

**THE EVOLUTION OF NATO'S PARTNERSHIPS STRATEGY - DEMOCRATIC
PEACE OR CLASH OF CIVILIZATIONS?**

Holger Mölder

University of Tartu

holger.molder@kmin.ee

**Paper prepared for the 6th Pan-European Conference on International
Relations in Turin from 12 to 15 September 2007 (Session 1-23: Cooperation and
Conflict in Transatlantic Relations).**

This is a draft paper and still in progress. Please contact if you like to cite. Comments are welcome.

Abstract

This paper examines the evolution of NATO's partnership strategy after the end of the Cold War and the possibilities for further developments. Since 1991, NATO started to develop its partnership strategy through cooperative security arrangements.¹ NATO's partnership strategy included elements of interest-based cooperative security, trying to establish cooperative relationship with new democracies surviving transition periods but still not being consolidated democracies. More value-oriented partnership has been offered to those countries, which intended to apply for membership in NATO.²

In 2006, the United States proposed the idea another NATO's partnership initiative – "Global Partnership"³ with the aim to establish institutional arrangement that would be a premium club for NATO's partners identified as sharing same values with NATO. Global partnership also aims to bind some so-called NATO's contact countries that contribute to the NATO-led operations⁴ institutionally with NATO.

NATO's partnership strategy has two options to move forward, moving towards democratic peace⁵ or clash of civilizations⁶. These options mean choosing between the global approach with intensified development of value-based partnerships identifying Us and Others (oriented towards clash of civilization) or developing interest-based partnerships on regional basis simultaneously with the development of the value-based security community (oriented towards democratic peace). The variety of options is also influenced by different security cultures evolved in the United States and in some European Allies.

Introduction

The Washington Summit of 1999 was a breakpoint in NATO's development after the Cold War. Not only because of three Eastern European countries – Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland - joined the Alliance just before the Summit. NATO's revised Strategic Concept of 1999 characterizes the conceptual change in the institution's development process, when polarity-based guidelines from the Cold War have been replaced with the

¹ North Atlantic Cooperation Council (NACC) was the first NATO's initiative from 1991 to 1997. This was followed by Partnership for Peace, Mediterranean Dialogue, Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council, South Eastern Europe Initiative, NATO-Russia Council, NATO-Ukraine Council, and finally by Istanbul Cooperation Initiative in 2004.

² Membership Action Plan is a primary mechanism for value-oriented partnership, to some extent also the Intensified Dialogue could be identified as preparatory mechanism.

³ Firstly the US Ambassador to NATO, Victoria Nuland, mentioned it in January 2006.

⁴ primarily Australia, Japan, New Zealand, South Korea

⁵ Democratic peace bases on the ideas of Immanuel Kant and the possibility of global peace through enhancement of democracy.

⁶ Samuel Huntington introduced emerging role of clash of civilizations in his works. It means that permanent conflict between different cultures is almost inevitable.

fundamental security tasks based on security, consultation, deterrence and defence, crisis management and partnership.⁷ Democratic peace was an essential element in this breakthrough. Since 1991 NATO's started to perform a partnership strategy, which introduced the principles of democratic peace⁸ to its neighbouring areas and promoted cooperation and security interdependence between Allies and their security partners. At the Washington Summit, NATO also launched the Membership Action Plan that established consolidated democracy as a norm for accession to NATO, which also means a serious movement towards self-identification as a security community. This program helped for aspirant countries, which aimed the future membership, to focus their preparation accordingly to norms NATO expects to fulfil from its prospective members.

From 2001, we witness another strengthening trend in Western civilization, which advocates polarity-based policies and follows an emerging neo-conservative approach to the world politics. Attack to the United States, organized by then relatively little-known terrorist organisation Al-Qaeda, has evidently promoted this rivalling direction towards clash of civilisations, once predicted by Samuel Huntington. The Iraqi operation of 2003, initiated by some NATO members, caused divergence in opinions - does the world return to the Hobbesian world, characterized by permanent clashes and polarities or continues the gradual change towards the Kantian world, characterized by cooperation and tolerance between different civilizations. The idea of a global partnership, proposed by the United States in 2006, marks a fundamental change in NATO's partnership strategy introducing new polarity-based type of cooperative security arrangements with Us and Other clearly distinguished and where partners are more identified as allies in the Global War against Terrorism than partners in security cooperation. In the long run, this trend may lead to return of NATO as military alliance, where NATO's partnership would be in the role similar to the coalition of willing.

NATO's transition from a military alliance to a pluralistic security community introduced by Karl Deutsch in 1950s, which started in 1991 and reinforced in 1999, is not

⁷ Comprehensive Political Guidance endorsed by NATO Heads of State and Government on 29 November 2006. ONLINE Available: <http://www.nato.int/docu/basicxt/b061129e.htm>

⁸ Following Michael Doyle's consideration: "even though liberal states have become involved in numerous wars with non-liberal states, constitutionally secure liberal states have become involved in numerous wars with one another," (Michael Doyle 1983, 61), this means introduction of democracy and peaceful behaviour to its neighbourhood.

still commonly accepted within the Transatlantic community, not even considering the rest of the world. Neo-conservative approach evokes hegemonic world in traditional Hobbesian means without recognizing possibility of universal peace and setting national interests above the universal peace. This paper examines motives why some controversial proposals have been developed with the purpose to reverse valid principles of NATO's partnership strategy. Even, if the story of the Global Partnership was unsuccessful and probably will be forgotten soon, this still would assist us to understand certain developments in international security environment just recently powerfully emerged.

From alliance to security community

The Cold War had a very clear security architecture consisting of polarity-oriented alliances (NATO, the Warsaw Treaty Organization) and cooperation-oriented collective security arrangements (UN, CSCE). David Yost indicates that collective security arrangements would be distinguished from alliances because of the absence of the principle of collective defence as "collective security, particularly in its traditional sense, was conceived as an alternative to the formation of alliances for collective defence," (Yost 1998, 8). Alliances symbolized confronting interests in the polarized world and sometimes this opposition has been value-based, for example between NATO and the Warsaw Pact. "During the Cold War, the creation of pro-democracy and pro-liberalism norms within NATO was a deliberate attempt to mark it out from its neighbour, the Warsaw Pact," (Bellamy 2004, 56). However, this was not a general rule to follow. Previously, even if democracy has been always ideologically connected with NATO's identities, this was not a consolidated norm for all for many years. Many NATO's allies – Portugal, Greece, and Turkey survived long periods where democracy in these countries was highly questionable. Spain was probably the first country where democratization was accompanied by NATO's membership in 1986. Nevertheless, some Cold War's alliances like NATO or the Warsaw Treaty Organization were simultaneously also hegemonic security communities, created in other motives than promoting democratic peace.

