NATO's Cooperation with Others: A Comprehensive Challenge

Agata Szydełko [*]

What defines NATO when it is compared to the United Nations and the European Union? Is NATO an "institution of doing" (task-oriented), or an "institution of being" (identity-based)? While trying to define the role and reasons for NATO's existence in comparison to the United Nations (UN) and European Union (EU) and trying to answer whether NATO is an identity-based or task-oriented institution, it is worthwhile to reach out to the sources and find out when and why these three international institutions were established in the first place and what is the primary driver of their decision making.

When? The Establishment of the UN, EU, and NATO

The United Nations officially came into existence on 24 October 1945, when the Charter was ratified by China, France, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, and the United States and by a majority of other signatories of the fifty-one original member states. United Nations Day is celebrated on 24 October each year.

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) was established in Washington, D.C. on 4 April 1949. The treaty, signed by the foreign ministers of Belgium, Great Britain, Canada, Denmark, France, Iceland, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, and the United States, provided for mutual assistance should any one member of the alliance be attacked. Greece and Turkey joined NATO on 18 February 1952, and the Federal Republic of Germany (West Germany) on 9 May 1955, setting the initial group of the Alliance at fourteen member nations.

About one year after the founding of NATO, on 9 May 1950, Robert Schuman, the French Minister of Foreign Affairs, made an important speech putting forward proposals based on the ideas of Jean Monnet. He proposed that France and the Federal Republic of Germany pool their coal and steel resources in a new organization that other

---

[*] Agata Szydełko is the Principal Business Manager responsible for the strategic planning, cooperation development and business assurance in support of Multinational and Bilateral Cooperation with the Nations in the area of C4ISR in the Directorate Sponsor Account NATO and Nations (DSA NN) within the NATO C3 Agency. This paper has been developed under 2011-2012 Edition of the NATO Executive Development Programme (NEDP) led by ESCP Europe Business School, under direction of Dr Cristina Barrios. The NEDP is a prestigious nine-month programme, designed specifically for NATO civilians at mid- to upper-management levels. The aim of the programme is to build and develop a network of international civilians with talent and potential from across the Alliance. It will enhance their knowledge of NATO, its identity and core values, as well as give an insight into a rapidly changing world.

European countries would be able to join. This date can be regarded as marking the birth of the European Union, and 9 May is now celebrated annually as Europe Day. On 18 April 1951, six countries—Belgium, the Federal Republic of Germany, France, Italy, Luxembourg, and the Netherlands—signed the treaty establishing the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC). So over the course of less than a decade—from 1945 to 1955—the European countries with the longest shared histories of military conflict over the past several centuries, and which just fought each other in two world wars in the preceding thirty years, decided to jointly establish or participate in three international institutions, each of which had a clear focus on the promotion of collaboration and collective efforts, international peace, and human rights.

Why? The Reasons for the Establishment of the UN, EU, and NATO

The original reasons for the establishment of these three institutions are described in their respective founding documents: the Charter of the United Nations, the North Atlantic Treaty, and the Statute of the Council of Europe, and can be summarized in the comparative table provided below.[1]

Although the implementation of the values has evolved over time, the core values have remained essentially unchanged for over sixty years of the existence of the respective organizations. These six decades have not been without changes, however. The EU has ratified seven subsequent treaties since 1949—Rome (1957), Merger (1965), Schengen (1985), Nice (2001), Maastricht (1992), Amsterdam (1997), and Lisbon (2007)—while NATO has adopted seven Strategic Concepts since the creation of the Alliance.

When trying to distinguish NATO's founding principles from those of the UN and EU, the clearest distinction comes in the definition of the reasons for NATO's existence. The invocation of the generic values of peace and freedom (which are supplemented with democracy and individual liberty) refers directly to the concrete political systems that the Alliance sought to preserve. Already in its founding documents, NATO very clearly defined the actual implementation methods for the preservation of those values, both at the level of the establishment of a common identity through the rule of law, stability, and well-being, as well as at the level of putting steps in place for the preservation of peace and security through the collective defense guarantees between the member states.

