic support for the Putin-Medvedev system rests on two pillars. The first is the combination of economic performance and resource wealth. The second is the leadership's tough approach to the specter of foreign enemies. Moscow stokes the popular fear of encirclement in a hostile world to justify its intimidation tactics at home and abroad.

These two pillars have sustained Putin's influence and helped to restore Russia's self-confidence. Yet as strong as the Putin-Medvedev system may appear today, its foundations betray serious fissures. The high growth of recent years has stalled, oil and other commodity prices have plunged, the ruble and the stock market have collapsed, inflation is raging, unemployment is rising and currency reserves are being depleted. Operations in Georgia showed that the country's eroding military lacks effective command and control systems and has problems projecting power even along Russia's periphery, leading Medvedev to reaffirm the need for military modernization.

The leadership has failed to invest Russia's energy wealth in measures to diversify its economy or to tackle truly stunning health challenges, decaying infrastructure and a host of other domestic ills. Intimidation tactics ostensibly justified by a hostile world have only served to stunt investment and encourage capital flight, and have left Moscow with few friends. Russia and the West are tangling over issues such as Kosovo and Iran, and the entire structure of conventional and nuclear arms control is dissolving. A new missile race looms, with Russia claiming that its thousands of strategic nuclear weapons are threatened by the ten missile interceptors Washington plans to deploy in Poland as a precaution against growing Iranian ballistic capabilities.

A host of other trends contribute to Russia's problems, including a dramatic population implosion, shrinking oil production growth, inability to meet natural gas contracts, and failure to develop new fields. As these challenges mount, the leadership is likely to face some key choices. It may decide to invest in its society, transform its economy with outside help, and forge productive relations with its neighbors; or it could turn to further bluster and adventurism. A mix is perhaps most likely, with Russia becoming less predictable and more inconsistent as it responds to a variety of pressures. Of the major powers, Russia's future seems the most uncertain.

The Western allies have an interest in ensuring sure that Russia understands the opportunities and consequences of its decisions, and should urgently develop a coherent and coordinated framework of relations that can help shape those choices. This strategy should have two tracks that work together.[19]

In pursuing **the first track,** Europe and North America would demonstrate their genuine interest in close and friendly ties with Russia and to explain the potential concrete benefits of more productive relations. The Western allies should make it very clear that they will be willing partners if Russia decides to use its wealth to invest in its people, build a more sustainable economy grounded in the rule of law, tackle its health and demographic challenges, and build better relations with its neighbors.

Western leaders should seek a broad strategic dialogue with Russia on topics ranging from the global financial crisis, global health, and climate change to transportation and energy in the Arctic. They should initiate comparative assessments of such challenges as terrorism, Iran and Islamic radicalism, similar to those they have conducted vis-à-vis the Balkans and Central Asia. This approach should be combined with an offer to extend monitoring and verification provisions of the START I strategic arms control treaty before it expires in December; revitalize bilateral U.S.-Russian and broader multilateral arms control negotiations; and engage in serious discussions on missile defense in Europe and globally. Russia's concerns about the imbalance of forces in Europe should be addressed by renewing efforts to secure ratification of the amended Treaty on Conventional Forces in Europe (CFE) and getting Russia to resume compliance with its provisions and fulfill certain Treaty-related commitments.

The United States and Europe should reiterate their interest in working with Russia to:

- ensure the security of its nuclear, biological and chemical weapons, materials, facilities and technologies
- expand trade, investment and sustainable energy supplies
- graduate Moscow from the U.S. Jackson-Vanik Amendment
- support Russia's efforts to join the World Trade Organization (WTO) and the OECD by fulfilling the terms and responsibilities of membership
- facilitate constructive Russian participation in global economic and financial markets
- include Moscow in a broad-based program of "forward resilience" as proposed in this report
- encourage active Russian engagement to prevent Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons.

North American and European allies should also engage Medvedev on his proposals[20] for a new European security architecture, ensuring that such discussions serve to strengthen and revitalize the Helsinki principles and the OSCE. Serious debate over the proposals would help to assuage Moscow's concerns about being ignored and possibly even lead to some improvements in the Euro-Atlantic security architecture. Such discussions could explore:

- constructive provisions of pan-European security arrangements
- steps to enhance crisis prevention and management
- provisions to enhance the sovereignty and territorial integrity of states such as Ukraine and Georgia and counter Russian assertion of "privileged interests" in certain countries along its periphery
- measures to improve energy security throughout Europe
- ways to advance progress on contentious security and arms control issues.

The **second track** would involve making clear that closer relations must be based on respect for international law, the UN Charter and the Helsinki principles, and respect for the sovereignty and independence of Russia's neighbors. The United States and Europe should stipulate that if Moscow continues to resort to intimidation tactics, cling to outmoded notions of spheres of influence, and fails to meet its agreements, as is currently the case with the Georgian cease-fire arrangements, the international community will hold Russia accountable.

Such clear signals to Moscow should be accompanied by independent allied measures to reassure allies concerned about Russian pressure and deter Moscow from further intimidation. These should include steps to diversify European energy resources; support democratic progress and "forward resilience" in wider Europe; improve cooperation on energy and cybersecurity; and reinforce the credibility of NATO's own mutual defense commitment.

NATO should be an integral part of both tracks of this strategy. It should be prepared to propose far-reaching cooperation that could transform Russia's relationship with the West. For a start, NATO and Russia should look for ways to build on their transit agreement to supply NATO forces in Afghanistan and their successful counternarcotics training program for Afghan and Central Asian personnel. They should move ahead with their planned Air Transport Framework Agreement, which would make Russia's airlift capability available for joint efforts. Combined or complementary efforts on missile defense should be explored anew.

Other possible steps could include exchanges of information on civil defense and biodefense, cooperation and training between NATO and Russian special forces, Russian involvement in collaborative armaments programs, and additional NATO-Russia military and "joint resiliency" exercises. A series of official and quasi-official dialogues could outline future directions for NATO-Russia relations. NATO's door should remain open.

Russia is not the Soviet Union, and dusted-off policies of containment are inappropriate to the challenges and opportunities we face in dealing with Moscow today. Keeping faith with our principles and holding true to our mutual commitments does not have to mean stumbling into a new Cold War. That is why both tracks of a new Russia strategy are so important. For this overall approach to be effective, each track must be advanced through close transatlantic consultation. Inevitable allied differences will have to be addressed, and nations on each side of the Atlantic will need to make resource commitments and difficult political choices to make the strategy work.

We have no illusions about the difficulty of such a strategy. Russia today is in a self-confident and assertive mood. It will be a challenging partner even in areas where U.S., European and Russian interests may coincide and cooperation would be mutually beneficial. Yet there is no alternative to engagement. Russia's choices are hers to make, but it is the West's responsibility to make the opportunities and consequences of those choices clear and credible.

II.
A New NATO

Chapter 4

NATO's Missions: Home and Away

Where does NATO fit?

NATO never fought a day during the Cold War. Today, it is involved in five different operations - fighting and securing stability in Afghanistan; keeping the peace in Kosovo; assisting defense reform in Bosnia and Herzegovina; patrolling the Mediterranean in an anti-terrorist mission under Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty; and training Iraqi security forces. The Alliance launched an extensive humanitarian relief operation for Pakistan after the massive earthquake in 2005, helped victims of Hurricane Katrina in the United States, and provided security support to the 2004 and 2006 Olympics and 2006 World Cup. New members have joined the Alliance, more are expected soon, and others are applying. Budding partnerships have been cultivated with the UN, the European Union and nations from the Mediterranean to the Pacific.

NATO is busier than ever, but it has also become less central to many members. It is doing more now than during the Cold War, but its wide range of activities does not easily inspire or sustain public, parliamentary - and hence financial - support. It is performing at an unprecedented tempo, but its efforts have exposed differences among allies over threat perceptions, strategic cultures, resources and capabilities. It is not heavily engaged in some key security challenges facing its members, and it is not succeeding in some in which it is engaged.

As a result, many see an Alliance adrift, lacking identity and driven more by outside events than by collective interests. This is troubling, because the need for transatlantic cooperation is rising, not falling. We must create a new Alliance consensus on the challenges to our security and on NATO's role in meeting them. Such a consensus is as important today as it was when the Alliance was born. The security challenges we face have changed, but the need for a common response has not.

Sixty years since its founding, NATO's three-fold purpose remains:

- to provide for the collective defense of its members
- to institutionalize the transatlantic link and serve as a preeminent forum in which allies can discuss issues of common security and strategy
- to offer an umbrella of reassurance under which European nations can focus their security concerns on common challenges rather than on each other.

To meet this purpose today, each element needs urgent attention, and each needs more than NATO.

As outlined above, the nations of the Alliance face a wide range of security challenges that call for capabilities beyond those of NATO alone. Security today means more than just the military defense of territory and sovereignty. We must increasingly plan, support, and execute a broad range of new and non-traditional roles, missions and functions - not all of which are well suited to traditional military forces.

If NATO is to be better, not just bigger, we must transform its scope and strategic rationale in ways that are understood and sustained by parliamentary and public opinion. We must change the nature of its capabilities, the way it generates and deploys its forces, the way it makes decisions, the way it spends money, and the way it works with others.

Most importantly, NATO needs a new balance. For the past 15 years the Alliance has been driven by the slogan "out of area or out of business." Threatened with irrelevance by its Cold War success, the alliance reached across the old East-West divide to include new members and new partners. It has sent soldiers and peacekeepers to trouble spots beyond its boundaries, from the Balkans to Afghanistan. It has become an expeditionary alliance.

We support NATO's continuing out-of-area transformation. But a single-minded focus on "out of area" objectives risks diverting us from NATO's enduring "in area" mission to protect North Atlantic nations from armed attack. Alliance leaders are right to say that Western security today begins at the Hindu Kush. But in an age of catastrophic terrorism, the front line tomorrow may run through Frankfurt's airport, Washington's metro, Rotterdam's port or Istanbul's grand bazaar.

If NATO is visible in expeditionary missions but invisible when it comes to protecting our own societies, support for the alliance will wane. Its role will be marginalized and our security diminished. NATO operates out of area, and it is in business. But it must also operate in area, or it is in trouble. If NATO cannot protect, it cannot project.[21]

NATO today faces a set of related missions both at home and away. At home, the aim is to maintain deterrence and defense; support efforts to strengthen societal resilience against a host of threats to the transatlantic homeland; and contribute to a Europe that truly can be whole, free and at peace. Away, the Alliance must prevent and respond to crises; participate in stability operations; and connect better with partners to cover a broader range of capabilities.

NATO Missions

Home	***Away***
Deterrence and Defense	Crisis Prevention and Response
Transatlantic Resilience	Stability Operations
Europe Whole, Free and at Peace	More Effective Partnerships

All these missions share five common requirements:

- Intensive debate to sustain public and parliamentary support and acceptance by other partners.
- Improved capabilities that are deployable.
- Better synergy between NATO and partners - whether those partners are nations, institutions or non-governmental organizations.
- Better cooperation between civil and military authorities.
- The matching of means to agreed missions.

NATO, however, need not always take the lead in tackling these missions. Depending on the contingency at hand, NATO may be called to play the leading role, be a supporting actor, or simply join a broader ensemble. For deterrence and defense, for instance, NATO remains the preeminent transatlantic institution. In all other areas, however, it is likely to play a supporting role or work within a larger network of institutions. Knowing where and when NATO can add value is critical to prioritizing resources and effort.

NATO: Leading Role, Supporting Actor, or Ensemble Player?

Home Missions	***Role***
Deterrence and Defense	Lead
Transatlantic Resilience	Support/Selective Lead
Europe Whole, Free and at Peace	Support/Selective Lead

Away Missions	***Role***
Crisis Prevention and Response	Lead/Selective Support
Stability Operations	Support/Selective Lead
More Effective Partnerships	Support/Ensemble Player

Home Missions

Deterrence and Defense. NATO's collective defense commitment, as stated in Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty, is the core of the Alliance. NATO plays an essential role in deterring and defending against attacks on the transatlantic homeland, from whatever source. In recent years the focus has been on terrorism, but since the Russian invasion of Georgia there has been renewed concern among some members - particularly those closer to Russia - about the adequacy of NATO planning and defense capabilities to deal with

more traditional threats by aggressor states. These concerns have prompted some allies to entertain the need for separate bilateral security guarantees.