Stephen Walt describes difference between alliances and collective security arrangements on the level of inclusiveness and exclusiveness:

An alliance is not a collective security agreement. A collective security arrangement is an inclusive institution: it commits the members to oppose any act of aggression, even one committed by one of its members. By contrast, alliances are exclusive institutions: they entail a commitment to support the other members against states outside the community. Although members of an alliance may also be part of a collective security organization and may engage in other forms of security cooperation, failure to keep these concepts distinct can lead to misleading analyses and muddy policy-making (Walt 1997, 158).

Typical alliances active today are, for example, ANZUS (Australia, New Zealand, the United States) and Five Powers Pact (Australia, New Zealand, Singapore, Malaysia, the United Kingdom).

The current security architecture in Europe experiences the presence of pluralistic security communities (EU, NATO); collective security arrangements (UN, OSCE); and cooperative security arrangements that focus on security cooperation (PfP, Mediterranean Dialogue). Cooperative security arrangements are rather cooperative and interdependent institutionalized international regimes⁹, created by security communities in order to promote security and stability in their neighbourhood. Security communities tend to be inclusive institutions as their main task is to preserve certain identities, norms and values within communities. Alliances, contrariwise, tend to be interest-based exclusive institutions that gather against commonly identified threat. Cooperative security arrangements, however, remain also to be exclusive institutions as they are communities' external mechanisms to enhance peace zones outside of the territory of security communities.

There is a difference between alliances and security communities what concerns collective defence. In the framework of military alliance, the commitment to collective defence must be clearly declared. Within security communities, the principle of collective defence is practically unavoidable because of increasing security interdependence. If different nations form a security community, it would be impossible to imagine that attack against one community member does not influence the security and stability of other members.

⁹ The traditional meaning of international regime “is a set of principles, norms, rules, and decision-making procedures around which actors’ expectations converge,” (Krasner 1983, 2). Katzenstein sets that international regimes are social institutions that mitigate conflict in a decentralized international society of states (Katzenstein 1996, 22).

After the end of Cold War's bipolarity, NATO and the European Union rediscovered Kantian principles of democratic peace, "by adopting Immanuel Kant's recipe for perpetual peace: representative democracy; international law and organisations i.e. enlargement of existing institutions by new members; and the development of free trade," (Lucarelli 2002, 4). The introduction of cooperative security arrangements is closely related to the development of liberal democratic security communities in Europe. Mutual interdependence and the presence of cooperative mechanisms between security partners would make military conflicts between them rare and exceptional. The valid Alliance's Strategic Concept indicates the important role of NATO's cooperative security arrangements in order to guarantee peace and stability in the current security environment, that enhances the task to promote peace and stability in the wider area:

The Alliance operates in an environment of continuing change. Developments in recent years have been generally positive, but uncertainties and risks remain which can develop into acute crises. Within this evolving context, NATO has played an essential part in strengthening Euro-Atlantic security since the end of the Cold War. Its growing political role; its increased political and military partnership, cooperation and dialogue with other states, including with Russia, the Ukraine and Mediterranean Dialogue countries; its continuing openness to the accession of new members; its collaboration with other international organisations; its commitment, exemplified in the Balkans, to conflict prevention and crisis management, including through peace support operations: all reflect its determination to shape its security environment and enhance the peace and stability of the Euro-Atlantic area.

(Strategic Concept 1999 <http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/1999/p99-065e.htm>)

In the Hobbesian world, security communities have been frequently examined as abstract imagined entities without any practical outcome. Institutionalisation of security communities enables to introduce commonly accepted principles, norms, values and decision-making procedures within community members. Therefore, an institutionalized approach for security communities refers to situation, where "institutional actors became promoters of liberal-democratic norms in order to respond the double security challenge of the end of the Cold War: their own international identity and legitimisation and possible instability and war in their neighbourhood," (Lucarelli 2002, 9).

While alliances perfectly fit to the anarchy of the Hobbesian world, security communities are valuable instruments in hands of the Kantian world. In the post-modern world, "security communities are institutionalised formations of countries, which share common values, unified norms and similar identity and exclude the use of force in

conflict resolution within the community,” (Mölder 2006, 10). The difference between Cold War’s military alliances and post-modern security communities lies on distinct principles for accession among others. We may also define security communities as value-centred international bodies. If security community expands to areas with different identities or competing values, it will be difficult to maintain its consistency.

Emanuel Adler and Michael Barnett examine three phases in the evolution of security communities – nascent, ascendant and mature phases. In the initial nascent phase governments do not explicitly seek to create security community and they begin to consider how they might coordinate their relations in order to increase their mutual security. In the ascendant phase, dense networks and new institutions and organizations that reflect tighter military coordination and cooperation will be created. In the mature phase, non-war community will be more or less institutionalized (Adler, Barnett 1998, 50-55). Within the NATO’s framework, nascent phase corresponds to the years 1991-1994, when first cooperative security initiatives were initiated. 1994-1999 describes ascendant phase of NATO as security community, when cooperative security arrangements and initiatives like Partnership for Peace, Mediterranean Dialogue, Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council and bilateral cooperative bodies for Russia and the Ukraine were established. In 1999, NATO has adapted new strategic concept that corresponds to the post-Cold War security environment and thus NATO started to take a form of a mature security community.

Cooperative security arrangements as enhancements of security communities are naturally dependent on internal developments within the communities, describing the development of NATO as a pluralistic security community:

1. First, from foes to friends, 1991-1994.

In this period, NATO stood against the immediate necessity to make contacts with young democracies in Central and Eastern Europe. This period started with the establishment of North-Atlantic Cooperation Council (NACC), the first cooperative security arrangement created by NATO.

2. Second, towards the first enlargement. 1994-1999.

This period is a starting point of actual consolidation. Establishing practical tools for promoting cooperative security, first of all through Partnership for Peace program but

also through the Mediterranean Dialogue, NATO started to build a permanent cooperative link with its neighbours. The establishment of Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council and bilateral arrangements for Russia and Ukraine characterize the period as introducing enhanced models of partnership as well. The Intensified Dialogue was the first step towards a possible enlargement.