---

[1] The Statute of The Council of Europe, available at http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/ Commun/QueVoulezVous.asp?NT=001&CM=8&DF=26/12/2011&CL=ENG. Chapter 1, Article 1 of the Charter states that "The aim of the Council of Europe is to achieve a greater unity between its members for the purpose of safeguarding and realising the ideals and principles which are their common heritage and facilitating their economic and social progress." It goes on to explain that "This aim shall be pursued through the organs of the Council by discussion of questions of common concern and by agreements and common action in economic, social, cultural, scientific, legal and administrative matters and in the maintenance and further realisation of human rights and fundamental freedoms."

Table 1: Original Reasons for the Establishment of the UN, EU, and NATO.

	United Nations: Charter of the United Nations (1945)	*NATO: North Atlantic Treaty (1949)*	*EU: Statute of the Council of Europe (1949)*
Values	International peace and security, respect for the principles of equal rights and self-determination of peoples	Peace, freedom, democracy, individual liberty	Ideals and principles that are the common heritage of the members; human rights and fundamental freedoms
Goals	Develop friendly relations; promote and encourage respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms; act as a hub to harmonize the actions of nations in the pursuit of these common ends	Rule of law, stability, well-being	Achieve greater unity between its members
Tasks	Take effective collective measures (and other measures as appropriate) to strengthen universal peace and achieve international cooperation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural, or humanitarian character	Ensure collective defense and preserve peace and security	Facilitate the economic and social progress of the member states; serve as a forum for discussion of questions of common concern; implement agreements and common action in economic, social, cultural, scientific, legal, and administrative matters and in the pursuit of the further realization of human rights and fundamental freedoms
Geographical Limitations	None	North Atlantic Area	The European continent (plus the United Kingdom)
Current number of member states	194	28	27

How? The Decision-Making Principles of the UN, EU, and NATO

The primary decision-making principles to be used vary significantly between the three institutions. However, in all of them the indispensable element of the decision-making process is the preparation of decisions before their formal approval, so that when the proposals are actually presented at the highest level, no real discussions need to take place. Instead, the decisions that were already agreed upon for approval are simply officially confirmed.

The new EU system of qualified majority voting is the decision-making system that most nearly resembles the actual political practices of the established European democracies. A qualified majority is achieved only if a decision is supported by 55 percent of the member states, including at least fifteen of them; the nations in this majority group must represent at least 65 percent of the Union's population.[2] Although certain policy fields remain subject to unanimity in whole or in part, in practice the Council attempts to achieve unanimous decisions, and qualified majority voting is often simply used as a means to pressure members to compromise in order to arrive at a consensus. For example, in 2008, 128 out of 147 European Council decisions were unanimous. Within the remaining decisions, there were a total of thirty-two abstentions, and only eight votes against the respective decision.[3]

---

[2] See "A New System of Qualified Majority," at http://europa.eu/scadplus/constitution/doublemajority_en.htm. Article I-25 of the Constitutional Treaty defines a new system of qualified majority voting. The old system allocating each Member State a certain number of votes has been abandoned in favor of a double majority system. The provision according to which a qualified majority must be supported by 55 percent of member states, including at least fifteen of them, requires clarification: in a union of twenty-five member states, fifteen States represent 60 percent of the total. However, in a union of more than twenty-five states, this provision will lose importance: from the moment that the union enlarges to twenty-six member states, 55 percent of the total number of states will, mathematically, require at least fifteen of them. This provision can therefore be seen as transitional.

Article I-25 specifies that these provisions also apply in cases where the European Council decides by qualified majority, in which case the President of the European Council and the President of the Commission do not take part in the vote. This new system went into effect on 1 November 2009, the date when the new Commission was inaugurated following the 2009 European elections.

