

ACADEMY OF ROMANIAN SCIENTISTS



Albert PATTERSON

Romeo OIȚĂ

Constantin ONIȘOR

Together ...
for
SECURITY

BUCHAREST

2010

Editura Academiei Oamenilor de Știință din România
Academy of Romanian Scientists Publishing House

Address: Splaiul Independenței, no. 54, sector 5, cod 050094
Bucharest, Romania

Descrierea CIP a Bibliotecii Naționale a României

PATTERSON, Albert

Together... for security / Albert Patterson, Constantin Onișor, Oiță Romeo.

București: Editura Academiei Oamenilor de Știință din România, 2010

Bibliogr.

Index

ISBN 978-606-92500-8-2

I. **ONIȘOR, Constantin**

II. **OIȚĂ, Romeo**

327.51 NATO

Chief of Departement: eng. Liviu-Mihai SIMA, Ph.D. (ABD)

Tehnoredactor: George LITEANU

Cover: George LITEANU

Redactor: prof. Andrei D. PETRESCU, Ph.D. (ABD)

Documentalist: eng. Ioan BALINT

Copyright © Editura Academiei Oamenilor de Știință din România, București, 2010

Contents

<i>INTRODUCTION</i>	7
Chapter 1. THE NORTH-ATLANTIC ALLIANCE. DECALOGUE OF REMARKABLE EVOLUTION AND REALITY	12
1.1 <i>ADAPTATION TO CHANGE</i>	12
1.2 <i>EVOLUTION AND COLD WAR</i>	12
1.3 <i>THE BEGINNING OF THE 21ST CENTURY</i>	14
1.3.1 The New Strategic Concept.....	14
1.3.2 The fight against international terrorism.....	16
1.3.3 The cease of conflicts in Western Balkans	17
1.3.4 The Maritime surveillance in Mediterranean Sea.....	19
1.4 <i>THE PRESENCE WITHIN THE EX-EUROPEAN SPACE</i>	19
1.4.1 Long term cooperation in Iraq	19
1.4.2 The support granted to the African Union	20
1.5 <i>STRATEGIC PREOCCUPATION OF EUROPEAN SECURITY</i>	20
1.6 <i>INTERNATIONAL COLLABORATION</i>	21
1.6.1 Partnership for Peace.....	21
1.6.2 Partnership relations with Russia and Ukraine	22
1.6.3 Mediterranean Dialogue	22
1.6.4 Cooperation in Middle East.....	23
1.6.5 Contact countries and international cooperation.....	23
1.7 <i>NATO ENLARGEMENT</i>	24
1.7.1 The policy of open doors in continuous development	24
1.7.2 Rigor and seriousness for the member states	25
1.8 <i>PERMANENT OPERATIONALIZATION</i>	26
1.8.1 For new threats, new capacities	26
1.8.2 Vulnerabilities and new acting capacities	26
1.8.3 Multinational rapid response force	26
1.9 <i>MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE</i>	27
1.9.1 Streamlined management	27
1.9.2 The managerial force and decisional consensus.....	27
1.9.3 Managerial participation.....	28
1.10 <i>PERMANENT ADAPTABILITY</i>	29

CHAPTER 2. NATO – ALWAYS IN PROSPECTIVE	30
2.1 <i>EURO ATLANTIC STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP</i>	30
2.2 <i>STRATEGIC FUNDAMENTS OF A NEW EURO-ATLANTIC PARTNERSHIP</i>	31
2.3 <i>A NEW ENERGY FOR NATO?</i>	33
2.4 <i>NEW HORIZONS AND CHANGING RELATIONSHIPS.....</i>	38
2.4.1 Analysis of the international context	38
2.4.2 Transatlantic partnership adjusted for the 21 st century	42
2.4.3 Strategic directions of action	45
2.5 <i>NEW ACTION MECHANISMS</i>	48
2.6 <i>THE MIDDLE EAST – THEATRE OF NATO PERFORMANCE</i>	50
2.6.1 Security in the Afghan – Pakistan space, as strategic priority.....	50
2.6.2 Collective interest for friendship relations with Russia	54
2.7 <i>A NEW NATO?.....</i>	56
2.7.1 NATO and international security.....	56
2.7.2 NATO in the 21 st century – characteristics of missions.....	58
2.7.3 The details of the new strategic concept.....	62
2.8 <i>STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIPS AND FRUITFUL COOPERATIONS</i>	69
2.8.1 NATO-UE strategic partnership.....	69
2.8.2 NATO-UN Cooperation.....	74
2.8.3 Partnership for peace.....	75
2.8.4 Co-operation dialogues and initiatives	76
2.8.5 Global Partnership	76
2.8.6 The operationalization of comprehensive approach	77
2.9 <i>REFORMS WITHIN THE MANAGEMENT AND FORCES RANGE</i>	78
Chapter 3. INTERNAL CHANGES FOR A MORE OPERATIONAL NATO	90
3.1 <i>ENHANCED FUNCTIONALITY.....</i>	90
3.2 <i>THE STRATEGIC UNITY OF THE ALLIANCE</i>	91
3.3 <i>STRATEGIC COMPETITION</i>	92
3.4 <i>CHARACTERISTICS AND PHYSIOGNOMY OF MILITARY ACTIONS</i>	94
3.5 <i>INFLUENCE INTO A GLOBALIZED WORLD</i>	96
3.6 <i>NATO FUTURE – SECURITY AND MILITARY IMPLICATIONS.....</i>	97
Chapter 4. NATO – MILITARY IMPLICATIONS AND ORIENTATIONS	108
4.1 <i>THE SUPPORT GRANTED FOR THE EFFORTS AGAINST PROLIFERATION</i>	108
4.2 <i>THE EXECUTION OF DISCOURAGEMENT OPERATION.....</i>	109
4.3 <i>INSURANCE OF THE MILITARY LOGISTIC SUPPORT FOR HUMANITARIAN ACTIVITIES....</i>	110
4.4 <i>OPERATION AND INTERVENTION FOR PREVENTING CONFLICT ESCALATION</i>	111
4.5 <i>TRAINING THE INTERNAL FORCES.....</i>	112
4.6 <i>THE PREVENTION OF VITAL RESOURCES FLOW BREAKDOWN</i>	112
4.7 <i>PROTECTION OF C4I SYSTEMS AND NETWORKS.....</i>	113
4.8 <i>PROTECTION OF CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE</i>	114
4.9 <i>COLLECTIVE INFORMATION OF SPREAD DEFENSE</i>	115

4.10 MINIMIZATION OF THE NEGATIVE IMPACT OF THE DISRUPTIVE TECHNOLOGIES	115
4.11 PROTECTION INTO THE ELECTROMAGNETIC SPECTRUM	116
4.12 GRATING HELP FOR CIVILIAN AUTHORITIES	117
4.13 EXPEDITIONARY OPERATIONS IN HUMAN ASSISTANCE SUPPORT	118
4.14 SUPPORT AND COOPERATION WITH MULTIPLE ACTIONS IN MULTINATIONAL OPERATIONS OF NATURAL DISASTERS RESPONSE.....	119
4.15 CLARIFICATION OF THE RULES OF INVOLVEMENT IN THE ALLIANCE'S OPERATIONS	119
4.16 PROTECTION AGAINST ASYMMETRICAL THREATS.....	120
4.17 EXPEDITIONARY OPERATIONS FOR PROTECTING THE COMMUNICATION LINES	121
4.18 OPERATIONS COORDINATION WITHIN A COHERENT AND MORE AMPLE FRAME	121
4.19 PARTNERSHIPS WITH PRIVATE SECURITY COMPANIES.....	122
4.20 ADEQUATE USE OF NON-LETHAL FORCE	123
4.21 IDENTIFICATION OF THE NEW THREATS OUTSIDE THE ALLIANCE	124
4.22 ADJUSTMENT OF THE MILITARY RECRUITMENT PROCESSES.....	124
4.23 INTENSE CIVIL – MILITARY CO-OPERATION	125
4.24 SUSTAINED MODELING OF THE SECURITY ENVIRONMENT	126
4.25 COHERENT INFORMATIONAL OPERATIONS.....	126
4.26 MILITARY OPERATIONS AGAINST NON-STATE ACTORS	127
Chapter 5. NATO – A DYNAMIC AND DIVERSIFIED FUTURE	129
5.1 STRATEGIC FORECAST	129
5.2 CONCEPTS FOR EVERYONE'S (NOT) UNDERSTANDING	131
5.3 DECISION MODELING.....	133
5.4 POLITICS – STRATEGY CORRELATION	134
CONCLUSION	137
SELECTIVE BIBLIOGRAPHY	138
ATTACHMENTS.....	142

INTRODUCTION

We live in a World filled with contradictions and uncertainty where the Allies, the Americans and the North Europeans have discordant relations, although the times ask for power and unity. The international relations need to gain some new orientations and connections. In this context, the North-Atlantic Partnership has to inspire a new reality and in addition, by brave decisions, it needs to be restored in order to support and solve a wider range of serious internal and external challenges.

