NATO, the renewed emphasis on Article V and the EU's common defence and solidarity clauses – an analysis of the changing nature of the transatlantic security community

Bjørn Olav Knutsen

Keywords

Nato

Teori om sikkerhetsfellesskap

Integrasjonsteori om EU

Frankrike

Approved by

Johan H Aas	Project Manager
Elling Tveit	Director

English summary

The aim of the report is to study the interplay between NATO as a security community in a Deutschian sense, and alliance solidarity in perspective of NATO's common defence clause. One of the main arguments is that NATO since the end of the Cold War has put too much emphasis on NATO's external dimension and not least stabilization operations beyond the Euro-Atlantic area.

The political result has been an alliance adrift and a multilayered alliance structure where the solidarity among the member states has been challenged. The result is that NATO, since the Lisbon Summit in 2010, is "coming home". Such a move raises some new challenges for politicians and analysts alike. The EU is a security actor with similar common defence- and solidarity clauses. These clauses can act as catalysts for contradictions in the transatlantic community, where a stronger EU foreign and security is an expression of EU-externalisation in terms of actively influencing and reshaping the international environment so as to make it more responsive to the agreed-on aims and common policies of the regional entity itself.

From a theoretical perspective, the report warns against the failure of regarding security community theory as a more general International Relations (IR) theory and other integration theories as subordinate ones. From an empirical perspective, the report studies the French reintegration into NATO in 2009 and asks whether such a move could be regarded as a form for EU-externalisation. The report also asks whether this reintegration can strengthen or weaken the transatlantic security community.

Sammendrag

Formålet med denne rapporten er å studere samspillet og sammenhengene mellom Nato som sikkerhetsfellesskap og alliansesolidariteten innen Nato i lys av alliansens felles forsvarsforpliktelser. Nato som sikkerhetsfellesskap betyr at det innenfor alliansen eksisterer stabile forventninger om fredelig konfliktløsning mellom medlemslandene, og at alliansesolidariteten kan defineres som normen om gjensidige tilpasninger av medlemslandenes sikkerhetsbehov innenfor den institusjonelle rammen som Nato-alliansen gir.

Et av hovedargumentene er at Nato siden den kalde krigens avslutning har lagt for stor vekt på internasjonale stabiliseringsoperasjoner utenfor det euroatlantiske området. Dette har ført til et lagdelt Nato der alliansesolidariteten har blitt utfordret. Konsekvensen er at Nato siden Lisboa-toppmøtet i november 2010 i økende grad vil "komme hjem". En slik utvikling utfordrer både politikere og eksperter som skal forsøke å forstå og analysere denne prosessen som også vil berøre EU-integrasjonen og EUs økende ansvar for egen sikkerhet.

EU er en sikkerhetsaktør med tilsvarende forsvars- og solidaritetsklausuler. Disse klausulene kan i seg selv være katalysatorer for økte motsetninger i det transatlantiske sikkerhetsfellesskapet. Bakgrunnen for dette er at en sterkere rolle for EU på det utenrikspolitiske området er å betrakte som et uttrykk for økt "EU-eksternalisering" og som et forsøk fra EUs side på å influere og å endre omgivelsene slik at disse blir mer lydhøre for unionens egen politikk.

Fra et mer teoretisk perspektiv advarer rapporten mot å betrakte sikkerhetsfellesskapsteori som en mer overordnet og "generell" internasjonal politikk teori, og andre integrasjonsteorier som mer underordnede teorier. Fra et mer empirisk perspektiv studerer rapporten Frankrikes reintegrering i Natos kommandostruktur i 2009 og undersøker om dette kan betraktes som en form for EU-eksternalisering. Rapporten spør også om en slik utvikling vil kunne styrke eller svekke det transatlantiske sikkerhetsfellesskapet og konkluderer med at det er førstnevnte utvikling som virker mest sannsynlig.

Contents

Preface

This report was presented as a research paper at the International Studies Association (ISA) conference in San Diego on 2 April 2012. The author would like to thank the other panelists at the panel on the Role of Alliances in Foreign Policies and especially Huyiun Feng at Utah University who functioned as panel discussant for very useful comments. The author would also like to thank Iver Johansen (FFI) and Svein Melby (IFS) who shared with me their insights into international relations and transatlantic relations in general. Their insights will be incorporated into a forthcoming new version of the paper which will be submitted to a peer-reviewed journal for possible publication.

Bjørn Olav Knutsen
May 2012

1   Introduction

Contrary to neo-realist predictions, NATO still endures more than twenty years after the end of the Cold War (Mearsheimer, 2001; Thies, 2009). However, the aim of this report is not to explain why NATO still is regarded as a relevant military alliance by its members, nor is the aim to explain why Europe still needs to import security from the US several years after the EU's common security and defence policy (CSDP) became fully operative, or why the US still has an interest in maintaining an institutionalised Euro-Atlantic security relationship (Melby, 2009). The aim of this report is to scrutinize one aspect which, ironically enough has been nearly overlooked in both scholarly and policy debates until NATO's Lisbon summit in November 2010, namely NATO's role and function as a collective defence alliance. Hence, what I aim to analyse in the present report is the interplay between NATO as a security community in a Deutschian sense (Deutsch, 1957), and alliance solidarity in perspective of NATO´s common defence clause (Article V in The North Atlantic Treaty). One of the main arguments in the report is that NATO in the two decades which has passed since the end of the Cold War has put too much emphasis on NATO's new missions, like partnerships with several other countries also beyond the traditional Euro-Atlantic area, but especially on international military stabilisation operations often far beyond the alliance's treaty based area of responsibility. The result has been an "alliance adrift" (Hamilton et al., 2009) and a multi-layered alliance structure. Consequently, the transatlantic security community has been weakened, also caused by the unilateralist foreign policies of the previous Bush-administration (2001-2009) (Daalder and Lindsay, 2005).

The term "multi-layered alliance" refers to an alliance "á la carte", divided into several factions of member states with divergent security interests (Jonson, 2010). This has mainly been caused by the differences in European and US approaches to the alliance which have been clearly reflected in the case of the stabilisation operation in Afghanistan (Knutsen, 2011). NATO's new strategic concept decided upon at the Lisbon summit in November 2010 clearly addresses these challenges (NATO, 2010b). Consequently, NATO is now refocusing towards what the alliance originally was meant to be: a collective defence alliance, also including a larger focus upon NATO's core area. This implies that the time now has become ripe to raise NATO's profile as the primary organisation for dealing with the full range of security issues of its member states, also closer to the alliance's geographical proximity.

As an example, the Norwegian core area initiative from 2008 emphasised that NATO, in the years to come, should have a closer focus upon NATO's own territory and own neighbourhood.[1] Such a move should include a re-introducing of regional responsibilities to NATO commands, i.e. the Joint Force Commands (JFCs) in Brunssum (the Netherlands) and Naples (Italy) should again,

---

[1] This document is a so-called non-paper which means that it has not been made public, but the previous State Secretary in the Ministry of Defence, Mr. Espen Barth Eide touched upon several of the topics raised in the non-paper in his speech in Luxembourg on 16 October 2009 (Eide, 2009).

according to the proposal, be given a distinct regional responsibility.[2] It should furthermore include improving geographical expertise and situational awareness; developing closer links between national- and NATO-headquarters; and increasing NATO involvement in training and exercises (Eide, 2009). All of these proposals have, later on, gained support from several other alliance members, also including the British proposal on an Alliance Solidarity Force, where this concept now has been integrated into NATO Response Force (NRF).[3]

Figure 1.1   The NATO symbol and the flags of the Member States

However, such a refocusing towards NATO's geographical proximity raises another puzzle in the alliance's developments since the turn of the millennium, namely its relationship with the EU and the Union's own ambitions as regards a common defence policy. Even though 21 European countries are members of both organisations, the Lisbon Treaty that entered into force in December 2009, underlines in Article 42.7 that "if a Member State is the victim of armed aggression on its territory, the other Member States shall have towards it an obligation of aid and assistance by all the means in their power, in accordance with Article 51 of the United Nations Charter." Accordingly, both NATO and the EU now have quite similar common defence clauses, even though the same article also states that "commitments and cooperation in this area shall be consistent with commitments under the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation, which, for those States which are members of it, remains the foundation of their collective defence and the forum for its implementation." Additionally, the EU also has a solidarity clause as expressed in Article 222 which states that "the Union and its Member States shall act jointly in a spirit of solidarity if

---

[2] Such a move should not imply that NATO is reintroducing the Area of Responsibility (AOR) concept again. Instead, it implies an increased "geographical focus" without, for the moment, defining what this exactly means. Personal interview with a Norwegian MoD official, 21 February 2012.