[3] Certain policy fields remain subject to unanimity in whole or in part, such as:
- Membership of the Union (opening of accession negotiations, association, serious violations of the Union's values, etc.)
- Taxation
- The finances of the Union (own resources, the multiannual financial framework)
- Harmonization in the field of social security and social protection
- Certain provisions in the field of justice and home affairs (the European prosecutor, family law, operational police cooperation, etc.);
- The flexibility clause (352 TFEU) allowing the Union to act to achieve one of its objectives in the absence of a specific legal basis in the treaties

The European Parliament is the only directly elected body of the European Union. Voters across all of the member states of the European Union, comprising 500 million citizens, elect the 736 Members every five years. This means that 0.0001472 percent of the entire EU population participates directly in the Parliament. This representation ratio is nearly seven times smaller than the average ratio observed in the four major EU countries themselves – Germany: 0.0007585 percent (622 seats, 82 million population); France: 0.0009159 percent (577 seats, 63 million population); United Kingdom: 0.0010484 percent (650 seats, 62 million population); and Italy (630 seats, 60 million population). This also means that each vote in the European Parliament represents approximately 680,000 European citizens. As states are allocated their seats according to population, the four largest nations in the EU—Germany, France, Italy, and the United Kingdom—together represent nearly 43 percent of the entire parliament.

The decision-making system employed by the United Nations seems to represent the totally opposite extreme from the principles of European democracies. Out of the 194 member states, only fifteen (less than 8 percent) are represented on the United Nations Security Council. Within those fifteen, five are permanent members: the People's Republic of China, France, the Russian Federation, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America; the non-permanent members are elected for a period of two years. Security Council decisions on procedural matters are made by an affirmative vote of nine members, while Security Council decisions on all other matters are made by an affirmative vote of nine members including the concurring votes of the permanent members. This means that the five permanent member countries, representing 2.58 percent of all the member countries, have veto power over all Security Council decisions on non-procedural matters.[4]

- The common foreign and security policy, with the exception of certain clearly defined cases
- The common security and defense policy, with the exception of the establishment of permanent structured cooperation
- Citizenship (the granting of new rights to European citizens, anti-discrimination measures)
- Certain institutional issues (the electoral system and composition of the parliament, certain appointments, the composition of the Committee of the Regions and the European Economic and Social Committee, the seats of the institutions, the language regime, the revision of the treaties, including the bridging clauses, etc.).

[4] See Chapter V of the United Nations Charter, at http://www.un.org/en/documents/charter/chapter5.shtml. Article 23 of Chapter V governs the composition of the Security Council. It specifies that, in addition to the five permanent members, the General Assembly shall elect ten other members of the United Nations to be non-permanent members of the Security Council, giving consideration to the contribution of members of the United Nations to the maintenance of international peace and security and to the other purposes of the organization, and also to equitable geographical distribution. These non-permanent members are elected for a term of two years; a retiring member is not eligible for immediate re-election. Each member of the Security Council has one representative.

Article 27 of Chapter V outlines the voting procedures on the Security Council. Each member of the Security Council has one vote. In addition to the provisions outlined above,

The decision-making principles of NATO are based on consensus, and thus best represent the principles of equality and solidarity of all the member states of the Alliance. All members of the North Atlantic Council (NAC) have not only an equal right to express their views but an equal share in the consensus on which decisions are based. Decisions are agreed upon on the basis of unanimity and common accord. There is no voting or decision by majority. This means that policies decided upon by the NAC are supported by and are the expression of the collective will of all the sovereign states that are members of the Alliance and are accepted by all of them.[5]

Key Challenges for NATO

NATO currently faces a wide range of tensions within and among its member states. While these tensions vary across the wide range of the organization (which reaches from the Pacific Coast of the United States and Canada eastward to the easternmost borders of Turkey), there are some common challenges. How can NATO deal with tensions resulting from political challenges within its member states? How can it address the balance between the civilian and military roles in intervention situations? And how can an organization that was founded to address the bipolar realities of the Cold War find a new role and new identity for itself in the post-Cold War era? One way to answer these questions is to examine what NATO actually does in cooperation with the UN and EU.

Formal Relationships between the Organizations

The formal relationship between NATO and the UN is established through NATO's founding document, the North Atlantic Treaty, which establishes a reporting mechanism on the invoking of Article V (NATO's collective defense guarantee) to the UN Security Council.[6]

---

any party to a dispute under consideration by the Security Council must abstain from the vote.