A NATO that continues to expand without being able to meet its core obligation to defend an enlarged treaty area runs the risk of becoming a hollow alliance. Moreover, lack of confidence in NATO's ability to carry out its fundamental commitment risks undermining another key element of NATO's purpose - to prevent the kind of renationalization of European defense and conflicting security guarantees that led Europe to disaster in the 20th century. Alliance leaders should, therefore, reaffirm their mutual defense commitment at NATO's 60th anniversary summit in Strasbourg/Kehl. They should also ensure that Article 5 is not just a paper commitment but is backed up by credible planning to determine the military capabilities, as well as the means and political solidarity, required to carry it out.

Transatlantic Resilience. At the same time, Alliance leaders should consider the meaning of their Article 5 commitment to "ensure the security of the North Atlantic area" in light of the challenges to societal security our nations face today, as discussed in Section I of this report. As we have stressed, there are major restrictions on the role NATO can and should play in this area – many issues of law enforcement, domestic intelligence, civil security and disaster response are well beyond NATO's area of competence, and are better handled nationally or bilaterally, or in some cases between the United States, Canada and the European Union.

There are some areas, however, where NATO itself, or NATO and the European Union together, could complement other efforts and do more to enhance transatlantic resilience. The Alliance has already been called upon to help member and non-member governments with security for mass public events and deal with the consequences of various natural disasters. It could well be called upon to play a role in dealing with a catastrophic terrorist event, particularly one involving agents of mass destruction. NATO efforts to enhance societal resilience in the transatlantic homeland would offer the Alliance both a 21st-century approach to Article 5 and new meaning and credibility in the eyes of NATO publics who are concerned about threats close to home.

Alliance leaders have the opportunity to articulate a strategic direction for homeland defense and transatlantic resilience in the next Alliance strategic concept. Relevant Alliance activities and capabilities need to be adapted and better integrated to deal with these threats and support the individual and collective efforts of member and partner countries to enhance societal security.

Europe Whole, Free and at Peace. NATO's third home mission is to contribute to overall transatlantic efforts to consolidate democratic transformation in a Europe that is not yet whole, free and at peace. The situation today is different than at the end of the Cold War or when new members joined NATO in this decade. Nonetheless, allies should be careful not to shut out other European peoples, while at the same time working to deepen practical security cooperation and create conditions under which question of

integration, though controversial and difficult today, can be seen in a more favorable light in the future.

NATO governments must remain firm on the Bucharest commitments to Georgia and Ukraine and follow through on subsequent pledges of further assistance to both countries in implementing needed political and defense reforms. In some cases, NATO may take the lead in offering membership and integrated security; in others, the European Union may be better placed to act, while sometimes both organizations may play mutually supportive roles.

Away Missions

Crisis Prevention and Response. NATO's role has evolved from its Cold War focus on Article 5 defense of allied territory to a broader mission set that embraces non-Article 5 missions to assist the international community in crisis prevention and response. In some cases, consultations within NATO or diplomacy by NATO can help prevent a crisis from escalating. NATO also has a unique capability to respond quickly to a wide spectrum of man-made and natural crises. The NATO Response Force (NRF) can be used for missions requiring rapid reaction at strategic distance. If the Alliance is to continue to play an effective role in crisis prevention and response, including humanitarian assistance, NATO must maintain an expeditionary capability and improve its ability to work effectively with civilian agencies (such as the UN and EU) and NGOs in a crisis.

Stability Operations. North American and European operations in the Balkans, Africa and Afghanistan have highlighted the need for lengthy, demanding stabilization and reconstruction (S&R) missions. As conflict ends, peace depends on establishing public security, essential services and basic governance. These tasks often fall to the military forces at hand before competent civilian resources can be deployed safely to take over. A lengthy period can then ensue where a combination of civilian and military forces is required to stabilize the region and lay a security foundation to enable the population to rebuild governance and a secure society. These goals require allied forces to perform demanding and often unfamiliar and unplanned tasks, such as fighting terrorists and criminal gangs, subduing ethnic violence, restoring distribution of electric power, water, food, and fuel, and rebuilding armies, police forces, and other institutions of governance and law enforcement. Sustaining such missions over time is politically and operationally difficult. Future requirements for such missions could be large.

More Effective Partnerships. NATO has an interest in forging partnerships with others who face common security challenges. Moreover, in many non-European operations NATO is unlikely to operate or to succeed on its own; other partners are likely to want to add their strength to that of NATO, and NATO is likely to need partners for its own success. NATO efforts to train and build the capacities of other countries and organizations offer a low profile way to develop closer relations, help others cope with their own regional problems, and perhaps even turn them into partners and force contributors. Allied forces will also be better able to operate together, and with others, if

they have trained together and have similar operational doctrines and procedures. NATO's patterns of multilateral training and joint command structures provide a firmer basis for shared military actions beyond Europe than any other framework available to the United States or any individual ally. NATO will thus remain a critical vehicle for ensuring interoperability between U.S. and European forces. Indeed, this may prove to be one of its most important military functions.

Moreover, in both crisis response and stability and reconstruction operations, the Alliance must be able to operate closely with civilian reconstruction and assistance agencies. NATO has developed a so-called Comprehensive Approach covering both the civilian and military challenges that come with crisis operations. The importance of this approach was acknowledged by NATO at its 2006 Riga Summit and subsequently in Bucharest. The core idea is that order and progress cannot be restored to damaged countries by military forces alone. As seen in the Balkans and Afghanistan, military action can secure space for civilian action in complex crises, but militaries cannot rebuild societies. Civilian functions, in turn, cannot normally be performed by a single institution, but require a multiplicity of actors, including foreign ministries, development agencies, the European Union, partner countries outside NATO, international agencies such as the United Nations and OSCE, NGOs such as the Red Cross, and numerous civilian contractors.

The demanding goal of the Comprehensive Approach is to fuse these civilian activities and blend them with ongoing S&R missions of military forces. This requires more structured relations between NATO, the UN, the OSCE, the European Union and other established international actors that enable them to be more proactive in preventing future crises in the first place, and to work together more effectively, including with NGOs, if crises actually occur. NATO needs to retool to undertake more stability operations elsewhere in the world, not just focus on ways to improve its performance in Afghanistan. NATO's support for the African Union in Darfur, for instance, may be a model of global engagement for which the Alliance should prepare more thoroughly.

Chapter 5

What's Needed for NATO

NATO cannot successfully carry out the responsibilities we propose as it is currently structured. The good news is that the Alliance has a track record of reform. In fact, NATO seems to be in a perpetual state of adaptation. Yet given its high operational tempo, reforming the Alliance can be like fixing a race car in the middle of a race. Nonetheless, NATO can, and must, do better.

Carrying Out NATO Missions at Home

Deterrence and Defense: NATO nations must be able to back up their political commitment to defend one another with capability and will if they are to deter those who would intimidate or attack any member.

NATO's ability to execute a timely Article 5 response requires prudent planning, periodic exercises, modified training and judicious infrastructure investment. All members of the Alliance, and especially those along its periphery, should be able to play their role in collective defense. To strengthen Article 5 preparedness NATO could:

- Restore the military capability of the NRF for the mission of "first responder" if a demonstration of military force is required after Article 5 is invoked. A fully capable NRF would be the symbol of the commitment of allies to meet their Article 5 commitment.
- Include in the Defense Planning Process a robust scenario that includes reinforcement of Allied territory. MC-161, NATO's assessment of future threats, should also ensure that "the full range" of possible threats is included.
- Exercise plans for territorial defense where appropriate along NATO's periphery. Exercises should be fully transparent and sized appropriately.
- Direct NATO military staffs to develop comprehensive plans for the timely handover of national forces to NATO control.
- Invest in essential infrastructure in appropriate Allied nations (especially in the newer Allies) to receive NATO reinforcements.
- Consider infrastructure upgrades in new member states so that NATO common assets, such as the AGS surveillance system, can be based there.
- Consider the creation of another NATO multinational corps composed of new members in central Europe.

Transatlantic Resilience*:* NATO and its members already possess noteworthy capabilities for this purpose, but the ability of governments to act as a fully organized, capable alliance is not well developed. NATO will need improved physical assets, strengthened strategic planning and operating capacities. It will have to coordinate closely with national governments, many of which view control of societal security resources as vital manifestations of their sovereignty, and have different constitutional approaches to domestic uses of their military and to civil-military cooperation in crises.

Additionally, NATO engagement in this area will require a fundamentally different relationship with the European Union. Among the 21 NATO allies and 5 Partnership for Peace nations that belong to the European Union, there is strong support for placing under EU authority a growing number of common European capabilities related to societal security and emergency response (such as customs, police cooperation, environmental security and information-sharing). Indeed, the European Union has undertaken a range of activities and initiatives aimed at improving its military and civilian capabilities and structures to respond to crises spanning societal defense and security, including cross-border cooperation in managing the consequences of natural and manmade disasters.

In short, NATO is likely to be a supporting player in more robust overall efforts to strengthen societal security in the North Atlantic area. Nonetheless, NATO efforts could build on promising yet modest developments already under way in several areas, including:[22]

- guarding the approaches to the NATO region and enhancing border security
- strengthening early-warning and air/missile defenses
- improving counterterrorism activities
- reinforcing transatlantic capabilities for managing the consequences of terrorist attacks (including agents of mass destruction) or large-scale natural disasters
- cyberdefense
- biodefense
- political consultations on energy security
- incorporating the concept of transatlantic resilience into the Strategic Concept
- creating a Civil Security Committee

Guarding the Approaches

From its earliest days, NATO has always guarded the air and sea approaches to Alliance territory. Today, it must supplement its conventional activities with measures to deal with asymmetrical and complex new threats.

After the post-9/11 invocation of Article 5, for instance, NATO deployed AWACS units to bolster North American air defenses and sent a maritime task force to the eastern Mediterranean to monitor and intercept vessels that might be supporting terrorists. Now known as *Operation Active Endeavour* (OAE), these maritime patrols cover the entire Mediterranean and involve partners from outside the Alliance. Russian and Ukrainian vessels have joined OAE and Mediterranean Dialogue countries, including Algeria, Morocco and Israel, have taken steps to become involved.

OAE offers tangible evidence that even Article 5 missions can be conducted in ways that facilitate cooperation with Moscow and other non-NATO capitals. NATO's extensive air defense system, including AWACS, was used to provide air surveillance at the Athens and Turin Olympic games in 2004 and 2006.

The NATO naval command in Naples has worked with participating governments in recent years to develop the Maritime Safety and Security Information System (MSSIS), a network of 46 national collection sites linked to central servers which disseminate data to participating countries to enhance maritime awareness. This increased information has helped each participating country to protect the security of its territorial seas and ports and has greatly improved the effectiveness of NATO and cooperative maritime security activities in countering terrorism.

To guard the approaches to North America, the United States and Canada agreed in May 2006 to renew indefinitely their bilateral air defense cooperation under the North American Aerospace Defense (NORAD) Agreement. Washington and Ottawa also agreed to integrate surveillance of the continent's maritime approaches and internal waterways to improve warning of terrorist and other threats - with response remaining the responsibility of the appropriate U.S. and Canadian national authorities.

At the 2002 Prague Summit, allied governments agreed to study options for protecting populations against ballistic missile threats. While the United States is pursuing deployment of missile defense facilities bilaterally with Poland and the Czech Republic, most European governments are not prepared to deploy such defenses to protect populations. In Bucharest, allies recognized the contribution the U.S. system would make to the common defense and asked the Council to develop options for a comprehensive missile defense architecture to extend coverage to all allied territory and populations not otherwise covered by the U.S. system, for review at the 2009 Summit. Iran's continuing development of missile delivery systems, if combined with nuclear weapons, would present a direct threat to Europe that could build support for fielding NATO missile defenses. The new strategic concept needs to address NATO's role in protecting alliance forces, territory, and populations against missile threats.

Counterterrorism

Counterterrorism within the NATO region remains primarily the responsibility of national intelligence, interior and police authorities. NATO's counterterrorism activities since 2001 have consisted primarily of safeguarding allied airspace and maritime approaches and intelligence sharing. The alliance has established a Terrorist Threat Intelligence Unit to improve intelligence sharing and analysis. NATO nations are developing cutting-edge technologies to protect troops and civilians deployed on NATO missions against terrorist operations - for example, in detecting "improvised explosive devices."

- NATO should agree on options for expanding intelligence sharing and strengthening its capabilities to support the protection of critical infrastructure. This should include plans to ensure the prompt dispatch of special operations forces - useful in disrupting some kinds of terrorist attacks - if national authorities ask NATO for this type of assistance.

- NATO should add anti-terrorist protection to its plans for securing pipelines, offshore platforms and ports to assure energy supplies in wartime.