[3] Personal interview with a Norwegian MoD official, 21 February 2012.

a Member State is the object of a terrorist attack or the victim of a natural or man-made disaster. The Union shall mobilise all the instruments at its disposal, including the military resources made available by the Member States".

These clauses in the Lisbon Treaty, together with the other provisions laid down in Chapter 2 in it, which deals with the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) and CSDP, acts as catalysts for contradictions in the transatlantic security community, which has been there ever since NATO and the EU were created in the late 1940s and early 1950s: the relationship between the EU process and the Atlantic level of cooperation (Hoffmann, 1965; Sæter, 2005). Therefore, the aim of this report is both theoretical and empirical. On the theoretical side, the aim is to analyse the mechanisms between the transatlantic security community on the one hand, and alliance solidarity, on the other. Empirically, the report aims to analyse how a larger emphasis on the collective defence mechanisms might have strengthened the alliance, as seen in the debate leading up to NATO's Lisbon summit. However, a more integrated and expanded EU, also within the sphere of security and defence, will logically imply a need for enhanced EU autonomy, also in its relationship with the US. This does not necessarily imply an increased level of conflict with the US, or dissolution of the transatlantic security community. But it will, inevitably, cause strains in this relationship if the US is unwilling to grant the EU a more equal status in the fields of security and defence. This development also raises some theoretical puzzles which this report also aims to clarify: how an integration process based upon neo-functionalist logics interacts with the geographically and politically broader transatlantic security community.

The rest of the report is structured as follows. The first part discusses how the transatlantic security community can be analysed within a "Deutschian approach" with emphasis on how the concept of alliance solidarity can be dealt with theoretically. The second part discusses the Strategic Concept of 2010 and how a refocusing by NATO on territorial defence will materialise. In the third part, I analyse the EU process within the sphere of security and defence with due focus upon the common defence- and solidarity clauses. In the last part, I discuss how the European integration process fit into the larger Euro-Atlantic security community. In this part, the French decision to reintegrate with NATO's military command structure in 2009, will serve as a case so as to illustrate the theoretical as well as empirical points.

2   The "Deutschian" security community concept and alliance solidarity

According to Arend Lijphart, it was Karl W. Deutsch' works on security communities in the late 1950s and 1960s, that first broke with the dominant school in international relations of that time, namely Realism (cited in Wæver, 1991: 71). According to the realist approach, perpetual peace among sovereign states is a near impossibility (Mearsheimer, 1994; Mearsheimer, 2001). Furthermore, with the introduction of the security community approach, it also became possible to make a much clearer distinction between the realist concepts of "the state of nature" and "the state of war". On the security community research agenda, these two concepts and the interplay between them, are studied empirically, first quantitatively, as done by Deutsch and his colleagues

when they studied transaction flows between societies, and later on by social constructivists who argues that international reality is a social construction driven by collective understanding, including norms that emerge from social interactions (Wendt, 1999). With the works of Adler, Barnett and other scholars, the security community approach has been made a viable theoretical tool so as to further our understanding of the workings of security communities, also including the nature of a military alliance like NATO.

Originally, Deutsch distinguished between two types of security communities: amalgamated and pluralistic ones (Deutsch, 1957). In an amalgamated security community, two or more states formally merge into an expanded state. A pluralistic security community retains the legal independence of separate states but integrates them to the point that the units entertain "dependable expectations of peaceful change" (ibid: 5). Deutsch furthermore defines peaceful change as the resolution of social problems, normally by institutionalized procedures, without recourse to large-scale physical force (ibid.: 5). Because NATO today consists of 28 sovereign member states, NATO, in the terms of Adler and Barnett, is a loosely coupled pluralistic security community (Adler and Barnett, 1998). In such a community, the members expect no bellicose activities from other members and, therefore, consistently practice self-restraint. A tightly coupled pluralistic security community possesses a political regime that lies between a sovereign state and a centralized government (ibid: 30). The EU is then a tightly coupled pluralistic security community, with the potential of becoming an amalgamated one.

Figure 2.1   Karl Deutsch (1912-1992)

According to Adler and Crawford, security communities are not spontaneous creations (Adler and Crawford, 2002). Rather, it is the dynamic and positive relationship between power, ideas, increased interactions, international organization, and social learning, which are the sources of both mutual trust and collective identity. These sources are therefore the necessary conditions for the development of dependable expectations of peaceful change. Furthermore, Deutsch emphasizes the importance of the creation of a "we-feeling" among its population. Such a feeling consists of trust, and mutual consideration; of partial identification in terms of self-images and interests; of mutually successful predictions of behaviour, and of cooperative action in accordance with it – in short, a matter of a perpetual dynamic process of mutual attention, communication, perception of needs, and responsiveness in the process of decision-making (Deutsch, 1957: 36).

When analysing the changing nature of NATO, as has been done in several research articles and more policy-minded analysis during recent years, one of the aspects that quite often is emphasised is that NATO is a very special kind of alliance. One argument is that NATO is one of the most adaptive institutions in history (Binnendijk and Cordero, 2008), as well as that NATO is one of the very few alliances in history that has survived its former enemies (Aybet and Moore, 2010). For our arguments sake, NATO has two characteristics as a military alliance: firstly, an integrated military command structure also during times of peace, and secondly, as the institutional expression of the transatlantic security community characterised by stable expectations on peaceful settlements of conflicts.

What makes NATO a security community is, as expressed by its former Secretary General, Javier Solana, that "… NATO is about much more than just collective defence. It is as much about developing trust, about establishing patterns of cooperation, about managing crises collectively, and about creating peaceful, stable relations among European and North American democracies" (cited in Adler, 1998: 144). As further described by Adler (1998: 143), NATO, after the end of the Cold War, has become Janus-faced, and looking on the one hand at realist power politics while also being a security community on the other. This implies a common defence capability with a strong deterrence potential, including a military command structure, as an insurance policy against Russia, and other potential and real adversaries. Therefore, it is in the interplay between NATO as a collective defence alliance and NATO as a security community that our understanding of the changing nature of NATO lies.

NATO's enlargement process, initiated in 1995 with the "Study on NATO Enlargement" further substantiates the argument that NATO is a security community. By enlarging NATO, so the argument went, one also enlarged the Euro-Atlantic security community, and so on laid the foundation for enhanced security for the Euro-Atlantic area as a whole. The study argued that the enlargement process should provide for "… increased stability and security for all in the Euro-Atlantic area, without recreating dividing lines. NATO views security as a broad concept embracing political and economic, as well as defence, components. Such a broad concept of security should be the basis for the new security architecture which must be built through a gradual process of integration and cooperation brought about by an interplay of existing multilateral institutions in Europe" (NATO, 1995).

Hence, by enlarging NATO in 1999, 2004 and 2009, this was as much about enlarging the transatlantic security community as it was about extending Article V guarantees to former enemies in the eastern part of Europe.[4]

This also implies that NATO, as an institution, has developed a norm-producing role. The most important norm within the alliance has always been mutual adaptations of the member states' security needs within the alliance's institutionalised framework. This includes the establishment of a common "we-feeling" among its members, based upon a common security identity (Adler and Barnett, 1998; Deutsch, 1957; Knutsen, 2007; Rupp, 2006; Yost, 1998). As an integral part of such a security identity, Deutsch emphasised the need for the compatibility of the main values relevant to political decision-making, which, traditionally has led to a very close link between NATO as the institutionalised expression of the transatlantic security community, and alliance solidarity within NATO. Alliance solidarity can in this respect be defined as NATO members' will and ability to handle security challenges in common.

In today's security environment, it is NATO's ability to meet potential threats against the alliance's own territories and populations in a robust manner, including the high-end scenarios, which makes it possible for NATO to sustain high-intensity conflicts also beyond NATO's borders. At the end of the day, it is this ability that forms the bedrock of public support for the full spectrum of NATO's tasks. As underlined by Eide (2009), it was this link that was gradually forgotten during the last decade and a half. Partly, this happened due to the increasing, day to day attention to operations, and partly, because in one way or the other, we all seemed to share the assumption that "history was over" and peace had come to Europe, once and for all (ibid.). Consequently, alliance solidarity, the political glue of the alliance, was slowly undermined, leading to a multilayered-alliance.

