



Does NATO still matter?

By Prof. Jan CZAJA



NATO's 61-ty anniversary.

NATO ' s crisis after the end of communism.

NATO enlargement process.

NATO and 9/11

NATO facing Iraqi crisis challenge: the old and new Europe. Refusal of Alliance to give support to Turkey .

Attempt of Istanbul and Riga Summit to restore the alliance unity.

Bucharest summit: the sinn of relinquishment.N



NATO' evolution: whether alliance still matters ?

Schroeder: NATO is no more the right place for strategic consultations.

Bush: NATO is the most effective alliance in the history.

Russians: NATO – atlantic club for discussions.

Alliance enlargement process: “open door” still valid?

Is NATO useful for United States ?

NATO and European Union. Europeans: We have to build our own defense capabilities [ESDP], NATO is for hard threats.



NATO and its *casus foederis* [art. 5 of WT] . NATO as a “box for tools” and concept of „mission” defines the coalition” – the coalitions of willing. Need of the new strategy. Still actual Strategy was approved in 1999.



NATO's transformation process. Impact of 9/11. Importance of Prague summit decisions:

- NATO Response Forces,**
- Reshuffle of NATO commands: instead of two strategic – Allied Command Operation [ACO] and Allied Command Transformation [ACO],**
- Prague Capabilities Commitment : stronger defense against WMD, improvement intelligence capabilities, interoperativity and communication skills, Strategic transportation,**
- Continuation of “open door” policy.**



NATO is seeking its new role. NATO and the old and new threats for security.

NATO in Afganistan . ISAF operation as the first out of area alliance operation.

It is the first but is it the last?

NATO and “building nation” operations.

Do the members of NATO really want and are eager to engage themselves in peace enforcement [war] missions? Do they want NATO global, acting out of area .



NATO's role in Afganistan

- Officially NATO's main role in Afganistan is to assist the Afghan Government in exercising and extending its authority and influence across the country, paving the way for reconstruction and effective governance. It is UN- mandated ISAF.
- ISAF missions:
 - providing security and stability and creating the conditions for reconstruction and development.
 - conducting security and stability operations,
 - supporting the Afghan National Army,



- supporting the Afghan National Police,
- disarming illegally armed groups [DIAG],
- providing post-operation assistance,
- providing security to permit reconstruction,
- organizing humanitarian assistance.



- Nowadays in Afghanistan there are over 40000 NATO soldiers from 26 countries.
- Security situation however is worsening: Afghan Army is not effective, penetrated by talibs; although NATO is providing R&D assistance, it is absolutely not enough to convince Afghan people. The influence and penetration of taliban enlarges. The number of acts of violence is increasing.
- NATO troops are forced [it also depends from status] to take part in real war. There is also strong penetration from islamic group from Pakistan .



- Eastern part of Afganistan, a long of Pakistani border [and that part of Pakistan] are absolutly out of any institutional control of any state or any army, being in hands of taliban groups, terrorists, drugs traders and former Pakistani secret services.
- In such condition, NATO troops, having different status [with or without permission to take part in military actions] is not able to fulfill the tasks.
- The first out of area test NATO may loose.



More questions about NATO

How important is NATO for United States: its national security, foreign and security policy?

Is NATO able to face new threats for security?

Is NATO the clamp fastened two coasts of Atlantic? Or may be for transatlantic relations more important are becoming the contacts on US – EU line?

Why in the last 10 years NATO,s Strategy did not change although the US National Defense Strategy as well as strategies of all Alliance members changed a couple of times?



NATO and threats for security

- What are the most important threats for euroatlantic security?
- Are they the same for all NATO members or only the perception of threats is different?
- In my opinion the graduation of threats for security in all NATO countries, US including, presented in official documents, is not real, if not artificial.
- It is the result of political correctness, different fears and both political and economical interests.



The biggest threats and challenges

- The biggest threats for international security are connected with the situation in Middle East.
- I mean not only Israeli – Palestinian [or Arab – Jewish] conflict, but the whole situation: Iran politics and ambitions, Afganistan and Pakistan neighbourhood [especialy North-Eastern border uncontrolled territory, dominated by a mixture of terrorist, drugs –mafian and Pakistani secret service groups. Plus Indian – Pakistani hostility and conflict. Everything in regional environment where every country has ambitious to have nuclear weapons.



- The second threat is terrorism but not this type of terrorism which We knew till now. This type of terrorism is extremely dangerous, but is not able to destroy any basis of biological, political, material and terrytorial substance of the West.
- But the groups of terrorists being in possesion of nuclear weapons, are able to do that, making the situation tatally uncontrolled.



