

CHARLES UNIVERSITY
FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
Institute of International Studies

Mgr. Iva Štverková

**The Role of the US in NATO:
How Did It Change after 9/11 under
Bush Administration**

Master thesis

Prague 2017

Author: Mgr. Iva Štverková

Supervisor: Mgr. Jana Sehnálková

Academic Year: 2017

Bibliographic note

ŠTVERKOVÁ, Iva. *The Role of the US in NATO: How Did It Change after 9/11 under Bush Administration*. Praha, 2017. 56 s. Diplomová práce (Mgr.) Univerzita Karlova, Fakulta sociálních věd, Institut mezinárodních studií. Katedra amerických studií. Vedoucí diplomové práce Mgr. Jana Sehnálková.

Abstract

The goal of this thesis is to examine president Bush's policy after 9/11 and its implications for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. The shock of 9/11 attacks resulted in "war mentality" manifesting itself in the pressure of the public and media for swift radical actions. This resulted in ad hoc decisions taken without proper analyses and consideration of consequences. After 9/11, Bush Administration used black-and-white rhetoric and simplified the war on terror into war between good and evil. The U.S. under Bush did not consider international institutions to play significant role in international politics and preferred bilateral cooperation. By omitting the Alliance, Washington, however, undermined NATO. Europe was sympathetic to the U.S. and proclaimed its support for Washington since day one but European NATO members and the U.S. had different threat perception regarding Iraq, and could not agree on a common solution. The actions taken by Americans in Afghanistan and Iraq and the reluctance of European allies in supporting the U.S. war against terrorism resulted in escalation of relations in the Alliance. As the U.S. headed toward engagement in two conflicts, it increasingly appreciated the value of NATO. On the other hand, Europe never forgot that the United States is its main ally. Most visibly, the Alliance fell behind the mission in Afghanistan in the most escalated time of conflict over Iraq, which actually freed American capabilities to be redeployed from Afghanistan to Iraq.

Abstrakt

Cílem této diplomové práce je analyzovat zahraniční politiku prezidenta G.W. Bushe po 11. září 2001 a její dopady pro Severoatlantickou alianci. Spojené státy

po teroristických útocích prošly šokem, který způsobil přijetí tzv. „válečné mentality“, jež se projevovala tlakem veřejnosti a médií na to, aby vláda rychle podnikla razantní kroky. To mělo za následek řadu ad hoc rozhodnutí přijatých bez řádné analýzy a zvážení následků. Bushova vláda používala po 11. září černobílou rétoriku a zjednodušovala válku proti terorismu na válku dobra proti zlu. Spojené státy za Bushovy vlády nepovažovaly mezinárodní instituce za důležité a místo nich preferovaly bilaterální spolupráci. Opomíjením Aliance ovšem Washington NATO podkopával. Evropa se Spojenými státy soucítila a od prvního dne USA podporovala, avšak evropští členové NATO a Washington vnímali hrozbu ze strany Iráku odlišně, a proto se nemohli shodnout na společném řešení. Kroky, které Američané podnikli v Afghánistánu a Iráku, v kombinaci se zdrženlivostí Evropy plně podpořily válku proti terorismu, měly za následek vyhocení vztahů mezi členy Aliance. Čím více se Spojené státy blížily vojenskému zásahu v Iráku a tudíž vedení dvou velkých válek, tím více začaly oceňovat roli, kterou může NATO hrát. Evropané na druhou stranu nikdy nezapomněli na to, že Spojené státy jsou jejich hlavním spojencem. To je zřejmé i z toho, že NATO převzalo misi v Afghánistánu v době, kdy Aliance byla na ostří nože kvůli Iráku, což v důsledku uvolnilo americké síly, aby se mohly přemístit z Afghánistánu do Iráku.

Klíčová slova

Spojené státy americké, USA, Severoatlantická aliance, NATO, 11. září, Irák, Afghánistán, transatlantické vztahy, G. W. Bush

Keywords

United States, U.S., North Atlantic Treaty Organization, NATO, 9/11, Iraq, Afghanistan, transatlantic relations, G.W. Bush

Range of thesis: 103 110

Declaration of Authorship

1. The author hereby declares that he compiled this thesis independently, using only the listed resources and literature.
2. The author hereby declares that all the sources and literature used have been properly cited.
3. The author hereby declares that the thesis has not been used to obtain a different or the same degree.

Prague 19.5. 2017

Bc. Iva Štverková

Acknowledgments

I would like to express my gratitude to my supervisor Mgr. Jana Sehnálková for her guidance in carrying out this thesis.

Institute of International Studies Master thesis proposal	
Jméno:	Bc. Iva Štverková
E-mail:	iva.stverkova@icloud.com
Semestr:	Winter
Akademický rok:	2015/2016
Název práce:	The Role of the US in NATO: How Did It Change after 9/11 under Bush Administration?
Předpokládaný termín ukončení (semestr, školní rok):	LS 2016/017
Vedoucí diplomového semináře:	prof. PhDr. Svatava Raková, CSc.
Vedoucí práce:	Mgr. Jana Sehnálková
V čem se oproti původnímu zadání změnil cíl práce?	It did not change. The goal remains to produce an analysis of NATO crisis from the perspective of the United States.
Jaké změny nastaly v časovém, teritoriálním a věcném vymezení tématu?	There were no changes. The topic of this thesis is not demarcated territorially. The timeframe is from the attacks on September 11, 2001 to the beginnings of invasion to Iraq in 2003.
Jak se proměnila struktura práce (vyjádřete stručným obsahem)?	<p>This thesis is divided into three chapters. The first chapter offers theoretical background. The first part examines main international relations theories and their application to international institutions. The second part, which is called "National Security Policy Decision-Making Process" identifies the main actors who create external security policy of the US.</p> <p>The second chapter "U.S. National Security Policy at the Turn of Millennium" is divided into three parts. The first part is focused on national security policy process under president Bush. The second part is dedicated to U.S. attitudes toward international institutions. The third part is then specifically aimed at U.S. position toward NATO.</p> <p>Chapter three called "9/11, Bush, and NATO" focuses on American and NATO's reaction to the attacks. It looks at why NATO as an alliance was not engaged in Afghanistan since the beginning. It also examines the Bush Doctrine. Another subchapter is focused on the conflict among NATO members regarding military solution for Iraq. The chapter is concluded by analysis why NATO did not fall apart and instead became important again.</p>
Jakým vývojem prošla metodologická koncepce práce?	The methodology remains to be a qualitative analysis.
Které nové prameny a sekundární literatura byly zpracovány a jak tato skutečnost ovlivnila celek práce?	A number of speeches of U.S. and NATO representatives was examined. From the

secondary literature, I would like to point out:

- John J. Mearsheimer, "The False Promise of International Institutions," *International Security* 19 (3/1994-1995): 5-49.
- James D. Morrow, "Alliance and Asymmetry: An Alternative to the Capability Aggregation Model of Alliance," *American Journal of Political Science* 35(4) (1991): 904-907.
- Roger Z. George and Harvey Rishikof, *The National Security Enterprise: Navigating the Labyrinth* (Georgetown: Georgetown University Press, 2011).
- Zbigniew Brzezinski, *Volba: Globální nadvláda nebo globální vedení*, trans. Martin Ritter (Praha: Mladá fronta, 2004).

The first two articles are useful to understand American perception of international institutions. The book from George and Rishikof offers an insight to the U.S. national security policy decision-making. The Brzezinski's monography outlines the dilemmas, which the United States have to face as a hegemon.

Charakterizujte základní proměny práce v době od zadání projektu do odevzdání tezí a pokuste se vyhodnotit, jaký pokrok na práci jste během semestru zaznamenali (v bodech):

In the last semester, I have dedicated my time especially to reading of primary sources and secondary literature. The structure of the thesis has been modified. I have also begun to work on the first chapter.

Podpis studenta a datum:

Schváleno:	Datum	Podpis
Vedoucí práce		
Vedoucí diplomového semináře		

Table of Contents

Introduction	3
Literature review	4
Structure	5
1 Theoretical Framework	7
1.1 Applying International Relations Theories to International Institutions	7
1.1.1 Realist and Neorealist Theory	7
1.1.2 Neoliberal Institutionalism.....	8
1.1.3 Collective Security	10
1.1.4 Constructivism and Critical Theory	11
1.2 U.S. National Security Policy Decision-Making Process	12
1.2.1 Executive Branch.....	12
1.2.2 National Security Act.....	12
1.2.3 Congress.....	13
1.2.4 Other Actors	14
2 U.S. National Security Policy at the Turn of Millennium	16
2.1 National Security Policy Process under G. W. Bush	17
2.2 The U.S. Attitude toward International Institutions	21
2.3 United States and NATO Membership	22
3 9/11, Bush, and NATO	28
3.1 NATO's Reaction to 9/11	28
3.2 Afghanistan	30
3.2.1 NATO: An Inconvenience for Washington.....	31
3.2.2 NATO's Role in Afghanistan.....	32
3.3 Bush Doctrine	35
3.4 Iraq	39
3.5 Why NATO Became Important Again	43
Conclusion	47
Summary	51
Sources	52

List of Acronyms

CIA	Central Intelligence Agency
DCI	director of central intelligence
EU	European Union
GWOT	Global War on Terrorism
ISAF	International Security Assistance Forces
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NSA 1947	National Security Act of 1947
NSC	National Security Council
NSS	National Security Strategy
OEF	Operation Enduring Freedom
OEF-A	Operation Enduring Freedom in Afghanistan
STANAVFORMED	Standing Naval Force Mediterranean
UK	United Kingdom
UN	United Nations
UN SC	United Nations Security Council
U.S.	United States
WMD	Weapons of mass destruction

Introduction

The specific geographical position allowed the United States to get used to an extraordinary sense of security. It lays between two oceans and it has two considerably weaker neighbors from north and south. The U.S. participated in both World Wars and became engaged in a number of conflicts over the years, for example in Vietnam or Kosovo, but a war never came to American mainland. Furthermore, the “victory” in the Cold War and immense advanced military capabilities demonstrated in the first Gulf War only reinforced American confidence in its exceptional strength. However, 9/11 shattered this illusion of invulnerability.

The U.S. foreign security policy in Bush’s first term was impetuous and ill-considered. The change in U.S. approach to NATO after 9/11 was ill-advised and only short-term deviation from long-term time-proven stable transatlantic cooperation. Europe will remain the main American ally in the future because it still has much to offer and only through international cooperation can Washington successfully exercise its role of a global hegemon.

After the end of World War II, the U.S. irretrievably renounced its policy of isolationism and became entangled in world affairs. With traditional European powers; the United Kingdom, France, and Germany; exhausted from the war and with more than enough domestic problems, and totalitarian Soviet Union trying to seize control over the world, the U.S. quickly became the leader of the liberal democratic world standing against the Soviets and the world power. Washington was one of the founding members of a number of international institutions including the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), a security alliance based on collective defense, which lasts till these days. NATO worked as deterrence against the Soviet Union during the Cold War and the Alliance slowly redefined its role in new unipolar world to suit international security scene without a clear enemy. After the attacks on 9/11, the Alliance activated the Article V of Washington Treaty for the first time in its history. The article guarantees collective action against an aggressor assaulting any of the member states. The U.S. decided not to make use of the offered assistance.

The goal of this thesis is to discover the reasons which led the Bush administration to bypass the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and instead to prefer a “coalition of willing”. This thesis will also try to examine whether this decision was made by a narrow group of people or whether it reflected a shift in public opinion

or a conviction of knowledgeable professionals. To that end, the thesis will also examine the foreign policy-making process in the U.S. government. To either confirm or disprove the thesis, it is necessary to answer whether the U.S. considered Europe as needed and important ally for the twenty-first century.

The topic of this thesis is not demarcated territorially. It is rather focused on U.S. government, and actions as well as speeches of its representatives regarding NATO and about how should Washington act abroad in response to the terrorist acts. The timeframe is from the attacks on September 11, 2001 to the beginnings of invasion to Iraq in 2003. The methodology used is qualitative analysis combined with induction.

Literature review

I primarily draw from a number of strategic documents made by U.S. government such as National Security Strategy as well as from international ones such as The Alliance's Strategic Concept, the Washington Treaty. A number of statements made by North Atlantic Council was analyzed. I also used several speeches made by key government official including, of course, the president George W. Bush.

While writing this thesis I derived from a number of books and articles to create a comprehensive analysis. Particularly two articles were very useful while writing the first part of chapter one focused on theory regarding security alliances: *The False Promise of International Institutions*¹ from John Mearsheimer and *Alliance and Asymmetry: An Alternative to the Capability Aggregation Model of Alliances*² from James Morrow. Both authors are political scientists and professors at top American universities. The first article examines the rationale behind international institutions in general, the second one focuses solely on security alliances. The compilation *The National Security Enterprise: Navigating the Labyrinth*³ edited by Roger Z. George and Harvey Rishikof provides much needed insights into the principal national security agencies and other significant institutions that shape the U.S. national security decision-making process. It was a very helpful source to understand how U.S. national security policy is made and implemented. The monograph *Permanent alliance? NATO*

¹ John J. Mearsheimer, "The False Promise of International Institutions," *International Security* 19 (3/1994-1995): 5-49.

² James D. Morrow, "Alliance and Asymmetry: An Alternative to the Capability Aggregation Model of Alliance," *American Journal of Political Science* 35(4) (1991): 904-907.