3. Third, systematic approach towards second enlargement. 1999-2004.

In this period between two major enlargements, NATO's partnership strategy mainly focused on enlargement-oriented programs like the Membership Action Plan. Therefore, those countries that remained outside of enlargement option started to play just a secondary role in partnership.

4. Fourth, seeking a new identity. 2004-

After NATO enlargement in 2004, when "the core of PfP nations" became members, NATO's partnership strategy suddenly found itself in the crisis. It was difficult to find common strategy for still left PfP partners because these countries were too different. At the same time, Middle-East and Mediterranean areas came more on focus as prospective partners of NATO. Istanbul Cooperation Initiative was launched for the Gulf nations. Further developments of Mediterranean Dialogue were discussed. Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro and Serbia joined the PfP program.

When the Berlin Wall disappeared...

NATO has been often seen as a symbol of the Cold War. After the fall of Berlin Wall and the decline of the Soviet Union, a long-time bipolarity in Europe started to vanish. The Berlin Wall, another symbol of the Cold War, establishing a visible border-line between East and West, was dismantled after November 9, 1989. This action symbolizes not only the reunification of Germany but also the reunification of Europe. Central and Eastern European countries returned to the Western civilization from where they were artificially removed for fifty years. New security situation in Europe immediately required new mechanisms to be established. NATO started to withdraw from being a bipolar military alliance already in the early stage of the break period. Already at the July 1990 London Summit Meeting, NATO invited Hungary,

Czechoslovakia, Poland, Romania, Bulgaria, and the Soviet Union to establish regular diplomatic liaisons with the Alliance (Barany 2003, 10).

Since 1991, NATO started to establish cooperative security arrangements in its neighbourhood.¹⁰ The development of cooperative security initiatives offered a tailored solution between quick enlargement and maintaining stability. “In the aftermath of the Cold War, the partnership concept served NATO primarily as a political tool for maintaining order,” (Kamp 2006, 3). By cooperative security arrangements NATO intended to promote cooperation in three important areas:

- 1) Establishing permanent contact with countries in the neighbourhood;
- 2) Initiating democratic reforms in security and defence sector of partner countries;
- 3) Common participation in international crisis resolution.

The North Atlantic Cooperation Council (NACC) was the first step towards partnership between NATO allies and countries that had remained outside of Western civilization during the Cold War. At the beginning of 1994, a new qualitative step was made with the launching of Partnership for Peace Invitation and Framework documents. Partnership for Peace (PfP) program, involving the rest of countries of the Euro-Atlantic security environment¹¹, has remained the core NATO’s cooperative security arrangement. There has been a wide range of initiatives assisting partner countries to promote not only their military capabilities but also liberal democracy in their societies. Partnership for Peace program stimulated democratization in several areas through following frameworks¹²:

- 1) Partnership (IPAP);
- 2) Cooperation and participation in international peace operations (PMF, PAP-T);
- 3) Military interoperability (PARP, OCC);
- 4) Training and education (TEEP);
- 5) Defence reform (PAP-DIB).

¹⁰ North Atlantic Cooperation Council (1991-97); Partnership for Peace; Mediterranean Dialogue; Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council; NATO-Russia Council; NATO-Ukraine Council; South Eastern European Initiative; Istanbul Cooperation Initiative)

¹¹ Not considering minor exceptions like Malta, Cyprus or small entities like Monaco, Andorra, San Marino or Liechtenstein.

¹² Planning and Review Process; Political-Military Framework; Membership Action Plan; Operational Capabilities Concept; Training and Education Enhancement Programme; Partnership Action Plan (PAP); Individual PAP; PAP on Terrorism; PAP on Defence Institution Building

Planning and Review Process (PARP) was initiated in 1995 and aimed to establish military interoperability through reforming the partners' planning systems and review process according to NATO's appropriate procedures. Individual Partnership Program is the principal training and education program, provided by NATO for Partner countries. Intensified Dialogue was created in order to tighten consultations between Allies and Partners before the Membership Action Plan was instituted in 1999. Political-Military Framework (PMF) develops procedures for partners' participation in NATO-led peace operations. Operational Capabilities Concept (OCC) was created in 1999 as an analogue to the NATO's initiative Defence Capabilities Initiative, in order to promote the military capabilities of Partners. Training and Education Enhancement Program (TEEP) concentrates on the promotion of partners' training and educational capabilities. One of the concrete outcomes is the establishment of PfP Training Centres.

Partnership Action Plan is a model elaborated for the NATO/EAPC Prague Summit. The main purpose of this initiative is to develop cooperation between NATO and Partner country according to individual needs. NATO has recognized that its every partner is an individual entity and therefore has initiated a complex of bilateral activities. When IPP facilitates multilateral cooperation, then relationship within Individual Partnership Action Plan (IPAP) is built up on individual basis. PAP on Terrorism characterises the mutual interest of NATO and its partners to take countermeasures and enhance cooperation in fighting against one of the most dangerous threats in the post-modern society. PAP on Defence Institution Building was a French initiative from 2003, in order to build up national defence systems in partner countries accordingly to the principles of liberal democracy (Mölder 2006, 23).

In 1995, NATO launched first cooperative security arrangement for the Middle East – the Mediterranean Dialogue. The Mediterranean Dialogue was initiated simultaneously with the Partnership for Peace Process. Since the issue of prospective membership was excluded in the Mediterranean Dialogue (MD), the development of the program has taken place more slowly. As a cooperative security arrangement, the MD involves Israel and the moderate Arabian regimes in the area – Algeria, Egypt, Jordan, Morocco, Tunisia, Mauritania. Over the last couple of years, the trend has been to develop cooperation between the PfP and the MD partners through common participation

in partnership activities. The Mediterranean Dialogue still remains similar arrangement as NACC – mostly dialogue with some practical cooperation. Recently, countries of the Mediterranean Dialogue started to participate in the activities of PfP. Their involvement in NATO-led operations is still almost non-existent with minor exceptions like Morocco's participation in the Balkans' operations (Bosnia and Herzegovina; Kosovo). However, discussion about participation of Mediterranean countries in the operation "Active Endeavour" may also be an option for their involvement in the future.