[5] See http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/topics_49763.htm.

[6] Full text of the North Atlantic Treaty is available at http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_17120.htm. Article 1 of the treaty states that the parties undertake, as set forth in the Charter of the United Nations, to settle any international dispute in which they may be involved by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security and justice are not endangered, and to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.

Article 5 holds that the parties agree 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 they agree that, if such an armed attack occurs, each of them, in exercise of the right of individual or collective self-defense recognized by Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, will assist the attacked party through such action as it deems necessary, including the use of armed force, to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area. Any such armed attack and all measures taken as a result are to be reported to the Security Council. Any hostilities initiated under Article 5 will cease when the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to restore and maintain international peace and security.

With the working relations between the United Nations and the Alliance limited during the Cold War, after the fall of the Berlin Wall NATO contributed to a number of the UN Security Council's Resolutions. Examples of this cooperation include:

- UN Security Council resolutions that provided the mandate for NATO's operations in the Balkans and in Afghanistan, and the framework for NATO's training mission in Iraq.[7]

- UNSCR 1325, which was adopted in October 2000. This resolution recognizes the disproportionate impact that war and conflicts have on women and children, and highlights the fact that women have been historically left out of peace processes and stabilization efforts. It calls for full and equal participation of women at all levels in issues ranging from early conflict prevention to post-conflict reconstruction, peace, and security.[8]

- UN Security Council Resolution 1540, establishing for the first time binding obligations on all UN member states under Chapter VII of the UN Charter to take and enforce effective measures against the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD), their means of delivery, and related materials.[9]

- UNSCR 1973, approved in March 2011, which called for the establishment of a ceasefire and a complete end to violence and all attacks against, and abuses of, civilians in Libya (the mandate ended on 31 October 2011).[10] The importance of this resolution and NATO's engagement draws on the doctrine of the Responsibility to Protect (R2P), the principle that sovereign states, and the international community as a whole, have a responsibility to protect civilians from mass atrocity crimes.

The EU developed a framework of cooperation with NATO that aimed to increase its visibility and capabilities.[11] Negotiations over the framework took almost three years, and were finalized in December 2002. It included the following elements:

- Berlin+ arrangements for the use of NATO assets and capabilities by the EU

Article 7 of the North Atlantic Treaty does not affect the primary responsibility of the Security Council for the maintenance of international peace and security.

Article 12 states that, after the Treaty has been in force for ten years, or at any time thereafter, the parties can consult together for the purpose of reviewing the Treaty, having regard for the factors then affecting peace and security in the North Atlantic area, taking into consideration current United Nations measures.

7   See http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/topics_50321.htm.
8   See http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/topics_56984.htm.
9   See http://www.state.gov/t/isn/c18943.htm.
10 See http://www.cfr.org/libya/un-security-council-resolution-1973-libya/p24426.
11 Can Buharali, EDAM Board Member, "Better NATO-EU Relations Require More Sincerity," Discussion Paper Series 2010/1, Centre for Economics and Foreign Policy Studies (EDAM), supported by the German Marshall Fund of the United States (GMF) (January 2010); available at http://www.gmfus.org/galleries/ct_publication_attachments/NATOgmf edamNATOpaper.pdf.

- Arrangements for a NATO-EU Strategic Partnership (set forth in the EU-NATO Declaration on European Security and Defense Policy (ESDP) and an exchange of letters between Secretary-Generals)

- Arrangements in the Nice Implementation Document regarding the involvement of non-EU European allies in the ESDP.

Despite the further recognition of the benefits of the close NATO-EU collaboration in May 2010 by the Group of Experts on a New Strategic Concept for NATO,[12] declarations on strengthening the collaboration by the heads of state and government in the Lisbon Summit Declaration in November 2010,[13] the creation of a new NATO Strategic Concept, and the call by NATO's Secretary-General for intensified NATO-EU practical cooperation,[14] all formal collaboration between NATO and the EU is strictly channeled through the NATO-EU Capability Group. This group works from a selective list of discussion topics that are mutually agreed upon in advance between the NATO and EU representatives; the actual collaboration is effectively limited to staff-to-staff exchanges at the working level.