Consequence Management

NATO has already been involved in international disaster relief – in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina (2005), the Pakistani earthquake (2005-2006), and central European flooding (2004). In the NATO region, a range of alliance capabilities (planning, logistics, operations) could help national and EU authorities manage the consequences of terrorist attacks, pandemics or large-scale natural disasters. NATO countries are jointly developing five nuclear, biological, and chemical-defense initiatives. The Alliance established a Czech-led multinational chemical, biological, nuclear, radiological (CBNR) defense battalion in 2004, which has been succeeded by the Combined Joined CBRN Defense Task Force in providing sophisticated detection and defensive technologies against these agents of mass destruction. NATO has also developed a proposal on civil-emergency planning that calls for non-binding guidelines and minimum standards for the protection of the civil population against these threats.

Alliance capacity to conduct relief operations after a catastrophic incident could be strengthened in a number of ways, to include:

- planning and civil emergency exercises with allied and partner governments and relief organizations;
- a study and inventory of Allied national homeland-defense requirements and capabilities, to be followed by collaboration with individual nations and the European Union to determine how to fix capability shortfalls or flawed planning;
- formation of a small, highly-ready force with military capabilities oriented to homeland missions, including consequence management, perhaps in the NRF;
- appropriate expansion of NATO defense or foreign minister meetings, to include interior, finance, health or other ministers in an effort to foster better understanding of transatlantic resilience challenges and possible responses;
- expanded terms of reference for the Assistant Secretary General for Defense Plans and Policy, including support for efforts to improve transatlantic resilience and defend the transatlantic homeland.

Cyberdefense

The responsibility to deter, detect, defend against and defeat a cyber attack rests primarily with nations and their private sectors. But the severe impact a cyber attack can have on a nation's information structure, and its use in recent military operations and intimidation campaigns, has implications for Alliance security. Moreover, given the deeply linked nature of societal networks, a cyber attack is unlikely to affect only one nation. NATO has cyber defense capabilities to protect its own systems and a small research center of excellence in Estonia. Cyber attacks in Estonia and Georgia signal that such campaigns can be expected.

- NATO, therefore, should be prepared not only to defend its own systems but to come to the aid of members when called upon.
- Allies might consider either bolstering the current center in Estonia or establishing a Cyber Center, at NATO or elsewhere, in partnership with governments and the private sector, including NGOs, and with significant NATO participation. A cyber center could help organize such a coordinated approach and develop ways to deter and defeat cyber attacks.

Biodefense

Successful global approaches to biosecurity must begin with the transatlantic community. Europe and North America together represent the largest repository of resources, skills, talents, leadership and international engagement to make health an integral part of societal resilience. The United States and various European countries have advanced domestic biodefense efforts, but relatively little has been done to strengthen international biodefense. Efforts to adapt nuclear nonproliferation regimes to the biological realm have been fraught with difficulties and are of questionable merit. Areas for cooperation include improved global biosurveillance capabilities; better early warning and detection systems; robust information-sharing, investigational and preparedness mechanisms; harmonized standards; and medical countermeasures and stockpiles.[23]

This is not primarily an area for NATO, but for health and interior ministries, as well as international organizations such as the World Health Organization (WHO.) Bilateral cooperation, and more effective U.S.-EU and global collaboration, including among scientists, is also key. But NATO has a role to play, particularly in terms of developing more effective response and mitigation capabilities and procedures, and refocusing Euro-Atlantic Disaster Response Coordination Center (EARDCC) training and exercises to place greater emphasis on intentional attacks instead of primarily natural disasters.

Political Consultations on Energy Security

Actions by both state and non-state actors to interrupt the flow of energy supplies have become a new tool of political intimidation. They illustrate the new security threats to the critical functions of allied societies. Russia has disrupted flows of gas to Ukraine and other European countries in the context of several political and pricing disputes and the PKK has attacked pipeline routes in Turkey.

The Alliance could contribute to intimidation deterrence through energy infrastructure protection capabilities and regionally-focused civil-military planning and coordination. There is some precedent for such an effort. In the 1980s, allied governments took part in *Operation Earnest Will,* a military endeavor designed to secure the supply of oil and protect tanker traffic in the Gulf during the Iran-Iraq War. It was not a NATO operation, but it provides an early example of a coalition of the willing working to address energy security issues. NATO discussions have already raised the possibility of protecting tanker traffic and oil platforms in periods of conflict, and using satellites to monitor developments in areas where energy resources come under threat.[24]

- A Transatlantic Forum on Energy Cooperation (TFEC)[25] could be established to include member nations of NATO and the European Union, as well as the European Commission and the NATO international staff. The objective of the forum should be to establish common, compatible and complementary energy strategies that lessen dependency on a single source and provide a "strategic reserve" that could be tapped by energy-consuming nations subjected to energy intimidation. TFEC should hold a series of dialogues to establish a clear understanding of possible additional stockpiling and emergency sharing measures to supplement those of the International Energy Agency's oil security system, as well as security measures, including any potential role for military force, and specific responsibilities of governments, the European Union and NATO.

Incorporate Transatlantic Resilience into the NATO Strategic Concept

The new NATO strategic concept needs to examine the changing demands of transatlantic homeland defense and societal security and outline the Alliance's proper role in dealing with these challenges. In particular, the document should include a statement of principles on Transatlantic Resilience outlining new challenges and steps the Alliance might take to complement national and EU efforts.

Create a Civil Security Committee within NATO

This type of organizational innovation would help NATO to meet the challenges posed by the contemporary security environment and to establish closer coordination and integration with civilian organizations and agencies.[26]

Europe Whole, Free and at Peace: NATO allies have an interest in consolidating the democratic transformation of Europe by working with others to extend as far as possible the area of European integrated security where war simply does not happen. Yet the Partnership for Peace is now smaller than the Alliance itself, and divided awkwardly between such core partners as Finland, Sweden and Switzerland and the countries of Central Asia. Post-communist applicants for NATO membership are weaker than earlier

aspirants and less well known to allied parliamentarians and publics. A number are beset with historical animosities and have yet to experience significant democratic reforms.

Opinion leaders in Washington and in European capitals will look closely at the nature and pace of domestic reforms, and for evidence of a willingness and desire to resolve historic conflicts, when they consider these countries as potential partners and allies. In addition, Russia is opposed to further extension of NATO into the post-Soviet space. Finally, as discussed earlier, some allies question the current credibility of NATO's guarantees to its own members. They worry that continued enlargement, without complementary efforts to bolster NATO defense, could simply hollow out the Alliance.

The Bucharest Summit showcased the intra-Alliance muddle over further enlargement. Although Alliance leaders could not agree to develop a Membership Action Plan (MAP) with Georgia or Ukraine, they announced that the two countries would in fact be members some day. This decision offers important political assurance to Georgia and Ukraine, but threatens to undermine the integrity of the MAP process. It may relieve applicants from undertaking the tough reforms necessary to add capability and value to the Alliance when they join and sends the wrong signal to Moscow about its ability to influence internal NATO decisions. NATO Foreign Ministers took positive steps to clarify and correct this situation at the December 2008 Ministerial meetings. Allied governments must remain firm on the Bucharest Summit commitments to Georgia and Ukraine and follow through on subsequent pledges of further assistance to both countries through the NATO-Georgia and NATO-Ukraine commissions and bilateral programs in implementing needed political and defense reforms.

Managing these very different expectations will be difficult. Yet there is no need to believe that EU and NATO enlargement must proceed in lockstep or not at all. In addition, given these various challenges, a strategy for democratic transformation and collective security in the region is likely to be more effective if its goals are tied to conditions rather than institutions.

Western actors should work with the states in the region, and others, to create conditions in which ever closer relations can be achieved. Such an approach has the advantage of focusing efforts on practical progress. The West has an interest in promoting democratic governance, the rule of law, open market economies, conflict resolution and collective security, and secure cross-border transportation and energy links, regardless of the institutional affiliation of countries in the region.

A new focus on societal resilience, and transatlantic interest in projecting resilience to neighboring countries, would be another way to engage and draw closer the nations of wider Europe, strengthening overall transatlantic security. "Forward resilience" could generate a wide set of initiatives, from internal security sector reform to offers of cooperation by the European Union and NATO on the types of proposals we have advanced for allied nations themselves. It could be an attractive mission for the Partnership for Peace.

Carrying Out NATO Missions Away

Crisis Prevention and Response: Crisis prevention and response can often require a mix of political and military tools. NATO's role in such situations can range from providing a forum for political consultations, to military presence, peacekeeping or high intensity combat. This role can be part of an effective effort at keeping crisis from forming or keeping it away from Allies and partners. Unfortunately, Allies have only a shallow pool of capable, deployable forces, and they are stretched thin today. NATO forces are deployed in various missions on land, sea and in the air, from combat-intense stability operations in Afghanistan, through anti-piracy and peacekeeping operations, to air policing missions over Allied territory.

Double- and triple-hatting of the same forces for concurrent EU and NRF missions also means that some force commitments are hollow and cannot be met. The only way out is for allies to increase the number of capable, deployable forces and to end the habit of double-hatting them to fill two commitments at once. Because larger defense budgets are unlikely, increasing the number of deployable forces may have to be made affordable by terminating other parts of a nation's force structure. Denmark was able to do this, for instance, by phasing out its submarine fleet and shifting funding to deployable forces. Pooling forces and developing niche capabilities are other ways in which NATO member states have been able to leverage their defense investments.

NATO's Rapid Reaction Force was designed to be a highly-ready, technologically-advanced force capable of undertaking a full spectrum of missions from crisis response, to show of force, to collective defense. NRF was also envisioned as an engine of NATO transformation. To date it has been used in missions to deter threats and to support the disaster relief efforts after Hurricane Katrina and the earthquake in Pakistan.

Allied governments confront a difficult dilemma, as many are having difficulty providing units for current operations in Afghanistan and elsewhere, let alone for various rotations of the NRF. Yet if the NRF is not used, it will languish as an expensive training facility rather than an effective tool for NATO action. Maintaining the operational effectiveness of this ready and highly-capable force seems essential to NATO's credibility and should not be beyond the means of allied governments. It is a question of political will.

NATO leaders must turn to this problem of deployable and capable forces as a first priority for a reformed NATO. Whether for territorial defense within the Alliance area, or a crisis response out of area, NATO needs a deeper pool of forces that are capable, deployable and sustainable, and there is no easy fix. Either defense budgets must be increased for additional personnel, training and equipment or spending on existing force structure, static command structure or unnecessary agencies/field establishments must be re-mixed to prioritize deployable forces and their enablers, especially ISR and helicopters. Countries that have not played a significant role in NATO operations should make the necessary changes to their deployable forces so that the Alliance can use their contributions.

Stability and Reconstruction (S&R) Operations: The transatlantic community faces a permanent need for improved S&R capabilities, especially to implement the "comprehensive approach" when assisting post-conflict societies. S&R operations run by NATO and the European Union in Bosnia, Kosovo and Afghanistan, for instance, had to be cobbled together on an ad hoc basis. Although many of the necessary capabilities - civilian as well as military - exist in the European Union, NATO and the Partnership for Peace, they are not organized into deployable assets that can provide a cohesive, effective response.

Governments should consider creating a NATO military Stabilization and Reconstruction Force (SRF), capable of working well with civilian resources of the European Union, UN, OSCE and others. The force would be and formed into an integrated, multinational security support group to organize, train and equip the military and police in stricken countries and assist in reconstructing government institutions, economies and infrastructure. While a dedicated NATO SRF and Alliance civilian capabilities are important, NATO is likely to play a supporting role in these efforts. For example, the European Union's "civilian" Headline Goals 2010 - little noticed in the United States - provide for new capacities in policing, the rule of law, civil administration and civil protection. The aim is to enhance Europe's ability to provide comprehensive and integrated security support, especially in the aftermath of conflict.[27]

While meeting requirements for S&R immediately after a conflict will be demanding, sustaining large S&R capabilities over a lengthy period is far more daunting. It necessitates periodic rotation of civilian as well as military personnel, creating the need for a substantial pool of available and trained resources. For the military component - the proposed NATO SRF - European military strength could be sufficient if mission-tasked and modestly reoriented in terms of training and equipment. European allies could provide the manpower and associated capabilities to generate large S&R assets, including administrators, trainers, military police, Civil-Military Cooperation (CIMIC), construction engineers, and medical personnel, although they will need to be better organized and prepared for both combat and non-combat contingencies.