Originally, NATO's Articles IV and V represent the foundation of the concept of alliance solidarity, where Article IV refers to NATO's commitment to consult if and when "…, in the opinion of any of them, the territorial integrity, political independence or security of any of the Parties is threatened" (NATO, 1949). Article V, the common defence clause, states in this respect that "an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all", and, consequently, "the Party or Parties so attacked …[shall take] such action as it deems necessary, including the use of armed force, to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area" (NATO, 1949). In perspective of the alliance's focus upon international operations in recent years, and especially after so many years with a NATO presence in Afghanistan, it has become politically necessary to strike a new balance between Article V and non-Article V activities. As argued below, there is a mutually constituting relationship between the two. Salience in non-article V and "away" missions is built on the credibility of NATO's core mission.

---

[4] In 1999 NATO was enlarged with the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland. In 2004 the enlargement included the following countries, Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia. In 2009, Albania and Croatia joined the alliance.

Nevertheless, the political and military attention has since the 1990's been put on NATO's "new" missions, like its partnership- and enlargement processes (Aybet and Moore, 2010; Deni, 2007). It was the terrorist attacks on New York and Washington in September 2001 which made NATO a "global alliance". The NATO Summit at Prague in November 2002 decided that NATO should take on global responsibility by e.g. establishing a NATO Response Force (NRF) intended to be deployable worldwide (Ringsmose, 2009: 290). As underlined in the Prague summit declaration: "Recalling the tragic events of 11 September 2001 and our subsequent decision to invoke Article 5 of the Washington Treaty, we have approved a comprehensive package of measures, based on NATO's Strategic Concept, to strengthen our ability to meet the challenges to the security of our forces, populations and territory, from wherever they may come" (NATO, 2002). These developments should be understood in perspective of the alliance's need to adjust in order to deal with threats arising out of global interdependence, such as state failures and instability in developing countries.

As underlined by several analysts, the mission in Afghanistan presents a particular problem for alliance solidarity in NATO. Korteweg (in Crosbie, 2009) argues that there has not been a consensus in NATO as to what success in Afghanistan is, and no consensus either on how this could be achieved. There has, however, been a consensus that a comprehensive approach of some sorts needed to be developed, but even here the goals and the means varies.

Even though international stabilisation operations have become paramount for NATO so as to secure peace and stabilisation beyond NATO territory, it is only during recent years, and especially so after 2008 and the war between Russia and Georgia, that NATO has been rediscovering its core-purpose of collective defence. Additionally, the ISAF operation in Afghanistan has turned out to become a serious political liability for several NATO member countries, as well as for the alliance itself. In fact, ISAF has in quite a significant way confirmed the tendencies towards a multi-layered alliance structure (Noetzel and Schreer, 2009a, b). Consequently, several politicians and policy analysts have started to talk about an alliance adrift (Eide, 2009; Hamilton et al., 2009). The main argument among these politicians and analysts is that the alliance needs to rebalance between missions at home and away: "Today, NATO operates out of area, and it is in business. But it must also operate in area, or it is in trouble" (Hamilton et al., 2009: vii).

Such a development refers to an alliance "à la carte", divided into several factions of member states that also include the hollowing out of alliance solidarity (Jonson, 2010: 3). Hence, partly as a result of the ISAF mission, alliance solidarity – traditionally the glue of the alliance – has suffered severely. Today, alliance solidarity is increasingly built on a case-by-case basis (Knutsen, 2010: 183). As underlined in the Albright Report from May 2010, an important milestone in the process leading up to the Lisbon summit, the ISAF mission has led to concerns about unity of command, concerns about the restrictions (caveats) placed on the troops contributed by some Allies, and disagreements over tactics and goals (NATO, 2010c: 31). The result has been a "desolidarisation" and a weakening of the alliance, also including a weakening of the transatlantic security community.

Due to such developments, which imply a more fractured NATO, it has become more important to develop a deeper understanding of the changing nature of the transatlantic security community, including the character of alliance solidarity. To do so, this report focuses in the following on three different, but highly related aspects of the transatlantic security community; namely (1) institutional procedures, (2) mutual responsiveness, and a (3) common ideological basis. Institutional procedures refer to the willingness of NATO-member countries to apply the alliance's institutional arrangements in the handling of the common security challenges, as e.g. NATO's consultation mechanisms and command structure. Mutual responsiveness is a central concept in the research on security communities. In this setting, this concept will be linked to the basic norm in the transatlantic security community since the foundation of NATO in 1949, namely the willingness to mutually adapt to each other's security needs within a multilateral framework. The common ideological basis is connected to the different countries' perceptions of the role of institutions in international affairs, and whether one sees the international system through the prisms of a Westphalian or an international society approach. Hence, the question is whether the international system is regarded as an anarchy where the balance of power dynamics reigns or as an international society where e.g. the security dilemma has been made obsolete.

As underlined in the next section, it is these three concepts that explain the "back to basic" approach now adopted by NATO: a refocusing towards what NATO originally was all about, a common defence alliance, including a "reinvention" of the North Atlantic Treaty.

3   "Geopolitics is back" – the lead up to the Lisbon summit and NATO's Strategic Concept

The international climate leading up to the NATO summit in Lisbon in November 2010 was quite different from the climate at the turn of the millennium when NATO's previous strategic concept was decided upon at Washington in April 1999 (NATO, 1999). At that time, NATO was conducting a military operation against Yugoslavia because of its ethnic cleansing of Kosovars (Henriksen, 2007). It had, furthermore, been active on the ground in Bosnia-Herzegovina since 1995 in the fulfilment of the obligations under the Dayton agreement. Hence, NATO was regarded as a means so as to promote peace, stabilisation and democratisation, in which NATO found its new role in conducting military operations beyond its traditional area of responsibility.

Today, however, geopolitics is back. The optimism surrounding the fall of the Berlin Wall is over, and the fundamental structure of the international system is again in flux. The short, uni-polar moment is over, and the global centre of gravity is moving eastwards (Eide, 2009). In Europe, Russia has re-emerged as a dominant regional power. The short war between Russia and Georgia in August 2008 did not only have an impact on Georgia and the remainder of the South Caucasus, but also on the global level of international politics (de Haas, 2009). NATO as an alliance has also, since 2001, gone through one of its most serious crisis since its foundation in 1949 in connection with the Iraq-war in 2003. The ISAF mission in Afghanistan has furthermore challenged the alliance's internal cohesion. Hence, NATO's strategic environment was far more fragile in 2010 than it was in 1999 and so also was the character of the transatlantic security

community. As pointed out by Shea (2011, p. 29), the lesson of Iraq and Afghanistan is that interventions which last longer than the First and Second World Wars combined are no longer feasible for cash-strapped western governments with ballooning fiscal deficits.

Therefore, what characterised the NATO alliance was increasing disunity among its members about fundamental matters regarding its character, role, tasks and policy. Furthermore, it was an increased impression that solidarity among allies was weakening with an alliance membership now much more diverse with quite divergent threat perceptions, where NATO's image – particularly in the Muslim world – of being an instrument of problematic US policy often prevailed (Wittmann, 2011: 32).

As a result, NATO's *institutional procedures* were on a quite regular basis replaced with bilateral arrangements, also leading to the breach with the most important norm inside NATO since its foundation, namely *mutual responsiveness* that encompasses the willingness to mutually adapt to each other's security needs within a multilateral framework. Even the *common ideological* basis was challenged, first and foremost by the unilateralist turn in US foreign policy under the Bush administration. This administration's view upon US foreign policy was that the US should stand aloof from the rest of the international system. Hence, the US developed, under the Bush administration, an increased scepticism towards institutions, treaties and liberal internationalism that could jeopardise American sovereignty and constrain the exercise of power (Ikenberry, 2004): 8-9). The Obama administration from 2009 and onwards, reemphasised that also the US is in need for international legitimacy and multilateral frameworks for its foreign and security policy. In this sense it stands for a far more multilateral approach towards international politics (Melby, 2009).