In order for the 60th anniversary of the Franco-German Summit to unfold at a higher level of transparency and perspective regarding the existence and the future of NATO, many scientific activities within the Euro-Atlantic space were previously organized. In the fall of 2008, four very successful working sessions were sustained in the United States, in prestigious institutions, like the Atlantic Council of the United States, the Center for Strategic and International Studies, the Political Center for National Technology and Safety, the University of National Defense and the Center for Transatlantic Relations.

At the School of Advanced International Studies of the Johns Hopkins University, a project regarding NATO's New Strategic Concept was launched, in order to be subjected to academic debates and more. Considering the importance and perspective of the problems and aspects of the New Strategic Concept, these debates continued and will continue, under an adequate form and to different levels, including national.

The Project of NATO's New Strategic Concept continuously and intensely generates ideas and ways of thinking adequate to the new international realities regarding the role of the North Atlantic Community within a global environment of security that is changing. Following almost 15 months of debate, many points of view concerning NATO's future were treasured up, based on pertinent opinions expressed by governmental personalities, military leaders, legislators, organizers, scientists and other experts from both sides of the Atlantic.

The most brilliant scientific manifestations were the major conferences, where the specific issues were examined with a high level of professionalism, in collaboration or being sustained by the embassies of several important countries, like NATO's member countries:

- The Royal Embassy of Netherlands and the Center of International Strategic Studies for Transatlantic Relations - having as topic the strategic environment and the implications over the Alliance's missions;

- The Embassy of France of the Group of Consultants for Strategic Issues of the Atlantic Council, where the debates have been focused on the Euro-Atlantic Institutions and the ones of international security and also on the transformation processes;

- At the National University of Defense, together with the Embassy of Denmark, the focuses of the debates were the action capacities;

- The Embassy of The Federal Republic of Germany and the Center of International Strategic Studies, this final conference being assisted by the Division of Public Diplomacy of NATO and the European Aeronautic Defense and Space Company - on this occasion an attempt was made to organize all the opinions and orientations presented up until that point into a complete documentary form.

All the conclusions, quite numerous, alternative and filled with prospective content, gave the specific coloratura of the New Strategic Concept. Therefore, it continues to generate debates for perfecting its international vision.

By the care of some organizers and participants to these clarifying and prospective activities, we managed, with considerable effort, to gather sufficient information to shape in the form of a documentary paper the most interesting new concepts and innovative laborious ideas, which, formalized in the process, managed to contour the content of NATO's New Strategic Concept.

We are all saying that the North-Atlantic Partnership must be reevaluated in order to strengthen, expand and render it efficient. Now, but for a short while, in our opinion, it is opportune to accomplish these goals, which become a top priority for the administrations of NATO's member states. Together, the United States and its allies have to be mutuality involved in collective defense, within a larger spectrum of collective security.

The world and its times impose the enlargement of the partnership between the Europeans and the North Americans and also for them to maintain a better connection with their institutions. It is to be discussed, for promoting a new vision over the Euro-Atlantic Partnership and to have it supported by decisive actions that shall stand as fundament for the New Concept, especially in regard of NATO's reform, the reshape of USA-EU relations and the Alliance's level of involvement in other key areas of the Transatlantic efforts.

Our documentary and internationally reflective work has two objectives:

- to present the new ideas concerning NATO's New Strategic Concept and therefore support the participation in laying out the ways to change for the Transatlantic Partnership;
- to further specify other appropriate opinions and recommendations for NATO's future and even in regard to the new partnership relations between USA and EU in the 21st century;

In our vision, now, in the first decade of the new century and 60 years since its incorporation, NATO's mission, with its four strategic objectives, had to remain the same:

- to ensure the collective defense for its members;
- to develop the Euro-Atlantic relation in an institutionalized and responsible manner;
- to offer a preeminent forum for Allies' debates regarding security and strategy;
- to offer an insurance buckler, so that the European Countries would have the possibility to focus their preoccupations toward the security against common challenges, rather than one against the other. Generally, but mainly in the last decades, the Alliance met its target and fulfilled its objectives, adjusting, sometimes harder, to the changing strategic circumstances. It is impossible not to cite at least the most important objectives fulfilled by NATO during the four decades since the Cold War, and specially afterward:
- the occidental protection of the European Continent against the threats from the East;
- the transformation of relationships between NATO members, overpassing the general divisions and divergences of the Continent;
- an initial military strategy of NATO for complementing / supporting the apparition of political development;
- the preoccupation, along with the EU, for a complete, free and stable continental area;
- the peaceful intervention in the Balkans, after hesitations, wrong steps and major human tragedies;
- bringing the central-European and south-eastern European countries within the Euro-Atlantic Community;

- the enlargement of the strategic vision toward the ones from South-Eastern Europe, in order to prepare them to build democracy, market economies and to develop peaceful relations with their neighbors;
- the further action according to their vision to include other democracies, from the Baltic Sea to the Black Sea;

After the terrorist attacks of 09/11/2001, for the first time, NATO invoked the Collective Security Treaty, Article 5 of the North-Atlantic Treaty, declaring that the attacks against United States represented attacks against all the nations of the Alliance. Since then, NATO was involved in Afghanistan and developed supplementary partnerships in order to face the terrorism threats and the evolution of challenges toward the Alliance's security.

In the last decades, new challenges have appeared, against which NATO states have searched for a new consent regarding the implication in the strategic environment and the collective method of approach, elaborating a guidance document, called The Strategic Concept of the Alliance. What surprises now is that the actual NATO Strategic Concept was adopted in 1999, before:

- the attacks of 09/11, the attacks with anthrax in the United States and the major terrorist attacks from Europe;
- the Transatlantic dissonance regarding the invasion of Iraq;
- the involvement of the Alliance in Afghanistan;
- the enlargement waves of NATO and EU;
- the cybernetic attacks on Estonia;
- the re-emergence of an imposing Russia and many other global trends.

It is obvious that there are too many changes now, when NATO meets its seventh decade of existence, for it to reach a consent on a new long term strategy, which should be a priority, not less important than the operational success in Afghanistan. We believe that the following strategic concept should mean more than offering guidance and vision for the NATO institution.

The New Strategic Concept, for a long time from now, should impose for the Alliance to assume a bigger role and to lay out its future regarding security, prosperity and freedom, not only for its people and states, but also for the whole world, based on a guidance document formulated under the form of a larger Euro-Atlantic Treaty.

This new approach regarding NATO's issues and the more complex aspects of modern security should start along with NATO's Summit of 2010 and to continue for a long time. The leaders of the Alliance should state their

involvement regarding the defense within the context of the 21st century challenges, and to launch the effort to elaborate the Atlantic Treaty, which should be more than a handout and to constitute a strategic practice.

Its acceptance and use as Atlantic Treaty should reflect and be based upon a firm and real political unity between Americans, Canadians and their European allies, regarding the structure and the operational form of their partnership, during the following years. Being subjected to general knowledge and debates, it should have a clear content regarding the role of NATO within the designated space and out of borders.

It should be more than a strategic concept for an international institution, it should renew, for a newly begun century, the historical agreement concluded by those from the North-Atlantic Alliance. A treaty of such importance and range can offer political guidance and future directives for the Transatlantic Partnership, on the basis of which there could be created the frame for a more ambitious, concrete and detailed concept, as guidance for the Military Authority of the Alliance, in regard to the force and capacity that should be met in order to sustain the forecasted approach.