In 1997, NATO started enhanced bilateral cooperation 16+1 with two biggest neighbours – Russia and the Ukraine. NATO has established distinctive partnership with two most powerful partners – Russia and the Ukraine. In 1997, simultaneously with the launching of Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council, NATO-Russia Council (NRC) and NATO-Ukraine Council (NUC) were also instituted. Through the creation of separate bilateral institutions, NATO emphasises cooperative partnership with these countries. Today, Russia tends to apply for equal position in partnership with NATO, while the Ukraine has applied for a Membership Action Plan and started to think about future membership. In 1999, a special program for the countries of Western Balkans has been initiated – SEEI (South East Europe Initiative). The Western have often become involved in ethnic clashes and border disputes. For now, a significant progress in democratization of Western Balkan countries has been made, and most of them are close to become NATO members soon.

In 2004, The Istanbul Cooperation Initiative (ICI) was launched at the NATO Summit in Istanbul. This initiative was developed because of the need to establish stability in the wider Middle-East area, full of existing and potential conflicts. The first three countries joining the ICI were Bahrain, Kuwait and Qatar, contributors to the US-led Iraq operation. From June 2005, the United Arab Emirates also participate in the Initiative. Consultations have been held also with Saudi Arabia and Oman. It is predictable that Afghanistan and Iraq will join the initiative after the stabilisation of their societies.

Currently, one of NATO's cooperation priorities in partner countries is an introduction of their security sector reforms, primarily in the former Soviet bloc countries. The promotion of civil-military cooperation is also among the priorities. "By

presenting itself as a Western institution embodying a set of values opposite to those represented by the Soviet bloc, NATO was able to use the communicative frameworks to change the partners' conception of civil-military relations" (Lucarelli 2002, 35). Security sector reform in NATO's partner countries refers to the immediate need of increasing democratization. In fact, with exception of Georgia, the Ukraine and, to some extent, Moldova, the former Soviet republics generally tend to be somehow careful in introducing democratic norms in their countries. The Soviet Union does not exist, but the legacy of this union is still a quite destabilizing factor in the neighbourhood of NATO. After the enlargement in 2004, NATO gradually started to establish links between different cooperative security initiatives and practised joint meetings with participation of all partners and also contact countries. NATO's contact countries are a term used for countries having bilateral relationship with NATO, outside existing partnership formats.¹³

Membership Action Plan (MAP) – a threshold for commitment of democratic peace and the possibility of next enlargements

The first Eastern European enlargement – Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland - accessed to NATO in the traditional way through political decision. In 1996, NATO started an Intensified Dialogue with 13 partner countries¹⁴. Most of them are member nations today. Intensified Dialogue, however, remained on the level of political consultations. The Membership Action Plan, launched in pivotal 1999, was a qualitative step forward. Although the next NATO enlargement in 2004 was technically also a political decision and the official rhetoric supported it, the requirement for participating in MAP program already included normative elements. Seven qualified countries getting the invitation were selected from ten so-called aspirant-nations participating in the Membership Action Plan framework.

Unlike other partnership initiatives, the Membership Action Plan has been established for countries that express interests for adaptation of principles followed by liberal democratic security communities and thus decided to apply for membership.

¹³ Previously the term triple-nons has been also use for countries that are not NATO members, EAPC/PfP partners and Mediterranean Dialogue partners.

¹⁴ Albania, Azerbaijan, Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania; Poland, Romania, Finland, Slovenia, Czech Rep., Ukraine, Hungary.

Aspirant nations who participate in the MAP program are thoroughly watched, reviewed and assessed by NATO authorities on the basis of their annual progress report. In order to accept any membership in NATO, there must be full commitment to the liberal democratic values and NATO's Membership Action Plan has proved itself as an effective mechanism for that. "The door to NATO membership under Article 10 of the North Atlantic Treaty remains open. The Membership Action Plan, building on the Intensified, Individual Dialogue on membership questions, is designed to reinforce that firm commitment to further enlargement by putting into place a programme of activities to assist aspiring countries in their preparations for possible future membership" (Membership Action Plan 1999).

NATO has pioneered in launching cooperative security arrangements and there is mutual interest between Allies and partners to enhance cooperation. The "Study on NATO Enlargement", launched in September 1995, has set seven criteria for NATO enlargement:

- 1) Encouraging and supporting democratic reforms, including civilian and democratic control;
- 2) Fostering in new members of the Alliance the patterns and habits of cooperation, consultation, and consensus building which characterize relations among current Allies;
- 3) Promoting good-neighbourly relations, which would benefit all countries in the Euro-Atlantic area, both members and non-members of NATO;
- 4) Emphasizing common defence and extending its benefits and increasing transparency in defence planning and military budgets, thereby reducing the likelihood of instability that might be engendered by an exclusively national approach to defence policies;
- 5) Reinforcing the tendency toward integration and cooperation in Europe based on shared democratic values and thereby curbing the countervailing tendency towards disintegration along ethnic and territorial lines;
- 6) Strengthening the Alliance's ability to contribute to European and international security, including through peacekeeping activities under the responsibility of the

OSCE and peacekeeping operations under the authority of the UN Security Council as well as other new missions;

7) Strengthening and broadening the Trans-Atlantic partnership (Yost 1998, 103-104).

Constructing norms for accession makes NATO closer to being a security community than an alliance. Norms established for future members are not solely military requirements but emphasize the presence of consolidated democracy as a necessity. Principles presented in the political chapter of Membership Action Plan are in accordance with the NATO's requirements for member states:

Aspirants would also be expected:

to settle their international disputes by peaceful means;

to demonstrate commitment to the rule of law and human rights;

to settle ethnic disputes or external territorial disputes including irredentist claims or internal jurisdictional disputes by peaceful means in accordance with OSCE principles and to pursue good neighbourly relations;

to establish appropriate democratic and civilian control of their armed forces;

to refrain from the threat or use of force in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the UN;

to contribute to the development of peaceful and friendly international relations by strengthening their free institutions and by promoting stability and well-being;

to continue fully to support and be engaged in the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council and the Partnership for Peace;

to show a commitment to promoting stability and well-being by economic liberty, social justice and environmental responsibility (Membership Action Plan 1999).

Thus, assuming that MAP establishes norms and values for prospective NATO membership, NATO becomes close to identify itself as a pluralistic security community.