³ Roger Z. George and Harvey Rishikof, *The National Security Enterprise: Navigating the Labyrinth* (Georgetown: Georgetown University Press, 2011).

and the Transatlantic Bargain from Truman to Obama⁴ written by Stanley Sloan is a great guide to the transatlantic relations and security cooperation. Stan Sloan explains that the alliance operates on bargaining between Europe and the United States and makes a strong case that NATO is still going to be relevant in the future. Tom Lansford's *All for One: Terrorism, NATO, and the United States*⁵ focuses on the role the Alliance played in the war against terrorism. It offers an in-depth analysis of Alliance's first invocation of Article V of the Washington Treaty. Lansford also describes common history and ideals, on which NATO has been built. The book specifically analyzes political differences among the member states. *The Choice: Global Domination or Global Leadership*⁶ written by former National Security Advisor Zbigniew Brzezinski provides a realistic picture about the U.S. interests, possibilities and options in the world. It also describes current and future dilemmas the U.S. government will face as a global leader. Brzezinski declares that American power and globalization are central realities of the world today. Globalization on one hand promotes American dominance but, on the other side, it fuels anti-American resentment. At the turn of millennium, the U.S. had unprecedented power but after 9/11 Americans also felt less secure than ever. Brzezinski brings to attention the historic choice facing America whether it will strive to dominate the world, or rather lead it. The book is a critique of the Bush administration, but Brzezinski offers an alternative according to which America's well-being and the world's are entwined. He calls for a responsible U.S. role in the world as a guarantor of global security and promoter of the global common good, which cannot work without international cooperation.

Structure

This thesis is divided into three chapters. The first chapter offers theoretical background. The first part examines main international relations theories such as realism, neorealism, neoliberal institutionalism, collective security theory, constructivism, and critical theory, and their application to international institutions. The second part, which is called "National Security Policy Decision-Making Process"

⁴ Stanley R. Sloan, *Permanent Alliance? NATO and the Transatlantic Bargain from Truman to Obama* (London, UK: The Continuum International Publishing Group Inc, 2010).

⁵ Tom Lansford, *All for One: Terrorism, NATO, and the United States* (Burlington, USA: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2002).

⁶ Zbigniew Brzezinski, *Volba: Globální nadvláda nebo globální vedení*, trans. Martin Ritter (Praha: Mladá fronta, 2004).

identifies the main actors who create external security policy of the US. It looks especially into the role of executive and legislative branch but also deals with courts, think tanks, and lobby groups. It explores National Security Act of 1947 and the changes it brought.

The second chapter “U.S. National Security Policy at the Turn of Millennium” is divided into three parts. The first part is focused on national security policy process under president Bush. It is oriented solely on external policy and does not examine domestic national security issues. The second part is dedicated to U.S. attitudes toward international institutions. The third part is then specifically aimed at U.S. position toward NATO.

Chapter three called “9/11, Bush, and NATO” focused on American and NATO’s reaction to the attacks. It looks at why NATO as an alliance was not engaged in Afghanistan since the beginning. It also examines the Bush Doctrine. Another subchapter is focused on the conflict among NATO members regarding military solution for Iraq. The chapter is concluded by analysis why NATO did not fall apart and instead became important again.

1 Theoretical Framework

1.1 Applying International Relations Theories to International Institutions

Different importance is put on alliances and international organizations in realism, institutionalism, collective security theory, and critical theory. Understanding the motivation behind entering and participating in an international institution, and specifically in an international security organization, is a baseline for analysis of the U.S. position toward NATO. Realism was predominant approach to international relations for centuries, however, the West attempted to build a system based on international institutions in the 20th century. While realism does not consider institutions to be of significant importance, institutional theories, which include institutionalism, collective security theory, and critical theory; have institutions in its core. As institutional theories are younger than realism, they are extensively a reaction to the realist theory dominant for centuries. The main issue they disagree on is whether international institutions have the ability to significantly contribute to the international stability.⁷

1.1.1 Realist and Neorealist Theory

Realist theory, or Realism, which stands on basic assumptions of anarchical international system, power struggle, national interest, and states as rational actors, has dominated international relations for centuries. Realism originated already in the 4th Century BC around the idea that a state that has the power to do so, would expand. Realism considers states to be the main actors in an anarchical international system. It holds that each state struggles for power and behaves in a rational way. Each state's most basic objective is survival. Realists think of the world to be a "self-help" system, in which each state can rely only on its own power and resources.⁸ The struggle for power is eternal or, as Mearsheimer puts it, international relations are "a state of relentless security competition".⁹ Reasons for trust among individual actors are very few and the possibility of war is omnipresent. A war

⁷ Mearsheimer, "International Institutions," 8-9.

⁸ Lansford, *All for One*, 9.

⁹ Mearsheimer, "International Institutions," 9.

could result in a termination of a state's existence thus placing other countries in the role of deadly enemies.¹⁰ It is so because there is no authority above nation-states that would have the ability to punish the aggressor.¹¹

Realism and Neorealism explain the creation of alliances as a response to shift in power and an effort to balance new great powers. Therefore, Realists tend to view NATO as a conventional alliance that was created to balance against new power realities emerging from the World War II and to respond to Soviet threat.¹² This view of NATO has proven to be simplistic especially as the Alliance has survived the disappearance of the Soviet Union and thus disappearance of the threat against which it was created.

According to Realism, international institutions do not have a meaningful influence on relations among states or on states' behavior. Institutions serve a dominant state to pursue its interests. Realists point out that international institutions lack capabilities to enforce universal rules.¹³ The cooperation through alliance is based on the balance-of-power logic and it is aimed against a common enemy. Furthermore, Realists propose that international institutions merely reflect the distribution of power in the international system and calculations of self-interests of individual players.¹⁴

1.1.2 Neoliberal Institutionalism

Neoliberal Institutionalism is based on idealist and liberal school of thought; it is a "hybrid between traditional realism and idealism".¹⁵ Basically, it is an effort to introduce moral and legal standards to behavior of states. Examples of this theory are Woodrow Wilson's effort to create the League of Nations after the World War I, or, for instance, Immanuel Kant and his enforcement of international law.¹⁶

Similarly to Realism, Neoliberal Institutionalism stands on the assumptions that the nature of international system is anarchy and that the actors

¹⁰ Ibid., 9.

¹¹ Lansford, *All for One*, 9.

¹² Alexandra Gheciu, *NATO in the "New Europe"*, (Stanford, USA: Stanford University Press, 2005), 211.

¹³ Lansford, *All for One*, 9.

¹⁴ Mearsheimer, "International Institutions," 13.

¹⁵ Lansford, *All for One*, 10-11.

¹⁶ Ibid., 10-11.

are nation-states.¹⁷ Furthermore, Neoliberal Institutionalism considers nation-states to be rational and therefore it assumes that they engage in cost-benefit analysis.¹⁸

Neoliberal Institutionalism, however, refuses definition of power used by Realist because it is too narrow as it basically includes only military strength and does not consider factors such as economic strength, attractiveness of actors, and appeal of their economic system, etc.¹⁹ In other words, the neoliberal institutionalism enriches traditional realist definition of power by adding soft power.

Another difference is that Realists consider international politics to be zero-sum game, while neoliberal institutionalism suggests that when one state succeeds, it may benefit others too.²⁰ This logic can be applied to international security as well. For example, the nuclear weapons capabilities of the U.S. or UK benefit the whole Alliance and it was used to deter the Soviet Union from attacking Europe members of NATO. In general, security gains of one country may as well produce security and stability to its surroundings.

Neoliberal Institutionalism considers cheating and distrust among states to be the main obstacles for cooperation in the international arena.²¹ The solution to this problem is institutions that establish rules, promote communication, and thus may encourage states to arrive to similar conclusions. However, the impact of institutions in the international security environment is limited because it is much more difficult to develop trust among states. The result of cheating or breaking the established rules by one state may end up being not just economic loss but it can be deadly and terminal for the other state.²² Mearsheimer points out a weak spot of neoliberalism to be its focus only on cooperation when states do not have contradictory interests and it does not concern itself with the role of institutions in securing stability of international system. Neoliberal institutionalists separate security from political economy or international politics, and they focus mostly on the latter, especially on economic cooperation and environmental issues.²³

With regard to NATO, neoliberal institutionalist scholars Robert Keohane and Celeste Wallander claim that alliances and security management

¹⁷ Gheciu, *NATO in the "New Europe"*, 216.

¹⁸ Lansford, *All for One*, 10-11.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 10-11.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 11.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 11.

²² Mearsheimer, "International Institutions," 18-19.

²³ *Ibid.*, 15-16.

institutions are two different concepts. While they define alliance as a coalition against a threat, they view security management institutions as platforms to deal with variety of risks. Therefore, NATO has to be regarded as a security management institution designed not only to deal with the Soviet Union (which is nowhere mentioned in the Washington Treaty) but also with variety of other challenges including mistrust among its own members or creating a common identity.²⁴

1.1.3 Collective Security

Collective Security theory recognizes the role military power has in international arena and emphasizes that its proper management is necessary to reach peace and stability. It considers the international institutions to be “key to managing power successfully”. This theory was crucial in creating post World Wars order.²⁵

The goal of Collective Security is to persuade states to act against Realism and accept three basic norms. First, it requires that all state abjure the use of force with the aim to alter already-existing status quo. In other words, it forbids a war of aggression. All the disputes should be settled peacefully. It suggests that when an aggressor appears, the international community isolates him and he has to face the power of all. Second, international community has to be formed by “responsible” states, which would automatically act against the aggressor. Third, states must trust each other. Each state has to believe that other states would not turn their back on it in case it becomes a victim of an aggressor.²⁶

Unfortunately, Collective Security theory does not suggest how to achieve these three norms. It does not offer an advice how to overcome fear among states, how to divide the costs when acting against an aggressor, how to build trust among states or solution for situation when an aggressor has strong political or economical ties to other states. Moreover, the line between defense and aggression is sometimes very thin as witnessed during “preemptive war” in Iraq, and it is sometimes very difficult for international community to agree on an aggressor, especially when unconventional warfare and non-state actors are more and more common.

²⁴ Gheciu, *NATO in the "New Europe"*, 216.

²⁵ Mearsheimer, "International Institutions," 27.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 27-33.

1.1.4 Constructivism and Critical Theory

Constructivism forms foundation of Critical Theory. It is created around the idea that ideology and discourse, the way people think about certain issues, have impact on international politics. Constructivists insist social context gives material structures a meaning because the meaning changes due to different interpretations.²⁷ An example of that is currently the word “refugee”, which originally meant a person who flees to safety due to war or persecution but today may be defined in much broader terms including for example economic refugee. Furthermore, according to Constructivism, actors identify and pursue interests based on certain identity, which is socially constructed.²⁸ For example, part of the rivalry between Saudi Arabia and Iran is based on socially constructed identities as Arabs vs. Persians.

Constructivism emphasizes process of socialization, in which a state can learn desired behavior and norms and thus be socialized into international community. An example of that is socialization of Central and Eastern Europe to the Western community after the end of the Cold War, which resulted in countries of that region entering the European Union and NATO.²⁹

Constructivism focuses solely on the process of change but it does not offer predictions about the future. It is a reaction to Realism in a way that it tries to alter the discourse in international politics, in which states think in terms of self-interest and self-help. Instead, it tries to prompt countries to identify their national interest with interest of international community or at least to think about their national interest in a context of international system.³⁰ Mearsheimer observes: “Critical theorists directly address the question of how to bring about peace, and they make bold claims about the prospects for changing state behavior. Specifically, they aim to transform the international system into a “world society”.”³¹

To conclude, institutions have the ability to shape perception and thus interests and preferences of individual states. They are, at least to some extent, also capable of creating a common identity. Therefore, Critical Theory considers the role of international institution in international system to be of high importance.

²⁷ Gheciu, *NATO in the "New Europe"*, 221-223.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 223.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 223.

³⁰ Mearsheimer, "International Institutions," 37-39.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 37.

1.2 U.S. National Security Policy Decision-Making Process

To be able to answer how much influence George W. Bush and his administration had on the U.S.-NATO relation, it is necessary to understand the decision-making process regarding U.S. national security policy and identify the main players. The president and the executive branch in general are in the center but they do not have unlimited power. The other main actors are the Congress, courts, media, think-tanks, and for instance lobby groups.

1.2.1 Executive Branch

In the center of the national security system lays the executive branch. U.S. president is the Commander in Chief, he also has the power to negotiate treaties, and he appoints heads of government departments. Traditionally, foreign security policy was handled mainly by the State Department, which is now called the Department of State, and also by the War Department and the Navy Department, which merged into the Department of Defense. However, the Department of State depends on currently serving president regarding the amount of power he would delegate to it and not every president consider it the main institution to handle foreign policy.³²

1.2.2 National Security Act

National Security Act of 1947 helped the U.S. to adapt for its new role in the world, which it took on after the World War II, and it created National Security Council (NSC), National Security Advisor, and the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA). Until the Second World War, the United States mostly maintained isolationist foreign policy with few exceptions one of them being the engagement in the World War I in 1917-1918. After the WWII, Washington did not decide to return to the traditional isolationism; instead the U.S. became engaged in the world affairs. National Security Act became the founding stone of new elaborate national security process, which was complemented by subsequent legislation as well as countless executive actions. The NSA 1947 created National Security Council, which was an institution with an aim to help the president to coordinate foreign policy and to serve as a mechanism for crisis management. National Security Advisor serves as the head of NSC.

³² Jon J. Rosenwasser and Michael Warner, "History of Interagency Process for Foreign Relations in the United States: Murphy's Law?," in *The National Security Enterprise: Navigating the Labyrinth*, ed. Roger Z. George and Harvey Rishikof (Georgetown: Georgetown University Press, 2011): 11-20.