Although the accession of Cyprus to membership to the EU in 2004 can be perceived as the main reason for the limited cooperation between NATO and the EU, due to the challenges this causes with NATO member Turkey in particular, there are other reasons why NATO-EU cooperation often faces challenges. One might be the EU's willingness to move into the area of defense and security, which has not traditionally been among the EU's foundational tasks, and historically has not been a responsibility that is attributed to the EU. With this move, the reciprocal relationships and roles of

---

[12] "NATO 2020: Assured Security; Dynamic Engagement – Analysis and Recommendations," of the Group of Experts on a New Strategic Concept for NATO, 17 May 2010; available at http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_63654.htm?selectedLocale=en. In the 1990s, NATO's primary goal (in association with the European Union) was to consolidate a Europe whole and free. For the first time in its existence it engaged in military action, putting a halt to ethnic cleansing in the Balkans. The Cold War's end enabled the Alliance to establish partnerships with former adversaries, including Russia, and to admit new members who embraced democratic values and who could contribute to NATO's collective security. The result was a Europe more democratic, united, and peaceful than it had ever been.

[13] "Strategic Concept for the Defence and Security of the Members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation," adopted by Heads of State and Government in Lisbon, 19 November 2010; available at http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/events_66529.htm. This concept stated that the NATO member states would, *inter alia*, strengthen NATO's strategic partnership with the EU, in a spirit of mutual openness, transparency, and respect for the autonomy and institutional integrity of both organizations; enhance practical cooperation in operations throughout the crisis spectrum, from coordinated planning to mutual support in the field; broaden political consultations to include all issues of common concern, in order to share assessments and perspectives; and cooperate more fully in capability development, to minimize duplication and maximize cost-effectiveness.

[14] See www.nato.int/cps/en/SID-5BAFFF96-B6D80BDD/natolive/opinions_70400.htm.

both NATO and the EU need to be redefined, particularly in consideration of the very fine distinction between the concepts of protection and defense.

It is worth noting that the only truly joint NATO-EU operation was Operation Althea in Bosnia and Herzegovina, launched in 2004. This level of collaboration has not been achieved in other instances where cooperation was not perceived to be imperative. Hence, today the two organizations do not fully cooperate, even though they work side by side in the same theater of operation in Kosovo (KFOR and EULEX), Afghanistan (ISAF and EUPOL), and the Gulf of Aden off Somalia (Ocean Shield and ATALANTA).

Since 2003, the EU has conducted more than twenty military and civilian operations. Among them, only two were Berlin+ type of operations that drew upon NATO assets and capabilities. There are at least two explanations for the low numbers of Berlin+ operations. First, these EU operations were small in scale, and hence all resources could be provided and managed by the EU. In any case, on most of these occasions their military component was restricted. Second, given the difficulties associated with NATO-EU relations, the EU has sought to build the capabilities to enable it to operate autonomously as early as possible.[15]

Mutually Reinforcing Institutions: Next Steps Toward Complementary Roles

The mutual reinforcement of the three international institutions—the UN, EU, and NATO—lies not only in the differences and complementary functions of their mandates, but also in the fact that the organizations share many member states. NATO and the EU already share twenty-one and possibly twenty-six members, with all the member states of those two organizations also being members of the UN.

Another aspect of the three institutions being complementary to one another is the direction of enlargement through the accession of new members to NATO and the EU. The European Union's direction of enlargement (bearing in mind the current financial difficulties within the Euro zone) is focused on the assimilation of the remaining countries of the Balkans—Croatia, Macedonia, and Montenegro—and is overshadowed with the dispute over the name of the Former Yugoslavian Republic of Macedonia (FYROM)[16] between FYROM and Greece.[17]

The possible accession of Iceland to the Union would have a minor impact on the EU at large. The accession is being hindered by sensitive discussions over the protection of agriculture and fisheries and whale hunting, although it is likely that these problems can be resolved in the near future.[18] The biggest challenge remains the possi-

---

[15] Buharali, "Better NATO-EU Relations Require More Sincerity."