Some European militaries (e.g. Britain and France) prefer to remain focused on traditional war-fighting. Germany and others, however, have turned at least in part toward S&R missions. More will be needed for S&R than is already planned, and NATO should provide planning guidance to set priorities for members as well as for its own commands. At its Riga Summit, NATO acknowledged the need to improve S&R capabilities, but took no steps to establish a deployable command or a center of excellence to support the S&R mission or to identify the size and characteristics of forces needed. Nor was anything definitive said in Bucharest. More energetic guidance is needed from NATO, as well as from the European Union, in this critical arena.

More Effective Partnerships: Not only does the strategic logic for partnerships remain compelling, but NATO's operational effectiveness increasingly depends on such partnerships. Sixteen non-members are involved in NATO operations, 15 of them in Afghanistan. NATO's array of partnership initiatives, however, has languished and needs

greater coherence. There is a notable lack of broad strategic direction and harmonization. The multitude of partner groups constitutes a disintegrated collage of good efforts without measures of effectiveness or mutually supporting plans and programs. Moreover, NATO has yet to establish a truly strategic partnership with the European Union or a meaningful partnership with the UN or such institutions as the OSCE or the African Union. NATO should establish an Assistant Secretary General for Partnership to give direction to all engaged staffs, and consider a variety of improvements described below.

A NATO-EU Strategic Partnership

Considering the extent of the security challenges we face, and given that it will often be impossible to address them with military means alone, there is a compelling need for improved cooperation between NATO and the European Union, and between each of them and the UN. The U.S.-EU relationship must become stronger and more productive as well.

NATO and the European Union have complementary interests and comparative advantages in developing rapid reaction capabilities and improving civilian-military responses in a wide range of areas, including disaster relief, conflict prevention, crisis management, and post-conflict stabilization and reconstruction. EU-NATO cooperation is necessary for NATO missions home and away - from efforts to strengthen transatlantic resilience and forge a Europe whole, free and at peace, to crisis prevention and stability operations far from the North Atlantic area.

The two institutions have largely overlapping memberships. Twenty-one countries are members of both organizations. All non-NATO EU member states except Cyprus belong to NATO's partner mechanisms, the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council and the Partnership for Peace, and the five non-EU NATO members (the United States, Canada, Iceland, Norway and Turkey) all have important links to the European Union. Although the two institutions are quite distinct in terms of ambition, scope and decision-making, they have demonstrated an ability to work together.

The sheer weight of common challenges and reduced resources should induce greater cooperation. While coordination will remain challenging, aligning the European Union's extensive civilian and budding military assets with NATO's military capacity and transatlantic reach would dramatically broaden the range and strength of tools at the disposal of the transatlantic community. Without a change in course, NATO and the European Union will continue to evolve separately, wasting scarce resources and creating growing areas of overlap and increased potential for confusion and rivalry. It is time to construct a new transatlantic security architecture that will strengthen both institutions individually, while allowing them to be effective partners.

Initial steps have been taken. A set of key NATO-EU cooperation documents, known in the jargon as the "Berlin-Plus" package launched during the Clinton Administration, was finalized after rather painful and prolonged negotiations on March 17, 2003. Such

arrangements focus on how NATO could help the European Union conduct military operations and on how mutual capabilities could be developed through cooperative defense planning. NATO also needs EU assistance to execute missions where a Comprehensive Approach is required for success. As James Dobbins has pointed out, it is quite possible to envisage an EU-led operation being completed without NATO involvement. It is much harder to conceive of future contingencies in which NATO is involved but not the European Union. To paraphrase our colleague Simon Serfaty, it is time to move beyond asking what NATO can do for the European Union, or the European Union for NATO, and forge mutual NATO-EU synergies.

NATO and the European Union may succeed each other in support of UN-sanctioned operations, as happened in the Balkans and now in the pirate-plagued waters off the Horn of Africa. From October to December 2008, NATO escorted UN World Food Program ships bringing food aid to Somalia and conducted counter-piracy activities. On December 14, 2008, the NATO-led *Operation Allied Provider* handed over to the EU-led *Operation Atalanta*. NATO met the immediate appeal from the UN; the European Union will provide longer term support to the UN relief operation.

France's pending re-entry into NATO's integrated military structure offers an important opportunity to build stronger NATO-EU ties. France today is the largest contributor to the NRF and participates in all major Alliance expeditionary operations, including in Kosovo and Afghanistan. Washington should offer clear support for reinforced European security and defense capabilities that can enable Europe to be a stronger partner for North America and also to tackle security challenges on its own when appropriate.

At times, the almost mind-numbing detail associated with efforts at NATO-EU cooperation make it easy to reduce this issue to a policy wonk's nightmare: hopeless but not serious. But NATO-EU cooperation is not a marginal technical issue. It is emblematic of a central debate over how and whether Europe and North America can align the grand experiment of European integration with a strategic shift of the transatlantic partnership to tackle 21st century security challenges together. Unfortunately, squabbling over technical details has so far been the preferred substitute for engaging this fundamental challenge in a more straightforward manner.

Those in Europe who believe that they must weaken NATO to strengthen the common European Security and Defense Policy (ESDP) are likely only to achieve an insecure and incapable Europe, unsure of itself and its role in the world. If they want Washington to support ESDP, they must produce real capabilities and assume real peacekeeping responsibilities, as they have for instance in Bosnia. Those in the United States who believe that strengthening ESDP means weakening NATO are likely only to ensure that a lonely superpower cannot count on the added abilities and resources of its allies when facing new threats and risks. If the United States wants European support for U.S. initiatives, it must be willing to allow its allies to develop the capacity to offer that support, even if at times they employ that capacity autonomously.

Little progress is likely, however, unless greater efforts are made to secure a settlement to the Cyprus dispute. Differences among Greece, Turkey, and Cyprus over this issue have blocked the strategic common good for too long and impeded the development of a more viable NATO-EU relationship. Overcoming this roadblock to a truly strategic partnership should be a high priority.[28]

For the foreseeable future, NATO will remain the transatlantic partnership's premier military alliance for high-end defense requirements, including force transformation, demanding expeditionary missions, and major war-fighting. The European Union does not aspire to such high-end military operations, but it could help promote armaments cooperation, common research and development (R&D) and procurement, standardization and interoperability, training, multinational logistics, and other activities in ways that conserve scarce resources and thereby benefit European and NATO defense preparedness.

The European Union is asking members to acquire military forces and related capabilities for several security and defense missions, including peacekeeping, training with foreign nations, S&R, limited crisis interventions in such places as Africa, and providing civilian assets for comprehensive approaches. While such assets may be primarily intended for EU use, future collaboration could perhaps result in them being assigned to NATO missions.

We suggest various initiatives to build a sound EU-NATO relationship:[29]

- ***Coordinated crisis response.*** NATO and the European Union should develop an institutional structure for a new NATO-EU security partnership. The new institutions must be established and practiced in advance or they will be untried and irrelevant when the need arises. Consideration should be given to a NATO-EU Crisis Management Center. If NATO and the European Union manage a crisis together from the start, they would find it easier to decide which institution should have the lead, or whether and how the crisis should be handled jointly. Such a Crisis Management Center could be part of the civil-military crisis center at the European Union. Fuller use could be made of the NATO and EU military liaison cells and contacts improved between the European Union's Monitoring and Information Center and the Euro-Atlantic Disaster Response Coordination Center (EADRCC). NATO's Civil Emergency Planning (CEP) Committee should be reestablished as a joint NATO-EU group dealing with civil emergency planning, stability and reconstruction, and avoiding mission conflict issues when required. This would have the benefit of getting rid of a huge and outdated NATO Committee, the CEP, to which most nations lend little credibility. It would recognize that NATO does have a role in both civil security and S&R, while acknowledging that as a crisis evolves any military role is likely to be replaced by civilian authorities.

- ***Joint planning.*** Both institutions could undertake joint planning in appropriate areas, especially on the Comprehensive Approach. NATO should welcome any EU planning capacity that strengthens capabilities to undertake complex combined operations. An institutional home could be found for a combined NATO-EU planning staff, where both institutions could undertake, where appropriate, joint defense planning, force planning, and doctrinal development of the Comprehensive Approach. NATO or the European Union could also host a security concept working group in which both institutions could focus on how they should address security issues, either separately or together. Joint planning exercises should be held, possibly including other parties, such as the UN and NGOs, leading to the sharing of "lessons learned."
- ***Joint operations command***. In major operations where the European Union and NATO are both engaged, such as in Afghanistan, the operation should be coordinated. One NATO Joint Force Command (as well as an EU Operational HQ) should be designated an EU-NATO command for major joint operations and could host EU planners to facilitate transparency and joint operations.
- ***Force generation***. A joint force generation mechanism will be required to request assets from both EU and NATO members for combined operations. While forces could be generated separately, a joint process could avoid NATO and the European Union competing for valuable capabilities.
- ***Partnership on WMD consequence management.*** A new partnership should be created to delineate the role of each organization in a crisis; create links between each and the WHO global health security network; and develop reliable channels for rapid communication among health and security officials. Regular biosecurity response exercises should be held jointly by the European Union, NATO, WHO, and national and local governments, in regular contact with the private sector.
- ***Compatible capabilities***. NATO and the European Union should ensure that the NRF and EU Battle Groups are successful and mutually reinforcing. European governments should continue to make Battle Groups more effective, while NATO members should recommit to full NRF capabilities as called for in Prague. NATO and the European Union should conduct joint training exercises to improve interoperability, work toward common standards for unit certification, and harmonized rotation and exercise scheduling. The European Union should make Battle Groups and joint assets available for selected, agreed NATO missions, and NATO should develop contingencies for the NRF to reinforce EU operations when needed.

Today, EU Battle Group capabilities are oriented toward smaller, short duration, less combat-intense operations. NATO's NRF/CJTFs are directed toward larger, longer missions that may often include conventional combat. This is a reasonable, non-mutually exclusive "complementarity of ambition" for EU and NATO rapid response forces given present resources. If NATO and the European Union can calibrate capabilities and operational planning toward these aims, including resolving the issue

of an Operations HQ at EU headquarters in Brussels, both organizations will achieve better uses of resources and Battle Groups, the NRF, and other high readiness forces will be far better prepared to meet operational requirements.

- ***NATO and the European Defense Agency (EDA)***. NATO's Conference of National Armament Directors (CNAD) and the Assistant Secretary General for Defense Investment should work more collaboratively with the EDA to rationalize European procurement and efforts by European governments to integrate military forces and structures across national borders. The NATO-EU Capabilities Group should be reinvigorated and closer collaboration developed between the EDA and Allied Command Transformation.
- ***"Forward resilience".*** NATO and the European Union should promote security sector reform, police and gendarmerie training, civilian control of the military, and economic reconstruction in partner nations where appropriate. The European Union could include public health-biosecurity measures in aid packages for new member states and candidate countries, while NATO could include similar measures in ongoing work in the Partnership for Peace, which includes Central Asia.

NATO-UN Relations

In September 2008, after almost 60 years of coexistence, the UN and NATO agreed for the first time to a formal relationship and a framework for expanded consultation and cooperation.[30] The two organizations already cooperate to safeguard Kosovo's fragile stability and struggle together in Afghanistan. NATO protects UN food aid shipments to Somalia against pirate attacks.

The United Nations has the most diverse experience with peacekeeping operations, yet its record is uneven. Further reform of the UN Department of Political Affairs and Department of Peacekeeping Operations is needed to improve their ability to lead crisis management and peace support operations.

In 1992 NATO became the first regional organization authorized by the UN Security Council to use force. The UNSC has mandated almost all ongoing NATO operations. It is a rare NATO operation in which the UN is not engaged in some fashion. There are many UN operations with no EU, NATO or U.S. involvement. There are no EU, NATO or U.S. operations without some UN involvement.[31] Despite its post-Cold War transformation, NATO depends on the capacities and expertise of the UN and its special agencies in the political, rule of law, humanitarian and development areas in places such as Afghanistan. If there is no progress in these fields, the Alliance will not be able to achieve its goals.

Like the European Union, the UN is becoming a key part of the Comprehensive Approach. Its success in bringing civil assistance can dictate how quickly military forces may disengage from conflict. The European Union has led several UN-mandated crisis

management missions, and together EU member states are the most important financial contributor to UN peacekeeping. [32]

The NATO-UN relationship, in contrast, has always been ad hoc. There is no routine, consistent joint planning or common crisis management. UN humanitarian bodies and agencies are concerned that closer cooperation with NATO could jeopardize their neutrality and impartiality in conflict areas and put their staff at risk, whereas NATO governments have been reluctant to provide their troops and assets to UN peacekeeping missions following the UN's failure to stop violence in Bosnia in the early 1990s. The NATO representation at the UN in New York is small and unable to undertake consistently the advance planning needed for NATO and the UN to work together efficiently. NATO needs to build up its presence at the UN with additional planners to develop the relationships and establish a routine planning capability; the UN should have representation at SHAPE; and the NATO-UN agreement should be operationalized.