NSA also established Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) and with it a director of central intelligence (DCI). Their main task has been analytical work on national level and clandestine operations abroad.³³

1.2.3 Congress

Congress plays another important role in national security system but its power and influence change in time. It has the explicit power to “provide for the common Defense,” “declare War,” “provide and maintain Navy,” “ratify treaties with foreign countries,” and “make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval forces,” according to the Article I of the U.S. Constitution.³⁴ In practice it means that Congress can influence foreign policy making through the budget process, hearings and committee reports, ratification of treaties, confirmation of ambassadors, or for example media statements. Gerald Warburg recognizes the strong role of executive that “directs all international diplomatic initiatives and commands U.S. military forces” but claims that “only by building a domestic political consensus, however cumbersome, can the president advance a sustainable policy.”³⁵ In other words, if the president wants to push through an effective foreign policy, he needs the support of Congress.

Congress became more involved in foreign policy making during the 1970s due to the negative experiences from Vietnam War and scandals of Nixon administration. Congress gained more supervision in what was considered president’s area of power. This change came in the form of War Powers Resolution of 1974 that terminated prerogative of the president to unilaterally deploy U.S. military.³⁶ Rosenwasser and Warner assess that “by the end of the 1970s, Congress had turned into an activist arm of government in foreign policy to counterbalance the imperial presidency.”³⁷ However, the War Powers Resolution has been violated in the past, for instance under Bill Clinton’s presidency during the bombing in Kosovo, and it has never resulted in a successful legal action against the president. After the 9/11 and under the Bush-Cheney administration, situation changed again. After the attacks, the power

³³ Ibid., 11-20.

³⁴ "The Constitutions of the United States of America", accessed April 8, 2017, <http://constitutionus.com>.

³⁵ Gerald Felix Warburg, "Congress: Checking Presidential Power," in *The National Security Enterprise: Navigating the Labyrinth*, ed. Roger Z. George and Harvey Rishikof (Georgetown: Georgetown University Press, 2011): 228.

³⁶ Rosenwasser and Warner, "Interagency Process," 11-20.

³⁷ Ibid., 20.

of the White House grew while the role of the Congress diminished. Supporters of powerful executive in foreign policy-making referred to the Federalist Papers written by Alexander Hamilton, James Madison, or John Jay to support their argument for presidential prerogatives in the diplomatic area, military operations and intelligence gathering either at home or abroad.³⁸ Involvement of Congress in national security policy making, however necessary, is often a nuisance, complicates matters and may be harmful to consistent U.S. foreign policy. It may undermine diplomatic efforts by indiscretion or action as well as inaction, which may make Washington an unreliable partner. However, oversight is necessary and U.S. democracy is build on overlapping powers and clash of competing interests.³⁹

1.2.4 Other Actors

Other significant actors in the making of U.S. national security policy are courts, media, think tanks, lobby groups, and public opinion. The U.S. Supreme Court and the federal courts have traditionally yielded to the executive power and Congress in foreign policy; however, they are becoming more and more involved. Courts engage in questions such as protection of state secrets, the Geneva Convention applicability, or detention of prisoners.⁴⁰

The main role of media lays in setting agenda, publishing alternatives, and evaluating the performance of politicians. Think tanks and experts analyze, formulate new initiatives, suggest options, as well as critique the government's choices. Lobby groups can represent either domestic group with foreign policy interests or foreign group that aims to influence U.S. foreign policy in a way that is more beneficial to them. They may offer expertise on specific issues as well; however, the bottom line is that their goal is to push through policies that benefit their interests.⁴¹

Foreign policy decisions are, as any other political decision in a democratic country, influenced by different groups. A cross-sectional and time-lagged analysis performed by Lawrence Jacobs and Benjamin Page find that internationally oriented business leaders influence the U.S. foreign policy the most.

³⁸ Warburg, "Congress," 228-229.

³⁹ Ibid., 242-243.

⁴⁰ Harvey Rishikof, "The United States Supreme Court: The Cult of the Robe in the National Security Enterprise," in *The National Security Enterprise: Navigating the Labyrinth*, ed. Roger Z. George and Harvey Rishikof (Georgetown: Georgetown University Press, 2011): 247.

⁴¹ Rosenwasser and Warner, "Interagency Process," 11-20.

Experts, who however may themselves be influenced by businesses, follow them. Many think tanks are financed by businesses (and to some extent also by organized labor) and therefore it may occur that those interests groups influence who are the recognized experts and the direction of their research. Labor, however, influences foreign policy decisions only weakly. Last but not least, there does not appear to be any significant impact of general public on foreign policy decisions. It is necessary to point out that the study of Jacobs and Page did not examine retrospective public opinion and its potential impact on policy makers' anticipation of later.⁴² It is very difficult to measure the impact of job approval on foreign policy. Furthermore, many experts encourage foreign policy decision makers not to respond to public opinion regarding this field because the public has a tendency to swing moods and calls for fast results and use "simple moralistic and legalistic" thinking distant from reality of international politics. Walter Lippmann cautioned against public opinion, which can be "deadly to the very survival of the state as a free society" because it creates a "morbid derangement of the true functions of power".⁴³ The influence of business leaders is the strongest in Senate and in the White House, labor finds more attentive ear in the legislative branch rather than the executive. The influence of experts is nearly equally spread. The public, with its minor influence, is most perceived by the House of Representatives due to the sensibility of Representatives toward job approval, especially regarding economic matters or issues of high salience such as questions of war and peace. While influence of business leaders and experts tends to be relatively quick, labor has slower impact exerted over time.⁴⁴

⁴² Lawrence R. Jacobs and Benjamin I. Page, "Who Influences U.S. Foreign Policy?" *The American Political Science Review* 99 (1) (February 2005): 115-120, accessed September 24, 2014, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/30038922>.

⁴³ Jacobs and Page, "Who Influences U.S. Foreign Policy?," 109.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 115-120.

2 U.S. National Security Policy at the Turn of Millennium

The dissolution of the Soviet Union meant it was no longer a threat and an optimistic atmosphere spread. The end of bipolar world, however, also brought new challenges. Washington found itself in a new powerful position of the world's only superpower. But after four decades of bipolar world with a clear enemy, the U.S. lacked a new strategic vision for its foreign policy. A number of new interpretations appeared in the U.S. during the 1990s about future sources of tension, instability, and conflicts in the world. For example, Pulitzer Prize winner Thomas Friedman held that globalization would have a positive effect on the world, as it would slowly smooth over the causes for collision.⁴⁵ Philosopher Francis Fukuyama in the book *The End of History and the Last Man*⁴⁶ argued that sociocultural evolution was over because liberal democracy and free word capitalism were the final form of human government. He saw optimistic future without conflicts as well because, in his opinion, liberal democracies do not have a reason for a war among themselves.⁴⁷ Less positive future ahead was awaiting us according to Samuel Huntington or Robert Kaplan. They both claimed that there would be new and never-ending clashes either on the lines where different civilizations and distinct cultures met or due to socioeconomic differences.⁴⁸ Nevertheless, since early 1990s, the U.S. had to face a number of new challenges and it had to do so as the world's only hegemon. For example, it could not ignore Iraq's aggression toward Kuwait in 1991. It also had to deal with countries freed from Soviet domination and nations, which separated from the Soviet Union. To add to that, Washington acted as a peacekeeper in ethnic conflicts accompanying disintegration of former Yugoslavia. Despite all of these new challenges, the U.S. overall mostly scaled back its foreign policy budget and it especially cut back its defense budget, which was up to 6,5 % of HDP during the Cold War.⁴⁹

⁴⁵ Thomas Friedman, *The Lexus and the Olive Tree*, (Picador, 2012).

⁴⁶ Francis Fukuyama, *The End of History and the Last Man*, (Free Press, 2006).

⁴⁷ Ibid.

⁴⁸ Samuel Huntington, *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*, (Simon & Schuster, 2011).

⁴⁹ Dinah Walker, "Trends in U.S. Military Spending," Council on Foreign Relations, published July 15, 2015, accessed April 20, 2017, <http://www.cfr.org/defense-budget/trends-us-military-spending/p28855>.

With the main (and only) enemy gone, the future of NATO began to be discussed. Realists claimed that it was no longer needed and that it should have been terminated. Others believed that it still had a role to play in international security but struggled to define what that role should have looked like. Isolationists in the U.S. thought that the end of the Cold War gave America time to rest and that Washington should have pulled back from the world's affairs. On the other hand, neo-realists recognized U.S. power but questioned how and to what extent it should have been used. Some of them were not afraid to demonstrate strength while others cautioned to be careful with military solutions and pushed America toward multilateral cooperation. To summarize it, there was not only a discussion about the future of NATO but also about the direction of U.S. foreign policy. To conclude, while the Alliance did not find all the answers, it did not dissolve and on the contrary expanded into central and later on to eastern parts of Europe. It also focused more on non-Article V cooperation, for example on consultations under article IV, which provides framework for consulting issues of territorial integrity, political independence, and security of NATO members.⁵⁰ That, however, does not mean that all the voices that called for opposite direction disappeared over night.

This chapter aims to explain U.S. external national security policy at the turn of millennium. To create a comprehensive analysis, it examines three different aspects: national security policy process under president Bush, administration's attitudes toward international institutions, and the US-NATO relations.

2.1 National Security Policy Process under G. W. Bush

George W. Bush's administration did not have its own coherent security policy strategy with clearly established priorities and Bush was searching for an overreaching topic in foreign policy since he assumed office in the beginning of the year 2001. G.W. Bush served as a governor of Texas before he was elected president and thus had little experience with foreign and security policy. When he became president, he adopted style similar to Ronald Reagan's, when he set the agenda, made a decision, but left the implementation to his cabinet officials. David Auerswald observed that Bush's foreign policy was directed by "ABC" mantra, which stands for "Anything But Clinton". It meant abolishing any policy his predecessor made,

⁵⁰ "The North Atlantic Treaty," NATO, published April 4, 1949, accessed April 20, 2016, http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/official_texts_17120.htm.

if possible, no matter whether it concerned the Middle East, North Korea, or international treaties. Before 9/11, Bush's administration focused on balancing against China and issue of missiles deployment. Nevertheless, Bush was still searching for an overreaching topic for his foreign policy. He found it after 9/11 as he made preventing future terrorist attacks aimed on the U.S. the main concern and the guiding principle for the rest of his time in the office.⁵¹

National security policy process under Bush was influenced by several factors including an unprecedented role of the vice president, problematic cooperation among government agencies, personal animosity among the highest government officials, or informal process of decision-making. First of all, the vice-president Dick Cheney played an unprecedentedly important role as he was empowered to attend all National Security Council meetings and Homeland Security Council meetings, and he was well-integrated in the national security process. He had his own fifteen person NSC staff similar to the president's NSC staff.⁵² Secondly, Condoleezza Rice, who was named National Security Advisor, did not see priorities of her function in managing inter-agency cooperation. She had a very personal relation with president's family and that might have been the reason why she did not focus on the traditional broker role among individual agencies and departments, and rather saw the priority in offering guidance to the president. In her own words "I consider it my first responsibility to be staff and counsel to the president, because he doesn't have anywhere else to go for that. The second most important responsibility is to make sure that when he wants to move an agenda in a particular direction that you can get this huge ship of state turned around and moved in the direction he wants to go ... The third most important function is to coordinate the rest of the government."⁵³ Former national security advisor Zbigniew Brzezinski also pointed out shortcomings in inter-governmental cooperation. The U.S. government, for example, lacked a central body that would focus on strategical planning and that would be in constant contact with the Congress. He admitted that the National Security Council tried to consolidate diplomatic and military efforts but "has only limited resources and too little time to engage in systematic and strategical planning,

⁵¹ David Auerswald, "The Evolution of the NSC Process," in *The National Security Enterprise: Navigating the Labyrinth*, ed. Roger Z. George and Harvey Rishikof (Georgetown: Georgetown University Press, 2011): 44-45.

⁵² Ibid., 44-45.

⁵³ Ibid., 45.

and moreover, it is necessarily influenced by political interest of the President.”⁵⁴ He concludes that it makes mostly ad hoc decisions, which become the presidential policy that the Congress either supports or refuses.⁵⁵ Rice did not manage the interagency process very well. Her team often did not provide background to ensure exchange of information among agencies. It also did not focus on important difficult questions and therefore it did not assess the consequences. Furthermore, vice president Cheney as well as secretary of defense Donald Rumsfeld made performing her duties more difficult by not treating Rice as equal. They often did not pass information or they ignored requests of the NSC. Especially Rumsfeld had repeatedly undermined NSC and Rice.⁵⁶ Another particularity of the national security process under Bush administration laid in the fact that real decisions were not made through the formal process but often during informal meetings in president’s home, his ranch in Texas, or at Camp David. Secretary of State Colin Powell and CIA Director George Tenet were often not present in those gatherings.⁵⁷ Eventually, the NSC improved in the second term partly due to many personnel changes. Rice became the Secretary of State while Stephen Hadley became the new NSA. Hadley focused more on the broker role and he was more successful in managing interagency coordination. Another significant change came when Robert Gates replaced Rumsfeld as Secretary of Defense. There were many other changes in staff, which resulted in a smoother national security policy-making process.⁵⁸

The Congress was controlled by Republicans for most of Bush’s presidency, which resulted in less scrutiny of executive decisions and greater support for Bush. From 2001 to 2003 while the Democrats had the same number of Senators, the House of Representatives was predominantly red, and in the period between 2003 and 2007, the Republicans had majority in both Houses.⁵⁹ This one-party rule had a strong impact on Bush Administration as executive branch gained more powers and Congressional was less likely to contradict the president. This is supported by the fact that there was not a single presidential veto in that period. Furthermore, there

⁵⁴ Brzezinski, *Volba*, 240.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 240.