According to Bellamy, contemporary NATO is open to any European state that fulfils military and political criteria. Previously, during the Cold War, NATO was open to any North Atlantic area state that might contribute strategic assets (Bellamy 2004, 69). Jeffrey Simon describes the Membership Action Plan as "a visible manifestation of the NATO "Open Door" (Article 10) policy with a clear set of Allied expectations from prospective members," (Simon 2004). At the same time, since 2004 only small minority of current NATO's partner countries is seeking membership. If Albania, Croatia, and Macedonia will join NATO in 2008, there will be no more prospective applicants for the near future. In 2005, the Intensified Dialogue that usually marks first step towards future membership was reinvented for Georgia and the Ukraine claiming for future membership but still considered too early to offer Membership Action Plan for them.

Table 1: PfP members with intensified cooperation with NATO¹⁵

	PfP	IPAP	Intensified Dialogue	MAP	NATO membership
Albania	1994			1999	+
Croatia	2000			2002	+
FYR Macedonia	1995			1999	+
Georgia	1994	2004	2005		+
Ukraine	1994		2006		+
Moldova	1994	2006			+
Montenegro	2006				+
Serbia	2006				+
Bosnia-Herzegovina	2006				+
Armenia	1994	2005			-
Azerbaijan	1994	2005			-
Kazakhstan	1994	2006			-

Perhaps Georgia has the strongest NATO aspirations among the current partner nations. However, this country suffers from unsolved conflicts with Abkhazia and South-Ossetia as these ethnically diverse territories demand secession. The Ukraine may have a prospective membership status, but this nation is internally divided with no clear consensus in applying for membership. Five advanced partners – Austria, Ireland, Finland, Sweden, and Switzerland - may join anytime but they do not wish. Azerbaijan, Armenia, Moldova and Kazakhstan are interested of extensive cooperation with NATO and introduction of some principles of democratization in their countries. Further interest means joining with the Individual Partnership Action Plan - IPAP. Uzbekistan was also in enhancing its cooperation with NATO but setbacks in internal democratization threw them far away from democratization and also complicated their relationship with NATO. Interest of Belarus, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan and Turkmenistan to promote reforms characteristic to liberal democratic security communities is rather modest.

¹⁵ Only prospective member-nations and partners with more intensive cooperation are represented here.

Neo-conservative approach in international politics and its influence to transatlantic security community

During 1990s, the attempt to establish a Kantian world based on principles of democratic peace at least in the Euro-Atlantic security environment was clearly visible. First signs of returning to the Hobbesian world started to show up since 2001, when Islamic terrorists attacked New York and Washington. Next major hit to the development of democratic peace was given in 2003, when the US-led coalition of willing invaded Iraq. The latter event was widely criticized by some allies and partners in NATO and EU. Coalition of willing introduces a new type of security arrangements that is close to the alliances. Differently from Cold War's alliances, coalitions of willing tend to be not permanent security arrangements, but assembled for certain operations. This formula has been previously used in the case of Afghanistan, but in the Iraqi case it acquired an ideological dimension involving the transatlantic-oriented states of NATO.

The renaissance of alliances is deeply connected with a Neo-Trotskyite ideology called Neo-conservatism that strengthened after the presidential elections in the United States in 2000 and greatly influenced the ideological stanchions of George W. Bush's administration. The so-called Bush Doctrine refers to the following principles: the idea of pre-emptive or preventive military action; the promotion of democracy and regime change, and a diplomacy tending towards unilateralism, a willingness to act without the sanction of international bodies such as the United Nations Security Council or the unanimous approval of its allies, which, however, by Robert Kagan is rather a traditional US policy than a new concept in American foreign policy (Kagan 2007, 2). Neoconservative ideology favours the return to the hegemonic security community and describes liberalism as a generally Utopian ideology. Since 2003, the neoconservative approach has shown intensions to become a dominant power in international politics.

Neo-conservatism is a political movement, which emerged in the 1930s in City College of New York among some American intellectuals. A new ideology started to appear in the 1960s, and coalesced as an influence group in the 1970s. Their ideas are declared in 1997 in the declaration called "The Project of for the New American Century". The general idea of the project was establishing a unipolar world under the United States' domination.

"We seem to have forgotten the essential elements of the Reagan Administration's success: a military that is strong and ready to meet both present and future challenges; a foreign policy that boldly and purposefully promotes American principles abroad; and national leadership that accepts the United States' global responsibilities."
http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle_east/6189793.stm

Many ideas Neo-conservatives use are borrowed from the Trotskyite revisionist Marxist ideology. Indeed, many theorists of neo-conservatism like Irving Kristol, Daniel Bell, Irving Howe, and Nathan Glazer are former Trotskyites. Francis Fukuyama, once connected with Neo-conservatives manifests that “in the formulation of the scholar Ken Jowitt¹⁶, the neoconservative position articulated by people like Kristol and Kagan¹⁷ was, by contrast, Leninist; they believed that history can be pushed along with the right application of power and will. Leninism was a tragedy in its Bolshevik version, and it has returned as farce when practiced by the United States,” (Fukuyama 2006, 4).

According to Irving Kristol, Neo-conservative postulates in foreign policy issues are: patriotism as a necessity; world government as a terrible idea; statesmen should have the ability to accurately distinguish friend from foe; protection of national interests both at home and abroad; and the necessity of a strong military (Kristol 2003). The raise of patriotism, strong critics towards the United Nations (standing against world government), identifying enemies and promoting polarity (distinguishing friend from foe), placement of US interests over global interests for example in environmental issues like the Kyoto Protocol (protecting national interest), preferring the use of military power in conflict regulation (strong military) – this all characterizes changes in international politics initiated by Neo-conservative strategists.

Gradually, Neo-conservative ideas about the necessity of world hegemon started to influence some European societies. “For some, mostly North American writers, disagreements between Western European states over the appropriate institutional configuration for Europe reflects the states’ concerns about their relative power. Other saw in the European project a desire to continue the age-old practice of balancing power whilst others caricatured post-Cold War Europe as being led by a ‘benign unipolar’ hegemon – the United States,” (Bellamy 2004, 65). Neo-conservatism is still a Trotskyite movement that idealizes perpetual fight for World revolution and objecting hegemony in

¹⁶ Ken Jowitt is American Political Scientist known from his anti-Wilsonian stance

the world. Even if the revolution enforces democracy, methods for the goal tend to be originally Marxist-Leninist. They do not believe that different civilizations can make peace and prefer to use power in order to establish peaceful settlements.