Chapter 1. THE NORTH-ATLANTIC ALLIANCE. DECALOGUE OF REMARKABLE EVOLUTION AND REALITY

1.1 ADAPTATION TO CHANGE

During more than six decades since its incorporation, the Alliance and the whole World have evolved in a manner that the founders of NATO and the analysts of international relationships and security paradigms could not imagine. As the whole strategic environment evolved, the pace of NATO's transformation became slower, a larger spectrum of risks and threats against the collective security being approached. Newer threats, like the proliferation of terrorism and weapons of mass destruction, know no boundaries and NATO has to face them, therefore deploying and still sustaining forces far away, like in Afghanistan. But this is not all. In parallel, it develops the necessary means and capacities to be able to respond to these new demands and, at the same time, it contributes to the international efforts to approach these numerous challenges.

While the nature of the threats faced by the member states and the manner of NATO's approach are changing, it is beneficial that the main lines of cooperation within the Alliance still comply with the principles of the Washington Treaty. The principle of collective defense still represents the cornerstone of the incorporation treaty and remains the sole principle that binds the undertaking members to protect each other. NATO offers a political and military frame for approaching the challenges against security. This frame reunifies the European and North-American interests and mainly aims to build a security based on understanding and cooperation, for the benefit of future generations.

1.2 EVOLUTION AND COLD WAR

In the year 1949, when the ideological differences between the East and the West were more and more obvious, 12 countries from both sides of the Atlantic formed the North-Atlantic Treaty Organization, having as main objective the creation of a mutual assistance pact in order to combat the risk represented by the increase of control exercised by the Soviet Union in Oriental Europe, over other parts of the Continent. In that period, Europe was still recovering from the destructions caused by the Second World War. Based on the commitment to

respect the principle of collective defense, NATO completed the role of the Marshall Plan, offering the frame for maintaining a stable environment, needed for the development of democracy and the economic progress. At that time, it was rightfully appreciated that the Marshall Plan and NATO were two halves of a whole.

At the beginning of the 1950s, the outbreak of the Korean War confirmed the Occident's fears regarding the expansion ambitions of the Soviet Union and therefore, NATO's member states intensified their efforts in developing the military and civil structures needed for the implementation of their agreement of collective defense. In time, more and more states became part of the Alliance. Through the Alliance, West Europe and North America reached a level of stability without precedent, creating the fundamentals of economic cooperation and European integration. At the beginning of the 1990s, after the Cold War had ended, the Alliance actively contributed to the dissolution of the old gap between the East and the West of Europe, by approaching the old enemies and by applying a cooperation strategy in the field of regional and spatial security. During the Cold War, the role and objective of NATO were clearly defined by the existence of the threat represented by the Soviet Union. At the beginning of the 1990s, the Warsaw Treaty was dissolved and the Soviet Union was collapsing. Along with the deliquescence of its traditional adversaries, some commentators considered that NATO was not needed anymore, and that the future expenses for defense and the investments for military forces could be reduced dramatically.

Many allies of NATO started to reduce the expenses for defense, which was an error. The end of the Cold War moved off the threat of a military invasion, but the instability in some parts of Europe was rising. A series of regional conflicts, often determined by ethnical tensions, emerged in the former Yugoslavia and in the former Soviet Union and were threatening to expand. New forms of political and military cooperation were needed in order to maintain peace and stability in Europe and for preventing the escalation of regional conflicts.

Indeed, NATO engaged in institutionalized relations with its former adversaries, creating new mechanisms of cooperation. Also, it was subjected to some major internal reforms for adapting the military structures and capacities in order (to facilitate/to equip?) the members for the purpose of new duties, such as crisis management, peacekeeping and operations to support peace, besides assuring their continuous ability to fulfill their fundamental function of defense. As an answer to these challenges against security, NATO did not remain only an

Alliance, with responsibilities in the field of collective defense, but also became the nucleus of a partnership between some culturally different countries, which cooperate closely in the field of security.

1.3 THE BEGINNING OF THE 21ST CENTURY

1.3.1 The New Strategic Concept

The Strategic Concept embraced at the Washington Summit in 1999 presented the future threats as being “multi-directional and often hardly to be forecasted” and paid special attention to the threats represented by the proliferation of mass destruction weapons, carrier vectors and their delivery means. Also, it was emphasized that the security interest of the Alliance could be influenced by other risks, of a larger spectrum, like the acts of terrorism, the acts of sabotage, the organized crime and also the interruption of the vital resources flow.

The following events proved how cautious the Allies had been. On 09/11 2001, the terrorists carried out with shocking brutality the attacks against objectives from the USA, the means used for their execution proving the vulnerability of the democratic and transparent societies in front of a new form of asymmetric threat. As a result, the Allies invoked Article 5 of the Washington Treaty, the provision regarding the collective defense of NATO, this way affirming that a new attack against one or more other states represents an attack against all of them.

Therefore, the Alliance adopted measures for the support of the United States. The Allies acted fast, and in the month of October, they sent ships in the east of the Mediterranean Sea, that anchored and started operations in search for the ships that were thought to develop terrorist activities. This deployment of forces still continues today, being called Operation Active Endeavour, which now includes the whole Mediterranean Sea. Among the measures adopted is the deployment of Allied individual forces in Afghanistan in order to support the actions of the United States against Al-Qaeda – the terrorist group responsible for the 09/11 attacks – and against the Taliban – the regime that sustains it.

Since August 2003, the Alliance is leading the mission for maintaining the peace, called The Supporting Force in the field of International Security. The gained experience emphasizes the fact that the threats against the Transatlantic

Community during the 21st century shall become more and more asymmetric and more likely they shall be sponsored by the sub-state groups and not by the national armies. In order to combat them, the military forces of the Allies have to be easier to deploy, to be more flexible and more efficient.

Secondly, these new threats can appear from outside the Euro-Atlantic area. For this reason, NATO has to become an Alliance with global partners that acknowledge the fact that the risks have to be confronted wherever they might appear.

Thirdly and lastly, the Transatlantic Alliance has to contribute to the elaboration of an all-inclusive political, economic and military solution, based on the collaboration with non-governmental and international organizations, like the United Nations, the European Union and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe.

Only this kind of strategy can reach the economic, political and ideological origins of the conflict, regardless of the place where it may occur and of the circumstances.

Considering these realities, NATO leadership had initiated periodical analysis concerning the members' activities and procedures, which led to a series of initiatives approved within successive summits of NATO.

From these strategic initiatives, we are mentioning:

- the creation of NATO Reaction Force – a technologically advanced force, flexible, extended, inter-operational and sustainable, including the ground, maritime and air forces;
- the incorporation of a structure of military control;
- the expansion of operations in Afghanistan in order to cover the whole country;
- the engagement in institutionalized relations with the countries from the Middle East through The Initiative of Cooperation from Istanbul;
- the improvement of the capacities in the key zones for modern military operations, such as terrestrial and aerial surveillance
- the enactment of a Complete Political Guide, which offers the fundament for the strategic priorities of the Alliance for the next following 10-15 years;
- the support for the Government of Iraq, by training its security forces;
- the enlargement of the Euro-Atlantic integration by inviting some new members to be part of the Alliance, and to participate in the partnership programs, so that more and more countries would have the benefit of a strengthened security.

1.3.2 The fight against international terrorism

During the immediate period following the 09/11 attacks, United States launched Operation Enduring Freedom, an operation against the terrorism in Afghanistan, to counteract the Taliban repressive regime, as a result of the unrest regarding the capacity of the Afghan security force to stabilize the country. In steps of international legitimacy and multilateral agreement, the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) was created, to be headquartered in Kabul and around it. ISAF and the Afghan Transitional Authority – the predecessor of the National Afghan Government – negotiated an Agreement of Military Technique in January 2002, within which the responsibilities of ISAF were settled.

Initially, ISAF had not been a NATO or a UN force, but a voluntary coalition under the authority of the Security Council. The voluntary countries were leading ISAF by rotation, for periods of 6 months (in the beginning, Great Britain, Turkey, Germany and Netherlands). However, while these missions were progressing, they were also slowed by the lack of continuity until, in the end, in August 2003, the Alliance assumed the strategic leadership, the control and coordination of the mission, allowing the settlement of a permanent headquarters of ISAF in Kabul.

Initially, the ISAF mandate was limited to Kabul and the surrounding areas, but step by step it expanded its competence, covering the whole Afghanistan. At first, it expanded toward the North, to the West, then to the South and in the end, toward the East of the country – the most dangerous and volatile region of Afghanistan. The essential role of ISAF is to help the Afghan Government to expand its authority all over the county and to create a safe environment.