Partnership for Peace (PfP)

NATO's premier partnership remains vital but is uneven in its relevance and effectiveness. For traditional European non-aligned and neutral countries, PfP has remained a valuable mechanism for political and operational cooperation with NATO on mutual security concerns while deferring or avoiding the membership question. Sweden, Finland and Austria, however, are looking to take their partnership with NATO to the next stage, in particular through a bigger political say in those NATO-led operations in which they participate. For countries in the Balkans, Ukraine, and Georgia PfP has remained a valuable tool for strengthening defense and advancing NATO/Western integration goals. For the Central Asians, it has become less useful as interest in NATO has waned, and resources are lacking.

PfP needs to be transformed, adequately resourced, and better integrated with bilateral and regional efforts to address new security challenges. NATO should look at developing new, tailored PfP projects, including programs for military education and training, security sector reforms and "forward resilience," border security, and sub-regional military cooperation in the Balkans, greater Black Sea region, and Central Asia. Successful subregional cooperation in Southeastern Europe could also be adapted to the Black Sea, and efforts should be pursued to develop Turkey's proposal for a Caucasus Stability and Cooperation Platform.

Mediterranean Dialogue and Istanbul Cooperation Initiative (ICI)

Allied interests in the stability and prosperity of the Mediterranean and the broader Middle East have increased greatly since these programs were first created. Alliance security depends on the stability that can be advanced through cooperation with these partners. NATO's engagement in Afghanistan and the training of Iraqi security forces have made the alliance more relevant to security in the broader Middle East. NATO's

role could grow if the Alliance were called on to provide forces to implement any future Palestinian-Israeli settlement - however unlikely such an accord appears at present.

NATO, the Gulf States, and others in the region are also concerned about the implications of Iran's nuclear activities and missile programs, and have common interests in energy security. At the Riga Summit, NATO governments launched a Training Cooperation Initiative to expand participation by Middle East partners and to explore joint establishment of a security cooperation center in the region. Unfortunately, not much has come from this initiative. It should be re-energized so that NATO can share its military training expertise to help partners build forces that are interoperable with those of Allies. ICI countries and NATO need to define future priorities, which might include combined peacekeeping operations, cooperation on crisis management and missile defense. The Alliance also needs a better public diplomacy strategy for the region.

Global Partnerships

As it takes on emerging global challenges, NATO must deepen partnerships worldwide. Since 2001, the Alliance has undertaken operational military cooperation with countries beyond Europe's periphery to counter terrorism and promote stability. Australia, New Zealand, Japan, and South Korea have either worked with the Alliance in Afghanistan or supported stabilization efforts in Iraq. The development of these relationships reflects NATO's need for a wider circle of partners beyond PfP to respond to complex global threats. At the Riga and Bucharest Summits, allies recognized the value of global partnerships with countries that share our values. There has been real progress in building political dialogue and developing individual Tailored Cooperation Packages.

Given that some of these countries are now offering to intensify their cooperation and to provide troops or civilian resources to NATO operations, they should be accommodated through closer political and military ties. NATO needs to facilitate routine political consultations with these countries; better integrate their armed forces into the planning and conduct of NATO-led operations in which they choose to participate; and improve their interoperability with NATO forces. NATO also needs to intensify its political dialogue with other major players, notably China, India and Pakistan. The need for flexible, practical cooperation with the AU, OSCE, and other international organizations seems likely to grow as the alliance responds to increasingly complex global challenges that affect transatlantic security.

The Comprehensive Approach

This will take a long time and much effort to implement effectively, as it requires not just change at NATO but close cooperation with civilian institutions such as the European Union and the UN that do not necessarily have the civilian capabilities and structures to link up with NATO military capabilities in a common operational approach. As outlined earlier, a first step could be to establish a NATO-EU Working Group on the

Comprehensive Approach made up of professional staff from both institutions to flesh out a division of labor and a concept of operations for both organizations. This could be the work of the new "NATO-EU Civil Emergency Planning and Stability and Reconstruction Committee" as suggested above.

The NATO integrated military command structure should incorporate civilians (including those from the European Union) as appropriate, not just at SHAPE, but also at the Joint Force Command HQs, to provide for the civil side of conflict management. The Berlin Plus agreement allows the European Union access to NATO military assets and capabilities for EU-led operations. The European Union should likewise be prepared to offer its civilian crisis management capabilities in support of NATO operations. The Working Group should consider how such a reciprocal arrangement for mutual support can be established during S&R operations. This should include establishing a reservoir of law enforcement capacity, working closely with the UN, and providing access to police trainers, prison service professionals, and judges, as well as public administrators and utilities and infrastructure engineers.[33]

Chapter 6

Internal NATO Reforms

In addition to tailoring capacities tailored to specific mission requirements, reforms are required in areas that cut across the mission spectrum. The Alliance should change the way it makes decisions; change the way it spends money; generate appropriate military capabilities; match missions to means; and rethink functional and geographical "areas of emphasis."

Change the Way NATO Makes Decisions

The rules and procedures which guide how NATO makes decisions - from voting in committees and in the North Atlantic Council (NAC) to the interaction between military and political staffs - have grown more complicated as NATO has grown larger. To adapt to 21st century circumstance, the Alliance should consider changes, including delegating authority to the Secretary General for internal matters.

Modify the consensus rule: NATO decision making at every level of the Alliance has been governed by the consensus rule; all decisions, large or small, are unanimous. While this is an important symbol of unity, especially when the NAC votes to deploy forces, the consensus rule also allows one nation to block the wishes of all others and also leads to lowest-common-denominator decisions. It is time for a thorough review, with an eye to restricting consensus decision-making to the NAC and budget committees, or perhaps only to certain decisions, such as deploying forces or spending money. Qualified majority voting, or requiring a simple majority, have been suggested as alternatives, especially in committees below the NAC.

Another important reform worth considering is the idea of allowing nations to opt out of an operation (even after joining a consensus in the NAC to approve the operation). In such a case, the nation opting out would not bear any of the operation's cost but would have no say in how it was executed.[34]

Reform the NATO Bureaucratic Structure: The International Staff and International Military Staff (IS/IMS) are the backbone of NATO HQ, fulfilling many important day-to-day functions to support decision-making in the NAC and the Military Committee. However, both staffs have hardened into bureaucratic stovepipes, often performing duplicative functions and working in an uncoordinated fashion that undercuts efficiency.

While an outside working group should review both staffs to determine how they might be reorganized, a reform that could be undertaken now is to increase the integration of the staffs at NATO HQ, which was begun on an experimental basis a few years ago. Such a mix of civilian and military staffs is key to implementing the Comprehensive Approach.

Revamp the NATO Military Committee (MC): The Military Committee played an important role in the past in providing military advice to the NAC and guidance to the Strategic Commands. In recent years, however, the MC has become an arena in which to fight political battles better fought elsewhere, undercutting the Committee's credibility. Today, many question whether the MC is the best source for unbiased military advice and whether it has been effective in motivating nations to improve military capabilities and force generation. We are tempted to recommend the abolition of the Military Committee to demonstrate the degree of our concern about the slow, and sometimes politically-driven, process by which the MC provides military advice. While we stop short of such a recommendation, those who support the MC should be pressed to explain why it would be more effective than other options. At a minimum, the MC's role, mission and processes should be closely reviewed.

Review Defense Acquisition: **C**reation of the EU's European Defense Agency (EDA) makes cooperation possible with NATO's Conference of National Armament Directors (CNAD). Both institutions suffer from the same capability shortfalls and lack of political will by their members to increase defense budgets or otherwise improve capabilities. While there is a NATO-EU Working Group on Capabilities, cooperation is largely sterile. Outside industry and acquisition experts should carefully review role of the CNAD to decide if NATO acquisition procedures should be revamped, and to seek ways the European Union and NATO could cooperate in meeting common capability shortfalls more efficiently, as described above.

Streamline the Command Structure: The NATO command structure is in a perpetual state of reform, and has morphed from the complex organization of the Cold War to a configuration more suitable for expeditionary operations outside the NATO region. As the Alliance evolves, however, so must its command structure, and there is still some unfinished business.

- One criticism is that SHAPE, despite being a *strategic* command, still has too much operational control that should belong to the commander in the field. SHAPE should remain principally a strategic level command.
- Second, NATO headquarters are not standard and often complex; their rules and procedures are often hard to understand. Command relationships can hamper rather than facilitate command. Most of the NATO command structure is still undeployable, necessitating the creation of ad hoc headquarters to serve KFOR and ISAF, while large staffs sit almost idle at fixed locations in Europe.
- Finally, the role of Allied Command Transformation (ACT) as an "engine for transformation" is also under the microscope. Critics say ACT has a weak impact on transformation, has no acquisition authority, and lacks credibility at NATO Headquarters. Some have always been concerned that the current arrangement - a dual-hatted supreme commander as head of both ACT and U.S. Joint Forces Command (JFCOM) - may not give that commander the time needed to devote to the difficult transformation task at NATO.

With these perspectives in mind we propose a reorganized and reoriented three-level command structure.

1. At the strategic level would be Allied Command Operations (ACO) commanded by the Supreme Allied Commander Europe (SACEUR) who should remain an American; and Allied Command Transformation (ACT) with a European Supreme Commander and two Deputies, one in charge of defense planning and acquisition and the other a U.S. deputy dual-hatted as Deputy USJFCOM in charge of transformation. ACT's duties would also include developing doctrine and training for the comprehensive approach, transatlantic resilience and defense, including the Atlantic approaches, with an element at USNORTHCOM in support of that mission.
2. The second level should be operational and comprised of three JFC headquarters in Brunssum, the Netherlands; Naples, Italy; and Lisbon, Portugal. Each JFC headquarters should have a geographic and functional focus.
   - JFC Lisbon's geographic focus should be the Mediterranean and Africa, and its functional priority NATO-EU collaboration.
   - JFC Brunssum should concentrate on southwest Asia and the broader Middle East as a geographic priority and the reappearance of a conventional threat as a functional priority.
   - JFC Naples should look after southeastern Europe and transatlantic resilience.

   Each JFC should be able to deploy a robust Joint Task Force, and there should be at least two Combined Air Operations Centers (CAOC) with a deployable CAOC capability. JFCs must be capable of operational oversight of multiple missions. All JFCs must be able to back one another, and must plan and exercise for Article 5 missions.
3. The third level should comprise three mobile joint HQs that would deploy to the mission area to conduct operations (e.g. for KFOR and ISAF). These HQs would replace most or all of the current six fixed component commands (two air, two land and two maritime). If required, the three deployable HQs could be supplemented by the High Readiness HQs already in existence in some allied nations or other HQs at lower readiness.

Change the Way NATO Spends Money

The way NATO spends money for operations and infrastructure is opaque and complicated and does not go far enough to lessen the financial burden on nations deploying on missions. Changes are needed to improve financial efficiency, increase military capability and cover costs that otherwise give nations an excuse not to participate in operations. Because governments will not readily increase common funding

contributions, greater efforts must be made to re-direct spending of common funds from the political and military bureaucratic structures to improving deployability and capabilities. This is routinely done through such mechanisms as Peacetime Establishment reviews, but the needed results have not been achieved.

The ISAF experience has caused NATO to rethink how it funds operations. More work, however, needs to be done to permit the use of common funds to cover operational costs and to purchase common equipment. The "costs lie where they fall" principle, which places the costs of Alliance operations on the nations actually taking part, has been under attack for many years. Still, that principle is largely followed, making it not only onerous to take part in deployments, but giving governments a reason to opt out on the grounds that they cannot afford to participate. The financial crisis makes it imperative for NATO to develop a new approach to funding operations and common equipment:

- **Facilitate cost-share operations.** Although wealthier allies feel they already pay too much into common funds and think it would be unfair for them to contribute more to common funding, poorer allies often cannot cover costs to deploy on missions. If wealthier nations do not contribute more to common funds, fewer allies will participate in Alliance operations.
- **Increase and broaden the use of common funds to procure common equipment for operations**. While the Alliance has increased the use of common funds to procure common equipment for operations, such use is often blocked by nations who "do not want to pay for a capability twice." Such a short-sighted view makes it easy for some nations to avoid shouldering the burden by pleading poverty. Alliance military authorities should suggest additional equipment that NATO could purchase and make available to nations and so it would be easier for them to deploy.[35]
- **Coordinate equipment procurement with the European Union**. This has the potential for the greatest efficiency, but is the hardest to implement. Both NATO and the European Union share common capability shortfalls that could be met more efficiently through common procurement. Much of such cooperation has been stalled by political and industrial base issues, as well as by the sheer complexity of common procurement by governments. Most efforts, even on a small scale, have failed miserably in the past. A working group including representatives of transatlantic industry should now consider a new approach.