Neo-conservative world has strengthened after 2003. National interests started dominate over global peace. The operation in Iraq was a starting point of neoconservative offensive in international politics that caused polarisation of Western world and setback to the establishment of Transatlantic security community. “The “schism” over Iraq threatened the West with strategic decoupling of the Europe and the United States,” (Krastev 2006, 2). The participation in Iraqi operation has drawn ties between Transatlanticism and Neo-conservative ideology, which rather destabilized than united the Western world and divided Western security communities between Transatlanticists (notably the United Kingdom, Poland and Denmark) supporting US Neo-conservative approach to global security and Eurocentrists (France, Germany, Belgium, and later Spain) that preferred to follow previous course of gradual development of democratic peace.

Transatlanticism in NATO strengthened after enlargements in 1999 and 2004. Donald Rumsfeld, former US Secretary Defence, made a remark concerning bipolarity between “Old Europe” (used describing Germany, France, and other traditional Western powers) and “New Europe” (as he called newcomers from the Eastern Europe supporting the US actions in Iraq).¹⁸ Julianne Smith notices internal division in NATO what concerns the future enlargement. “There are two opposing groups in NATO. First of them is concerned about joining security consumers from unconsolidated democracies with NATO and advocates criteria, consequences and limits for new aspirants. Other group, led by the United States, has much positive approach for enlargement and this group considers willingness to participate in military operations as a main factor when considering accession,” (Smith 2006, 18). Pax Americana, the U.S. dominated world, became highly popular especially in new democracies in Central and Eastern Europe. These societies have a long-time experience in living hegemonic security communities and Pax Americana would represent an opposite type of hegemonic security

¹⁷ Robert Kagan is American neo-conservative scholar and writer.

communities, where democratic principles are maintained but streamline for right ideology is present. Many new members applied for special relationship with the United States as they see the United States’ military power as a main guarantee for them against from possible attacks from neighbouring countries, namely keeping in mind Russia’s possible aspiration to re-establish itself as a superpower. Therefore, the United States has been a strong supporter of NATO’s further enlargement. From “old members” of NATO, Pax Americana is more favoured in the United Kingdom and Denmark. Relationship to Iraqi operation most adequately represents the position of Pax Americana in NATO.

Table 2 Participation in Iraqi operation

<i>Iraqi invasion in 2003:</i>
the United States, the United Kingdom, Australia, Denmark, Poland
<i>Iraqi operation in May 2007¹⁹:</i>
NATO members before 1999 - the United States, the United Kingdom, Denmark (3 of 16)
NATO members after enlargements – Poland, Romania, Bulgaria, Latvia, Czech Republic, Lithuania, Estonia (7 of 10)
MAP nations – Albania, FYR Macedonia (2 of 3)
PfP nations ²⁰ – Georgia, Azerbaijan, Armenia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Kazakhstan, Moldova (6 of 20)
Contact countries - Republic of Korea, Australia, El Salvador, Mongolia (4).

Neo-conservative ideology that identifies friends and foes required appropriate enemies. The attack of Islamic terrorists to the United States in September 2001 caused a situation close to that was identified by Samuel Huntington as a clash of civilizations. Huntington invented a descriptive theory that prescribes general trends in international politics while emphasizing a possible cultural conflict. And Huntington was right, because culture-based conflicts indeed become influential (Huntington 1996). After 2001 and the beginning of the Global War against Terrorism (GWAT), there were attempts to identify natural enemies and allies again. Al-Qaeda was probably not the best example to use as a terrorist organization without clearly identified borders and membership.

States fitted to the Neo-conservative approach more appropriately. The role of enemy may be directed for different actors often representing other civilization than

¹⁸ Outrage at “Old Europe” remarks. BBC News. Thursday, 23 January, 2003, 18:15 GMT ONLINE. Available: <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/2687403.stm>

¹⁹ Layer in 2007, several nations including Denmark, Latvia, Lithuania decided to withdraw their troops from Iraq.

Western – countries of Axis of Evil; Moslem countries; Russia; Iran etc. On January 29, 2002, the US President George W. Bush firstly used an expression – the axis of evil.²¹ Axis of evil initially included six countries – Iran, Iraq, North Korea, Cuba, Libya, Syria. Later, after ousting of Saddam Hussein’s regime in Iraq, Iraq was excluded. At the same time, Libya started to change its policy towards the Western world, abandoning its weapons of mass destruction programs and paying compensations to the families of Pan Am flight 103 as well as UTA flight 772. Therefore, Libya has succeeded to normalize relations with the United States and the European Union.

During the Cold War, the Islamists were often treated as natural allies of Western Bloc because of Atheism practiced by Communist regimes. “At one time or another during the Cold War many governments, including those of Algeria, Turkey, Jordan, Egypt, and Israel, encouraged and supported Islamists as a counter to communist and hostile nationalist movements. At least until the Gulf War, Saudi Arabia and other Gulf states provided massive funding to the Muslim Brotherhood and Islamists groups in variety of countries,” (Huntington 1996, 115). Indeed, even the United States often saw Islamists as opposition to the Soviet influence under the circumstances of bipolar world. Secular movements in Islamic countries have been, contrariwise, often supported by the Soviet Union. First change in that position occurred in 1979 with the Islamic revolution in Iran. The Iran’s revolution did not suit to the bipolar World Order as it was anti-Western and anti-Soviet at the same time. During Iraqi-Iran war 1980-1988, East and West supported leftist secular Arab nationalist regime of Saddam Hussein in Iraq. However, in 1980s anti-Western attitude concerned only smaller Shia community. Western governments supported most powerful Sunnis in the Afghanistan conflict.

Neo-conservative approach has been strengthened not only in the United States. For example, the politics of Vladimir Putin in Russia has many similarities with Neo-conservative ideology because their international policy also proceeds from national interests in the first place. The opposing role of Russia to NATO is still somehow controversial. On the one hand, Russia and NATO have established cooperative relationship and started active military cooperation. The majority in NATO does not

²⁰ Excluding aspirant nations in the MAP

consider Russia as enemy anymore. “The reality is that the West’s relations with Russia are increasingly marked by a mix of cooperation and competition,” (Asmus, Holbrooke 2006, 9). On the other hand, some Eastern European countries, especially Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania and Poland continually prioritize the Russian threat what makes Russian bilateral relationship with these countries close to the Cold War’s opposition between East and West. Simultaneously, it leads to the strengthening Neo-Conservative tendencies in so-called “New Europe”.