In order to accomplish this, it assists the development of the Afghan security forces, with actions of army and police training; it identifies the need for reconstruction for certain civil buildings; it supports the government in its action of disarming the groups armed illegally and it is involved in actions against drug traffic, supporting the activities of humanitarian assistance. Also, it tries to improve the interaction between the civilian and military entities and to elaborate a more systematical strategy for field cooperation.

To emphasize this, some of the Provincial Reconstruction Teams – small groups composed of civilians and militaries, coordinated by ISAF – attend the civil projects developed all over the country, such as the construction of schools and orphanages, street rehabilitation, disarming actions, mine clearing and other similar actions.

ISAF develops close coordination actions with the National Afghan Government. One of the most alluring of these actions is the elaboration of a Frame Project for maintaining the cooperation relationships through partnerships focused on promoting the reforms within the defense field, the construction of institutions within the defense field and the interoperability between the National Afghan Army and NATO members. In addition, a Senior Civil Representative of NATO sustains the political and military objectives of the Alliance, working directly with the Afghan Government and with other international organizations, maintaining contact with the neighboring countries.

1.3.3 The cease of conflicts in Western Balkans

After the dissolution of former Yugoslavia, NATO intervened with military forces in order to cease the conflict in Bosnia and Herzegovina - in the year 1995, in Kosovo in 1999, and in the former Republic of Macedonia in 2001. In Bosnia and Herzegovina, NATO Allies developed aerial operations against the Bosnian forces in Serbia, in August and September 1995. This action helped leaning the power balance between the ground forces and convinced the Bosnian leadership to accept the Peace Treaty, agreement negotiated in Dayton, Ohio.

The NATO peacekeeping forces arrived in Bosnia and Herzegovina in December 1995 through the Implementation Force. The IFOR troops were followed by the Stabilization Force (SFOR), a mission that, 10 years later, in December 2005, was successfully terminated. The mandate of peacekeeping was after that undertaken by the European Union. NATO's military intervention in Kosovo came after a year during which the violent actions escalated and Belgrade repeatedly violated the resolutions of the Security Council of UN, leading to the annihilation of the Albanian repression in Kosovo. In March 1999, the Alliance decided to launch an air campaign against the military and paramilitary structures of the Yugoslav Government, which was responsible for the repression actions. This decision was reached after all the other options were eliminated, and the discussions for concluding a Peace Treaty failed, being unable to overpass the intransigence of Belgrade.

The air campaign lasted for 78 days and had the following consequences: the cease of all the military actions of the parties involved in the conflict; the retreat from Kosovo of the Yugoslav army, the police and the Serbian paramilitary forces; an agreement regarding settling down an international military presence in Kosovo; an agreement regarding the unconditioned and safe

return of the refugees and of the persons alienated and the insurance that all the parties implied wished to collaborate for a political agreement in Kosovo. The mandate of the Kosovo Force (KFOR) led by NATO lies in the Military Technical Agreement signed by NATO and the Yugoslav commanders and from the Resolution of the UN Security Council no. 1244, both from June 1999.

The accomplishment of KFOR consisted in blocking new hostilities, settling a safe environment and demilitarizing the Kosovo Liberation Army. More than that, KFOR supports the international humanitarian actions and cooperates with the international civil entity of the UN, Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK), in order to create a secure environment for the future development of Kosovo.

Following the Declaration of Independence of February 17 2008, NATO reaffirmed that KFOR was to hold its position in Kosovo, according to the Resolution of the Security Council of UN no. 1244, until the Security Council of UN should decide otherwise. NATO reiterated this position at the summit of Bucharest, in April 2008. NATO also stated that KFOR shall cooperate and assist the United Nations, the European Union and other international actors, when necessary, in order to support the development of a secure, democratic, multi-ethnic and peaceful Kosovo. Now, NATO has around 15.000 troops in Kosovo.

In August 2001, the president of Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia asked for NATO's support in order to disarm the ethnical Albanian groups that could have destabilized the country. NATO agreed, but only if the government was to reinstitute specific rights of the minorities. The representatives of the Albanian ethnical community of the country and the government reached a public agreement, which was mediated by special delegates of different international organizations, NATO included, and from the United States. This agreement allowed NATO to deploy around 3.500 soldiers on a voluntary mission of 30 days for disarming the groups of Albanian nationality.

At the request of Skopje leadership, NATO troops remained in the country, offering protection for the observers of the European Union and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe until the end of March 2003, when the European Union took over the mission. These initiatives helped cease the conflicts and paved the way for reconciliation and for the country to reconstruct. Now, KFOR represents the only vast deployment of Allied forces in the Balkans, although NATO maintains its headquarters in Sarajevo and Skopje in order to assist the governments of the host-country in the reforms in the field of defense.

1.3.4 The Maritime surveillance in Mediterranean Sea

Launched after the tragic events of 09/11, Operation Active Endeavour is an operation of maritime survey led by NATO's naval forces, in order to detect, annihilate and protect against terrorist activities in the Mediterranean region. NATO ships anchored in the Eastern Mediterranean region and began patrolling the area on October 6 2001, 20 days after the operation was officially initiated.

In order to succeed, the operation was also extended in Gibraltar Bay, at the beginning of 2003, and then in the entire Mediterranean region, a year later, in march 2004. The operation is limited to activities that are related to terrorism, but it also has benefic effects on the security of the economic and trade activity in the entire Mediterranean region.

This region is an agglomerated commercial route that, *inter alia*, is used for the transportation of almost 65% of the oil and gases consumed in Western Europe.

More than that, NATO intervened in order to save the survivors of some incidents like oil platforms that were hit, shipwrecks and destroyed ships. In 2004, Operation Active Endeavour supported the Greek Government, assuring the security of the Olympic and Paralympic Games.

1.4 THE PRESENCE WITHIN THE EX-EUROPEAN SPACE

1.4.1 Long term cooperation in Iraq

NATO has a vital strategic role in stabilizing Iraq and has supported the Iraqi government since 2004, through NATO Training Mission - Iraq (NTM-I). NATO and Iraq agreed to continue long-term cooperative relations and made this official by approving the proposals for a Structural Frame of Cooperation.

NATO helps Iraq ensure its own security by training Iraqi militaries from both inside and outside of Iraq, by supporting the development of the country's security institutions, the delivery coordination of the equipment's donated by the NATO member states, and generally, by offering support in order to reform the field of defense in Iraq. The cooperation with Iraq was developed pursuant to the Resolution of the Security Council of UN no. 1546, through which the support of the international and regional organizations was requested, in order to satisfy the needs of the Iraqi population regarding security and stability and of the Iraqi Government, upon the ulterior requests.

1.4.2 The support granted to the African Union

The habitants of Darfur Province of Sudan had been the victims of a brutal civilian war, since the year 2003. The conflict caused a humanitarian crisis that led to the killing of thousands of people and the alienation of other millions. At the request of the African Union (AU), NATO started to grant assistance for the AU mission in Sudan, from July 2005 and until the termination of mission, on December 31 2007.

When this mission started to have a hybrid UN-AU character, in January 2008, NATO expressed its opening toward other ulterior requests for support. In June 2007, NATO agreed, on principle, with a request arrived from AU to provide strategic support for the deployment of its troops, for a mission in Somalia (AMISOM).

The country had not had efficient leadership since 1991 and was suffering due to the fights between the rival groups and because of hunger and disease. NATO offered its support in constructing buildings for AU's facilities of long-term peacekeeping, and especially for the African Stabilization Force, also upon AU's request.

In order to assure maximum efficiency and synergy, the support granted by NATO is complying and coordinated with other international organizations – mainly United Nations and European Union – as bilateral partners.

1.5 STRATEGIC PREOCCUPATION OF EUROPEAN SECURITY

NATO's sphere of strategic preoccupations is focused inevitably on high-level diplomacy, the summits of the Alliance and the military campaigns. However, most of the Allied activities take place far from mass-media coverage. NATO is regularly involved in a series of projects for the improvement of European security. These projects include the support for military reforms in Eastern Europe, the elaboration of civilian life re-specialization programs for the former military officers and assistance in mine clearing and disposing of old deposits of munitions.