[16] Turkey recognizes the Republic of Macedonia with its constitutional name.

[17] See http://www.euractiv.com/enlargement/eu-macedonia-relations-linksdossier-329923. EU candidate status was granted in December 2005, under the U.K.'s EU presidency. Yet FYROM has not been able to open any negotiating chapters, with Greece vetoing the start of talks due to the name issue.

[18] See www.europarl.europa.eu/news/nl/pressroom/content/20110318IPR15863/html/MEPs-welcome-Iceland's-progress-towards-EU-membership.

ble accession of Turkey, a prospect for which the EU simply does not seem to be ready. The EU considers Turkey's accession to be different from previous enlargements because of the combined impact of Turkey's population; geographic size and location; economic, security, and military potential; as well as its cultural and religious characteristics.[19] The accession negotiations between the EU and Turkey have been stalled since 2008.[20]

The primary directions for NATO enlargement follow somewhat different courses:

- The accession of the additional Balkan nations (Bosnia and Herzegovina, FY-ROM, Moldova, Montenegro, Serbia)

- Integration of the European countries that are not yet part of the Alliance (Austria, Finland, Sweden, Switzerland, Ireland)

- Strengthening NATO's partnership with Russia

- Accession of the former Soviet Republics (Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyz Republic, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, Uzbekistan)

An interesting summary of the next steps to these complementary roles is the "Study on NATO Enlargement," dated 3 September 1995 (available on the NATO website), which considers the process of NATO enlargement as being complementary to the enlargement of the European Union – a parallel process that contributes significantly to extending security and stability throughout Europe and extending it to the new democracies in the East.[21]

---

[19] Commission of the European Communities, Brussels, 6 October 2004, Sec 1202; Commission Staff Working Document on Issues Arising from Turkey's Membership (Com 656 final).

[20] See http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/candidate-countries/turkey/eu_turkey_relations_en.htm.

[21] See http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_24733.htm. The Study on NATO Enlargement (3 September 1995) outlined several principles of enlargement, stating that the accession of new member states should help to promote the purposes and principles of the UN Charter, and to safeguard the freedom, common heritage, and civilization of all Alliance members and their people, founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty and the rule of law. New members are required to conform to these basic principles.

Enlargement was to be conducted in line with the provisions of Article 10 of the North Atlantic Treaty, which states that "the parties may, by unanimous agreement, invite any other European state in a position to further the principles of this Treaty and to contribute to the security of the North Atlantic area to accede to this Treaty." In addition, enlargement presumes that new members will enjoy all the rights and assume all obligations of membership under the Washington Treaty; accept and conform with the principles, policies and procedures adopted by all members of the Alliance; strengthen the Alliance's effectiveness and cohesion; and preserve the Alliance's political and military capability to perform its core functions of common defense as well as to undertake peacekeeping and other new missions.

New members are also expected to be part of a broader European security architecture based on true cooperation throughout the whole of Europe. Such a structure would threaten no one, but would serve to enhance stability and security for all of Europe. They are also expected to respect the continuing important role of the Partnership for Peace (PfP, which will

A Comprehensive Approach to Global Security

According to the European Security Strategy (ESS), "In contrast to the massive visible threat in the Cold War, none of the new threats [outlined in the ESS] is purely military; nor can any be tackled by purely military means. Each requires a mixture of instruments." Moreover, most of the present-day conflicts take place in locations that are physically distant from the European or Euro-Atlantic territories, yet many of them are still regarded as posing a threat to the populations of EU or NATO member states. The human security concept that is accepted within the EU[22] and the UN concept of Responsibility to Protect[23] both call for the internationalization and globalization of responsibilities for preventing genocide and mass atrocities and for protecting potential victims.