⁵⁶ Auerswald, "The Evolution of the NSC Process," 46.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 45-46.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 46-47.

⁵⁹ "Party Divisions of the House of Representatives," United States House of Representatives, accessed April 8, 2017, <http://history.house.gov/Institution/Party-Divisions/Party-Divisions/>. "Party Division," United States Senate, accessed April 8, 2017, <http://www.senate.gov/history/partydiv.htm>.

were 50 % less congressional hearings regarding policies of the executive as there were between 1961-1968 when Democrats analogously had dominated Congress. Warburg therefore assesses that “the political will and the ability of Congress to alter Bush administration policy were limited.”⁶⁰ Former Senate Judiciary Committee Chairman Arlen Specter reflected “decades from now, historians will look back at the period from 9/11 to the present as an era of unbridled executive power and congressional ineffectiveness.”⁶¹

While Congress did not utilize its constitutional power to declare war, it granted the president the power to act, which resulted in military operations in Afghanistan and Iraq. Congress has not adopted declaration of war since 1941, when it entered the World War II, even though the U.S. has deployed its military on several occasions, for example during the Korean War or in Vietnam War. Even in the case of Iraq, Congress did not declare war but it voted on authorization for the president acting as Commander in Chief to take “all necessary means” in case the diplomatic efforts to force Hussein to comply with UN resolutions fail.⁶² According to Warburg, Congress for months ahead of the vote had received only intelligence reports supporting the claim that Iraq had or was not far from gaining weapons of mass destruction (WMD) while the opposing reports and analyses, mostly prepared by the State Department, were often withheld. To add to that, not many hearings altogether were held. Furthermore, the voting occurred shortly before elections and many Congressmen feared that questioning the necessity of military involvement in Iraq would portray them as soft on terrorism and that it might cost them their seat.⁶³

In the case of Iraq, the Congress became caught up in a position of a bureau that only “adds a stamp to already made strategical decisions”.⁶⁴ The president connected terrorist threat to violation of previous UN mandates, and added proclamation about Iraq having weapons of mass destruction. The Congress was not able to resist such a strong campaign, and it gave the president a free hand in 2002 to carry out a military campaign with or without UN approval

⁶⁰ Gerald Felix Warburg, "Congress: Checking Presidential Power," in *The National Security Enterprise: Navigating the Labyrinth*, ed. Roger Z. George and Harvey Rishikof (Georgetown: Georgetown University Press, 2011): 235.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 235.

⁶² H. J. Res, “114 — 107th Congress: Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002,” www.GovTrack.us, published 2002, accessed May 12, 2017, <https://www.govtrack.us/congress/bills/107/hjres114>.

⁶³ Warburg, "Congress," 237.

⁶⁴ Brzezinski, *Volba*, 239-240.

without additional consent from the legislative branch.⁶⁵ While the president's office has to be the place where national interests are organized and where decisions among priorities are made, the cooperation with the Congress is very important. It is obvious that the nature of Congress, where interests of various groups cross, does not allow to effectively determine priorities of foreign policy. In the words of former National Security Advisor Zbigniew Brzezinski; "Only executive branch, with hierarchical order and which is subordinated to the President, is able to determine and, for national security's sake, has to determine national interests of the US".⁶⁶ Nevertheless, the cooperation with the Congress is key to maintain public support and thus to be in harmony with basic American values because the Congress should represent people's will. Brzezinski warns "in opposite case, U.S. priorities could gain strongly imperial character."⁶⁷

2.2 The U.S. Attitude toward International Institutions

Creating institutional order is beneficial for any world power in the long-term because it forms more predictable and favorable international environment and thus saves the hegemon energy, resources, and time while pursuing its interests. John Ikenberry argues that willingness to participate in any international institution stands on a basic dilemma between what a state can gain and the price it has to pay. However, a state, which manages to create institutional order that works to its benefits in the long-term is better off than without it because a free-floating system requires more coercion, which translates to more costly and incessant exercising of power. Dominant states, such as the US, see the benefits of an international institution in its potential to create more stable and predictable international environment and in the ability to lock-in other states in a desirable policy orientation. On the other hand, the negative is that the leading state reduces its own policy autonomy and it must put restrictions on its own ability to exercise power.⁶⁸ Proponents of neo-liberal institutionalism see another benefit of international institutions in its ability to help solve collective action problem as it reduces transaction costs and commitment

⁶⁵ Ibid., 239-240.

⁶⁶ Ibid., 239.

⁶⁷ Ibid., 239.

⁶⁸ John G. Ikenberry, "State Power and the Institutional Bargain: America's Ambivalent Economic and Security Multilateralism," in *US Hegemony and International Organizations*, ed. Rosemary Foot et al. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003): 51-54.

problems. Nevertheless, international institutions can become instruments of political control and coercion.⁶⁹

With that being said, it is important to underline that the administration of George W. Bush adopted neo-realist approach to international relations and, as mentioned in the first chapter, realism and its offshoots do not consider international institution to be significant. Since the beginning of his presidency, Bush moved away from liberal multilateralism favored by his father George Bush and his predecessor Bill Clinton. After 9/11, the division among officials about how rules and institutional agreements fit into campaign against terrorism surfaced in full strength. Bush offered Americans an alternative from multilateralism - a grand strategy of unilateralism but not isolationism based on a starkly realist vision of American interest and global power realities. It stressed American preponderance, which in his view allowed the U.S. to selectively engage Europe and Asia. In this view, the U.S. should not be ashamed of using military power and selective engagement, which would allow it to act on the world but not being entangled by the world. America under Bush was not afraid to dominate world politics with military forces. However, Tarzi warned that “long term, coercive global hegemonic primacy is economically unsustainable, and the opportunity costs are exorbitantly high. The gap between eroding American economic power and the economic costs of escalating the American global commitments this grand strategy demands gravely damaged American power.”⁷⁰

In the first term of Bush’s presidency, cooperative security, arms control, and multilateralism were pushed into the background. Bush administration rejected a number of international agreements and institutions including the Kyoto Protocol, the International Criminal Court, the Biological Weapons Ban, and the Trade in Light Arms treaty. Furthermore, it was considering backing out of those it was already involved in, for example it was signaling possible unilateral withdrawal from 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile defense treaty.⁷¹

2.3 United States and NATO Membership

NATO means many things to many people; it is a bargain, in which each side gains something different. Ikenberry sees the security alliance created

⁶⁹ Ibid., 51-54.

⁷⁰ Tarzi, "Coercive Global Primacy," 42.

⁷¹ Ikenberry, "Institutional Bargain," 67-69.

after the World War II as “the most elaborate and institutional bargain”.⁷² NATO was an instrument for reintegration of West Germany and its rehabilitation; it reinforced the process of European integration including supporting London’s and Paris’s commitment to open and integrated Europe and reducing fears of revival of unrestrained German military power. Last but not least, the U.S. became committed to European security, something what it was always reluctant to do. The same security alliance served as a mechanism to stabilize and integrate Central and Eastern Europe after the end of the Cold War as the administration of Bill Clinton used a strategy of “enlargement” and pushed for more institution-building agenda.⁷³ Stanley Sloan describes NATO as a transatlantic bargain. According to him, at the beginning there was an original bargain: Washington would help with Europe’s economic recovery after the World War II as long as Europe would work together, and the U.S. would commit to Europe’s defense while European states would cooperate to defend themselves against the Soviet Union.⁷⁴ However, each state pushed for its own goals and tried to add its own layer on top of the original bargain. France tried to prevent revival of German military power. The UK saw Washington’s commitment to Europe as a way to keep its troops available around the world to secure its position as a world power and prevent expansion of Russia. Canada emphasized political values. When Germany was joining NATO, it desired to get back its sovereignty. The three new members entering the Alliance in the 90s, the Czech Republic, Hungary, and Poland, regarded membership in NATO as acceptance among Western states and they saw the Alliance as a protection against Moscow’s influence.⁷⁵

Martin Reichard argues that European strategic importance decreased after the end of the Cold War as there was no reason to believe that “a conflict of medium to major scale involving U.S. troops would emerge there in near future” and Europe lost its role as the first line of defense for the US. In addition, he suggests that it is not the importance of the Alliance in the transatlantic relations that was diminishing but the importance of transatlantic relation itself as Washington had been reorienting toward Asia.⁷⁶ On the other hand, the U.S. interests in Asia do not have

⁷² Ibid., 61-64.

⁷³ Ikenberry, "Institutional Bargain," 61-64.

⁷⁴ Sloan, *Permanent Alliance*, 4.

⁷⁵ Ibid., 5.

⁷⁶ Martin Reichard, *The EU-NATO Relationship: A Legal and Political Perspective* (Burlington, USA: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2006), 21-23 and 29.

to necessarily result in disengagement with its main long-term ally with established mechanisms for cooperation. Furthermore, none of the Asian states can replace Europe in its role of a strategic ally with common interests and values, not to mention none of them having comparable economic, political and military strength.

On contrary, Christopher Layne argues that for the U.S., NATO is the crucial instrument to retain its presence in Europe even after the collapse of the Soviet Union. The reason why the U.S. would want to stay in Europe is based on “Offensive Realism”, which argues that the U.S., Russia, or any other world’s great power would engage in expansionist behavior and that it would seek hegemony. Firstly, “capabilities drive intentions” meaning that as a country gains more power, it becomes more and more engaged in international politics and therefore it desires more influence. The insecurity of anarchic nature of international system drives states to become as powerful as possible for their own protection. Secondly, the only way to stay safe in such an environment is to become the most powerful one. It follows that “for hegemons, the injunction seems to be that they must expand their power or die.”⁷⁷

On the other hand, after the end of the Cold War, realist and neo-realists claimed that “NATO is a disappearing thing”.⁷⁸ They see the reason why states make alliances in a balancing of threat rather than in balancing of power.⁷⁹ The Alliance lost its enemy after the dissolution of the Soviet Union and therefore also its *raison d’être*. According to the leading realist Kenneth Waltz, the Alliance lost its purpose when the world became unipolar. The Alliance does not provide guarantees anymore, as it cannot answer against whom it would provide it. Instead Waltz argues, NATO has been turned into a “hegemonic tool” of the U.S. used to “project its egoistic interests in Europe”.⁸⁰ As an example, the process of “nurturing democracy” in Central and Eastern Europe in the 1990s was only a guise for following the interests of military-industrial complex there.⁸¹ The significance of NATO after the end of the Cold War has substantially diminished and even though the organization may linger on in name, the lack of common external threat would make the alliance break up. Many in Washington considered NATO to outlive its days and they regarded European allies

⁷⁷ Christopher Layne, "US hegemony and the perpetuation of NATO," *Journal of Strategic Studies* 23 (3) (2000): 66.

⁷⁸ Thomas Risse-Kappen, “Public Opinion, Domestic Structure, and Foreign Policy in Liberal Democracies,” *World Politics* 43 (4) (July 1991): 481-482.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, 481-482.

⁸⁰ Gheciu, *NATO in the "New Europe"*, 214.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 214.

as feckless, narrow-minded, and not willing to spend enough on defense. Senior official in Pentagon Douglas Feith and his joke about NATO's motto "Keep the myth alive!" is an illustration of how many in Bush administration thought.⁸²

To add to that, many Americans regard NATO as a way how the U.S. sponsors European defense without getting anything significant in return. The question of burden-sharing within the Alliance has been present since the founding members signed the Washington Treaty and it resurfaced again after the dissolution of the Soviet Union as the Allies were not occupied with immediate serious threat to their security. Especially many Americans saw the Alliance as "a creator of burdens for the United States rather than an instrument for sharing them".⁸³

Neo-liberals respond to neo-realists by saying that NATO still has its place in the world because it is more complex than a mere security alliance created ad hoc against a present threat, it is built on common liberal values that have long-term validity. The fact is that the Washington Treaty, which created the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in 1949, nowhere names its enemy to be the Soviet Union and it instead claims that the members desire to "safeguard the freedom, common heritage and civilisation of their peoples...they seek to promote stability and well-being in the North Atlantic area."⁸⁴ Alexandra Gheciu claims that NATO far outdone the neorealist expectations and that it is more complex than other security alliances known from before. "The founders of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization were seeking to set up a complex security organization, one that would not only respond to potential geostrategic challenges but would also build up a collective Western identity and prevent a possible loss of liberal ideas and norms in the Euro-Atlantic area."⁸⁵ Liberal values are stated in the preamble of the Washington Treaty and include "democracy, individual liberty and the rule of law".⁸⁶ Sloan supports the view that NATO was not a traditional security alliance because it provides "broad and flexible mandate through which to defend and promote allied interests and security" and he points out that the Washington Treaty was written in "flexible language to facilitate

⁸² Ivo Daalder and Philip Gordon, "Euro-Trashing," *Washington Post*, May 29, 2002, accessed April 8, 2017, https://www.washingtonpost.com/archive/opinions/2002/05/29/euro-trashing/83f76527-f2d6-4244-80e3-e53a98f6e8c2/?utm_term=.9c0d10f6a4a6.

⁸³ Sloan, *Permanent Alliance*, 10.

⁸⁴ "The North Atlantic Treaty."

⁸⁵ Gheciu, *NATO in the "New Europe"*, 211.

⁸⁶ "The North Atlantic Treaty."

adjustments to accommodate changing international circumstances”.⁸⁷ This view is more likely to be found among Democrats and it was overshadowed during Bush’s presidency.