Even though some analysts has underlined that the 2010 Strategic Concept is quite similar to the previous strategic concepts of 1991 and 1999, especially as regards the emphasis on crisis management and out-of-area stabilisation operations, it is important to emphasise the huge differences also (Shea, 2011; Wittmann, 2011). One of the most innovative aspects was the way the concept was framed. It was the NATO summit at Strasbourg/Kehl in April 2009, celebrating the 60th anniversary of the alliance that decided to initiate the process leading up to the new strategic concept. This process was as much about pressing the reset button for the functioning of the NATO alliance as a whole, as it was a process leading up to a new strategic concept. By several analysts, as well as by NATO and its Secretary General, Anders Fogh Rasmussen himself, considered the Lisbon summit (19-20 November 2010) to be the most important one in several years.

Figure 3.1   NATO's Secretary General Anders Fogh Rasmussen presents the Strategic Concept at the Lisbon summit in November 2010

The most innovative was undoubtedly the consultation process which lasted for approximately nine months under the leadership of the former US Secretary of State Madeleine Albright. She led a group of 12 external experts that worked from September 2009 until 17 May 2010 when the report "NATO 2020: Assured Security; Dynamic Engagement" was presented to the public (NATO, 2010c).

During this process, they conducted several seminars and visited all NATO capitals as well as Moscow, talking to innumerable security policy experts, political leaders and civil society representatives (Shea, 2011: 29-30). As further pointed out by Shea (ibid.), who at present is Deputy Assistant Secretary General for Emerging Security Challenges, this consultation process was not only a useful reality check for the Alliance, in terms of meeting outside expectations, but also enabled the allies to identify the crucial balances in the actual Strategic Concept text: between Article V collective defence and out-of-area operations; between nuclear deterrence and the need for arms control; between reassurance for NATO's new member states and a new quality engagement with Russia built around missile defence cooperation; and between what NATO can do itself and what it needs to do in partnership with others. This process helped, undoubtedly, in building an enhanced legitimacy for NATO, including NATO's own stakeholders in government, parliaments and the wider strategic community.

The Strategic Concept which was named "Active Engagement, Modern Defence" underlines introductorily that this new concept will guide the next phase in NATO's evolution, so that it continues to be effective in a changing world, against new threats, with new capabilities and new partners (NATO, 2010b). The content of the document revolves around three essential core tasks; deterrence and defence, security through crisis management, and finally, promoting international security through cooperation. Under the same chapter named Core Tasks and Principles, we also find the need for NATO consultation and the alliance as the "… unique and essential transatlantic forum for consultations on all matters that affect the territorial integrity, political independence and security of its members, as set out in Article 4 of the Washington Treaty". With regard to collective defence, the central character of Article V is restated unequivocally in the document.

This was important in the light of concerns expressed particularly by new allies who feared that this commitment could be diluted or taken less seriously by NATO members who, surrounded by friends and allies, might put out-of-area missions and harmony with Russia first (Wittmann, 2011: 34). Therefore, it is reassuring for the new members of the alliance, that the communiqué in point 19 underlines that NATO will "carry out the necessary training, exercises, contingency planning and information exchange for assuring our defence against the full range of conventional and emerging security challenges, and provide appropriate visible assurance and reinforcement for all Allies".

This does not, however, rule out the possibility that international stabilisation operations will remain high on the international security agenda. It surely will, which first of all is due to the current international security environment, where terrorism, cyber attacks, asymmetrical challenges, failed and failing states, and all the other security challenges the Strategic Concept covers. In an international situation where out-of-area missions will remain relevant, there is, however, a mutually constituting relationship between the two. Salience in non-Article V and "away" missions is built on the credibility of NATO's core mission (for further arguments in this direction, see (Eide, 2009). In this perspective it seems fair to argue that the Strategic Concept of 2010 operates within the realm of more symmetrical, rather than asymmetrical challenges and threats. Even though Wittmann (2011) argues that there is no solid unity in the document on a number of issues, including whether NATO is a regional or a global organisation, or on how it must balance collective defence and expeditionary orientation, it seems fair to argue that this document is far more forward-looking than the previous document which in sum was drawing experiences from the 1990's only. The result was that when the terrorist attacks on New York and Washington DC materialised on 11 September 2001, the member states and the alliance as such were rather ill-prepared to meet the challenges and threats now facing them.

At present, the most worrying element in the time to come is the impact from the financial crisis which has resulted in severe reductions in European defence budgets. As Hyde-Price (2011, p. 51) argues, the defence expenditure reductions in the "big three" (Germany, France and the United Kingdom) are seen as particularly troubling. Collectively, European NATO states have reduced their defence expenditure from €228bn in 2001 to €197bn in 2009 despite Afghanistan, Iraq, the fight against terrorism and a great number of EU and NATO missions (Hyde-Price, 2011: 51). Simultaneously, the Obama administration has warned its European allies that they could no longer expect the US to shoulder a disproportionate burden of maintaining the 28-member alliance. Today, the US accounts for 75 percent of all NATO defence spending, up from 50 percent during the Cold War (Whitlock, 2012). Therefore, a debate on US retrenchment from European security politics has started to appear. Some analysts argue that several European allies have grown too comfortable with shifting the responsibility for military action to the US (Schake, 2012: 17). Additionally, more and more European countries cut their defence spending not only because of budgetary pressures, but because they have grown less willing to use force as an element of state power in the international system. Consequently, this will mean that the European NATO allies in the time to come will need to do more individually, or in combination, without US participation.

As a result, we are not hearing analysts and pundits anymore who argue that NATO should go global (Daalder and Goldgeier, 2006). On the contrary, we are hearing analysts who argue the opposite, that NATO is not institutionally able to conduct counter-insurgency operations (COIN). The argument is that NATO's strategic value is undermined by its own institutional rules and procedures, and that NATO's primary COIN-function is, consequently, limited to operating under a narrow remit to defuse the conditions from which insurgency grows (Kay and Khan, 2007). The willingness among the NATO members to undertake such engagements is, however, quite rare. Therefore, NATO will remain an essentially regional organisation for the defence of Europe and its immediate neighbourhood. There is a risk that the US might lose interest in NATO under such conditions. However, Washington may also choose to view the alliance's unique ability to ensure military interoperability at all levels of allied forces as a common good that deserves to be supported (Heisbourg, 2012: 31-32). Therefore, the US interest in maintaining and further developing a transatlantic security community, and thereby keeping NATO as an institution to serve US security interests in Europe, should not be underestimated.

The Strategic Concept of 2010 and the Lisbon summit as such could in this perspective be regarded as a summit that assembled around NATO as a collective defence alliance, including the efforts to strengthen NATO's consultation mechanisms. In sense, the NATO summit strengthened the alliance's institutional procedures and the norm connected with mutual responsiveness. Such a development also implies that the common ideological basis, as the foundation for the transatlantic relationship in NATO, has been strengthened. On the basis of these three concepts, we can argue that the American and the European member states of NATO further underlined their common interest in maintaining NATO as the essential forum for consultation on Euro-Atlantic security issues. Anders Fogh Rasmussen, the Secretary General, was therefore right when he stated that this summit was the most important one in several years (NATO, 2010a). In this sense also, the concept of alliance solidarity was further developed by emphasising that NATO should remain predominantly a regional alliance, and that collective defence should remain the core business of the alliance. Consequently, the links between alliance solidarity and the transatlantic security community is pretty close, and closer than previously assumed.

However, as a report from the EU Institute for Security Studies (EU-ISS) emphasised in connection with NATO's Lisbon summit, the EU-NATO cooperation on military capabilities should also be improved, and NATO should, consequently, become a military component of a stronger EU-US strategic relationship (de Vasconcelos, 2010). The main argument here is that NATO does not cover the full spectrum of EU-US security relations. Hence, the time is ripe for a broader framework addressing all aspects of international security, ranging from crisis management to collective defence and from domestic security, freedom and justice to the Responsibility to Protect. This challenge raises another problem in European security politics, which undoubtedly has been there since these to institutions were established, namely how these two institutions should relate and cooperate with each other. As Hoffmann underlined in an article back in 1965: What will happen if the new partner might want to open a firm of its own instead of serving as the junior partner in America's mighty concern (Hoffmann, 1965): 87)?