Neo-conservatives are still under the illusion that we live in the unipolar world as the United States as the greatest military power is the predominant power that has an ability to guide the developments in world politics. They refer to the fact that there are no counter-balancing powers (Kagan 2007). Nevertheless, particularly, the Iraqi case and the developments in Afghanistan do not support this illusive view. They exclude the possibility that the polarity-based world might not exist in the age of post modernity anymore.

Global partnership – reinventing Cold War again?

Present-day NATO’s security concerns are still concentrating mostly on the Euro-Atlantic area and its neighbourhood. NATO-led crisis management operations take place in the Balkans and in Afghanistan. With Europe democratized and stabilized, NATO has two options to move ahead, either remaining to the Euro-Atlantic area as an inclusive institution similar to security communities or turn to be a “global policeman” that may be in interests of the United States, which, indeed, is the non-European country with global interests. The latter case forces NATO to act exclusively as a military alliance described by Stephen Walt (Walt 1997, 158).

By Samuel Huntington’s classification, NATO’s partnership initiatives currently cover three civilizations – 17 Islamic countries, 9 Orthodox countries and 7 Western countries + Bosnia and Herzegovina involving in all three civilizations – Islamic (Bosniaks), Orthodox (Serbians) and Western (Croats). At the same time, 22 countries from 26 members of NATO belong to Western civilization with the only exceptions of

²¹ George W. Bush 29.01.2002 State of the Union Address.
<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/01/20020129-11.html>

Greece, Bulgaria, and Romania (Orthodox) and Turkey (Islamic). This makes NATO predominantly a Western security community.

Table 3: NATO’s partnerships and civilizations

	Western	Orthodox	Islamic	Other
EAPC/PfP	Sweden, Finland, Switzerland, Austria, Ireland, Croatia	FYR Macedonia, Serbia, Montenegro, Ukraine, Belarus, Russia, Georgia, Armenia, Moldova	Albania, Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Uzbekistan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan	Bosnia-Herzegovina
MD	Israel ²²		Algeria, Morocco, Mauritania, Tunisia, Jordan, Egypt	
ICI			Bahrain, Qatar, Kuwait, United Arab Emirates	

The US administration pursued with the proposed idea of a global partnership to modernize the Alliance and to distinguish “Westerners” from other cooperation partners. However, a majority of European allies with a notable exception of Eastern-European countries did not show up support to the US initiative (Kamp 2006). One purpose of global partnership was further integration and possible institutionalization of NATO’s contact countries including Australia, New Zealand, Japan, South Korea, Argentina, Chile, Mongolia, Indonesia, and Malaysia as NATO’s partners in NATO-led international operations. Nevertheless, these countries have shown little interest towards institutionalization and prefer maintaining bilateral relationship.

During the Bush’s administration, the United States has possessed much global ambition than just to be a guarantee of the European security. Being a great military power, the United States prefers to use NATO as an alliance of trusted partners. ”We

²² By Samuel Huntington

want NATO to be able to demonstrate that we have an alliance that is taking on global responsibilities, that it increasingly has the global capabilities to meet those challenges and is doing it in concert with global partners,” Nuland²³ said.²⁴ The proposal for Global Partnership was an attempt to establish neoconservative link to NATO and move it away from post-Cold War liberalism that the Neo-conservatives do not believe. Value-based partnership would be used as a back door to alliances, which follows the Neo-conservative approach with clear division between Us and Others. By Karl-Heinz Kamp, “this new approach is different from the previous partnership concept in two key areas. First, it is not oriented politically towards maintaining order, but rather has a security focus. Second, it is based on the principle of military capability,” (Kamp 2006, 4).

The idea did not acquired expected popularity among the majority of European allies. “For a global role NATO will need the political empowerment of all its member states (most of which are also EU member states), whose societies will have to accept the significant costs entailed by NATO’s structural adjustments and capability improvement,” (Tanner 2007, 4). This reflects to increasing dissonance between Neo-conservative approach of the current United States’ administration and Liberalism of some European Allies. Under the recent presidency of Jacques Chirac, France was a leading voice of the opponents. “For Alliot-Marie²⁵ ... the contribution of countries such as Australia and Japan in the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) under NATO command in Afghanistan should be recognized.”²⁶ French Minister of Defence also said that allies “should not change the fundamental nature of NATO ... Nowadays some people talk of the possibilities to extend NATO missions in two directions, one is geographic, developing new partnerships with countries, the other functional, operating in the civilian domain, notably in the reconstruction of countries emerging from crisis.”²⁷

If NATO becomes a „global policeman”, this means that it must become a global institution itself not excluding global partners from future membership. The extension of

²³ Victoria Nuland, US Ambassador to NATO since 2005.

²⁴ Defense News.com. U.S. French in Fierce Debate on NATO Role. 11.01.2006. ONLINE. Available: <http://defensenews.com/story.php?F=2325808&C=europe>

²⁵ Michele Jeanne Honorine Alliot-Marie. French Minister of Defence from 2002 to 2007.

²⁶ Defense News.com. U.S. French in Fierce Debate on NATO Role. 11.01.2006. ONLINE. Available: <http://defensenews.com/story.php?F=2325808&C=europe>

²⁷ Defense News.com. U.S. French in Fierce Debate on NATO Role. 11.01.2006. ONLINE. Available: <http://defensenews.com/story.php?F=2325808&C=europe>

NATO outside of its traditional area is not a new idea. In 2006, former prime minister of Spain Jose-Maria Aznar raised the issue of potential membership of Israel, Japan and Australia in NATO.²⁸ Also, Italian minister of Defence Antonio Martino admitted the possibility of Israeli membership.²⁹ On the other hand, the Israeli membership may influence the future of Mediterranean Dialogue and Istanbul Cooperation Initiative. Ivo H. Daalder and James Goldgeier published an article in “International Herald Tribune”, recommending opening the Alliance for all who will apply and meet requirements despite their geographical location.³⁰

If the European Security and Defence Policy will strengthen in the future, the need for two identical security communities would become questionable. The dilemma that requires a solution satisfying all sides is the presence of the United States’ security interests in Europe. Otherwise, is there need for global, transatlantic or European security community? Global partnership as proposed by Ambassador Nuland is rather reinventing traditional alliance or re-establishing hegemonic type of security community. This may lead to a reverse attempt to identify Us against the Other and create new borderlines within NATO’s cooperative security arrangements, distinguishing partners from each other by their contribution and/or commitments. The Comprehensive Political Guidance, NATO admitted in 2006, provides framework and political direction for NATO’s transformation for the next 10-15 years. This document still follows the Kantian tradition of NATO’s strategic concept of 1999 as there are stated that “NATO’s 1999 Strategic Concept described the evolving security environment in terms that remain valid” (Comprehensive Political Guidance 2006). Therefore, currently there is probably no major interest for changing principles of NATO’s future development. However, some pressure from the Neo-conservative side is perceivable.