- The third threat is proliferation WMD. This is not only the problem of Iran, North Korea, Pakistan. That is [not yet ongoing] process which will be very difficult to stop and to control.
- The forth one is still rising possibility of cyber-attack on crucial elements of Western infrastructure, including security instalations [vide: Estonian case]



- The new threat, still unknown, may be the impact of current economic crisis on security. It may not only weaken the NATO security structures but creates new threats, like temptations to keep the power through the provocation of new external conflict.
- We all welcome the resume of NATO-Russia Council but I am afraid Russia is the country which may still create serious problems to Alliance.



- NATO-Russia partnership is uneasy task.
The point is that it is not possible to build up European security system without Russia, but it is not possible to have Russia in this system.
It is necessary to dialogue with Russia, to create new ties, but Russia will never be coherent with NATO. In nearest occasion, it may be Ukraine NATO membership, new conflict will take place.



Symptoms of current NATO crisis

- The lack of wider vision of Alliance, strategic concept including.
- Unclear interpretation of art.5 of WT.
- The lack of trust –especially in USA, the leader of NATO – in effectiveness of decision making process, internal coherentness and strategic-operational capacity of NATO. Still unknown is the real Obama’s opinion about Alliance.



- Discrepancy within Alliance relating „open doors” policy. The questions whether further enlargement has really sens?
- Ongoing process of dissolution: still less number of NATO members are eager to engage in Alliance military missions, as in Afganistan. Hutton: *In NATO We have spongers.*
- The other question: could be NATO eager to intervene in Baltic countries in the case of violation of their terrytorial integrality [as in Georgian case]? The British proposal of NATO’s Solidarity Forces looks like trying to face the challenge.



Jaap deHoop Scheffer & Rasmussen proposals

- NATO has to define clearly security threats.
- NATO has to make clear interpretation of art. 5 of WT. , especially in the case of military attack on alliance member's territory. The question relates the cases of terrorism, cyber-attack, cut of energy supply.
- It has to be comprehensive approach to security, encompassing military, political, diplomatic and economic measures.



- NATO has to continue the process of transformation of its forces into light, mobile troops.
- Still very important is defense and consolidation of Europe. Therefore indispensable is to continue the NATO enlargement process.
- NATO has to rething its relations with Russia, especially after Georgian crisis. The dialogue has to be maintain at least on the level of former West – Soviet Union relations.



NATO's new strategic concept.

- NATO-alliance for new time and challenges, still regional not global,
- Old threats - New threats: terrorism, cyber-attacks, climate changes.
- Art.. 5 WT still matter. Territorial defence.
- Open door policy actual.
- Invitation to Russia for cooperation in antimissile shield.
- Cooperative security: UN, OSCE, Russia, China, and others.



Conclusions

- Does NATO still matter? The simple answer is possible but it is not enough and not satisfactory. NATO still matters but even making further transformation, restructuring of forces and military commands, increasing the defence capacity - structural weakness which appeared after the collapse of communism, will be not able to overcome.



- The main reason is the lack – in NATO Nations public opinion – the existencial threats for their terrytorial sovereingnty and independence, as it was before the Second World War and during cold war.
- Current threats and new threats [including terrorism] are not ricognized as threats to their national survival. Out of area engagement are not treated as indispesible.



- We have also to take into consideration the new strategic culture arose in Europe, which We can call „passive pacifism”. Totally different is American strategic culture which may be called culture of „power policy”.
- Also because of that only US is able to pave the way of NATO evolution, however the question how important is the Alliance for US appears.
- Western Europe is not able to give substantial contributions because of historical burdens, actual military capacity and disparately energetical and bussines dependence [especially Germany and France] from Russia. EU is able however to use its capacity as civil power, especially diplomacy.



Poland and NATO evolution. For Poland the most important are:

- **keeping classic defense alliance functions,**
- **strengthen alliance capacity to face new threats,**
- **further NATO enlargement [Ukraine],**
- **provide effective cooperation with EU,**
- **further transformation of NATO defense capacity, towards mobility,**
- **Poland put forward 22 modernization proposals,**
- **Poland is not in favor of such a concepts like “box for tools” and “mission defines the coalition”.**



For Poland NATO still matters, but not whole process of evolution is acceptable. Poland is concerned because of the rising distrust in NATO military capacity by the United States. In Poland's opinion, NATO needs a new strategy. Also, the mechanism of Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty has to be more effective. What might be the NATO reaction in the case of an attack on any of the new alliance members' territory?