4 How to understand the EU's common defence- and solidarity clauses

The close links between the transatlantic security community and alliance solidarity explains, as the previous section illustrated, NATO's refocusing towards collective defence and the alliance as first and foremost a regional organisation. The Lisbon Treaty's strengthening of the EU's CSDP instruments, to also encompass "harder" security measures like the common defence clause in Article 42.7 and the solidarity commitment in Article 222, should further on underline the EU's ambitions as regards becoming a more comprehensive and holistic security actor (see e.g. (Zwolski, 2012). As the former SG/HR Javier Solana insisted on several occasions, artificial distinctions between military missions and civilian ones should and must be avoided, because all CSDP missions involve both elements and that the distinctiveness of CSDP derives precisely from its civilian-military synergies (Howorth, 2007: 209-212). As the engagements in the Western Balkans, in the Middle East and in Afghanistan have shown, without the complementary civilian instruments of crisis management, the application of military power can often lead to failure.

The inclusion of these clauses in the Treaty should therefore not be regarded as a European attempt to become a rival to the US in the military sphere. On the contrary, the security situation in Europe will suffer severely if the US withdraws its military forces from the continent, and thereby abandons NATO as the institutional framework for the US military and political presence in Europe. The strengthening of the CSDP-mechanisms should first and foremost be regarded as means so as to acquire improved military capabilities, so as to avoid a one-sided dependence on the US in security issues like conflict management and conflict prevention (Sæter, 2005: 48). But it should also be emphasised that shall NATO as an alliance function properly, it needs to operate in a more equal setting. Jolyon Howorth explains in this respect that NATO and the EU contain 21 of the same nations, but the fact that one of those organisations contains the US, while the other does not, renders them totally different types of actors (Howorth, 2012: 14).

Figure 4.1   The EU-NATO relationship is of vital importance for European security

Consequently, from a European perspective, an absolute precondition for a continued transatlantic security community is that the US abandons its unilateralist foreign policy tradition and orients itself towards a multilateral approach regionally as well as in a more global setting. Additionally, the US must also accept that the EU's influence counts as much as the US' within the realm of NATO, and at the same time recognise that the US will never achieve a veto capability when it comes to the EU's further integration process. The introduction of these two clauses should therefore be seen in perspective of the continuing European integration process which might lead to a European strategic culture along the ways towards a more supranational security and defence policy in the EU (Meyer, 2006; Norheim-Martinsen, 2007; Ojanen, 2006).

As Teija Tiliikainen wrote in a report for the Finnish Ministry of Foreign Affairs in 2008, the mutual assistance clause emphasises solidarity among the EU members and in the long run it might form an incentive for the further intensification of the common defence policy (Tiliikainen, 2008). But she also underlines that such a clause will not have any immediate implications for the EU's military structures nor for the common capabilities of the Member States. Hence, NATO's common defence forms the core of defence cooperation for the majority of the EU's members. This is a result of the fact that the EU has a limited capacity to act as a security actor as long as Member States fail to internalise – both nationally and at the EU level – the concept of "pooled sovereignty" in order to foster democratic decisions on mutual defence (Topala, 2011: 4).

However, as Hanna Ojanen also points out, the more the EU becomes active in questions that used to belong to NATO, the more the two organisations are also compared to one another as to their respective efficiency and legitimacy in carrying out their tasks (Ojanen, 2006: 73-74). Actually, a set of formal arrangements between the two organisations, collectively and better known as the Berlin Plus framework, has been in effect since March 2003. This remains the main formal framework for EU-NATO cooperation, outlining the conditions under which the EU can draw on NATO assets in operations where NATO as a whole does not wish to act (Græger and Haugevik, 2011: 745). This arrangement has, however, not worked as intended, largely because of disagreements between Greece and Turkey concerning Cyprus' status. It should also be underlined that the French position as regards EU autonomy in security- and defence matters might also have played a significant role here, even though France at NATO's Strasbourg/Kehl summit in 2009 decided to reintegrate with NATO's military command structure. The result has therefore been a hampered political dialogue, a lack of coordination of strategy, a similar lack of institutional cooperation and, consequently, a security deficit when it comes to joint EU-NATO action (ibid: 746).

Nothing indicates that the EU-NATO relationship will improve either, which implies in practise that the Berlin Plus arrangement is obsolete. However, in perspective of NATO being the institutional expression of the transatlantic security community, how does the EU-process fit into this larger process of Atlantic cooperation, and how can we treat it theoretically? Here it might be argued that as long as the US follows a multilateral track in its foreign policy orientation, the transatlantic security community will live and most probably prosper. This will, however, not in any way indicate that the transatlantic security community should be regarded in a status-quo

perspective. Due to financial crisis, but also as a result of the European integration process, a concerted effort from both sides of the Atlantic is needed to reform the alliance: the European countries will need to assume greater responsibility for their own security, and the US will need to show understanding and support their efforts (Heisbourg, 2012; Schake, 2012).

Theoretically speaking, when studying European integration within the larger and more geographically encompassing Euro-Atlantic security community, it firstly becomes important to avoid the failure of regarding security community theory as a more general IR theory, something which again is taken to justify the subordination of other integration theories, like neo-functionalism, to the theory of security communities. Secondly, it becomes important to avoid regarding European integration, also within the spheres of security and defence, as something likely to remain permanently subordinate to the wider "Western" organisations of security communities and interdependence (Sæter, 1998: 33). Hanna Ojanen warns about the same aspects, when she from an integration theory point of departure analyses two models for studying European integration within the sphere of security and defence (Ojanen 2006). This is firstly a new type of supranational defence which may become a reality within the EU, and secondly, only challenged by the EU's close cooperation, or "fusion" with the intergovernmentalism of NATO. According to her, an EU-NATO fusion would imply that the EU would lose the opportunity of gradually developing a supranational security and defence policy (ibid: 71).

Therefore, to regard European integration as subordinate to the geographically broader Euro-Atlantic security community as expressed through NATO, will violate reality in the sense that it disregards the character and fundamental importance of the chief integration motives of some of the main European actors involved as well as the potential system-transforming effects of the integration process itself (Sæter, 1998: 38). The introduction of the common defence and solidarity clauses in the Lisbon Treaty, as well as the strengthening of the CFSP-mechanisms in it, can be regarded as part of an EU-externalisation process in terms of actively influencing and reshaping the international environment so as to make it more responsive to the agreed-on aims and common policies of the regional entity itself. To empirically illustrate this point, the last part of this report will analyse the French decision in 2009 to become reintegrated with NATO´s military command structure, a decision some analysts regarded as a U-turn in French security policy (Irondelle and Mérand, 2010: 30). The next section will illustrate that this was not the case. On the contrary, it could be regarded as a French attempt to "Europeanise" NATO through EU-externalisation, but also as an attempt to strengthen the Euro-Atlantic security community so as to foster stronger political and military ties between Europe and the United States.

5 France and NATO: Reintegration as part of a process towards "Europeanisation" and a continuing transatlantic security community?

France left NATO's military command structure in 1966 due to what the French president at that time, Charles de Gaulle, considered to be a changed security situation. He argued that the reduced threat from the Warsaw Pact, and a less credible US military guarantee towards Western Europe

had led to new conditions for France's relationship with NATO. Therefore, he concluded that the military integration in NATO was not in conformity with French national interests, while nevertheless remaining a full member of the alliance (Sæter, 1971: 314-315). Additionally, de Gaulle considered the US-led NATO alliance not as an alliance by equals, but as an alliance where the smaller member states, including France, were clearly subordinated to US leadership (Hoffmann, 1965: 96). In this respect, the French relationship with NATO has been labelled "friends, allies, but not aligned" (Fortmann et al., 2010: 1). Consequently, the French foreign policy ambition has been to create the conditions for an autonomous EU foreign policy, a multilateral institution-based international system, and the recreation of French "la grandeur" within the frameworks of a strong union legitimised by the respect for international law and human rights (Rieker, 2005: 273-274).

Figure 5.1   President François Hollande and President Barack Obama at NATO's Chicago Summit in May 2012

There were several historical processes at play that finally led to the decision by France in March 2009 to become reintegrated in NATO's military command structure. Firstly, France has since the end of the Cold War participated in all military stabilization operations led by NATO. The reason was that Paris during the first half of the 1990's became convinced that effective military intervention in the Balkans could only take place within a NATO framework. This was due to the alliance's competencies in operational planning and command structures (Howorth, 2010: 15). Consequently, France has grown closer to the alliance operationally and became in 2007 the fifth-leading financial contributor in NATO with 138 million Euros, or 7.5 percent of NATO's budget (Irondelle and Mérand, 2010: 33).