In addition, NATO is actively involved in the coordination of humanitarian actions. In 1999, the Euro-Atlantic Disaster Response Coordination Center (EADRCC) was opened, through which they coordinated emergency and humanitarian assistance from NATO and the partner countries, in case of natural

or human disasters. For example, NATO offered help for the flood victims, after Hurricane Katrina hit the United States in September 2005. A month later, a devastating earthquake in Pakistan left behind 73.000 dead and other 4 million homeless.

The North-Atlantic Council approved the expansion of the aid given through EADRCC. On numerous occasions, EADRCC mobilized resources in order to help the Euro-Atlantic countries affected by the floods, forest fires or earthquakes. NATO has a scientific program that finances the practical cooperation in security matters regarding the fields of civilian science, environment and technology. NATO's Science for Peace and Security (SPS) mainly aims to elaborate tangible recommendations and solutions for different problems, trying to answer the participants' specific needs.

The scientists from NATO member states, the Partners and the Mediterranean Dialogue attend these activities, which are effectively contributing to the general security through facilitating collaboration, creating networks and constructing capacities.

1.6 INTERNATIONAL COLLABORATION

1.6.1 Partnership for Peace

Since the end of the Cold War, NATO has had a series of initiatives for consolidating the dialogue, for building trust and cooperation. It has created relations with its former adversaries, as well as the European states, the neighboring Mediterranean states and the Middle Eastern ones. A step in this direction was the founding of the North-Atlantic Cooperation Council, in 1991.

Since it was renamed the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council, it became the main forum of consultations and cooperation between NATO and the non-member states from the Euro-Atlantic area.

In 1994, NATO introduced an initiative known as the Partnership for Peace (PfP). This is a program meant to assist the participating countries in reforming their armed forces, in order to enable them to play a corresponding role in a democratic society and to participate in the NATO peacekeeping operations.

In addition, it offers opportunities for practical cooperation in different fields, allowing each partner country to dose its participation according to its interests and its specific security needs.

The extension and palette of activities is huge, covering fields like the reform of defense, peacekeeping, emergency civilian planning, and cooperation in the science, education and training fields, as well as the safe destruction of the munitions, of the small caliber and light weapons.

1.6.2 Partnership relations with Russia and Ukraine

The Russian Federation and Ukraine were among the numerous countries to engage actively in activities of partnership with NATO, from the beginning. In 1997, the cooperation became more formal, along with the conclusion of the bilateral agreements between each of these countries and NATO.

The NATO-Russia Permanent Common Council and NATO-Ukraine Commission were created in order to facilitate the constant consultations and the discussions regarding security and for the development of practical cooperation relations within an wide range of fields.

Since then, after the 09/11 terrorist attacks, which proved the need of a common international action for approaching new threats against security, the Allies and Russia have developed a closer and deeper relation.

In 2002, they created the NATO-Russia Council (NRC), presided by the General Secretary, where all NRC countries participate equally, taking decisions together, replacing the NATO-Russia Permanent Common Council. NRC identified the fight against terrorism, crisis management and the non-proliferation of mass destruction weapons, as being the key-areas for cooperation.

The NATO-Ukraine relation became closer as years passed. An important issue was the support granted by NATO and the Allies for Ukraine's efforts of reformation, especially in the field of defense and security. These reforms are vital for the democratic development of the country and for the accomplishment of its objective, and namely, to be more integrated into the Euro-Atlantic structures.

In 2005, an Intense Dialogue with Ukraine was initiated, concerning its aspirations of obtaining the member status and the necessary reforms in this sense. In 2008, NATO members agreed that Ukraine should become a NATO member, in the future.

1.6.3 Mediterranean Dialogue

The PfP initiative was completed by the initiation, in the year 1995, of a Dialogue with six countries - Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Mauritania, Morocco and

Tunisia – from the Mediterranean region. The program, which Algeria joined in 2000, has as main objective the creation of good relationships and the improvement of a mutual understanding with the countries from the Mediterranean region, and also, to promote security and regional stability. In 2004, the Dialogue transformed into a true partnership for promoting better cooperation relations through assistance in the field of defense reform, through cooperation in the field of border security, amelioration measures for interoperability and others. The new partnership focused on the anti-terrorism fight. Some countries involved in the Dialogue contributed with troops within NATO's peacekeeping operations in the Balkans and offered to support the Action of Active Operations.

1.6.4 Cooperation in Middle East

The launch of Istanbul Cooperation Initiative (ICI) in 2004 proved the Alliance's openness to accept the Middle Eastern countries, which were not yet involved in the Mediterranean Dialogue. The initiative aims to promote bilateral cooperation with interested countries in the region in areas such as anti-terrorism, crisis management, civil emergency planning and border control. Currently, Bahrain, Qatar, Kuwait and United Arab Emirates joined this initiative.

1.6.5 Contact countries and international cooperation

Being given that the security threats are becoming more unpredictable in nature, scale and origin, NATO has expanded its partnerships. It appealed to global partners in order to help it approach global threats that have emerged since the beginning of this century. These so-called "contact countries" which are neither States nor NATO partners, are countries such as Japan, New Zealand, Australia and South Korea.

NATO has engaged in relations with other international organizations that have a complementary role in promoting peace and security. In the context of peacekeeping operations and crisis management, NATO is working with organizations that possess the necessary tools to ensure long-term peace through political, economic and social development.

These organizations include: United Nations, European Union, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe and other institutions, such as EUROCONTROL and the International Committee of the Red Cross.

Besides these institutional ties, the transatlantic relationship between the European members of NATO and the United States makes the Alliance's relations with EU more special. Like any constructive relationship, it has evolved, as external circumstances have changed. Without reviewing the history of transatlantic relations at the end of World War II, it is important to note that the European NATO member states were very dependent on the United States, immediately after the war, both in security and economic development.

In subsequent years, Europe has become stronger and more united. The European Union began to develop a common foreign and security policy in the early 1990s and Europe is increasingly positioned as a major player in international affairs. In December 1999, the EU decided to develop the ability to take tasks in crisis management and has taken important steps to create the required political and military structures.

This paved the way for the EU to take two of NATO missions in the Balkans a few years later. This process was facilitated through "Berlin Plus" arrangements, allowing EU to access NATO capabilities for the operations where NATO was not involved.

Currently, this is the foundation of cooperation between EU and NATO, leading the NATO mission to be taken over by the former Macedonian Republic of Yugoslavia in late March 2003 and by Bosnia and Herzegovina in December 2004.

1.7 NATO ENLARGEMENT

1.7.1 The policy of open doors in continuous development

In a relatively early stage, the Alliance's founding members - Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, United Kingdom and United States have expanded the list of Member States of the Organization to include Greece and Turkey (1952) and Germany (1955). Several decades later, in 1982, Spain joined as well.

The next expansion occurred after the Cold War, when a number of Central European countries have decided that their future security interests would

be served best by joining NATO and expressed their intention to become members. Three former Partner countries - the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland - became members in March 1999 increasing the number to 19 member countries.

At the end of March 2004, what we call the largest enlargement of NATO took place: other seven countries - Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia - joined the Alliance. More recently, in July 2008, Albania and Croatia have signed adhesion protocols.

Former Macedonian Republic of Yugoslavia will be invited to join the organization as soon as possible once the country's name issue is resolved. NATO's doors remain open. Intensified dialogues with Georgia and Ukraine are held on the aspirations of these countries and the reforms required for adhesion. In 2008, Alliance leaders agreed that both countries are to join NATO in the future.

1.7.2 Rigor and seriousness for the member states

The seven members that adhered to NATO in 2004 and the ones that joined thereafter received an Action Plan for membership that came into force in 1999, in order to help the partner countries concerned to prepare for membership. The plan offers aspiring members practical advice and specialized assistance.

In return, aspiring members are expected to meet certain essential requirements, including a functioning democratic political system that is based on market economy, fair treatment of minorities, commitment to peaceful resolution of disputes with their neighbors, the ability and willingness to bring military contribution to the Alliance and the commitment to a democratic control of their armed forces. Participation in this plan offers no guarantee of future membership status, but helps countries to adapt their armed forces and prepare for the duties and responsibilities incumbent to membership of the Alliance.

NATO is not engaged in recruiting new members, but allies are keen to consider requests for obtaining membership in the democratic countries that share the Alliance's values and could contribute to its fundamental objectives. NATO leadership has demonstrated that NATO enlargement is not an end in itself but a means to expand NATO's security and to provide more stability for Europe.