²⁸ Israel in NATO? Some Say It Should Happen. By Julie Stahl, April 28, 2006. ONLINE. Available: <http://www.cnsnews.com/ViewForeignBureaus.asp?Page=/ForeignBureaus/archive/200604/FOR20060428e.html>

²⁹ Israel NATO Membership ‘Not on the Table’: Scheffer, REUTERS cable, September 2, 2006, mirrored on *Defense News* ONLINE. Available: <http://www.defensenews.com/story.php?F=1525103&C=europe>

³⁰ Ivo H. Daalder, James Goldgeier. NATO: For Global Security., Expand the Alliance. *International Herald Tribune*, October 12, 2006. ONLINE. Available: <http://www.brookings.edu/views/op-ed/daalder/20061012.htm>

Conclusion

The concept of global partnership differed significantly from other NATO's cooperative security arrangements, established since 1991. It may bring NATO back from being a pluralistic security community and represents polarity-based ideas that would be characteristic to military alliances. While security communities are established to preserve certain values, norms, identities and beliefs; military alliances, contrariwise, are established to fight for interests of members of the alliance. Liberal democratic security community sets a goal of democratic peace – keeping in mind that democracies do not go to war against each other. Return of military alliances may cause clash of civilizations, because that may raise competition where every civilization will fight for survival.

Global partnership puts NATO to the crossroad in its partnership strategy. Is this way to move forward a revolutionary Westernization of the world, which presumably leads to the clash of civilizations? Or is an evolutionary peaceful change in international relations still possible, by following principles of democratic peace? Neo-conservative trend in the United States may end after the Presidential elections in 2008. Nevertheless, if the conceptual unity in cooperative security arrangements will disappear and a “premium partnership” will be established, it also means the re-organization of NATO's present cooperation-oriented partnership strategy that has been evolved since 1991. The alternative would be to promote individual solutions for partnership, while continually aiming to maintain peace and stability in the neighbourhood.

REFERENCES:

- Adler, Emmanuel. Barnett, Michael 1998. *Security Communities*. Cambridge University Press.
- Asmus, Ronald D. Holbrook, Richard C. 2006. Re~Reinventing NATO. ONLINE. Available: http://www.gmfus.org/doc/A4_Holbrooke_c.pdf.
- Barany, Zoltan 2003. *The Future of NATO expansion. Four Cases*. Cambridge University Press.
- Bellamy, Alex J. 2004. *Security Communities and their Neighbours. Regional Fortresses or Global Integrators?* Palgrave MacMillan.
- Comprehensive Political Guidance endorsed by NATO Heads of State and Government on 29 November 2006. ONLINE Available: <http://www.nato.int/docu/basicxt/b061129e.htm>

- Doyle, Michael W. 1983. Kant, Liberal Legacies, and Foreign Affairs., *Philosophy&Public Affairs*, Vol. 12 No. 4 (Fall 1983): 57-69.
- Fukuyama, Francis 2006. After Neoconservatism. *New York Times*. February 19, 2006.
- Huntington, Samuel 1996. *The Clash of Civilizations. Remaking World Order*. New York: Touchstone Book.
- Kagan, Robert 2007. End of Dreams, Return of History. *Policy Review*, August & September. ONLINE. Available: <http://www.hoover.org/publications/policyreview/8552512.html>
- Kamp, Karl-Heinz. 2006. Global Partnership: A New Conflict Within NATO?. *Analysen und Argumente der Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung* Nr. 29. ONLINE. Available: http://www.kas.de/upload/dokumente/29-Global-Partnership_e.pdf
- Krastev, Ivan 2006. NATO in the Age of Populism. ONLINE. Available: http://www.gmfus.org/doc/A4_Krastev_d.pdf
- Kristol, Irving 2003. *The Neoconservative Persuasion* ONLINE. Available http://www.weeklystandard.com/Utilities/printer_preview.asp?idArticle=3000&R=785F27881
- Layne, Christopher 1994. Kant or Cant. *International Security*. No. 19 vol. 2, pp. 5-49
- Lucarelli, Sonia 2002. *Peace and Democracy: Rediscovered Link The EU, NATO and the European System of Liberal-Democratic Security Communities*. ONLINE. Available: <http://www.nato.int/acad/fellow/00-02/Lucarelli's.pdf>
- Membership Action Plan 1999. ONLINE. Available: <http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/1999/p99-066e.htm>
- Mölder, Holger 2006. NATO's Role in the Post-Modern European Security Environment Cooperative Security and the experience of the Baltic Sea region. *Baltic Security and Defence Review* vol .8, 2006. pp. 7-33.
- Simon, Jeffrey 2004. Partnership for Peace: Charting a Course for a New Era. *Strategic Forum*, No. 206 March 2004.
- Smith, Julianne 2006. Transforming NATO (... again). Center for Strategic and International Studies. ONLINE. Available: http://www.csis.org/media/csis/pubs/061114_nato_primer.pdf
- Tanner, Fred 2006. Is NATO Going Global? *GCSP Policy Brief* No. 14. ONLINE. Available: http://www.gcsp.ch/e/publications/Globalisation/Publications/Policy_Briefs/Brief-14.pdf
- The Alliance's Strategic Concept 1991. ONLINE. Available: <http://www.nato.int/docu/basicxt/b911108a.htm>
- The Alliance's Strategic Concept 1999. ONLINE. Available: <http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/1999/p99-065e.htm>.
- Walt, Stephen M. 1997. Why Alliances Endure or Collapse. *Survival*, vol.39 no.1 (Spring) pp. 156-79.
- Yost, David S. 1998. *NATO Transformed: The Alliance's New Roles in International Security*. Washington: The United States Institute of Peace.