When the French president Nicolas Sarkozy finally decided to take the last step towards full NATO integration, this was clearly a result of a "creeping reintegration process" that has been going on since the 1990's. For example, France received observer status in NATO's Military Committee (MC) in 1993, and in 2007 when Sarkozy became president, the reintegration process had gone so far that France had become a member of nearly all NATO institutions. The exceptions were the Defence Planning Committee (DPC), the Nuclear Planning Group (NPG) and the integrated military command structure (ibid: 34). As part of NATO's continuing transformation process, France has also been heavily involved in NATO Response Force (NRF), where France from the outset has been one of the leading shapers (Pesme, 2010: 46-47). NRF has since the NATO summit in Prague (the Czech Republic) in November 2002 been at the centre of NATO's ongoing transformation, making NATO more in line with the global security challenges and threats (Rupp, 2006: 118).

Secondly, the EU integration process and France's insistence that this process should lead to a common defence policy and a possible common defence has played a significant role in explaining France's rapprochement towards NATO. From Sarkozy's perspective, the French reintegration process should be regarded as a means so as to boost CSDP and thereby the EU as an international renowned security- and defence actor. In France, a common foreign- and security policy has for a long time already been considered to be the heart and the motor of the EU integration process (Wind, 1992: 23).

Hence, since 2003, when CSDP became fully operative, the EU has conducted 26 civilian and military operations in three continents, mobilising a total of 10,000 European troops and 4000 police officers ((NOU), 2012: 726; Gnesotto, 2009). As both Gnesotto and Meyer argue, a European strategic culture is in the making, a culture which furthermore transcends the different national security cultures and interests, including compatible reactions and coherent analysis towards the outside world (Gnesotto, 2000; Meyer, 2006). Additionally, when the Lisbon Treaty entered into effect in 2009, the EU pillar structure was reformed that made it more feasible for the EU to further develop a more holistic approach in its foreign and security policies (Zwolski, 2012), even though coordination issues still pose some important challenges for the EU in its conduct of a foreign policy (Norheim-Martinsen, 2009: 113-116). However, the EU is not trying to copy NATO in becoming a similar military actor, because the distinctiveness of the EU is its civilian-military synergies, which clearly makes it a more comprehensive actor in security affairs (Howorth, 2007: 212).

Therefore, to enhance the EU's role as a security actor can be regarded as an example of an EU externalisation process in terms of actively influencing and reshaping the international environment, and especially so NATO where "Europeanisation" of the alliance has been considered as an overarching goal. Also from a French perspective, NATO integration is considered to be part of a rebalancing of the alliance so as to create a more viable transatlantic security community. For example, just five months after he became French president, in November 2007, Sarkozy stated his clear ambitions for France in a speech before the US Congress. In the speech he underlined that "…the more successful we are in establishing a

European defense, the more France will be resolved to resume its full role in NATO" (cited in Irondelle and Mérand, 2010: 34). At the same time, he also underlined that "all in all, I want to be your friend, your ally, your partner. But a friend who stands tall, an independent ally and a free partner" (cited in Howorth, 2010: 25), thus stating his clear ambitions for France as well as the EU as an independent security actor.

By some analysts, the policies by Sarkozy towards NATO have been called a gamble. Will France achieve what it wants from NATO-integration, or will it just become an ordinary NATO country that takes part in NATO operations under US leadership? The jury is still out on this matter, but some critics have emphasised that a new division of labour between the EU and NATO will appear as a consequence of Sarkozy's move (Irondelle and Mérand, 2010: 37-38). Such a division of labour includes a division between a high-intensity NATO and a low-intensity EU, with NATO keeping the right of first refusal. The same analysts also pose the possibility that the NATO-EU relationship might be organised around a reversed Berlin Plus agreement, stipulating that NATO could use the EU's civilian instruments, capabilities and resources (ibid.). The danger of such a move is that the EU might turn out to be just a civilian agency of the Atlantic alliance. Consequently, the French aim of turning the EU into a strategic actor as a result of French reintegration will not materialise. CSDP will in such a situation not disappear but evolve incrementally towards a permanent Berlin Plus situation, "in which the EU retains the political and strategic directions for a large number of missions, but NATO becomes a forum and enabler for the interoperability standards that these missions require" (ibid: 38). Other analysts underlines that the EU is currently neither a relevant nor visible performer in the context of NATO, whether in its institutional cooperation with the alliance or as a bloc of EU member states within NATO (Græger and Haugevik, 2011: 753). They point out that the Cyprus issue and the diverging agendas and priorities among member states on both sides make it difficult for the two organisations to find a shared way ahead.

Figure 5.2   The importance of soft power when analysing European integration of security and defence

However, the French move has already had some very important implications for NATO as a collective defence alliance and the transatlantic relationship as a security community. For a long time already, NATO has developed into an alliance for global intervention under a US political and military umbrella (see e.g. Sæter, 2005). As Howorth puts it, NATO which initially was designed to deliver a US commitment to European security, has now gradually been redesigned to deliver European support to the US' global strategy (Howorth, 2010: 23). By far the most important test has been the ISAF-operation in Afghanistan that has divided NATO members into contending camps and the result has become a multi-layered alliance structure (Howorth, 2010; Knutsen, 2011; Noetzel and Schreer, 2009a). Consequently, we have witnessed an institutional fragmentation of alliance-solidarity, where alliance solidarity no longer is a function of the transatlantic security community. On the contrary, the recent decade's experiences has illustrated that alliance solidarity is something which, to an increasing extent, has been built on a case-by-case basis (Knutsen, 2011).

Therefore, in connection with the work on NATO's strategic concept, France and its most important partner in Europe, Germany, advocated views that underlined the very close relationships between NATO as a security community and NATO as first and foremost a collective defence alliance. According to these two countries, NATO is an alliance with a regional, not a global aim. Hence, NATO's core task is collective defence, but both of them regard NATO's non-article 5 missions in a pragmatic way, and on the basis of a case-by-case approach (Ehrhart, 2010: 106). Furthermore, France has advocated that NATO must strengthen its consultation mechanisms in accordance with Article IV in the North Atlantic Treaty. NATO, should however, be kept intergovernmental, and confirm the alliance's strictly military role in crisis management and in concert with other actors in international security (Pesme, 2010: 55). As a consequence, what France wants for NATO is an alliance that de-emphasises NATO's interventionist agenda, which has harmed the transatlantic relationship, undermined alliance solidarity, and consequently challenged the character of the transatlantic security community.

In fact, we have to some extent witnessed a US-French understanding on several security issues during recent years. Firstly, the US has since 2007 given up its traditional resistance towards an autonomous EU security and defence policy (Korski et al., 2009: 1). Secondly, the former deputy director for defence strategy and requirements on the US National Security Council (NSC), Kori Schake, has emphasised that America's NATO allies will need to do more individually, or in combination, without American participation (Schake, 2012: 16). The Obama administration's insistence on playing only a supporting role in NATO's Libya Operation "Unified Protector" in 2011 might be considered as a clear step in such a direction. As commonly known, France and Great Britain were the lead-nations in this campaign against the former Libyan regime, even though the operation was dependent on US support on several vital capabilities like censors, intelligence and targeting. Thirdly, a US retrenchment from Europe may accelerate the emergence of a CSDP with a defence capability that is less dependent on US participation and support. According to Schake, this is a solution "many European governments have long hoped for" (ibid.). In fact, no region or country, save the US, possesses a portfolio of military power capabilities and a willingness to use them comparable to those of Europe (Moravcsik, 2010).

These three elements can analytically speaking, be taken as a clear sign of EU externalisation, but also as a clear sign of how the transatlantic security community might develop in the times to come. This is partly a result of French reintegration into NATO's command structure. Firstly, the processes which led to France's new relationships with NATO confirm the strong relationships between NATO as a security community and the alliance's common defence clause.

Secondly, alliance solidarity relates in this respect to NATO as a common defence alliance with a regional, not a global aim. Therefore, in the times to come, NATO must be able to strike a right balance between NATO's Article V and non-Article V activities. Hence, it becomes even more important to emphasise the mutually constituting relationships between the two (Eide, 2009).