The enlargement process helps to annihilate conflicts, since the mere prospect of membership is an incentive for the aspiring members to resolve their disputes with their neighbors and to accelerate reforms and democratization.

Moreover, new members should not only benefit from obtaining this status, but also to contribute to the security of all Member States. In other words, they must be both suppliers and consumers of security.

1.8 PERMANENT OPERATIONALIZATION

1.8.1 For new threats, new capacities

The security challenges our society faces today imply well-equipped forces and specialized structures to deal with threats such as terrorism, proliferation of mass destruction weapons and the instability determined by the situations of the under-developed states. In the early 1990s, NATO had already begun to revise its military capabilities in order to convert the static formations of the Cold War in more mobile forces, necessary for crisis management operations.

The events of September 11th have accelerated this process. At the Prague Summit in 2002, NATO leaders introduced major reforms to dramatically reshape military capabilities. They identified specific areas for improvement, have created the NATO Reaction Force and streamlined the military command structure into an effort to improve the capacity to respond to various types of security threats, either within the Euro-Atlantic or outside of it.

1.8.2 Vulnerabilities and new acting capacities

At Prague, eight specific areas were identified as vulnerabilities needed to be resolved as quickly as possible. These included areas such as strategic air and sea raids, chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear defense and air surveillance. The Allies have committed to acquire these skills, essential for the Alliance to respond to the new types of threats. Since the Prague Summit, NATO has explored other areas that needed to be upgraded, especially for defense against terrorism.

1.8.3 Multinational rapid response force

The objective of NATO's Reaction Force (NRC) is to enable the provision of capacities for rapid response to various types of crises occurring worldwide, acting as a force in the first phase and being able to be reinforced with additional

troops in a later stage. Having a base that can be supplemented if necessary, it represents a multinational force that includes the ground, air, sea and special forces that can move within 5 days of the request and can sustain operations for 30 days or even more if they are replenished. The multinational rapid reaction force (a part of it) has been already deployed with great enthusiasm and success in The United States when Hurricane Katrina hit New Orleans and the neighboring area in September 2005.

The same thing happened in Pakistan after the devastating earthquake of October 8 2005. Beside its capacity of response and its deployment force, the NRF represents practically the spearhead of NATO's transformation efforts.

It trains staff to work in a highly sensitive environment, using emergency technologies in a multinational context. Each participant is subjected to this kind of training phase, being a catalyst for change in national and multinational forces.

1.9 MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE

1.9.1 Streamlined management

Adapting to the security environment after the Cold War, NATO has revised its military command structure to support fewer and more flexible and mobile forces. The number of command centers was reduced and the role of coordinating NATO's efforts of transformation was attributed to the United States Strategic Commandment, the Commandment of Alliance Transformation (formerly the Alliance Command Centre). The European Centre for Strategic Command was responsible for all NATO operations and is now known as the Alliance Operations Command Center. Streamlining military command structure is an ongoing process, revised regularly by NATO.

1.9.2 The managerial force and decisional consensus

One of the Alliance's sustainability reasons is represented by making decisions by consensus. Therefore, before taking any important decisions, consultations and interactive discussions are held. Although this system may seem cumbersome and slow for an outside observer, it has two major advantages. First, sovereignty and independence are respected for each Member State. Secondly,

when a decision is reached, all the Member States that undertake its implementation support it.

In some situations, there is no consensus, as it happened in the spring of 2003, when the countries estimated differently the threat posed by Saddam Hussein's regime in Iraq. While different positions require that the Allies will not always agree on the actions necessary, NATO's objective is to facilitate consultations and discussions between them so as to reach consensus whenever possible.

1.9.3 Managerial participation

The leading players in NATO are the member countries that are forming the Organization itself. They are represented at each level. For this reason, within the headquarters at Brussels, each country has a permanent representative with the rank of ambassador, supported by a national delegation, including diplomatic staff and defense advisors that are participating in meetings or ensure the fact that the national experts attend these meetings.

The main body of political decision in NATO is the North-Atlantic Council that meets at the ambassadorial level every week. Within the Council there are also held regular meetings of the foreign ministers, defense ministers and, occasionally, heads of state and government. The North Atlantic Council, together with two bodies responsible for defense - Defense Planning Committee and Nuclear Planning Group - are at the forefront of a complex system of committees. Under this system, the Military Committee is responsible for providing military advice to the three main bodies and assistance on military matters regarding the strategic commandments. As a result, it has the special status as the authority of the NATO military base.

NATO has a General Secretary that is appointed for a period of four years. This is an official of one of the international member countries. The General Secretary chairs the meetings of the North Atlantic Council and other relevant bodies of NATO and helps reach consensus among its members. In performing its duties, it is assisted by international experts and officials from all NATO countries.

NATO does not have its own armed forces. Most available forces remain under national command and control until they are assigned with tasks by the member countries, tasks regarding the field of collective defense, and until new

missions, such as peacekeeping. Shortly, NATO is a forum that brings together countries prepared to integrate and engage their forces in multinational activities for a specified period. Its military and political structures are dealing with the preventive planning necessary for the execution of duties by the national forces, and also with the organizational arrangements for their joint command, control, training and exercise activities.

1.10 PERMANENT ADAPTABILITY

Originally a creation of the Cold War, the Alliance undertook new fundamental engagements since the European partition process ended. It opened to Eastern Europe, receiving new members and creating a network of partnerships extending to Central Asia. Also, it engaged in crisis management operations to curb violence caused by ethnic and regional conflicts in Europe and, more recently, beyond the Euro-Atlantic area. The period after the Cold War proved to be a more complex security environment - a trend that seems to continue during the 21st century.

The Alliance's Strategic Concept, approved in 1999, anticipated many of the threats and challenges faced by the new security environment. Since the terrorist attacks of September 11th 2001, the Alliance has shifted its efforts to adapt to the reality of asymmetric threats. It adopts a more complex and ambitious approach to security by extending and deepening partnerships, modernizing the available forces and providing support in crisis areas that are new to the organization. In conclusion, the Organization shall accelerate the transformation process to create new political ties and strong operational capabilities in order to respond in an increasingly globalized world.

CHAPTER 2. NATO – ALWAYS IN PROSPECTIVE

2.1 EURO ATLANTIC STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP

The main problem for NATO in the future should seek to find the right questions, ideas and conceptions about the role of the transatlantic organization in a changing global security environment. A pertinent analysis targets the characteristics of the international environment and the implications in the missions that are newest and consecrate for the Alliance, the dominant institutions and processes involved, and the rethinking and reform of the US-European relationship or partnership (USA-EU).

In our approach, we may clearly define the need of a more effective Atlantic partnership, based on some fundamental principles such as unity and rigor, brave decisions and the functioning in conditions of internal and external challenges. These problems should keep the headline of the strategic management of allied countries, to generate reciprocity on defense in a broad spectrum of collective security.

The unanimous opinion is that the partnership should be extended based on a better connection with the collective and national institutions in order to promote a new vision, supported by decisive action that will reform NATO, the USA-EU relations and other key areas of transatlantic interest. Specifically, there are actually three goals: the aspiration to find and trace the path of change for the transatlantic partnership, specifying recommendations for improving the future of NATO and US-EU partnership.

Even now, after a decade of the 21st century, NATO's objective should remain the same - the collective defense of its members, the institutionalization of the transatlantic link and pre-eminent forum for Allies' deliberations regarding the national, collective and shared security.

The results obtained during its evolution can be seen in the continental European unity, in EU development, in the substantial participation in international security, in security partnerships and the constant adjustment to new threats and challenges. It is worthwhile that each time new challenges have occurred, NATO nations have sought a new consensus on changing the strategic

environment and on a collective approach, drafting a guidance document entitled "Strategic Concept of the Alliance".

Now, we believe that there should be a consensus on a new long-term strategy, which, as it is estimated in America, should be a priority, not less important than the operational success in Afghanistan. This new strategic concept should be different than the other ones: under the direction of NATO, to undertake by its content, the form of a perfected and wider Atlantic Treaty, which would reflect a strong and real political consensus between the American, Canadian and European allies, on how their partnership would work in the coming years, both in the Euro-Atlantic area and around the world, therefore becoming a new historical agreement.