Generate Appropriate Military Capabilities

If NATO is to reform along the lines we propose, it must generate the appropriate capabilities to meet its missions. Without credible capabilities, strategic concepts, treaty guarantees and summit declarations mean little to allies or those who would confront them.[36] NATO credibility rests on a demonstrable capability for timely military response to threats to any member's territory. Credibility also requires the capabilities to carry out other missions that allies have agreed. Every NATO Strategic Concept has had at its core

clear guidance on required military capabilities. A new Concept will have to address the increasing demand for usable capabilities alongside the reality that available resources will contract across the Alliance. NATO militaries need considerable further restructuring to achieve far more availability of resources. NATO itself needs greater efficiencies and better business practices.

I. Capabilities for Article 5 and non-Article 5 missions

A. Deployable Conventional Forces. Forces that cannot deploy are of almost no use for Alliance missions, whether under Article 5 or not. About 70 percent of European land forces cannot deploy, either because of obsolete equipment, lack of mobility assets, reliance on fixed logistics, or a lack of plans or training for movement operations. Many units suffer all these shortfalls as a result of conscious decisions by many allies not to invest in making more than a faction of their forces deployable. Troop rotations mean that 30 percent of forces that are deployable yield no more than 10 percent sustained mission support. With a force almost half a million smaller, the United States deploys well over twice as many troops as Europe.

1. **Major Combat Forces.** Not only light forces must be deployable. Heavy armored forces that would anchor land defense of the Alliance must be deployable, strategically and operationally by aircraft, ship, rail or road. NATO boundaries are hundreds, often thousands of kilometers from where forces are located in the heart of Europe. Article 5 credibility is eroded by the absence of plans and assets enabling forces to get where they may be needed. Years of as yet unprogrammed investment in planning, training and equipment acquisition will make it had to restore that credibility.
2. **Intervention Forces.** The focus today is on Afghanistan, as it must be, and on Kosovo, where security remains tense. These interventions strain allied forces because the reservoir of deployable lighter forces for non-Article 5 missions is just as inadequate as for Article 5 missions. In Afghanistan national caveats by some allies increase the demands on the forces of allies without caveats. Rotational schemes, essential to long operations by volunteer militaries, exponentially increase force requirements. Europe has 1.3 million non-conscript land forces, yet in 2007 was only able to muster an average deployment of fewer than 80,000 for all operations – NATO, EU and national. As in the case of heavy armor, many lighter forces needed in Kosovo and Afghanistan are simply undeployable and therefore unavailable.
3. **The NATO Response Force (NRF).** The NRF is the most visible example of the shortage of ready, available forces, especially to meet Article 5 missions. Yet for many reasons allies are reluctant to meet force requirements. As a result, the NRF's capabilities and mission have been scaled. Although the NRF is intended to be NATO's most prominent instrument of response, pressure has been needed from the start to fill the modest NRF requirements of 25,000 combined land, air and naval forces, and the assembly of a brigade

of land forces numbering just 2,000 to 3,000 has been especially difficult. In late 2008, for instance, just two months before its mission window, land forces in the 13th rotation of the NRF were reported to be at only 26 percent capacity, with no commitments for helicopters or logistics. Shortfalls are due to the demands of meeting troop requests for current operations, particularly ISAF in Afghanistan, and many forces are simply unusable. The NRF must be kept robust and ready for an array of missions, including disaster assistance and humanitarian relief. Downsizing the NRF from 25,000 to 10,000 is being considered, but it is not the right choice.

4. **Special Operations Forces and Stabilization Forces.** Conflict regions like Afghanistan are inherently complex, with warfare and stability operations inextricably intertwined. Forces must understand their environment be able to work with a host of partners. Short tours frustrate continuity among multinational forces, destroying institutional memory and expertise. Tours of at least six months should be the norm. All allies maintain small contingents of Special Operations Forces (SOF) as well as the military police, engineering, civil affairs (CA), civil-military (CIMIC), and medical units that are most needed to conduct stabilization or crisis response operations. However, these types of forces are inadequate in number relative to the long nature of such operations.

B. Commonly Funded Force Enablers. Three critical sets of force enablers or multipliers should be approved by NATO for common funding under the NATO Security Investment Program (NSIP) or under the Military Budget, as appropriate. These enablers are too costly yet too critical to continue to depend primarily on national means. The dire result of that policy can be seen in ISAF shortfalls today.

1. **Strategic and Theater Lift,** including sealift and airlift as well as land movement to Alliance borders, is essential to respond to warnings and threats under Article 5, as well as to crises well beyond NATO territory. While the Alliance has organized its sealift capabilities, some of these should be NATO funded, as should some airlift capabilities, including aerial refueling. Strategic response requires mobility planning, training and exercises. Airfields and ports should be surveyed and upgraded to handle appropriate vessels/aircraft and numbers of movements.

2. **Network Enabled Command, Control and Communications (C3).** Communications and information systems are incompatible across NATO forces at the operational and tactical levels, and far too much of both NATO and national network systems (especially U.S. systems) remain non-interoperable.

3. **Interoperable Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance (ISR).** National capabilities span a wide, disparate range, and systems are far more often incompatible than compatible. There must be greater willingness to

share information across multinational elements; procedural obstacles - especially in the United States - are more daunting than technological ones. Common-owned and -funded systems would do much to solve these problems.

If the Alliance is to be serious about common funding and procurement, the United States must modify its technology transfer procedures and drop the "Buy American" policy with respect to its closest allies.

C. Missile defense of both territory and deployed forces has emerged as a potentially important requirement for future deterrence against missile threats from Iran and possibly other countries. Should transatlantic diplomacy succeed in stopping Iranian acquisition of nuclear weapons, interceptor deployment may not be necessary. Yet current U.S. and allied efforts should continue now for two reasons. First, such efforts are prudent given the lead time necessary for deployment. Second, should diplomacy fail and Tehran acquire nuclear weapons capability, a defensive response is likely to be a more palatable and effective option than an offensive military response.

As NATO moves forward, it should seek to put missile defenses in place without rupturing relations with Russia. As a start, the new U.S. administration and European allies should commit to engaging with Russia on missile defense issues. The Alliance also needs to follow through on its 2008 Bucharest Summit commitments to explore how the planned U.S. missile defense sites in Europe could be integrated into current NATO plans and to develop options for a comprehensive missile defense architecture to extend coverage to all Allied territory and populations not otherwise covered by the U.S. system, for review at the 2009 Summit.[37]

D. Nuclear Forces. We support the long-term goal of a world without nuclear weapons. None of our considerations contradict initiatives such as Global Zero. Yet when it comes to practical implementation, it is important to keep in mind that, historically, the presence of U.S. nuclear weapons in Europe has been a preeminent symbol coupling European and North American security. For this reason, a unilateral U.S. decision to withdraw its nuclear weapons could be seen in Europe as a U.S. effort to decouple its security from that of its allies and thus question the very premise of the Atlantic Alliance.

If such a step is to be considered, therefore, the initiative should come from Europe. If European allies are confident that European and North American security is sufficiently coupled without the presence of U.S. nuclear weapons in Europe, the U.S. is unlikely to object to their removal. Alliance discussion of NATO's choices should be framed by the following requirements:

- Careful consideration of future needs for theater nuclear delivery capabilities, i.e., the appropriate number of dual capable aircraft (DCA) and the number of devices to be prudently associated with them.

- Close and reflective negotiations among all allies, but especially those that store these weapons. Allies should keep in mind that once withdrawn, it will be all but impossible politically to return them. Redeployment in time of tension would readily be seen as an act of war.
- If reductions or even elimination is considered, NATO needs a strategy for negotiating an equivalent reduction by Russia, the other holder of such weapons.

Match Missions to Means

A vision without resources is a hallucination. And yet the gap is daily growing between the missions NATO is called to assume and the means it has to perform them.

Even as it conducts operations, NATO needs adequate capabilities to continue the process of force transformation across the Alliance. The capacity to train to higher standards on more tasks and to transform forces and practices while conducting high operational tempo deployments requires a larger proportion of usable forces.

Even capabilities that are ready to deploy, however, can be unavailable owing to the high cost of deployment itself. European NATO members, for example, own approximately 1,000 attack and approximately 2,000 transport helicopters, but have deployed no more than a small fraction of these to ISAF, where they are urgently needed. The Alliance urgently needs to examine ways to alleviate such costs through changes in how operations are funded or essential capabilities are fielded.

NATO has tried the full array of incentives and mechanisms to encourage its members to maintain sufficient levels of ready forces and defense investment. In each case, the initiative fell short - sometimes very short - of agreed goals. Moreover, we are in the midst of a deep economic crisis of indeterminate length. For these reasons, we do not believe that NATO can expect any growth in resource availability. The opposite is more likely - declining defense resources on both sides of the Atlantic over a sustained period.

Generating political will to invest in military capabilities is a national responsibility. Each member government makes its own case to publics and parliaments. Some argue that such investment is necessary to keep the Alliance strong; others stress concerns over national security; still others point to countering terrorism and instability in Afghanistan rather than dangers at home. Whatever the rationale, member governments should make it clear that modern defense capabilities cannot be regenerated from low levels in one or two years' time, should a threat suddenly come into public focus. Nor should members rely solely on other allies while foregoing basic defenses of their own.

Political will also affects decisions to employ capabilities already on hand. NATO commanders must constantly navigate multiple national caveats, for instance, which represent the conditions under which forces have been committed. NATO leaders need to achieve as broad a consensus on missions as possible in order to reduce the preference for national caveats.

The only source of greater capability in the near term is to improve what is already on hand by generating economies within current defense budgets. The Alliance needs to make a number of major changes:

- Reconsider NATO's ambition of being able to conduct two large and six small operations simultaneously, which it cannot fulfill for at least 10 years, and which is not attuned to the mission set we have set forth.
- Increase the usability of NATO's 12,500-person formal command structure, none of which is deployable.
- Look for capabilities where the pooling of assets by some members can be agreed, such as the C-17 airlift initiative among 12 members and partners.
- Reorganize where practical into multinational units comprised of national component forces or even national niche forces.
- Expand civilian capabilities available to NATO by energizing and implementing the Comprehensive Approach.
- Renew emphasis on consolidating R&D investment and sharing technologies.
- Look earnestly at collective procurement or contracting for transport helicopters; for intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance (ISR) assets; and for centralized logistics, along the lines of the consortium purchase of strategic airlift by a group of NATO members described above.
- Redouble efforts to shift national defense budget spending away from personnel and infrastructure costs and toward investment, training, and readiness. The goal is smaller, better equipped, more deployable forces.
- Bolster Alliance capacities to support member states' national efforts to safeguard against cyber attacks from whatever source.
- Put teeth in NATOs "Peacetime Establishment" (PE) Review to save military budget funds by cutting static command structure or cost-sharing with other institutions NATO's Cold War era research facilities.

Rethink Functional and Geographic "Areas of Emphasis"

For good reasons the Alliance has resisted 'divisions of labor,' 'role specialization' and 'niche capabilities' in the past. Yet, persistent low defense investments create serious gaps that cannot be closed in the near term. Therefore coordination along both functional and geographic lines, framed by the notion of "lead" and "supporting" organizations, may be wise, with central organizing principles and procedures. This could result in a greater ability of the broader alliance to meet a widening array of challenges. NATO could call on members to make the most of limited investments by creating strong capacity in select areas without being absolved of maintaining comprehensive forces at lower capability. The focus should be on creating stronger, mutually reinforcing capabilities from all allies.

Functional areas of emphasis should be explored along the lines of stability operations/irregular forces and major combat forces. A geographic view might look at NATO and EU regions of emphasis. For example, NATO is charged with responsibility for collective defense of allied territory as well as operations in south Asia, particularly Afghanistan. The EU has taken the lead on most crisis response operations in Africa and is assuming more and more missions in the Balkans outside of NATO itself. Neither functional nor geographic roles should be considered exclusive domains. Rather these should be regarded as lead and support domains, such that transatlantic partners reinforce each other with an array of capabilities.

Conclusion

Taken together, these reforms promise to reinforce each element of NATO's enduring purpose, while repositioning the Alliance within a broader, reinvigorated Atlantic partnership more capable of responding to the opportunities and challenges of the new world rising.