Thirdly, the EU and its Member States will in the years to come have to shoulder a much larger burden when it comes to the EU's own security. The EU's own common defence and solidarity clauses should in this respect be regarded as an addendum to NATO's own common defence clause, which also underlines that the "commitments and cooperation in this area shall be consistent with commitments under the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation, which, for those States which are members of it, remains the foundation of their collective defence and the forum for its implementation." Nevertheless, for the non-NATO EU-members, these clauses increases their obligations vis-à-vis the other European NATO members. Furthermore, as a consequence of these clauses, it becomes even more important to follow the security debates in these countries. For example, for a country like Finland, Teija Tiilikainen argues that Finland should consider whether Finnish legislation should be reviewed pertaining to the possibility of providing armed assistance to the other Member States if war occurs (Tiliikainen, 2008).

How can we then conceive of NATO as a security community from a more theoretical angle? Firstly, NATO's institutional procedures need to be strengthened in the form of enhancing NATO's consultation procedures. A viable transatlantic security community is dependent upon NATO remains the main forum for consultation on Euro-Atlantic security issues. As the experiences from the recent year's stabilisation operations have shown, there are closer links between alliance solidarity and the transatlantic security community than previously thought of.

Secondly, mutual responsiveness which in this context includes the norm for mutual adaptation of NATO member states security needs within an institutional framework. This norm will undoubtedly be challenged in the coming years. The rebalancing of NATO which will be the result of US retrenchment will of course be further challenged from EU externalisation. As a result, even stronger emphasis should be put on NATO as a common defence alliance binding the US and its European allies together in a transatlantic security community. If a better balance between NATO's Article V and non-Article V missions are found, the greater political legitimacy NATO as an alliance will become. This might enhance the basic norm of mutual adaptation which, by security community theorists, are considered to be of considerable importance.

Thirdly, the common ideological basis is of course connected to the US foreign policy orientation of multilateralism, since a unilateral foreign policy orientation is contradictory to a continuing

and sustainable transatlantic security community. The previous Bush administration in the US clearly belonged to this tradition in US foreign policy, where the Iraq war in 2003 was the absolute climax in its unilateralist foreign policy tradition. But, as emphasised by Howorth, even throughout the Iraq crisis, France continued to act as a firm ally of the USA, participating strongly in the US-led Afghanistan mission and even at times providing more troops to the country than any other alliance member including the US itself (Howorth, 2010: 14).

6   Conclusions

The fundamental character of the transatlantic security community is changing. This report has first of all shown that the interplay between NATO as a security community in a Deutschian sense, and alliance solidarity in perspective of NATO's common defence clause is stronger than previously thought of. Additionally, even though it is necessary to emphasise that international military stabilisation operations will continue to be of importance for NATO's political relevance, it becomes even more important to strike a new balance between NATO's Article V and non-Article V missions (Eide, 2009). NATO is busier than ever, but in recent years we have observed an alliance adrift (see e.g. Hamilton et. al., 2009). This report has therefore argued that the three concepts, (1) institutional procedures, (2) mutual responsiveness, and a (3) common ideological basis, are of relevance for understanding NATO's transformation and the changing nature of the transatlantic security community.

Firstly, NATO's consultation mechanisms as expressed through Article IV in the North Atlantic Treaty need to be strengthened so that NATO remains the primary forum for consultations on transatlantic security issues. A strengthening of the institutional procedures also includes a closer focus upon NATO's own territory and own neighbourhood, including a re-introducing of regional responsibilities to NATO's two Joint Force Commands.

Secondly, mutual responsiveness as a concept also implies that NATO is in need for continuing transformation. At NATO's Chicago-summit in May 2012, "smart defence" has been introduced as a concept, together with two other themes as Afghanistan beyond 2014, and how to strengthen NATO's network of partners across the globe. As NATO's Press Service underlines, "with the financial crisis in Europe, severe deficit reduction measures in the United States and increased pressure on defence budgets, NATO's added value is to help countries work together. NATO has the capacity to connect forces and manage multinational projects" (NATO, 2012). Hence, smart defence implies greater prioritisation, specialisation and cooperation that will be turned into a long-term capability strategy. Therefore, it becomes even more important to emphasise the continuing connections between NATO transformation and maintaining the norm on mutual adaptations to each other's security needs within the NATO framework.

Thirdly, unilateralism as a tradition in US foreign policy orientation stays in contrast to a viable transatlantic security community. However, the debate we are witnessing now on US retrenchment from Europe is not a sign of such a unilateralist turn. On the contrary, if a US retrenchment implies that the EU takes on greater responsibility for its own security, including

it's near abroad, through a process of EU externalisation, a more balanced transatlantic security community might emerge. Such an externalisation process which implies a more coherent EU foreign policy will, in such a perspective, make the transatlantic security community stronger and with greater legitimacy. It should in this respect be noted that the 21 Member States that are also NATO members have rarely been seen to coordinate their position or attempt to seek with a single voice in NATO (Græger and Haugevik, 2011: 749). France's reintegration into NATO's command structure might further enhance the EU's ability to act in a more coherent manner within a NATO context, but the jury is still out when it comes to assessing the long-term implications of such a move.

What this study also has shown is that it becomes more important in the years to come to study the linkages between the European integration process and NATO, i.e. to study their mutual impacts and especially how EU externalisation will influence upon NATO's institutional procedures and the dominating norm on mutual adaptations. It is within this framework the future character of the transatlantic security community can be found.

References

Adler, Emanuel (1998): "Seeds of peaceful change: the OSCE's security-community building model," *Security Communities*, Emanuel Adler & Michael N. Barnett (eds.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Adler, Emanuel & Michael N. Barnett (1998): *Security communities*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Adler, Emanuel & Beverly Crawford (2002) "Constructing a Mediterranean Region: A Cultural Approach," Arrábia Monastery, Fundacao Oriente: Lisbon, Portugal.

Aybet, Gülnur & Rebecca R. Moore (eds.) (2010): *NATO in Search of a Vision*. Washington DC: Georgetown University Press.

Binnendijk, Hans & Gina Cordero (2008): *Transforming NATO*. Washington DC: The Center for Technology and National Security at the National Defense University.

Crosbie, Judith (eds.) (2009): *Can NATO's solidarity crisis be fixed?* Security & Defence Agenda The Hague Centre for Strategic Studies.

de Haas, Marcel (2009): *NATO-Russia Relations after the Georgian Conflict*. Clingendael

de Vasconcelos, Álvaro (eds.) (2010): *What do Europeans want from NATO?* Paris: EU-Institute for Security Studies (EU-ISS).

Deni, John R. (2007): *Alliance Management and Maintenance. Reconstructing NATO for the 21st Century*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Deutsch, Karl W. (1957): *Political Community and the North Atlantic Area: International Organization in the Light of Historical Experience*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
Daalder, Ivo & James Goldgeier (2006): "Global NATO", *Foreign Affairs* 85(5):105-113.

Daalder, Ivo & James M Lindsay (2005): *America Unbound. The Bush Revolution in Foreign Policy*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Ehrhart, Hans-Georg (2010): "Homeward bound ..., wherever: France's return to the military integration of NATO from a German point of view " *European Security* 19(1):97-112.

Eide, Espen Barth (2009): "Collective defence in today's security environment." *Ministry of Defence*. Oslo: Ministry of Defence.

Fortmann, Michel, David Haglund & Stéfanie von Hlatky (2010): "INTRODUCTION: France's 'return' to NATO: implications for transatlantic relations" *European Security* 19(1):1-10.

Gnesotto, Nicolle (2000): "For a common European security culture" *WEU-ISS Newsletter*, 31.

Gnesotto, Nicolle (2009): "The need for a more strategic EU" in *What ambitions for European defence in 2020?* Álvaro de Vasconcelos (eds.). Paris: EU Institute for Security Studies (EU-ISS).

Græger, Nina & Kristin M. Haugevik (2011): "The EU's Performance with and within NATO: Assessing Objectives, Outcomes and Organisational Practices" *Journal of European Integration* 33(6):743-757.

Hamilton, Daniel, Charles Barry, Hans Binnendijk, Stephen Flanagan, Julianne Smith & James Townsend (2009): *Alliance Reborn: An Atlantic Compact for the 21st Century* Washington DC: The Atlantic Council, Center for Strategic and International Studies, Center for Technology and National Security Policy, NDU Center for Transatlantic Relations, Johns Hopkins University SAIS.

Heisbourg, Francois (2012): "The defence of Europe: Towards a new transatlantic division of responsibilities" in *All Alone? What US retrenchment means for Europe and NATO*, Tomas Valasek (eds.) London: Centre for European Reform (CER).