NATO's new Strategic Concept, adopted at the Lisbon Summit in November 2010, underlines that the lessons learned from NATO operations show that effective crisis management calls for a comprehensive approach involving political, civilian, and military instruments. Military means, although essential, are not enough on their own to meet the many complex challenges to Euro-Atlantic and international security. Allied leaders agreed at the Lisbon Summit to enhance NATO's contribution to a comprehensive approach to crisis management as part of the international community's effort and to improve NATO's ability to contribute to stabilization and reconstruction efforts.[24]

So the changes in three dimensions of military conflicts—the combined nature of the threat, the distant geographical location of the conflict, and the recognition of the inter-territorial responsibilities for protection—are well identified and recognized. The answer to the challenges those changes bring is the adoption of a comprehensive approach that involves all the key international stakeholders, including the UN, EU, and NATO.

NATO has the benefit of great clarity about the reasons for its existence, directly calling on the principles of democracy and individual liberty and setting forth imple-

---

both help prepare interested partners, through their participation in PfP activities, for the benefits and responsibilities of eventual membership and serve as a means to strengthen relations with partner countries that may be unlikely to join the Alliance soon or at all. Finally, new NATO member states are expected to complement the enlargement of the European Union, a parallel process that also contributes significantly to extending security and stability to the new democracies in the East.

22 Mary Kaldor, Mary Martin, and Sabine Selchow, "Human Security: A New Strategic Narrative for Europe," *International Affairs* 83:2 (2007): 273–88. "[A] human security approach may be the only way to close what can be described as the security gap. Conventional military approaches do not seem to be working in places like Iraq or Afghanistan or Lebanon. Millions of people live in situations of deep insecurity, in large parts of Africa, the Middle East, the Balkans, Central Asia and the Caucasus. The inability of our institutions to address the challenge of global insecurity greatly weakens their legitimacy."

23 Alex J. Bellamy, "The Responsibility to Protect – Five Years On," *Ethics and International Affairs* 24:2 (Summer 2010): 143–69.

24 NATO, "A 'Comprehensive Approach' to Crisis Management" (updated 21 March 2012); available at http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/topics_51633.htm.

mentation principles through the collective defense provision. Actually, NATO can be regarded as an instance of regional implementation of the principles of the UN, with the added political context of democracy, and the benefit of building on numerous historical and economic commonalities between the member states. As such, it can serve as an implementation and consultation platform between the EU and UN, since it already shares twenty-one members with the EU. At the same time, NATO is able to remain clearly focused on the preservation of peace and security for its member states.

Although the decision-making principles of NATO are based on consensus, the stipulation that NATO operations require approval in the form of United Nations Security Council resolutions in order to go into effect *de facto* brings Alliance missions under the oversight of nations that are not part of NATO, including the Russian Federation (which is a NATO partner) and the People's Republic of China. This challenging arrangement establishes the need for extensive consultations about any Alliance operations and missions before the UN mandate is even granted, thus recognizing the key role of the non-NATO nations in the development of the mission and relevance of the Alliance. With an increasing regional role, Turkey, next to China and Russia, has emerged as the third key partner in the further development of the strategic partnerships between the UN, EU, and NATO.

The call of United Nations Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon on the UN to close the gap between its lofty rhetoric and its often less-than-lofty performance cannot be met by any single international organization alone. The complementary roles of the UN, EU, and NATO should continue to be fully employed—in particular in the case of NATO-EU collaboration—in the pragmatic implementation of high-level political decisions.

Bibliography

Bellamy, Alex J.. "The Responsibility to Protect – Five Years On." *Ethics and International Affairs* 24, no. 2 (2010): 143-69.

Buharali, Can. "*Better NATO-EU Relations Require More Sincerity*." In *Discussion Paper Series 2010/1*. Centre for Economics and Foreign Policy Studies (EDAM), 2010.

Kaldor, Mary, Mary Martin, and Sabine Selchow. "Human Security: A New Strategic Narrative for Europe." *International Affairs* 83, no. 2 (2007): 273-88.

NATO 2020: Assured Security; Dynamic Engagement – Analysis and Recommendations., 2010.

NATO. *Strategic Concept for the Defence and Security of the Members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation*. Heads of State and Government in Lisbon, 2010.