The different geography of the European members of the Alliance and the United States has reflected in their mentality. The proximity of the Soviet Union and experiences from the World Wars during which the fighting occurred on its territory caused Europe to be highly concerned about the consequences of war and therefore striving as much as possible to avoid it. On the other hand, Washington was able to some extent separate the threat of the Soviet Union in Europe from its homeland. In the 1980s, Flora Lewis captured this difference by writing “Nobody in Europe, West or East, imagines that war means only fighting overseas. For all Europeans, the question of war is the question of survival, not just of superiority.”⁸⁸ This experience had impact on European mentality even after the dissolution the Soviet Union. Europeans have had higher toleration to vulnerability and came to terms with the fact that complete security is never guaranteed. On contrary, the U.S. continued to search for a way how to return to its traditional invulnerability given by its location and isolation. The “Star Wars Program” of the Reagan administration is one of the examples of American reluctance to accept security risks brought by modernization of technology. On the other hand, Europeans learned to accept vulnerability as a fact of life and do not understand the mindset fueling American efforts. This different way of thinking is visible in the reaction to 9/11 attacks. The United States was in deep shock and it was confronted with the fact of its own vulnerability for the first time.⁸⁹

When dealing with the instability in the Third World and beyond NATO borders in general, Europe prefers diplomacy, economic policies and instruments such as development aid and regards Washington’s approach too focused on military solutions. The gap between Americans and Europeans is widest when the U.S. president is conservative, for example during Reagan, Bush sr., and again under the administration of George W. Bush.⁹⁰

The first Gulf War and the intervention of NATO on the side of Kuwait, which was considered successful, influenced the direction of the Alliance after the end

⁸⁷ Sloan, *Permanent Alliance*, 6.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, 77.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, 81.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, 82-83.

of the Cold War. This change is reflected in the new strategic concept in 1991. Since then, the Alliance has focused more on non-Article V cooperation as a direct assault on one of the members of the Alliance was less probable in the near future, and more on collaboration when dealing with threats to security of a member state.⁹¹ Allies looked mainly to Article IV to find a mandate for such actions as it states: “The Parties will consult together whenever, in the opinion of any of them, the territorial integrity, political independence or security of any of the Parties is threatened.”⁹²

The NATO’s Strategic Concept of 1999 confirms “the fact that large-scale conventional aggression against the Alliance is highly unlikely” and declares that NATO still plays central role in a Euro-Atlantic security structure. Heads of states and governments of NATO members approved the concept. It stresses the NATO’s enduring purpose to safeguard the freedom and security of all its members, furthermore, it also points out that it contributes to peace and stability in the Euro-Atlantic region.⁹³ While “the Alliance does not consider itself to be any country’s adversary,” it recognizes that a wide variety of military as well as non-military risks emerged. Namely the Alliance is subject to “uncertainty and instability in and around the Euro-Atlantic area and the possibility of regional crises at the periphery of the Alliance, which could evolve rapidly,” external nuclear powers, and proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their usage by non-state actors. In the Concept, the Alliance professes common values of democracy, human rights and the rule of law, and it proclaims: “the security of Europe and North America are indivisible.” The Concept offers a new sense of commitment and it formulates common approach to international security in the new century. It identifies security challenges and risks, which are shared by all members of the Alliance. It repeats the NATO’s commitment to collective defense by stating that “any armed attack on the territory of the Allies, from whatever direction, would be covered by Articles 5 and 6 of the Washington Treaty,” and it recognizes that the security of Alliance could be affected by wider scale of risks such as “terrorism, sabotage and organized crime, and by the disruption of the flow of vital resources” or large migration caused by armed conflicts.⁹⁴

⁹¹ Ibid., 9.

⁹² “The North Atlantic Treaty.”

⁹³ “The Alliance’s Strategic Concept,” NATO, published April 24, 1999, accessed April 8, 2017, http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/official_texts_27433.htm.

⁹⁴ Ibid.

3 9/11, Bush, and NATO

*On September the 11th, 2001, America felt its vulnerability – even to threats that gather on the other side of the earth. We resolved then, and we are resolved today, to confront every threat, from any source, that could bring sudden terror and suffering to America.*⁹⁵

(G. W. Bush)

The attacks on September 11, 2001 changed the United States and American perception of security. Lansford describes it with the following words: “The myth of American security invincibility was shattered and the episode demonstrated the vulnerability of the United States.”⁹⁶ Such an assault was unexpected and it shocked unprepared Americans.

The nation united behind the president after the attacks. The public support is visible from approval ratings, which skyrocketed from 51 % to 90 % in the first weeks after the attacks.⁹⁷ The Congress was strongly backing the president as well and it expanded presidential powers. The Congress passed the Authorization for Use of Military Force against Terrorism that allowed Bush to “use necessary and appropriate force against those nations, organizations, or persons he determines planned, authorized, committed, or aided the terrorist attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001, or harbored such organizations or persons”.⁹⁸

3.1 NATO’s Reaction to 9/11

The NATO allies reacted immediately after the attack and they individually as well as together as the Alliance condemned the assault. The NATO press release from September 11 expresses support to the U.S., calls for combating terrorism and stresses that this attack was committed against a member of NATO: “The NATO nations unanimously condemn these barbaric acts committed against a NATO member

⁹⁵ "President Bush Outlines Iraqi Threat," The White House, published October 7, 2002, accessed April 20, 2016, <http://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2002/10/20021007-8.html>.

⁹⁶ Lansford, *All for One*, 8.

⁹⁷ "Presidential Approval Ratings - George W. Bush," Gallup, accessed April 20, 2016, <http://www.gallup.com/poll/116500/Presidential-Approval-Ratings-George-Bush.aspx>.

⁹⁸ "Public Law 107-40-Sept. 18, 2001," US Government Publishing Office, published September 18, 2001, accessed April 20, 2016, <https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/PLAW-107publ40/pdf/PLAW-107publ40.pdf>.

state. (...) It underscores the urgency of intensifying the battle against terrorism (...) All Allies stand united in their determination to combat this scourge . (...) Our message to the people of the United States is that we are with you.”⁹⁹ Already on September 12, 2001, not even twenty-four hours after the attacks, NATO decided to invoke the Article V and thus consider the terrorist attack an assault against the whole Alliance and on Western values: “The Council agreed that if it is determined that this attack was directed from abroad against the United States, it shall be regarded as an action covered by the Article 5 of the Washington Treaty, which states that an armed attack against one or more of the Allies in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all.”¹⁰⁰ The official invocation came later in October 2, 2001 after investigations proved that the assault indeed originated outside of the U.S.¹⁰¹ When the Washington Treaty was signed 52 years back, nobody could have imagined that the first invocation of the Article V would mean that Europeans were coming to assist the United States and not the other way around.¹⁰² The Article V is written in a flexible language and does not create any automatic or legal obligations. Nevertheless, the original idea was that the invocation would trigger military operations to help an ally under attack. Since the build-up of military structures in the 1950s, these military operations would be planned and executed through NATO structures. During the Gulf War in 1990 the topic of what would the invocation actually mean was briefly debated because of the possibility that Iraq would retaliate by attacking NATO member Turkey. The assault never happened and therefore, there was no clear answer.¹⁰³

Since the decision to use collective defense clause was made, the European NATO members expected the invocation of the Article V to mean that they would be part of military operations in Afghanistan. As the French officials put it couple days after the attacks as NATO decided to activate collective defense clause in case the attacks originated from abroad, “it clearly means political support and implies a strong presumption of European help and participation in U.S. military

⁹⁹ "Statement by the North Atlantic Council," NATO Press Release, published September 11 2001, accessed April 11, 2017, <http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/2001/p01-122e.htm>.

¹⁰⁰ "Statement by the North Atlantic Council," NATO Press Release, published September 12, 2001, accessed April 20, 2016, <http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/2001/p01-124e.htm>.

¹⁰¹ Lansford, *All for One*, 2.

¹⁰² Philip H. Gordon, "NATO After 11 September," *Survival* 43 (4) (2001): 89.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, 91.

actions of the kind that now seem likely.”¹⁰⁴ However, in September 2001 at a briefing of NATO defense ministers, the U.S. deputy secretary of defense Paul Wolfowitz made clear that the U.S. does not plan to use the Alliance’s structures and it would neither excessively rely on European forces.¹⁰⁵

While the decision to invoke Article V was strongly backed by the United Kingdom, France, Italy, and Spain; some of the other members showed reservations from the beginning. They were reluctant not because they would not consider the assault to fulfill criteria to activate collective defense but rather because they did not trust the U.S. reaction. Germany as well as for example Norway, Belgium, and the Netherlands were afraid that Washington might overreact.¹⁰⁶

3.2 Afghanistan

The United States launched Operation Enduring Freedom in Afghanistan (OEF-A) in October 2001. Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF) is an official name for the American Global War on Terrorism (GWOT), which is not limited to OEF-A but also includes other operations for instance in the Philippines or Horn of Africa.

While Bush did not initially decide to call on the NATO members, he asked the UN to authorize the Alliance to participate in the operation. On December 20, 2001, the UN SC in the Resolution 1386 called for International Security Assistance Forces (ISAF) to be established, confirmed the central role of the UN and the U.S. leadership of the coalition creating ISAF.¹⁰⁷ The initial goals of the ISAF were to secure Kabul, support the reconstruction, and help recently established Afghan Transitional Authority.¹⁰⁸ The objective of ISAF was to “enable the Afghan government to provide effective security across the country and develop new Afghan security forces to ensure Afghanistan would never again become a safe haven for terrorists”.¹⁰⁹ The U.S. made sure that the ISAF leadership was not entrusted in the hands of NATO but Washington,

¹⁰⁴ Joseph Fischett, "Allies Unsure of What a Counterterrorism Offensive Might Require: NATO Unity, but What Next?" New York Times online, published September 14, 2001, accessed April 11, 2017, http://www.nytimes.com/2001/09/14/news/14iht-natox7Fx7Fx7Fx7F_ed3_.html.

¹⁰⁵ Gordon, "NATO After 11 September," 92.

¹⁰⁶ Fischett, "Allies Unsure of What a Counterterrorism Offensive Might Require."

¹⁰⁷ Sloan, *Permanent Alliance*, 187.

¹⁰⁸ "About RS," Afghanistan Resolute Support, accessed November 6, 2016, <http://www.rs.nato.int/history.html>.

¹⁰⁹ "ISAF's mission in Afghanistan," North Atlantic Treaty Organization, accessed April 16, 2017, http://www.nato.int/cps/eu/natohq/topics_69366.htm.

and allied military operations against Taliban and al-Qaeda continued to be carried out within OEF and the “coalition of willing”.

3.2.1 NATO: An Inconvenience for Washington

Washington considered the European support as “politically useful but not particularly significant militarily”.¹¹⁰ The fact is that the U.S. would have to, in many cases, sustain the offered troops, which could overburden the U.S. military logistics. Furthermore, some of the capabilities offered were not appropriate for the planned operations in Afghanistan. These two reasons led some Americans to think that the offers were just gestures aimed at scoring political points in Washington without actually having to follow through.¹¹¹

Another reasons for not to using NATO to conduct military operations in Afghanistan from the beginning was that the U.S. military officials wanted to ensure that they would have the decision-making process firmly in their hands.¹¹² The memory of Kosovo experience, which is often labeled “war by committee”, was too recent.¹¹³ The need to find a consensus complicated air-strike campaign and limited the mission in the Balkans. According to the report of the U.S. General Accounting Office from July 2001 “the need to maintain alliance cohesion during the conflict led to important departures from standard U.S. military doctrine and resulted in a limited mission with unclear objectives.”¹¹⁴ In the eyes of many American military staff, the Kosovo conflict lasted longer, caused more risks to the Alliance, and damages to former Yugoslavia were more extensive as a consequence to this kind of leadership.¹¹⁵ Therefore, the U.S. administration was not willing to give up control of the command, especially on mission as important for them.

To add to that, Europe could offer only limited capabilities. European NATO members could offer mainly ground forces, which were not needed in such extent due to the different nature of warfare. For example, the number of National Guard and Reserve Forces the U.S. had to mobilize for OEF was only one third of what was mobilized for the first Gulf War because the nature of the war changed.

¹¹⁰ Gordon, "NATO After 11 September," 92.

¹¹¹ Nora Bensahel, *The Counterterror Coalitions: Cooperation with Europe, NATO, and the European Union* (Santa Monica, 2003), 9-10.

¹¹² Lansford, *All for One*, 108.

¹¹³ Daalder and Gordon, "Euro-Trashing."

¹¹⁴ Sloan, *Permanent Alliance*, 161.

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 161.

Technology was an issue too. The gap between capabilities of the U.S. and its European allies had been growing. The second war in the Gulf was very technical but the capabilities of allies were limited.¹¹⁶ For example, “in NATO, only the United States, the United Kingdom and France have the full range of expeditionary capabilities (air, land, sea and special operations) that allow them to engage in significant overseas campaigns.”¹¹⁷

Looking at it from a different angle, the fact that realist and neo-realist were in power in Washington played significant role as well. They did not believe in utility of international institutions, therefore those in the highest offices of the U.S. government preferred cooperation on bilateral basis. The public was pressuring for swift action and planning involving more countries and more armies would take precious time that Washington was not willing to sacrifice.¹¹⁸ The U.S. had a need for a centralized command without influence from outside. Washington was aware of the undecided issues regarding NATO’s functioning, which came up already at the end of 1990s. For example, the NATO’s area of operation became a topic because the Washington Treaty restricts Article V to the attacks north of the Tropic of Cancer and it does not specify the area where NATO can respond to such an attack.^{119,120} Washington was not willing to reopen this debate in the time of a crisis.