To succeed in this new world, Europeans and Americans must define their partnership in terms of common security rather than just common defense, at home and away. This will require the Alliance to stretch. Depending on the contingency at hand, NATO may be called to play the leading role, be a supporting actor, or simply join a broader ensemble. Even so, NATO alone - no matter how resilient - simply cannot stretch far enough to tackle the full range of challenges facing the Euro-Atlantic community. It must also be able to connect and work better with others, whether they are nations or international governmental or non-governmental organizations. And if NATO is to both stretch and connect, it will need to generate better expeditionary capabilities and change the way it does business.

These changes must be grounded in a new consensus among Europeans and Americans about the nature of their partnership, and guided by a new determination on both sides of the Atlantic to work closely together on a daunting strategic agenda. A new strategic debate, perhaps leading to an Atlantic Compact, could help to engage our publics and breathe new life into our institutions.

Such an effort is likely to be moot, however, if Europe and North America are unable to quell the threat emanating from the Afghan-Pakistani borderlands, or to develop a common approach to Russia. The trick is to combine the urgent with the important, to forge the consensus needed to tackle current challenges while keeping the longer term health of our Alliance in mind.

We are confident that we can do better - together.

Endnotes

[1]For views on this approach see Daniel S. Hamilton, "Transforming Wider Europe: Ten Lessons from Transatlantic Cooperation," in Per Carlsen and Hans Mouritzen, eds., *Danish Foreign Policy Yearbook 2005* (Copenhagen: Danish Institute of International Studies, 2005); Ronald D. Asmus, ed., *Next Steps in Forging a Euroatlantic Strategy for the Wider Black Sea* (Washington, DC: German Marshall Fund of the United States, 2006).

[2]See Richard L. Kugler and Hans Binnendijk, *Toward a New Transatlantic Compact* (Washington, DC: Center for Technology and National Security Policy, National Defense University, August 2008).

[3]See Daniel S. Hamilton and Bradley T. Smith, "Atlantic Storm," *EMBO Reports* 7, 4-9 (January 2006); Daniel Hamilton and Tara O'Toole, "Facing Up to the Bioterror Threat," *International Herald Tribune*, January 31, 2005; G. Kwik, J. Fitzgerald, T.V. Inglesby, T. O'Toole, "Biosecurity: responsible stewardship of bioscience in an age of catastrophic terrorism," *Biosecurity and Bioterrorism* 1, pp. 27-35, (2002).

[4] For an overview, see the 2008 report of the U.S. National Intelligence Council, *Global Trends 2025: A Transformed World*, available at http://www.dni.gov/nic/PDF_2025/2025_Global_Trends_Final_Report.pdf; *Towards a Grand Strategy for an Uncertain World: Renewing the Transatlantic Partnership* by Gen. (ret.). Klaus Naumann, Gen. John Shalikashvili, Field Marshal The Lord Inge, Adm. Jacques Lanxade, and Gen. Henk van den Breemen, with Benjamin Bilski and Douglas Murray, available at http://www.worldsecuritynetwork.com/documents/3eproefGrandStrat(b).pdf; and the Worldwatch Institute's annual *State of the World* series, particularly *State of the World 2009: Into a Warming World* and *State of the World 2006: Special Focus: China and India*. For selected European assessments, see The European Union's *A secure Europe in a better world: European Security Strategy*, 2003, http://www.iss.europa.eu/uploads/media/solanae.pdf; The French White Paper on defense and national security, 2008, available at http://www.ambafrance-ca.org/IMG/pdf/Livre_blanc_Press_kit_english_version.pdf; The White Paper on German Security Policy and the Future of the Bundeswehr, 2006, available at http://www.bmvg.de/fileserving/PortalFiles/C1256EF40036B05B/W26UWAMT995INFOEN/W_2006_eng_DS.pdf?yw_repository=youatweb.

[5]For comparisons of 11/9 and 9/11, see Daniel S. Hamilton, *Die Zukunft ist nicht mehr, was sie war: Europa, Amerika und die neue weltpolitische Lage* (Stuttgart: Robert Bosch Stiftung, 2001); and Daniel S. Hamilton, "Reconciling November 9 and September 11," in Christina Balis and Simon Serfaty, eds., *Visions of America and Europe: September 11, Iraq, and Transatlantic Relations* (Washington, DC: CSIS, 2004).

[6]For views, see Stephen Flynn, *The Edge of Disaster: Rebuilding a Resilient Nation* (New York; Random House, 2007) and *America the Vulnerable* (New York: HarperCollins, 2004); Thomas P.M. Barnett, *The Pentagon's New Map: War and Peace in the Twenty-First Century* (New York: Berkley Books, 2004); Esther Brimmer, ed., *Five Dimensions of Homeland and International Security* (Washington, DC: Center for Transatlantic Relations, 2008); Daniel Hamilton, Bengt Sundelius and Jesper Grönvall, *Protecting the Homeland: European Approaches to Societal Security--Implications for the United States* (Washington, DC: Center for Transatlantic Relations, 2005); Anne-Marie Slaughter, "America's Edge," *Foreign Affairs*, January/February 2009.

[7]See Peter Barschdorff, *Facilitating Transatlantic Cooperation after the Cold War* (Hamburg: Lit, 2001). Constitutive documents for an *acquis Atlantique* would include, in addition to national documents, the North Atlantic Treaty of 1949; the Transatlantic Declaration of 1990; the Charter of Paris of 1990; the New Transatlantic Agenda of 1995; and the Washington Declaration of 1999.

[8]For European perspectives, see Alvaro de Vasconcelos and Marcin Zaborowski, "The EU and the world in 2009: European perspectives on the new American foreign policy agenda" (Paris: EU ISS Report No. 4, January 2009); Bertelsmann Foundation, "Trans-Atlantic Briefing Book," November 2008.

[9]See Daniel S. Hamilton and Joseph P. Quinlan, *The Transatlantic Economy 2009: Annual Survey of Jobs, Trade and Investment between the United States and Europe* (Washington, DC: Center for Transatlantic Relations, 2009), available at http://transatlantic.sais-jhu.edu/Publications/TE_2009_finaltext.pdf; also Daniel S. Hamilton and Joseph P. Quinlan, *Europe and Globalization: Prospering in the New Whirled Order* (Washington, DC: Center for Transatlantic Relations, 2008), available at http://www.amchameu.be/Pubs/globalizationeuropeFINAL.pdf.

[10]Bengt Sundelius and Jesper Grönvall, "Strategic Dilemmas of Biosecurity in the European Union," *Biosecurity and Bioterrorism* 2, pp. 17-23, (2004); Homeland Security Presidential Directive 10 (HSPD-10). National Security Presidential Directive 33 (NSPD-33). *Biodefense for the 21st Century*. (Washington, DC: The White House, 2004). http://www.whitehouse.gov/homeland/20040430.html; R. Danzig, "Proliferation of biological weapons into terrorist hands," in *The Challenge of Proliferation: A Report of the Aspen Strategy Group* (Washington, DC: Aspen Institute, 2005), pp. 65-81.

[11]For further details and recommendations, see Anja Dalgaard-Nielsen and Daniel S. Hamilton, *Transatlantic Homeland Security* (London/New York: Routledge, 2006); Esther Brimmer, ed., *Transforming Homeland Security: U.S. and European Approaches* (Washington, DC: Center for Transatlantic Relations, 2006), Daniel S. Hamilton, "Transforming Homeland Security: A Road Map for the Transatlantic Alliance," in Brimmer, op. cit.; Antonio Missiroli, ed., *Disasters, Diseases, Disruptions: a new D-drive for the EU*, Chaillot Paper No. 83 (Paris: EU Institute for Security Studies, 2005).

[12]For some further suggestions, see Tamara Cofman Wittes and Richard Youngs, "Europe, The United States, and Middle Eastern Democracy: Repairing the Breach," Brookings Institution, Saban Center for Middle East Policy, Analysis Paper 18, January 2009.

[13]She made these comments participating in *Atlantic Storm*. See Daniel S. Hamilton and Bradley T. Smith, op. cit.
[14]For further perspectives, see Daniel Hamilton and Gerhard Mangott, *The Wider Black Sea Region in the 21st Century: Strategic, Economic and Energy Perspectives* (Washington, DC: Center for Transatlantic Relations, 2008).
[15]Currently, the U.S. and the EU have no provision for mutual assistance. Some may raise concerns about committing the EU's non-aligned countries to such an agreement. Yet all non-NATO EU members except Cyprus are members of the Partnership for Peace, which does provide for consultation should any partner perceive "a direct threat to its territorial integrity, political independence, or security." Moreover, we suggest the clause be crafted to allow each member to offer assistance "as it deems necessary."
[16]Our colleagues Franklin Kramer and Simon Serfaty, for instance, have suggested the formation of a new body – a Transatlantic Forum – composed of the member nations of NATO, the member nations of the EU, plus the Secretary General of NATO and the President of the European Commission. This Transatlantic Forum would seek accord on processes and procedures for decision making and policy implementation, including synergies among institutions that take full advantage of transatlantic strengths. The Transatlantic Forum could be limited to an annual summit, or could be supported by working groups coordinated by a small staff. See Franklin D. Kramer and Simon Serfaty, "Recasting the Euro-Atlantic Partnership," available at http://www.csis.org/media/csis/pubs/csis_euroatlantic_feb07.pdf. If this is a bridge too far, annual U.S.-EU and NATO summits could be held back-to-back, or working level efforts could be initiated to seek synergies across multiple avenues of action. For related ideas, see Ronald D. Asmus, "New Plumbing, New Purposes – Rebuilding the Transatlantic Alliance," *American Interest*, November/December 2008; Simon Serfaty, ed., *A Recast Partnership? Institutional Dimensions of Transatlantic Relations* (Washington, DC: CSIS, 2008).
[17]For further exploration, see "Saving Afghanistan: An Appeal and Plan for Urgent Action" (Washington, DC: Atlantic Council of the United States, 2008), available at http://www.acus.org/files/publication_pdfs/1/012808-AfghanistanbriefwoSAG.pdf; F. Stephen Larrabee and Julian Lindley-French, "Revitalising the Transatlantic Security Partnership: An Agenda for Action," a Venusberg Group/RAND Corporation project, November 2008; and the supporting paper by Seth G. Jones and James Dobbins, "Stabilizing Afghanistan and Pakistan: Towards a Regional Approach;" Daniel Korski, "Afghanistan: Europe's Forgotten War," (London: European Council on Foreign Relations, January 2008), available at http://ecfr.3cdn.net/c43ad7d70cf03ddadb_cem6bqqcx.pdf; Seth G. Jones, "Getting Back on Track in Afghanistan," Testimony presented before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Subcommittee on the Middle East and South Asia on April 2, 2008, available at http://foreignaffairs.house.gov/110/Jon04022008.pdf; James F. Dobbins, *After the Taliban: Nation-Building in Afghanistan* (Dulles, VA: Potomac Books, 2008); Seth G. Jones, *Counterinsurgency in Afghanistan* (Arlington, VA: RAND, 2008); Leo Michel, "Euro-Atlantic Security Cooperation and U.S.-French Relations," forthcoming article as part of a CTR/Robert Schuman Foundation project on the future of Franco-American relations.
[18]For further discussion, see Daniel S. Hamilton, "Unsettled: The New Eastern Europe and the West After the Russian-Georgian Conflict," *Welttrends*, 63/2008; Celeste A. Wallander, "American Priorities for a Transatlantic Strategy on Russia," forthcoming article as part of a CTR/Robert Schuman Foundation project on the future of Franco-American relations; Celeste A. Wallander, "Russian Transimperialism and its Implications" in Alexander T.J. Lennon and Amanda Kozlowski, eds., *Global Powers in the 21st Century: Strategies and Relations* (Cambridge MA: MIT Press, 2008), pp. 217-235; World Bank, "Russian Economic Report , no. 17" (Moscow: World Bank Russia Country Office, November 2008); Eugene Rumer, "Mind the Gap: Russian Ambitions vs. Russian Reality," in Ashley J. Tellis, Mercy Kuo, and Andrew Marble, eds, *Strategic Asia: Challenges and Choices* (Washington DC: The National Bureau of Asian Research, 2008), pp. 167-196; Stephen Sestanovich, "What has Moscow Done? Rebuilding U.S.-Russian Relations," *Foreign Affairs*, vol. 87, number 6 (November/December 2008), pp. 12-28; Julianne Smith, *The NATO-Russia Relationship: Defining Moment or Déjà vu?* (Washington, DC: CSIS, 2008). For commentary on Russian views on eastern Europe, see Angela Stent, "The Lands In-Between: The New Eastern Europe in the Twenty-First Century," in Daniel Hamilton and Gerhard Mangott, eds., *The New Eastern Europe: Ukraine, Belarus and Moldova* (Washington, DC: Center for Transatlantic Relations, 2007).
[19]Russia is not the Soviet Union. Nonetheless, NATO history offers guidance. In the wise prescriptions balancing deterrence and détente by the 1967 Harmel Report, and then during the tense deployment of intermediate range nuclear missiles first by the Warsaw Pact and then by NATO in the 1980s, the Alliance ensured military security while pursuing vigorous and ultimately productive diplomatic engagement aimed at easing tensions and building a more secure world. In both of these cases a dual track approach (diplomatic and military) worked both to draw the alliance together and to deal effectively with Moscow. We need a similar dual track approach now.
[20]See President of Russia, "Speech at Meeting with German Political, Parliamentary and Civic Leaders, Berlin June 5, 2008, available at http://www.kremlin.ru/eng/text/speeches/2008/06/05/2203_type82912type82914type84779_202153.shtml.; President of Russia, "Speech at World Policy Conference, Evian France, October 8. 2008, available at http://www.kremlin.ru/eng/text/speeches/2008/10/08/2159_type82912type82914_207457.shtml.; also "Speech by Russian Minister of Foreign Affairs Sergey Lavrov at MGIMO University, Academic Year, September 3, 2007, available at http://www.sras.org/sergey_lavrov_speaks_at_mgimo.
[21]See Daniel S. Hamilton, "NATO Summit I: In area, or in trouble," *International Herald Tribune*, November 26, 2006, available at http://www.iht.com/articles/2006/11/26/opinion/edhamil.php; Larrabee and Lindley-French, op. cit.
[22]For further exploration, see Dalgaard-Nielsen/Hamilton, op. cit.; Brimmer, op. cit.; "Transatlantic Homeland Defense," *CTNSP-INSS Special Report*. Washington, DC: National University Press, May 2006; Anne C. Richard, *Role Reversal: Offers of Help From Other Countries in Response to Hurricane Katrina* (Washington, D.C.: Center for Transatlantic Relations, 2006); Gustav Lindstrom, *Protecting the European homeland: The CBR dimension*. Chaillot Paper No. 69 (Paris: EU Institute for