2.2 STRATEGIC FUNDAMENTS OF A NEW EURO-ATLANTIC PARTNERSHIP

The aspirations for a new Euro-Atlantic partnership will be based on the principles, rules, regulations and procedures that were established and accumulated over several decades, that form a true *acquis Atlantique* that could become the basic expectations we'll have from ourselves and from each other.

In recent decades, the achievements at NATO level determined the transatlantic relationship to be a partnership for world transformation. They reached objectives that members could not have achieved by themselves and this emphasizes the partnership when an agreement is concluded, often becoming the center of any effective global coalition. Although the partnership is as vital as ever, it must focus on a new agenda. Today's strategic environment is dynamic, complex and unpredictable. The two partner continents still face threat of terrorism and still have in view the potential of a conflict between the major states, plus a variety of unusual challenges, requiring further urgent attention.

The specific of the situation in perspective is that these challenges require the support of mutual defense commitment in a much broader spectrum of security, being necessary to reposition our key institutions and mechanisms, particularly to improve partnerships and links with partners.

The analyses in terms of strategic priorities for partnerships highlight some objectives for the allies from the two continents:

- To take care of the immediate economic challenges while developing future orientation;

- To build a transatlantic resilience in order to protect links, and both the pillars of security and defense;
- To develop capabilities and skills able to address against the full range of challenges that are faced by the modern Euro-Atlantic security;
- To strengthen the image of Europe with complete, free and self-determined functionality;
- To participate in the transatlantic efforts and not only for preserving a clean and attractive planet.

The European and American priority assessments in this respect are about the same, namely for this agenda, NATO being indispensable, but not sufficient. New regulations between US-EU frameworks are needed, for mutual assistance and institutional innovations.

The debates regarding the visions of a more effective and more resistant partnership shall be controversial if the Allies will not be able to intensify the suppression of terrorism where this is preparing for action, in the border areas of Afghanistan and Pakistan. Any delay or failure in that theater of confrontation is a nightmare for the allies and their partners, and NATO's credibility is endangered to be irreparably destroyed.

In this regard, we believe that the triptych must be reviewed: threats, objectives and action strategies. The terrorist threats against US and Europe are directly related to the border area between Afghanistan and Pakistan, being today the most immediate and acute threats against transatlantic security. The objective of NATO forces in this theater is to prevent attacks and to insure that this region will never again be the starting point of such threats. The action strategy must be better determined based on different components, like: the understanding of NATO's involvement in Afghanistan, by invoking the collective defense clause of Article 5 (dated September 12 2001); an integrated international coordination more efficient for the Afghan priorities, combined with the political involvement of the local leaders and a wider approach, into a larger secure region in Pakistan and not only.

The Alliance must maintain the relationships with Russia, for which a higher level of implication and mutual solutions is needed, thus obtaining a more coherent and effective partnership. For this purpose, they should develop a strategy based on these two concepts:

- the settlement in concrete terms of the potential mutual benefits, based on more efficient relationships;

- the clarification concerning the fact that these relationships may not be based on the spheres of influence, but the compliance with the international law, UN Charter and the Helsinki principles.

2.3 A NEW ENERGY FOR NATO?

This core question is justified since there are many pertinent considerations that NATO remains indispensable and sufficient, but it must be a bigger part of the Euro-Atlantic and the World. For this new existential application of the Alliance, there are needed:

- A better balance between the domestic and foreign missions;
- The increase of sufficiency for current and future security challenges;
- The extension of the missions and the improvement of the links with the partners;
- A higher level of flexibility, being prepared for the role of leading actor, to play a supporting role or simply to join a larger assembly.

Based on these new requirements and demands, certainly the things require change, and not just in any way, but in a structural-functional one. Modern security, which is increasingly invoked in this decade of the 21st century, implies some doctrinal requests and exigencies, operational and functional, given that NATO is more committed than ever, but many perceive certain disorientation in collective management. We believe that it is necessary for a new consensus regarding the challenges against the collective security and the Alliance's role in identifying, defining and solving them.

For these demanding requirements, it is appropriate for NATO to be:

- More efficient, not only bigger;
- Flexible and adaptable for transforming its purpose so far in its strategic reason to exist;
- More attractive and convincing in order to be understood and supported by national parliaments and public opinion;
- More flexible in changing the nature of its capacities and the method how it generates and deploys its forces;
- More firm in taking decisions;
- More transparent in regard of how it spends the money;
- More cooperative in working with others.

For what NATO should be within the Euro-Atlantic space and in the World, a balance is needed between its internal and external missions. In this first decade, the Alliance was led based on the managerial principle of "outside the area or outside the activity," now leading operations outside the area, but still carrying out many domestic activities.

We appreciate the internal and external missions of NATO as being proportional – but only as number and related. The domestic missions aim: to maintain the discouragement and defense, to support efforts to strengthen the social resilience against the threats addressed to the Alliance, to contribute in maintaining a complete, free and peaceful Europe. The external missions are targeting to prevent and appropriately respond to crises, to participate within the stabilization operations and to improve the relations with global partners in order to cover a wider range of missions and capabilities.

Specific for the Alliance remain the common specific requirements of these missions, all of them implying intense debates for sustaining the public and parliamentary support, improved usable capabilities, the development of better synergy with partners, a better cooperation between civil and military authorities and, especially, the adequate means for the established missions. A final major requirement is the mission of deterrence and defense that may be exercised in other areas where it is possible and appropriate for the Alliance to lead only selectively, to play a supporting role or to work with a larger network of institutions. Therefore, it is necessary to prioritize the resources and efforts, which now appear as a critical issue because NATO needs to know where and when to increase the value of collective security interests.

The missions of deterrence and defense need to strengthen Article 5, for which a NATO response force was assured, perfectly capable, to be available within and outside the area. At the same time, an adequate reinforcement of NATO capabilities in the area is needed in order to improve the ones neglected in the past decade with transparency and proper sizing. Then, there is a need to strengthen the infrastructure of the appropriate allied nations (especially newer allies), to consider the placement of additional common NATO assets, such as the NATO ground surveillance system in the new Member States and why not to create another multinational NATO body composed of the new members from Central Europe.

Regarding the transatlantic resistance it is necessary and possible for NATO's role in supporting the overall efforts to be higher regarding both internal

and social security in the North Atlantic area and also to be included in the new strategic concept. Mainly, there will be taken into account the expansion of warnings, the combat against terrorism, the unconventional defense and the political consultations regarding the energy security.

NATO should continue to advocate for a unitary, free and peaceful Europe, being interested in consolidating the democratic transformation of the continent, working with others in order to expand, as much as possible, the space of integrated security. The "open door" policy will enable NATO and EU enlargement, the candidate states being accepted democratically for integration.

If the Alliance will continue to play a real role within the areas where it is involved, it will need more capable, useful and sustainable forces. The maintenance of operational efficiency is essential for NATO's credibility, even if the allies are in a difficult situation regarding defense budgets. However, some priorities are obvious, like the utilizable and multiplicative platform type forces of Intelligence, Supervision and Recognition.

In regard of stabilization and reconstruction operations, there should be taken into account the creation of a Stabilization and Reconstruction NATO force, as an integrated multinational security force, that would be organized, prepared and provided for post-conflict operations, compatible with EU efforts. The realities from the operation theaters prove that NATO's efficiency depends on solid partnerships. NATO needs to settle a truly strategic partnership with EU and serious partnerships with UN, OSCE, the African Union and Russia.

The complexity of the actual and future missions of NATO implies the execution of internal reforms, at the political, military and managerial level. Changes are necessary in regard of how decisions are taken, by applying the rule of consensus only in the North-Atlantic Council and when the funding in the Budget Commissions is voted. Also, the option of non-attendance within an operation should also mean the non-attendance in taking decisions concerning that operation. Of course, there are other issues concerning the authority transfer, political and military fusions and the reconstruction of NATO's Military Committee.

At the same time there must be resolved several other problems of cooperation with EU, regarding the counterbalance of joint incapacities and the construction of a strong and modern industrial base of transatlantic defense. The most visible managerial reform must be fulfilled by creating a command structure, adequate to the military action level, the transformation management specific and

the American specific dimensions. This will result in allied, transformation and American command structures, within the military operations theaters, by force categories, fixed, disrupted and mobile. Certainly, there shall be obtained, besides the operational and action performance of management, a financial economy based on which performing equipment's will be procured.