3.2.2 NATO’s Role in Afghanistan

Even though the operation in Afghanistan wasn’t conducted through NATO, it does not mean that the Alliance did not participate militarily. As a matter of fact, the NATO members provided direct as well as indirect assistance both individually and collectively. For instance, missiles launched by American and British troops jointly on October 7, 2001 commenced the war in Afghanistan.¹²¹ This step required a high degree of interoperability and was possible only due to long-term cooperation that is anchored in the NATO membership. Allies also took a number of measures that allowed redeployment of American forces. While the U.S. did not ask

¹¹⁶ Lansford, *All for One*, 110.

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 120.

¹¹⁸ Sloan, *Permanent Alliance*, 244.

¹¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 242.

¹²⁰ “The North Atlantic Treaty.”

¹²¹ Lansford, *All for One*, 108.

the Alliance for direct military involvement, it requested eight measures and NATO agreed to grant this request. In these measures, the Allies agreed to:

- *enhance intelligence sharing and co-operation, both bilaterally and in the appropriate NATO bodies, relating to the threats posed by terrorism and the actions to be taken against it;*
- *provide, individually or collectively, as appropriate and according to their capabilities, assistance to Allies and other states which are or may be subject to increased terrorist threats as a result of their support for the campaign against terrorism;*
- *take necessary measures to provide increased security for facilities of the United States and other Allies on their territory;*
- *backfill selected Allied assets in NATO's area of responsibility that are required to directly support operations against terrorism;*
- *provide blanket overflight clearances for the United States and other Allies' aircraft, in accordance with the necessary air traffic arrangements and national procedures, for military flights related to operations against terrorism;*
- *provide access for the United States and other Allies to ports and airfields on the territory of NATO nations for operations against terrorism, including for refueling, in accordance with national procedures.*
- *that the Alliance is ready to deploy elements of its Standing Naval Forces to the Eastern Mediterranean in order to provide a NATO presence and demonstrate resolve; and*
- *that the Alliance is similarly ready to deploy elements of its NATO Airborne Early Warning force to support operations against terrorism.*¹²²

These measures allowed the U.S. to redeploy its own troops, which were involved in the NATO operations or that would have to provide security for U.S. bases abroad. The second point provided an opportunity for NATO to help in case the war in Afghanistan spilled over. Bush aimed to signal international support and offer

¹²² "Statement to the Press by NATO Secretary General, Lord Robertson, on the North Atlantic Council Decision On Implementation Of Article 5 of the Washington Treaty following the 11 September Attacks against the United States," NATO On-line Library, published October 4, 2001, accessed April 20, 2016, <http://www.nato.int/docu/speech/2001/s011004b.htm>.

security guarantees (which were stronger by NATO's involvement) for those who decided to help Washington in the fight against terrorism, especially nations in Central Asia. Permission to over-flight as well as access to ports and airfields was granted by not only NATO members but also other countries. This significantly simplified planning of the logistics for the U.S. Naval deployment in the Mediterranean manifested resolve and signaled NATO's readiness to expand its role as the main mission of Standing Naval Force Mediterranean (STANAVFORMED) is the ability to be rapidly deployed to an area of "tension and crisis" and to form a platform for more powerful naval force to be build around it. NATO AWACS aircraft were sent to the U.S. to protect American homeland and thus freeing up U.S. aircrafts to be deployed elsewhere. According to the U.S. secretary of state Colin Powell, these measures showed "viability of the alliance" and "have proven so helpful to [US] efforts".¹²³

The Alliance also served as a forum to facilitate assistance and cooperation on bilateral level. Even though, the NATO's military structures were not used, members of the Alliance were able to be involved individually in joint operations due to interoperability of both military procedures and equipment.¹²⁴ Interoperability is key because it would be practically impossible to cooperate effectively otherwise. For instance in case of air-to-air refueling, it is necessary to use compatible technology, to know the procedures, to be able to communicate, and to have the operation rehearsed. NATO has a high degree of interoperability due to years of cooperation including joint exercises and operations.

The United Kingdom has the highest level of interoperability with the U.S., which led to its involvement since the day one. British troops were ready to operate within the U.S. command structure and launched the operation in Afghanistan together with the US.¹²⁵ French forces deployed to the region were limited in comparison to the British but they still consisted of 2000 soldiers by November. The role of France was limited because it demanded multilateral command structure and Paris wanted to be involved in planning of the operations. This was, however, something that Bush administration would not allow.¹²⁶

¹²³ Lansford, *All for One*, 111-115.

¹²⁴ *Ibid.*, 118.

¹²⁵ *Ibid.*, 120.

¹²⁶ *Ibid.*, 122.

To sum up, the Alliance experienced a rare atmosphere in the fall of 2001. After a decade of doubts about its reasons for existence, trying to identify its mission and questions about its utility, the Article V of Washington Treaty was activated, the U.S. was undertaking operations in Central Asia with direct and indirect help of NATO allies, which was possible due to the high level of interoperability. Objections of Europeans, if there were some, were not against the operation itself but rather that they were not involved enough.¹²⁷ Furthermore, as Gordon points out, there appeared an “ironic contrast to previous conflicts like the Gulf War, Bosnia and Kosovo - as the Afghanistan campaign began, the United States actually faced a situation in which the NATO allies were offering more troops and equipment than the Pentagon, for military and political reasons, could or wanted to use.”¹²⁸

3.3 Bush Doctrine

Bush Doctrine is encapsulated in the National Security Strategy (NSS) released in September 2002 and it emphasizes “unilateralism”, “a doctrine of preventive war”, and “commitment to the freedom agenda”. According to neoconservative columnist Charles Krauthammer, it is “essentially a synonym for neoconservative foreign policy”.¹²⁹ NSS declares that the U.S. will act unilaterally if necessary without support of international community. The Administration claims that it will defend American people by

*identifying and destroying the threat before it reaches our borders. While the United States will constantly strive to enlist the support of the international community, we will not hesitate to act alone, if necessary, to exercise our right of self-defense by acting preemptively against such terrorists, to prevent them from doing harm against our people and our country.*¹³⁰ [emphasis by the author]

This is one of the most controversial phrases in the NSS for two reasons. Firstly, the U.S. uses its hegemonic position and it straightforwardly admits the will to use its power. Secondly, preemptive strike is a very problematic term. There is a slim

¹²⁷ Gordon, "NATO After 11 September," 96.

¹²⁸ Ibid., 92-93.

¹²⁹ Shah M. Tarzi, "The Folly of a Grand Strategy of Coercive Global Primacy: A Fresh Perspective on the Post-9/11 Bush Doctrine," *International Journal on World Peace* 31/3 (September 31, 2014): 27.

¹³⁰ "The National Security Strategy", 6.

line between preemptive war and preventive war, which is forbidden by all members of the UN. The United States recognized that its “best defense is a good offense” and therefore Washington declares that it “will, if necessary, act preemptively” to prevent the U.S. from being targeted by enemy’s unconventional attack.¹³¹ Furthermore, the term preventive and preemptive is often unintentionally used interchangeably by government officials creating more confusion. Jeffrey Record explains the difference between preemptive war and preventive war: preemptive warfare is justifiable when the threat is “instant, overwhelming, leaving no choice of means and no moment for deliberation”, on the other hand, preventive war lacks legal sanction because the threat is not certain or imminent. The preventive war is initiated in the belief that military conflict is inevitable and delay would involve a great risk.¹³² According to Harvard professor Graham Allison, preventive warfare stands on a logic “I may some day have a war with you, and right now I’m strong and you’re not. So I’m going to have the war now.”¹³³ This logic, for instance, stood behind the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor in 1941. Professor Tarzi from Bradley University warns: “preventive warfare represents a profound strategic recklessness. A gamble on exquisitely accurate intelligence, it prejudices the failure of all other elements and devices of American power and encourages resort to military forces, thereby it is self-defeating and harmful to the stability of the international system,” and he continues by saying “to proceed with anticipatory self-defense, the preventer must presume that its intelligence is or ought to be near-perfect, credible, and actionable” because preemption means to act against an attack that had been ordered or is under way.¹³⁴ David Kennedy from Harvard Law School questions legality of preemptive war and he says that such behavior is “nearly indistinguishable from simple aggression”.¹³⁵ Brzezinski criticizes that “a sudden creation of strategical doctrine of preventive war, which reversed well-established international conventions, only underscored a view that a surrounded hegemonic power tormented by increased domestic threat does not have to be able to create foreign policy democratically, openly and a one which is well-considered.”¹³⁶ The Bush administration reasoned that preemptive warfare had always been possible before enemy actually

¹³¹ Ibid., 6 and 15.

¹³² Jeffrey Record, "Bush Doctrine and war with Iraq," *Parameters* 33/1 (Spring 2003): 7.

¹³³ Ibid., 7.

¹³⁴ Tarzi, "Coercive Global Primacy," 38-39.

¹³⁵ Ibid., 41.

¹³⁶ Brzezinski, *Volba*, 241.

attacked and it was legitimate when the threat was imminent. Washington claimed that such conditions had to be adapted to modern days and spread of unconventional warfare because the character of warfare had changed. Nowadays a traditional declaration of war is rare and conflicts are less dependent on large standing armies that require time to mobilize. The NSS observes that “legal scholars and international jurists often conditioned the legitimacy of preemption on the existence of an imminent threat - most often a visible mobilization of armies, navies, and air forces preparing to attack.” Therefore, it comes to conclusion that “we must adapt the concept of imminent threat to the capabilities and objectives of today’s adversaries. Rogue states and terrorists do not seek to attack us using conventional means.”¹³⁷ To conclude, it is questionable whether the U.S. had the right to invade Iraq. Washington used arguments in support of preemptive war, which is possible under international law. However, these arguments were not well founded and therefore contested by many, who claim that the war in Iraq was preventive, and as such illegal. Another questionable issue in the NSS is the “freedom agenda”. The question is whether the promotion of democracy in the world is a genuine goal of American foreign policy or if it serves as justification for other strategic interests.¹³⁸ Either way, it became a strong argument against West’s hesitations and a vindication for the war in Iraq because who would want to deny Iraqi people freedom and democracy. To conclude, I will use words of a critic of Bush Doctrine professor Tarzi: “the 2002 NSS envisions a grand strategy of unchallenged American primacy, a coercive hegemonic order dominated by the United States, one in which the United States would prevent or pre-empt the rise of a rival state, be it a friend or a competitor.”¹³⁹ The NSS directs the U.S. toward “coercive global hegemonic primacy,” which is costly and economically unsustainable in the long-term and it gravely damages American power.¹⁴⁰ So not only such foreign undermines NATO but it also not advantageous for the United States itself.

The NSS identifies terrorist organizations with global reach, weak states that harbor and assist them, and rogue states as three main threats to the U.S. security.¹⁴¹ The NSS says “The enemy is terrorism - premeditated, politically motivated violence perpetrated against innocents” and continues “we make no distinction between terrorists

¹³⁷ "The National Security Strategy", 15.

¹³⁸ Tarzi, "Coercive Global Primacy," 29.

¹³⁹ Ibid., 32.

¹⁴⁰ Ibid., 42.

¹⁴¹ Record, "Bush Doctrine," 5.

and those who knowingly harbor or provide aid to them.”¹⁴² One of the key aspects to measure threat according to Bush administration, and thus the reasoning behind identifying these three as main threats, is the assumption that deterrence, used during the Cold War, does not truly work against rogue states seeking WMD and is completely useless against terrorist groups.¹⁴³ The NSS claims that “deterrence based only upon the threat of retaliation is less likely to work against leaders of rogue states more willing to take risks, gambling with the lives of their people, and the wealth of their nations.”¹⁴⁴ This, however, is not true because rogue states are led by dictators who depend on the survival of their country and the regime. They might be aggressive in their politics but they would be careful not to cross the line. It follows that the argument that deterrence would not work in the case of Iraq is flawed.

While Bush named Iraq together with Iran and North Korea to belong among “axes of evil” and to be rogue states, Washington spoke only about the war against Hussein, not against Teheran or Pyongyang. The U.S. was aware of North Korea’s effort to arm itself with missiles and weapons of mass destruction at the expense of starving its citizens. The behavior of Iran is ascribed to an unelected few who repress the hope for freedom of majority of Iranian people’s. And Iraq has attempted for over a decade to develop forbidden weapons such as anthrax, nerve gas, and nuclear weapons. Therefore, Bush concludes in his 2002 State of the Union Address with now famous label: “States like these, and their terrorist allies, constitute an axis of evil”.¹⁴⁵ The difference between Iraq and the other two is that the Bush Administration believed that Iraq’s effort to gain WMD was fueled by Baghdad’s intentions to use them against countries in the region, which would cause instability worldwide, and that Hussein was willing to provide WMD to terrorist organization that would use them against the U.S. Therefore, Iraq presented an imminent threat for Washington. Moreover, Washington believed that Iraq already had ties to terrorist organizations: “Iraq continues to flaunt its hostility toward America and to support terror.”¹⁴⁶ The connection between secular Iraq and highly religiously fundamental al-

¹⁴² "The National Security Strategy of the United States of America", U.S. Department of State, September 2002, accessed October 18, 2016, <https://www.state.gov/documents/organization/63562.pdf>, 5.

¹⁴³ Tarzi, "Coercive Global Primacy," 26.

¹⁴⁴ "The National Security Strategy", 15.

¹⁴⁵ "President Delivers State of the Union Address," The White House, published January 29, 2002, accessed April 9, 2017, <https://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2002/01/20020129-11.html>.