Henriksen, Dag (2007): *NATO's Gamble. Combining Diplomacy and Air Power in the Kosovo Crisis*. Annapolis, Maryland: Naval Institute Press.

Hoffmann, Stanley (1965): "The European Process at Atlantic Cross-purposes" *Journal of Common Market Studies* 3(2):85-101.

Howorth, Jolyon (2007): *Security and Defence in the European Union*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Howorth, Jolyon (2010): "Prodigal Son of Trojan Horse: what's in it for France?" *European Security* 19(1):11-28.

Howorth, Jolyon (2012): "The EU, the US and NATO" in *What do Europeans want from NATO?,* Álvaro de Vasconcelos (eds). Paris: EU - Institute for Security Studies (EU-ISS).

Hyde-Price, Adrian (2011): "NATO's Political Transformation and International Order" in *NATO's New Strategic Concept: A Comprehensive Assessment*, Jens Ringsmose and Sten Rynning (eds.). Copenhagen: Danish Institute for International Studies.

Ikenberry, G. John (2004): "The End of the Neo-Conservative Moment." *Survival* 46(1):7-22.

Irondelle, Bastien and Frédéric Mérand (2010): "France's return to NATO: the death knell for ESDP?" *European Security* 19(1):29-43.

Jonson, Pål (2010): "The debate about Article 5 and its credibility. What is it all about?" *Research Paper* (58):12.

Kay, Sean & Sahar Khan (2007): "NATO and Counter-insurgency: Strategic Liability and Tactical Asset?" *Contemporary Security Policy* 28(1):163-181.

Knutsen, Bjørn Olav (2007): *NATO and the changing nature of the transatlantic security community*. Kjeller: FFI.

Knutsen, Bjørn Olav (2010): "Stabiliseringsoperasjoner: Mot et lagdelt Nato?" in *Utfordringer og strategi i freds- og stabiliseringsoperasjoner*, Tore Nyhamar (eds). Oslo: Abstrakt forlag.

Knutsen, Bjørn Olav (2011): "Europe, the US, and the Creation of a Multilayered NATO: Lessons from Afghanistan" in *Issues in EU and US Foreign Policy*, Münevver Cebeci (eds.). Lanham: Lexington books.

Korski, Daniel, Daniel Serwer & Megan Chabalowski (2009): *A New Agenda for US-EU Security Cooperation*. Madrid: FRIDE.

Mearsheimer, John J. (1994): "The false promise of international institutions" *International Security* 19(3):5-49.

Mearsheimer, John J. (2001): *The tragedy of Great Power Politics*. New York: Norton.

Melby, Svein (2009): *Obama og amerikansk utenriks- og sikkerhetspolitikk*. Oslo: Norwegian Institute for Defence Studies.

Meyer, Christoph O. (2006): *The Quest for a European Strategic Culture. Changing Norms on Security and Defence in the European Union*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.

Moravcsik, Andrew (2010): "Europe: The Quietly Rising Superpower in a Bipolar World" in *Rising States, Rising Institutions: Challenges for Global Governance*, Alan Alexandroff & Andrew Cooper (eds.). Washington DC: Brookings Institution Press.

NATO (1949): *The North Atlantic Treaty*. Brussels: NATO.

NATO (1995): *Study on NATO Enlargement*. Brussels: NATO.

NATO (1999): *The Alliance's Strategic Concept*. Brussels: NATO.

NATO (2002): *Prague Summit Declaration*. Brussels: NATO.

NATO (2010a): *NATO Launches an Ambitious Agenda for Lisbon summit.* Brussels: NATO.

NATO (2010b): *Strategic Concept for the Defence and Security for the Members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation - Active Engagement, Modern Defence*. Brussels: NATO.

NATO (2010c): Analysis and Recommendations of the Group of Experts on a New Strategic Concept for NATO: *NATO 2020: Assured Security; Dynamic Engagement*. Brussels: NATO.

NATO (2012): *Preparing for Chicago*. Brussels: NATO.

Noetzel, Timo & Benjamin Schreer (2009a): "Does a multi-tier NATO matter? The Atlantic alliance and the process of strategic change" *International Affairs* 85(2):211-226.

Noetzel, Timo & Benjamin Schreer (2009b): "NATO's Vietnam? Afghanistan and the Future of the Atlantic Alliance" *Contemporary Security Policy* 30(3):529-547.

Norheim-Martinsen, Per M. (2007): *The ends and means of a militarised European Union: European strategic culture revisited*. Oslo: Norwegian Institute for Defence Studies.

Norheim-Martinsen, Per M. (2009): *Beyond Intergovernmentalism: An Analysis of the European Union as a Strategic Actor*. Cambridge: University of Cambridge.

NOU, Norges offentlige utredninger (2012): *Utenfor og innenfor. Norges avtaler med EU* Oslo.

Ojanen, Hanna (2006): "The EU and NATO: Two Competing Models for a Common Defence Policy" *Journal of Common Market Studies* 44(1):57-76.

Pesme, Frédéric (2010): "France's 'return' to NATO: implications for its defence policy" *European Security* 19(1):45-60.

Rieker, Pernille (2005): "Power, Principles and Procedures: Reinterpreting French Foreign Policy Towards the USA" *International Politics* 42: 264-280.

Ringsmose, Jens (2009): "NATO's Response Force: finally getting it right?" *European Security* 18(3):287-304.

Rupp, Richard E. (2006): *NATO After 9/11. An Alliance in Continuing Decline*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Schake, Kori (2012): "US retrenchment is right and overdue" in *All Alone? What US retrenchment means for Europe and NATO*, Tomas Valasek (eds.) London: Centre for European Reform (CER).

Shea, Jamie (2011): "What does a New Strategic Concept do for NATO?" in *NATO's New Strategic Concept: A Comprehensive Assessment*, Jens Ringsmose & Sten Rynning (eds.). Copenhagen: Danish Institute for International Affairs.

Sæter, Martin (1971): *Det politiske Europa. Teori, idé, praksis*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Sæter, Martin (1998): *Comprehensive Neofunctionalism. Bridging Realism and Liberalism in the Study of European Integration*. Oslo: Norwegian Institute of International Affairs (NUPI).

Sæter, Martin (2005): "USA sett fra Europa" in *Hva nå USA og Europa?* John Kristen Skogan (eds.). Oslo: Gyldendal Akademisk.

Thies, Wallace J. (2009): *Why NATO endures*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tiliikainen, Teija (2008): *A Report on the mutual assistance clause included in the EU's Lisbon Treaty.* Helsinki: Ministry for Foreign Affairs.

Topala, Oana (2011): *How Common is CSDP? Solidarity and Mutual Defence in the Lisbon Treaty*. Brussels: European Security Review.

Wendt, Alexander (1999): *Social Theory of International Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Whitlock, Craig (2012): "NATO allies grapple with shrinking defense budgets." *Washington Post*. Washington DC.

Wind, Marlene (1992): "Eksisterer Europa? Refleksioner over forsvar, identitet og borgerdyd i et nyt Europa" in *Europa Nation-Union - efter Minsk og Maastricht*, Christen Sørensen (eds.). København: Forlaget Fremad A/S.

Wittmann, Klaus (2011): "An Alliance for the 21st Century? Reviewing NATO's New Strategic Concept" *NATO's New Strategic Concept: A Comprehensive Assessment* (2):31-42.

Wæver, Ole (1991): *Introduktion til Studiet af International Politik*. København: Forlaget Politiske Studier.

Yost, David S. (1998): *NATO Transformed. The Alliance's New Roles in International Security*. Washington DC: United States Institute for Peace Press.

Zwolski, Kamil (2012): "The EU as an international security actor after Lisbon: Finally a green light for a holistic approach?" *Cooperation and Conflict* 47(1):68-87.

List of Acronyms

AOR	Area of Responsibility
CFSP	Common Foreign and Security Policy
COIN	Counter insurgency
CSDP	Common Security and Defence Policy
DPC	Defence Planning Committee
EU	European Union
EU-ISS	EU-Institute for Security Studies
IR	International relations
ISAF	International Security Assistance Force
JFC	Joint Force Command
KFOR	Kosovo Force
MC	Military Committee
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organisation
MoD	Ministry of Defence
NPG	Nuclear Planning Group
NRF	NATO Response Force
SG/HR	Secretary General/High Representative
UN	United Nations
USA	United States of America