Of high interest for NATO remains the strategic deployment of forces, based on generating adequate military capacities.

They must contain the conventional disruptive forces, light and heavy armed forces, the initial intervention force, including NATO's Response Force, the Special Forces for Action and Stabilization – more and more necessary, but for the moment inadequate to the long and unique nature of modern military operations. To these, with mandatory character, there shall be added the acceleration agents of forcers or multipliers: transportation both strategic and from the operations theatre – including air refueling and transportation helicopters; C3 (network command, control and communications) and interoperable information platforms, supervision and exploration.

Lately, as a potentially important request for future, appeared the need to discourage the missiles threats from Iraq and possibly from other countries. In case the transatlantic diplomacy will be able to put an end to the Iraqi procurement of nuclear weapons, the deployment of interceptors could become unnecessary. But the efforts of the US Allies should continue for two reasons:

- these types of efforts are prudent, considering the time advance necessary for deployment;
- in case diplomacy fails and Teheran gains the capacity to procure the nuclear weapons, a defensive answer is more probable to represent a preferable and efficient option, than a military offensive response.

As the diplomatic military answers are getting refreshed, the Alliance has to respects the commitments taken at the Bucharest Summit of 2008, and namely, to explore the methods of how it could integrate the US anti-missile defense locations planned for the European territory into the current plans of NATO. In order to achieve this, it is necessary to elaborate options for a vast defense architecture to defend against missile attacks, in order to extend the coverage to all the Allied territories that otherwise are not protected by the US system, and also to work with the US for the participation of Russia. In this context of international security, NATO should join the global support, to create, on a long term, a World without nuclear weapons, considering the following:

- the Euro-Atlantic security was also based on the preeminence of American nuclear weapons in Europe, thus, their retreat should be an amicable understanding;
- the initiative in this sense should come from Europe, only if the European Allies believe that the European and North-Atlantic security are sufficiently connected, so that the presence of nuclear weapons in Europe would not be necessary anymore;
- taking the future requirements into consideration and taking into account that once these forces are retreated, it will be impossible, from the political perspective, for them to be brought back;
- the reduction and elimination of these weapons should be executed at the same time with Russia's equivalent steps.

The main place in streamlining the allied actions is occupied by the adjustment of missions to means, because NATO cannot expect an increase of the available resources. Consequently, it has to improve and offer more capacities from the same resources and to redouble its efforts in reducing the existent expenses. In order to reduce expenses, NATO should:

- elaborate a new approach regarding the method of funding the operations and essential capacities on the battle field;
- develop the capacity of deployment by eliminating the non-disruptive structures;
- search for capacities for which massing the assets by certain members would be approved;
- to raise the number of multifunctional units contained by the national forces, including the niche forces;
- settle a NATO – EU working group in order to concretize and implement a wider approach;
- create a NATO – EU industrial group, to collaborate for the procurement of common articles;
- press on so that the defense budget would not be spent for personnel and infrastructure, but for investments, training and promptitude.

For good reasons, the Alliance resisted working into divisions inherited from the past. However, the constantly decreasing investments for defense are leading to serious gaps, which cannot be remedied in the near future. Thus, functional and geographical coordination with the principles and procedures of coordination may be a smart move. In this sense, the following should be solved:

- the functional areas of interest should be better explored regarding the forces for stabilization operations / special operations and the forces for major combats;
- a closer look from the geographical perspective would point out the regions of interest for NATO;
- EU-NATO should be responsible with the collective defense of the Allied territories;
- EU should lead most of the crisis reaction operations in Africa and should assume more and more missions in the Balkans, even outside NATO;
- the earlier mentioned functional and geographical roles should not be considered as being exclusive domains, more likely they should be regarded as guidance and support, so that the transatlantic partners would reinforce each other with a series of capacities.

2.4 NEW HORIZONS AND CHANGING RELATIONSHIPS

2.4.1 Analysis of the international context

We feel that the World is no longer as it was and it seems to be true. Elements of absolute novelty have been announced since several years ago, and compel us to rapidly reform the transatlantic and other partnerships. We face benefic aspects and issues, but sometimes we deal with unsure and undecided relations, that are formed rapidly. The registered progress has also many positive aspects: the democracy is worldwide expanded, the governments chosen by the people are more and more efficient, the scientific, technological, transportation and communication revolutions are increasing the quality of life and are freeing human thinking, the middle classes are subjected to globalization and this creates major opportunities. Moreover, peace rules almost all over the world. Against expectations, the regional and zonal gains were shared equality because, for many states, the change meant only disruption and insecurity.

This is why at global level there is a high preoccupation regarding the impact of the regional, ethnical and religious conflicts, of terrorism, the migration waves determined by poverty, the increase of population and environment changes, the accentuate diminution of resources, especially energy and water, the

environment degradation and the effect of climate modification over the security environment.

The beginning of our century was tripped by one of the biggest recessions that many generations knew. US and EU still remain with over 60% of the world economy, but the financial crisis and the economic recession that accompanies it seriously influenced the World's capacities. The developing countries were most influenced, assisting to the evaporation of foreign capital, the decrease of export markets and the weakening of foreign currency, banks and stock market.

Contrary to all these descendent realities, the relations remain in process of development between continents and certainly they shall continue to exercise a strong influence over the international order that evolves quite rapidly. The globalization brought high benefits for trade and capital flow, a wider technological spread and a proportional economic increase.

However, it was not enough to stop the geopolitical fights or the ones with ideological origin. There are still active obscure forces, the terrorism, the organized crime and radical ideologies (Jihad vision over the World), which continue to supply the regional tensions, the transnational threats, the confrontations and the lack of stability. Before these vicissitudes, the governments are trying to face the challenges, especially those of the independent networks of any state, which are moving freely out of borders.

As if not all of these were sufficient, the worst devastating agent of mass destruction appeared – the infectious diseases – that are passing from nature's hands into human hands. The amazing scientific progress increases the dual potential of cure or murder.

The biological technologies that are available today allow the production of some biological agents, which are available for the research laboratories, and therefore, we sometimes helplessly assist as state and non-state actors use these to produce catastrophic human effects. The current national systems for epidemics management were put through tests by several epidemics and remain entirely inadequate for the unique challenges of bio-terrorism.

Within the context of globalization, most of the threats against current peace and stability have local roots, but in a more and more interconnected world, the same conflicts can now have a global impact. In this context, the governing issues become a hard trial concerning national security.

The instable regions and the independent ones or the government that surrenders when it must deal with major challenges raise dangers for neighbors

and can become the stage of bigger problems of terrorism, migration, poverty and despair.

The epicenter of turbulence remains between the Middle East and Southwest Asia, because of the regions where the unclear issues, the religious and territorial conflicts, the poor society, the intolerant and fragile regimes and the lethal combinations between technology and terror obstruct the development and global prosperity.

The essence of instability starts from the energetic resources, catastrophic terrorism, ethnical and religious intolerance, Islam conflicts and violence, intra/interstate tensions, regional influences and the liquidation of political and economic consequences of the wars developed recently within these areas.

Central Asia attracted a focus point of the competition over the energy resources, under the confronting sights of China and Russia that are struggling to gain the regional influence. The transition of leadership shall be an important test for the regional and zonal powers, but a failure could cause successive crashes, new turbulences and violence.

Therefore, the significant and extended instability can become a definitive characteristic of Central Asia, including the states with different levels of bankruptcy, in a strong confrontation with the radical Islamic movements, organized crime and weapon traffic, materials for mass destruction weapons and narcotics. According to the assessments of the foreign specialists, China, India and Indonesia, which are into a dynamic course of affirmation, could reshape the area of power in Asia and not only.

Japan remains a major actor on the global level, but the internal political misunderstandings blocked it from undertaking other responsibilities for increasing the global security proportionally with its position. China is in the course of affirmation as the second economic power in the world, the biggest importer of resources, the biggest source of pollution and an important military power.

Nevertheless, China has to face many internal challenges, with the perspective of bigger social turbulence if the economic increase is unsure or if the issues related to the government, social welfare and regional development shall not be managed and over passed.

It is possible for India to benefit of an economic increase, to strengthen its army and to try to claim itself as a major independent power, especially in the Indian Ocean, even if the confrontation with Pakistan continues. The flourishing