¹⁴⁶ Ibid.

Qaeda was at least questionable. Iraq was under sanctions and therefore in serious need of income. Furthermore, Baghdad did have a common enemy with al-Qaeda in the form of free and democratic United States. Nevertheless, the idea that Iraq was selling weapons of mass destruction to a religiously fundamental terrorist organization, which was very hostile to its radical nationalist regime, was unlikely.¹⁴⁷ On the other hand, Washington for example did not consider North Korea, while still “evil”, an imminent threat because it had acted moderately on international scene in recent years despite having more advanced nuclear program.¹⁴⁸

3.4 Iraq

Many Americans had called for a regime change in Iraq even before the September 11, 2001. European officials warned already back then that American attack on Iraq could have “damaging effects on the cohesion of the grand coalition,” meaning NATO.¹⁴⁹ Europeans generally agreed that Hussein’s regime was in violation of international law and was a grave problem but a majority of European politicians strongly opposed to resolving it by force.¹⁵⁰

In January 2003, Washington asked the Alliance what support roles they could play in case of the war with Iraq. Among discussed was an aid to Turkey, the only NATO member bordering Iraq. For instance, the Allies considered sending Patriot missiles and AWACS surveillance planes to protect Turkish territory. Besides defensive assistance to Turkey, NATO countries also talked about access to airspace, ports, and bases; placement of additional ships in the Mediterranean; providing security of American bases abroad; replacing American soldiers elsewhere so they can be redeployed; and the possibility that NATO would lead reconstruction mission in Iraq after the war. However, Germany, France, and Belgium publicly opposed such planning because they still believed in peaceful disarmament of Iraq.¹⁵¹

Europe sought UN resolution for Iraq and conditioned its support on it. Even in the immediate post 9/11 atmosphere, when invasion to Afghanistan was being prepared, many Europeans stressed the need for legitimacy, which could have been ensured by as broad international coalition as possible and the approval of the UN.

¹⁴⁷ Tarzi, "Coercive Global Primacy," 39.

¹⁴⁸ Record, "Bush Doctrine," 5.

¹⁴⁹ Gordon, "NATO After 11 September," 94.

¹⁵⁰ Sloan, *Permanent Alliance*, 247-248.

¹⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 249-250.

France proposed a resolution condemning the attacks to the UN already one day after the assault, i.e. on September 12, 2001.¹⁵² It was no surprise that sanctioning a military solution by the UN Security Council was important for European NATO-members in the case of Iraq as well. There already was a number of UN resolutions regarding Iraq since the beginning of the 1990s and Iraq repeatedly violated them. However, it was not clearly stated there what the response should be in such a case. They were written in ambiguous language that did not explicitly authorize military intervention.

There were mainly two problematic questions regarding Iraq. The first one was whether Iraq is a problem of terrorism, and the second whether the U.S. had the right to take actions even without UN SC resolution explicitly authorizing operation against Hussein's regime.¹⁵³ Washington made its case against Iraq based on Hussein's support of terrorism and on his attempt to gain and possibly use and sell weapons of mass destruction, actions that posed an imminent threat to the United States.¹⁵⁴ The only way to prevent Iraq to do so was the regime change because all the other options did not work. In the words of president Bush: "We've tried sanctions. We've tried the carrot of oil for food, and the stick of coalition military strikes. But Saddam Hussein has defied all these efforts and continues to develop weapons of mass destruction."¹⁵⁵ On the other hand, European leaders did not consider Iraqi regime to pose imminent threat, at least not to themselves or the U.S., but they agreed that it should not be allowed to gain WMD. European allies saw solution mainly in renewed UN inspections and so far did not find sufficient reasons for regime change.¹⁵⁶ The dispute escalated to the point when Washington claimed that it had the right to take military actions because Iraq would not comply with previous UN resolutions and weapon inspections, while France and Germany publicly disagreed, argued for continuing inspections, and threatened to block a new UN Security Council resolution that would explicitly allow military actions.¹⁵⁷

Germany and France, however, did not speak for the whole Europe. Eight European NATO-members signed a public declaration named "Letter of Eight",

¹⁵² Gordon, "NATO After 11 September," 95.

¹⁵³ Bensahel, *The Counterterror Coalitions*, 17.

¹⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 18-19.

¹⁵⁵ George W. Bush, "Address to the United Nations General Assembly, New York, September 12, 2002" Selected Speeches of President George W. Bush 2001-2008, accessed April 5, 2017, https://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/infocus/bushrecord/documents/Selected_Speeches_George_W_Bush.pdf, 144.

¹⁵⁶ Bensahel, *The Counterterror Coalitions*, 18.

¹⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 18-19.

in which they expressed their support for the U.S. The “Letter of Eight” acknowledged role of the U.S. in European security and emphasized the common values. It also pointed out that the United Nations itself had had already recognized the threat represented by Iraqi regime and its WMD programs. It emphasized that “all of us” were bound by the UNSC Resolution 1441. The letter concluded that the UNSC had been tasked with “preserving international peace and security” and thus must ensure compliance with its resolutions.¹⁵⁸ The letter was published on January 30, 2003 under the named “Europe and America Must Stand United”. It was signed by eight European countries (representatives of the United Kingdom, Spain, Italy, Portugal, Denmark, Czech Republic, Poland, and Hungary), which gave it its latter nickname.¹⁵⁹ It was soon after followed by Vilnius letter issued by the Vilnius group¹⁶⁰, which reflected the attitude of the Eastern and Central Europe. Vilnius letter was even more outright support for the U.S.¹⁶¹ When the operation in Iraq began, the UK, Poland, and Denmark participated in the military campaign and other countries provided indirect support or later on directly joined as well.¹⁶² Furthermore, the disagreement regarding Iraq did not interfere with (and maybe even led to) the NATO's decision to take over the ISAF mission in Afghanistan. The consensus among all of the Allies about Afghanistan was reached in April 2003.^{163,164}

In 2004, when the U.S. moved toward stabilization and reconstruction of Iraq, NATO members agreed at the Istanbul Summit that the role of the Alliance could be expanded. European leaders were however reluctant to do anything, which could help Bush in his reelection campaign. They were still too aware of the fact, that the U.S. acted unilaterally and that claims used to justify the war made by Bush administration about Iraqi WMD and ties to terrorism were not supported by

¹⁵⁸ David Miller, “World Opinion Opposes,” *Global Policy Forum*, published November 21, 2001, accessed June 11, 2016, <https://www.globalpolicy.org/component/content/article/154/26553.html>.

¹⁵⁹ Ibid.

¹⁶⁰ The Vilnius group composed of Baltic states Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania, and also Slovenia, Slovakia, Croatia, Albania, Romania, Bulgaria, and Republic of Macedonia.

¹⁶¹ Mihaela Gherghisan, “Vilnius 10 sign letter on Iraq,” *EUObserver*, published February 6, 2003, accessed June 11, 2016, <https://euobserver.com/enlargement/9269>.

¹⁶² Bensahel, *The Counterterror Coalitions*, 20.

¹⁶³ Sloan, *Permanent Alliance*, 189.

¹⁶⁴ “Consensus decision-making is a fundamental principle which has been accepted as the sole basis for decision-making in NATO since the creation of the Alliance in 1949. Consensus decision-making means that there is no voting at NATO. Consultations take place until a decision that is acceptable to all is reached.” in “Consensus decision-making at NATO,” North Atlantic Treaty Organization, accessed May 13, 2017, http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_49178.htm.

evidence.¹⁶⁵ Tarzi suggests that the logic connecting Hussein with al Qaeda was flawed because power and regime survival were important to Saddam Hussein and he would not risk his own destruction by providing WMD to a group that was radically Wahhabis and thus inherently hostile to his secular nationalist regime. Therefore, he argues, that acquisition of WMD would have provided Iraq with an ability to deter its competitors in the region as well as others, including the United States, to secure its own survival. Baghdad would have not wanted to risk selling them to a belligerent terrorist group. Furthermore, the intelligence about Hussein's possession of WMD proved to be flawed.¹⁶⁶

In case of Iraq, Tarzi observes, the U.S. "unilaterally gave itself the right to define the nature of the threat to the international community and to choose the instruments through which to remove the threat".¹⁶⁷ Washington demonstrated its tendency toward hegemonic coercive policies and its willingness to unilaterally dominate international scene as it decided to invade a Muslim Arab country in the center of the pre-dominantly Muslim Arab Middle East without UN approval, without support of its European allies and states in the region, and against the will of international community as a whole.¹⁶⁸ The foreign policy strategy of Bush administration undermined the U.S. efforts on international scene in the last five decades when the U.S. representatives had been attempting to gain international legitimacy through placing constraints on its own power and thus creating favorable international environment prone to cooperation and peaceful settlement of conflicts. The neoconservatives removed many of those constraints and, as a consequence, Washington lost international legitimacy. The fact is that policy of unilateral primacy inherently inclines toward politics of coercion.¹⁶⁹ Tarzi observes that "unilateral global hegemonic primacy is inherently coercive, it lacks domestic and international legitimacy, and the strategies to achieve it are unbearably costly, self-defeating, and ultimately unattainable".¹⁷⁰

Among the negative results of the Bush doctrine and the intervention in Iraq is also the fact that removing Saddam Hussein strengthened Iran, created

¹⁶⁵ Sloan, *Permanent Alliance*, 253.

¹⁶⁶ Tarzi, "Coercive Global Primacy," 40.

¹⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 36.

¹⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 36.

¹⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 36.

¹⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 35.

undesirable precedent of using force, destabilized international system, and impacted negatively efforts to reach international stability and peace. The secular regime of Saddam Hussein with majority of positions of power in country filled with Sunni Muslims provided a counterweight to predominantly Shia Iran. After the Iraq War, the new predominantly Shia government was created in Iraq. This resulted in strengthened Iran because one of the main Iran's former adversaries was weakened and destabilized by war and the newly established government tended to see Tehran more favorably. Furthermore, the invasion without UN approval, without backing of majority of European countries, and without support of Muslim Arab countries in the region created dangerous precedent, which could encourage others to resort to same measures. For instance, India could begin war against Pakistan under the pretext that Pakistan supports terrorist acts in Kashmir. To add to that, it endangered international stability, which is more likely to occur when countries "resist the temptation to initiate war preventively".¹⁷¹ Brzezinski points out the resulting paradox of militarily successful war carried out without broad international support: "America has never had more reliable global military power, yet its political trustworthiness has never been lower."¹⁷²

3.5 Why NATO Became Important Again

The Bush administration had been forced to acknowledge that it needed the Alliance to deal with the demands of two conflicts. Iraq was given highest priority. As Washington decided for military operations in Iraq, Bush began to recognize the value of NATO and it begun to see its possible role in Afghanistan. By engaging the Alliance more, the U.S. would free some of its own soldiers and capabilities so that they could be redeployed to Iraq.¹⁷³ The change in the U.S. foreign policy in Bush's second term was visible in Bush's "fence mending" trip to Europe in February 2005.¹⁷⁴ NATO took over the complete leadership of ISAF in 2003 and thus was responsible for everything from command over planning to coordination. Furthermore, in December 2003, the UN Security Council authorized an extension of the ISAF mission from Kabul to the whole Afghanistan.¹⁷⁵ The fact that the Alliance took over the mission

¹⁷¹ Ibid., 40-41.

¹⁷² Brzezinski, *Volba*, 251.

¹⁷³ Sloan, *Permanent Alliance*, 189.

¹⁷⁴ Ibid., 254.

¹⁷⁵ "About RS."

in Afghanistan in time of crisis over Iraq showed, according to Sloan, that NATO could work through even the worst of conflicts between member states: “The fact that the allies fell in behind the ISAF mission at a time when the alliance was so profoundly divided over Iraq suggested that the alliance could survive its most heated disagreements.”¹⁷⁶

There was a number of external factors coming from outside of the U.S. that contributed to the rehabilitation of relations in the Alliance. As EU Constitution failed, it became clear that Europe could not become a “balancer” of U.S. power. Europe realized that rather than act as a counterweight, it needs to work together with the U.S. New NATO members and Eastern and Central European countries aspiring for membership in the Alliance were dedicated to NATO. In time of crisis, they worked as a spare engine and supplied the Alliance with vitality and energy.¹⁷⁷ The transatlantic relations warmed after elections in Germany and France in 2005 and 2007 and further after the U.S. elections in 2008. Schröder, who had personally bad relations with Bush, was replaced by Angela Merkel as German chancellor in 2005. Nicolas Sarkozy became the French president in 2007. In 2008, Barack Obama was elected the U.S. president replacing Bush, who personally was not regarded favorably by many European allies. Moreover, the U.S. and Europe are usually the closest when America votes left and Europe right. All these transitions helped normalize relations between the U.S. and Europe. Despite disagreements about Iraq, NATO members still has shared basic liberal values and interests. Furthermore, they have been interdependent economically so much that it was not in the interest of either to go through a serious long-term quarrel. Renewed self-confidence of Russia in its foreign policy and Moscow’s intervention in Georgia in 2008 served as a final blow to the crisis within the Alliance. Russia’s aggressive behavior opened eyes to allies on both sides of Atlantic and they once again realized that they were not each other’s enemy.¹⁷⁸

Europe, while not completely ideal, is still the best choice for the U.S. as the main ally. The dissolution of the Soviet Union in the early 1990s opened the discussion about the future role of NATO, if there was any, and this discussion was never solved. According to Brzezinski, terrorist attacks on 9/11 created space for voices (especially from right wing, neoconservative, religiously fundamental groups) calling

¹⁷⁶ Sloan, *Permanent Alliance*, 200.