Security Studies, 2004); Esther Brimmer, "The ESDP and Homeland Security," Sven Biscop and Johan Lembke, *EU Enlargement & the Transatlantic Alliance* (Boulder: Lynne Rienner, 2008).
[23]B.T. Smith, et.al., "Navigating the Storm: Report and Recommendations from the Atlantic Storm Exercise," *Biosecurity and Bioterrorism* 3, pp. 256-267 (2005); Marc L. Ostfield, "Strengthening Biodefense Internationally: Illusion and Reality," *Biosecurity and Bioterrorism* 6, pp. 261-267, (2008).
[24]See Paul Gallis, "NATO and Energy Security," CRS Report for Congress, March 21, 2006.
[25]For details, see the forthcoming Atlantic Council report by Franklin Kramer and John Lyman, "Transatlantic Cooperation for Sustainable Energy Security: A Report of the CSIS Global Dialogue Between the EU and the US," January 2009.
[26]See the report of the NATO Defense College, *NATO's organizational evolution: the case for a Civil Security Committee*, November 2008.
[27]For details, see http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cmsUpload/Civilian_Headline_Goal_2010.pdf. See also Julian Lindley-French and Robert Hunter, "Enhancing Stabilization and Reconstruction Operations," CSIS, December 10, 2008; *Play to Win: Final Report of the Bipartisan Commission on Post-Conflict Reconstruction* (Washington, DC: CSIS, 2003). For more on a NATO SRF, see Hans Binnendijk and Richard Kugler, "Needed: A NATO Stabilization and Reconstruction Force," *Defense Horizons*, September 2004. For its relationship to transformation, see Daniel S. Hamilton, ed., *Transatlantic Transformations: Equipping NATO for the 21st Century* (Washington, DC: Center for Transatlantic Relations, 2004).
[28]During the Berlin Plus discussions there was focus on the need for an EU arrangement with Turkey on EU operations affecting Turkish interests. Some arrangement is clearly necessary and is certainly not beyond the reach of creative and determined diplomacy.
[29]For more, see *Transatlantic Transformation: Building a NATO-EU Security Architecture* (Washington, DC: Atlantic Council of the U.S., March 2006), available at http://www.acus.org/docs/0603-Transatlantic_Transformation.pdf; Esther Brimmer, ed., *The EU's Search for a Strategic Role: ESDP and its Implications for Transatlantic Relations* (Washington, DC: Center for Transatlantic Relations, 2002), available at http://transatlantic.sais-jhu.edu/PDF/publications/esdp_book.pdf; Julian Lindley-French, "NATO and the EU: Terms of Engagement or Estrangement?" in Simon Serfaty, ed., *A Recast Partnership? Institutional Dimensions of Transatlantic Relations* (Washington, DC: CSIS, 2008); Daniel Hamilton, "American Perspectives on the European Security and Defense Policy," *Danish Yearbook of International Affairs* (Copenhagen: Danish Institute for International Studies, 2004), available at http://transatlantic.sais-jhu.edu/PDF/articles/DH%20Article%20from%20Dannish%20Institute.pdf.
[30]For an overview of the NATO-UN relationship and their recent agreement, see Michael F. Harsch and Johannes Varwick, "Towards a stronger role for regional organizations in international security? United Nations and NATO's joint declaration," forthcoming in the April/May 2009 issue of *Survival*. Also David S. Yost, *NATO and International Organizations* (Rome: NATO Defense College, 2007).
[31]See James Dobbins, "NATO's Role in Nation-Building," *NATO Review*, Summer 2005, available at http://www.nato.int/docu/review/2005/issue2/english/art1.html; James Dobbins et al., *The UN's Role in Nation-Building: From the Congo to Iraq* (RAND, 2005).
[32]See Harsch and Varwick, op. cit.
[33]Various allies have useful experience in this regard. For instance, Canada pioneered the 3D concept (Defense, Diplomacy, Development) including through its deployable civilian elements, CANADEM. Norway has NORDEM, a stand-by roster of civilian human rights monitors and investigators. For more see http://www.nrc.no/?aid=9160720.
[34]See Leo G. Michel, "NATO Decisionmaking: Au Revoir to the Consensus Rule?" Strategic Forum, 202, INSS, National Defense University Press, August 2003, available at http://www.ndu.edu/inss/Strforum/SF202/SF202.pdf; *Towards a Grand Strategy*, op. cit.; Gen. (ret.) Klaus Naumann, Inaugural speech, SHAPE Lecture series, May 10, 2005, available at http://www.nato.int/shape/opinions/2005/s050510a.htm.
[35]The Alliance could also develop more creative approaches to financing or make tough choices and cut existing infrastructure. For instance, savings can be realized in the NATO Security Investment Program (NSIP) by enforcing financial rules. NATOs "Peacetime Establishment" (PE) Review might save military budget funds by cutting static command structure or cost-sharing with other institutions such as Cold War era research facilities like the NATO Underwater Research Centre (NURC).
[36]For more, see *Towards a Grand Strategy for an Uncertain World,* op. cit.
[37]The ten mid-course interceptors slated to be installed in Poland and the narrow-beam X-band radar set for the Czech Republic would protect European territory north and west of northern Greece to central Ukraine against the sort of ICBM attacks of which Iran might be capable at some point in the next decade. The site in Poland could not defend all of Europe even if it worked perfectly. Areas south and east of the coverage line, including all or part of Turkey, Greece, Bulgaria and Romania, are too close to Iran, the putative threat, to be attacked by long-range missiles, but they could be attacked by shorter range systems. For a discussion of the issues, see Walter B. Slocombe, "Europe, Russia and American Missile Defence," *Survival*, 50:2, 19-24.

About the Authors

Daniel Hamilton is the Richard von Weizsäcker Professor and Director of the Center for Transatlantic Relations at the Paul H. Nitze School of Advanced International Studies (SAIS), Johns Hopkins University; and Executive Director of the American Consortium on EU Studies. He is the host of *The Washington Post/Newsweek International*'s online discussion feature *Next Europe* (www.washingtonpost.com/nexteurope). He has served as Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs, responsible for NATO, OSCE and transatlantic security policy; U.S. Special Coordinator for Southeast European Stabilization; Associate Director of the Policy Planning Staff, and Director for Policy in the Bureau of European Affairs. He was Senior Associate at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and Deputy Director of the Aspen Institute Berlin. He has also taught at Berlin's Hertie School of Governance, the Free University of Berlin, and the University of Innsbruck and is a frequent media commentator. Recent publications include *The Transatlantic Economy 2009*; *The Wider Black Sea in the 21st Century: Strategic, Economic and Energy Perspectives* (2008); "The United States: A Normative Power?" (2008); *Europe and Globalization* (2008); *The New Eastern Europe: Ukraine, Belarus and Moldova* (2007); *Transatlantic Homeland Security* (2005); *Terrorism and International Relations* (2005); *Transatlantic Transformations: Equipping NATO for the 21st Century* (2004).

Charles Barry is a national security consultant and Senior Research Fellow at the National Defense University's Center for Technology and National Security Policy. He has work with NATO as a U.S. military officer and policy analyst for more than 20 years and since 1994 has published numerous articles and books on transatlantic affairs. He earned his Doctorate in Public Administration from the University of Baltimore.

Hans Binnendijk is Vice President for Research at the National Defense University and Founding Director of NDU's Center for Technology and National Security Policy. He has served as Senior Director for Defense Policy and Arms Control at the National Security Council, as Principal Deputy Director and Acting Director of the State Department's Policy Planning Staff, and as Legislative Director of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Stephen J. Flanagan is Senior Vice President and Henry A. Kissinger Chair at the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS). Before joining CSIS in June, 2007, he served for seven years as Director of the Institute for National Strategic Studies and Vice President for Research at the National Defense University NDU). He has held several senior positions in government, including Senior Director for Central and Eastern Europe at the National Security Council, National Intelligence Officer for Europe, and Associate Director of the State Department's Policy Planning Staff. He also has held academic and research appointments at Harvard's Kennedy School of Government, the International Institute for Strategic Studies, and the Council on Foreign Relations. He earned his A.B. in political science from Columbia University and his Ph.D. in international relations from the Fletcher School at Tufts University. He is a member of the Council on Foreign Relations and the International Institute for Strategic Studies. He is widely published and is co-editor, most recently, of *Strategic Challenges: America's Global Security Agenda*, 2008).

Julianne Smith is director of the CSIS Europe Program and the Initiative for a Renewed Transatlantic Partnership, where she leads the Center's research and program activities on U.S.-European political, security, and economic relations. She has authored or contributed to a number of CSIS books and reports, including "The NATO-Russia Relationship: Defining Moment or Déjà Vu?" (2008); "Understanding Islamic Charities" (2007); "Transforming NATO (…again)" (2006); and "America and the World in the Age of Terror" (2005). She is also an associate fellow at the London-based Royal United Services Institute for Defence and Security Studies (RUSI). Earlier, Smith served as deputy director and senior fellow in the CSIS International Security Program, where she oversaw the management of more than 30 security-related projects and focused on a range of European security issues, including European defense integration and EU-U.S. counterterrorism cooperation. Before joining CSIS, she worked at the German Marshall Fund as program officer for the Foreign Policy Program and director of communications for the Project on the Role of American Military Power. She has worked as a senior analyst on the European security desk of the British American Security Information Council and in Germany at the Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik. She is a recipient of the American Academy's Public Policy Fellowship, the Robert Bosch Foundation Fellowship, and the Fredin Memorial Scholarship for study at the Sorbonne in Paris. She received her B.A. from Xavier University and her M.A. from American University.

James J. Townsend Jr. is a Vice President of the Atlantic Council of the United States and is Director of the Council's Program on International Security. He was previously the Principal Director of European and NATO Policy in the Office of the U.S. Secretary of Defense, responsible for managing the day-to-day defense relationship between the United States, NATO, the EU and the nations of Europe and Canada. Before this assignment, he was the Director of NATO Policy and the Director of the Defense Plans Division at the U.S. Mission to NATO. He is an adjunct professor of international studies at American University and has lectured overseas and in the U.S. at the War Colleges, National Defense University, and the Foreign Service Institute. He has also provided commentary in the international media on TV, radio and in newspapers. He earned a B.A. from Duke University and an M.A. from the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies (SAIS).