¹⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 255-257.

¹⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 255-257.

for a new alliance based on common opposition to Muslims. It follows that states that have trouble with Islamic radicalism should be the primary and natural allies of the U.S., whether it is Russia, China, Israel, or India.¹⁷⁹ However, such a union would be short-term and unreliable. It cannot replace an alliance, which stands on common democratic values. Moreover, who else should be the U.S. ally than members of NATO? Israel is a clear choice for the main regional ally in the Middle East at first sight because it is a democracy, culturally close to the U.S., with considerable military strength. Israel has a very strong lobby in Washington supported by significant financial and political support from Jewish community living in the U.S. However, national interests of both countries diverge. Low prices of Middle Eastern oil are in U.S. economic as well as strategic interests, and therefore, Washington is dependent on good relations with Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates.¹⁸⁰ It follows, that Washington cannot be ignorant to Arab reservations to Israel and Israeli territorial claims. Therefore, the U.S. in its support of Israel has to be careful not to be perceived as the same enemy as Israel is for Muslim nations. Democratic and regionally strong India could appear as another potential main ally, however, India is still religiously, culturally, ethnically, and linguistically fragmented with significant Muslim minorities at its borders and Muslim neighboring countries. Nationalism and religious disunity combined could transform into violent conflicts that would threaten territorial integrity and stability of India. Furthermore, India's interests were mainly regional with main adversaries in Pakistan and China. The U.S. could not afford to make an enemy of either.¹⁸¹ Russia and the U.S. had a common threat perception regarding Islamic radicalism. Moscow's democratic and pro-Western course since the fall of the Soviet Union could have gotten it on a list of potential main allies in the war against terrorism.¹⁸² However, Russia was still not a democracy and therefore could not lead by example. Furthermore, many countries in the Middle East and central Asia had not forgotten historical injustices, for which they blame Moscow. On the other hand, Europe, which is more and more organized in the EU and militarily united in NATO, is the only possible long-term ally with sufficient economic and military resources and political strength to stand beside the U.S. Brzezinski believes that "only cooperation

¹⁷⁹ Brzezinski, *Volba*, 53-54.

¹⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 88.

¹⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 89-90.

¹⁸² The perception of Russia was very optimistic at the time. For example, there were even discussions about Russia potentially entering NATO.

on both side of Atlantic can set truly global course, which significantly improves the worldwide situation".¹⁸³

¹⁸³ Brzezinski, *Volba*, 258-259.

Conclusion

The event of 9/11 irreversibly changed the United States. The U.S. was shocked by the knowledge of its own vulnerability. After the attack, the United States were overwhelmed by an enormous crowd distress supported by the fierce and dramatic notions of constitutional actors. Personal and national security overshadowed traditional American devotion to civil rights and freedoms. In domestic policy, civil rights were suppressed especially by the PATRIOT Act, signed into law in October 2001, which gave security apparatus and secret services more powers at the expense of individual privacy and other civil rights and freedoms. In foreign policy, the event of 9/11 resulted in the effort to extend the direct hegemonic influence of the U.S. as much as possible, especially in south Asia and in the Middle East. Such policy was influenced by public hysteria and it was not sustainable in the long-term. It was not the first time the U.S. experienced it. Already at the end of the 18th century during the war with France, the Alien and Seditions Acts, which suppressed the freedom of speech in the name of strengthened national security, were passed. In 1918, the Espionage Act against pacifists and radicals was adopted. Another example is from the World War II when over hundred of thousands Japanese were interned.

The attacks on 9/11 caused severe trauma to the American idea of invincibility. The U.S. did not experience being under attack on its mainland for the entire twentieth century. The shock led to “war mentality” manifesting itself in the pressure of the public and the media for swift radical actions. This resulted in ad hoc decisions taken without proper analyses and consideration of consequences. Such impetuous policies were handed over to the Congress only to approve or refuse them without a proper discussion and a room for objections. Congress, which was dominated by the Republicans, let the president to deal with the crisis how he wanted, and it did not oppose him. None of the Congressmen dared to look soft on terrorism in front of voters in time when security was a very sensitive topic.

The proclamations of support by NATO members in reaction to the 9/11 were welcome but the Alliance as a whole was not perceived as essential for the war in Afghanistan. The U.S. under Bush did not consider international institutions to a play significant role in international politics and preferred bilateral cooperation. Furthermore, the shock and the subsequent “war mentality” caused that the dealing with those responsible for 9/11 was extremely important. The public pushed

for rapid actions. Washington had too recent memories of the war in Kosovo, in which the disagreement among allies and the need to democratically find a consensus complicated and prolonged matters. The U.S. was not willing to give up or even share the decision-making authority on such important issue as catching those responsible for the 9/11 attacks. Furthermore, the NATO did not have much to offer anyway. Due to the highly technical nature of the war, not as many ground forces were needed, and technical underdevelopment of the European military became apparent.

The U.S. foreign policy under Bush was neoconservative. In National Security Strategy 2002, Bush Administration came up with the grand strategy of unilateralism according to which, the U.S. should act as a world hegemon without being entangled by it. It should not be afraid to use its military power or take actions alone without international support. The NSS of 2002 makes case for the preemptive war, which is only a small step from the preventive war or act of aggression forbidden by the UN. There is a very slim line between preemptive war, which is a form of self-defense, and preventive war, an aggression against a possible future rival. The NSS 2002 also uses extremely broad definition of terrorism and, moreover, it defines terrorists as the problem instead the socioeconomic conditions creating fertile soil for terrorism. Terrorists and terrorist acts are only symptoms of much deeper problems. Even if you would be able to catch or kill all the terrorist of today's world, when you do not solve the problem itself, you can be sure that more terrorists would appear. Compared to the U.S., Europe realized it and was cautious about American formulation of the problem. After the 9/11, Bush Administration used black-and-white rhetoric and simplified the war on terror into war between good and evil, which is apparent for example from the label "axes of evil" or proclamations in the spirit of "who is not with us is against U.S."

Europe was sympathetic to the U.S. and proclaimed its support for Washington since day one. However, it expected to be included in the decision-making process and military operations in Afghanistan, or at least consulted as a major ally, which did not happen. Many Europeans felt antipathy toward Bush and did not trust the U.S. policy-making. Moreover, some of the European NATO members, especially Germany and France, strongly opposed military intervention in Iraq. Europe, however, never forgot that the United States were its main ally, and at the end in the moment of truth did not hold back its support despite its rhetoric. Most visibly, the Alliance fell in behind the mission in Afghanistan in the time of the most escalated

conflict over Iraq, which actually freed American capabilities to be redeployed from Afghanistan to Iraq.

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization was founded over half century before the collective defense clause was activated for the first time. Since its beginning in 1949, NATO has been more than a mere security alliance known from before. It was built on shared values such as democracy, liberalism, and the rule of law, and not only as a short-term union against common threat. Nevertheless, the Soviet Union was the main enemy till the end of the Cold War and NATO had to transform in the 1990s to fit into the new world order and to find its place in the new international security situation. The discussions about the NATO's direction continued in the new millennium, even though the voices saying that the Alliance was no longer needed quietened down. Right after the attacks on 9/11, the Alliance stood behind the U.S. and offered assistance. NATO was, however, undermined by Washington, which was omitting the Alliance and rather used bilateral partnerships. Furthermore, European NATO members and the U.S. had different threat perception regarding Iraq, and could not agree on a common solution. This resulted in a crisis in transatlantic relations.

The conflict was not only between the European NATO members and the U.S.; Europe too was divided. Even though NATO was pushed to the sidelines in Afghanistan, individual support provided by NATO members was significant. The importance of transatlantic partnership is clearly demonstrated in the symbolic joint launching of missiles by American and British troops that began the war in Afghanistan. The fact that the allies agreed on taking over the mission in Afghanistan in the time of crisis over Iraq shows that rhetoric and an unsuccessful effort to push the other side to certain solutions preferred by one side does not necessarily mean a terminal rift for the Alliance. NATO is a democratic organization, which means that each side is more than welcome to argue its point.

The reaction to 9/11 was so swift that there was no time for an opposition to form. With time, more and more critics appeared. The reasoning for the invasion to Iraq proved to be faulty. Furthermore, Bush Administration realized that its policy is costly and unsustainable in the long-term. It increasingly appreciated the value of NATO as it headed toward engagement in two conflicts at the same time.

To conclude, the policies made by Bush Administration after 9/11 were rash and ill-conceived. There were no plans for reconstruction of Afghanistan or Iraq, no classified evaluations of future development, costs, or a timeframe for how long

the U.S. would be engaged in the wars. As U.S. headed toward the intervention in Iraq, it realized that it cannot be engaged in two conflicts alone and more and more appreciated the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Even though some European members of the Alliance were reluctant to support the war in Iraq, NATO took over ISAF mission and allowed Washington to move its troops elsewhere. At the end, it became clear again that the U.S. and Europe still need each other.

Summary

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization constitutes cornerstone of our security today. This thesis is a study of handling of the crisis in the Alliance after the attacks on 9/11. It describes and analyzes factors, which triggered the crisis. Since this thesis has limited extent, it is only from the perspective of the United States and focuses on period between 2001-2003.

The first part offers theoretical background of security alliances in the eyes of the leading international relations theories and explains national security decision-making process in the U.S. The second chapter examines U.S. National Security Policy at the Turn of Millennium under Bush Administration. In the third chapter, U.S. reaction to 9/11 in relation to NATO is analysed.

Sources

Afghanistan Resolute Support. "About RS." Accessed November 6, 2016. <http://www.rs.nato.int/history.html>.

Auerswald, David. "The Evolution of the NSC Process." In *The National Security Enterprise: Navigating the Labyrinth*, edited by Roger Z. George and Harvey Rishikof, 31-54. Georgetown: Georgetown University Press, 2011.

Bensahel Nora. *The Counterterror Coalitions: Cooperation with Europe, NATO, and the European Union*. Santa Monica, 2003.

Brzezinski, Zbigniew. *Volba: Globální nadvláda nebo globální vedení*. Translation Martin Ritter. Praha: Mladá fronta, 2004.

Daalder, Ivo, and Philip Gordon. "Euro-Trashing." *Washington Post*, May 29, 2002. Accessed April 8, 2017. https://www.washingtonpost.com/archive/opinions/2002/05/29/euro-trashing/83f76527-f2d6-4244-80e3-e53a98f6e8c2/?utm_term=.9c0d10f6a4a6.

Fischett, Joseph. "Allies Unsure of What a Counterterrorism Offensive Might Require: NATO Unity, but What Next?" *New York Times* online. Published September 14, 2001. Accessed April 11, 2017. http://www.nytimes.com/2001/09/14/news/14iht-natox7Fx7Fx7Fx7Fx7F_ed3_.html.

Friedman, Thomas. *The Lexus and the Olive Tree*. Picador, 2012.

Fukuyama, Francis. *The End of History and the Last Man*. Free Press, 2006.

Gallup. "Presidential Approval Ratings - George W. Bush." Accessed April 20, 2016. <http://www.gallup.com/poll/116500/Presidential-Approval-Ratings-George-Bush.aspx>.

Gheciu, Alexandra. *NATO in the "New Europe"*. Stanford, USA: Stanford University Press, 2005.

Gherghisan, Mihaela. "Vilnius 10 sign letter on Iraq." *EUObserver*. Published February 6, 2003. Accessed June 11, 2016. <https://euobserver.com/enlargement/9269>.

Gordon, Philip H. "NATO After 11 September." *Survival* 43 (4) (2001): 89-106.

Hoder Lukáš. *Transatlantické vztahy v době krize: Hegemonie USA a emancipace Evropy po 11. září 2001*. Brno: Masarykova univerzita - Mezinárodní politologický ústav, 2009.

Huntington, Samuel. *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*. Simon & Schuster, 2011.

Ikenberry, John G. "State Power and the Institutional Bargain: America's Ambivalent Economic and Security Multilateralism." In *US Hegemony and International Organizations*, ed. Rosemary Foot, S. Neil MacFarlane, and Michael Mastanduno, 49-70. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

"ISAF's mission in Afghanistan." North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Accessed April 16, 2017. http://www.nato.int/cps/eu/natohq/topics_69366.htm.

Jacobs, Lawrence R. and Benjamin I. Page. "Who Influences U.S. Foreign Policy?" *The American Political Science Review* 99 (1) (February 2005): 107-123. Accessed September 24, 2014. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/30038922>.

Lansford, Tom. *All for One: Terrorism, NATO, and the United States*. Burlington, USA: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2002.

Layne, Christopher. "US hegemony and the perpetuation of NATO." *Journal of Strategic Studies* 23 (3) (2000): 59-91.

Mearsheimer, John J. "The False Promise of International Institutions." *International Security* 19 (3/1994-1995): 5-49.

Miller, David. "World Opinion Opposes." *Global Policy Forum*. Published November 21, 2001. Accessed June 11, 2016. <https://www.globalpolicy.org/component/content/article/154/26553.html>.

Morrow, James D., "Alliance and Asymmetry: An Alternative to the Capability Aggregation Model of Alliance." *American Journal of Political Science* 35(4) (1991): 904-907.

NATO. "The Alliance's Strategic Concept." Published April 24, 1999. Accessed April 8, 2017. http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/official_texts_27433.htm.

NATO. "The North Atlantic Treaty." Published April 4, 1949. Accessed April 20, 2016. http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/official_texts_17120.htm.

NATO On-line Library. "Statement to the Press by NATO Secretary General, Lord Robertson, on the North Atlantic Council Decision On Implementation Of Article 5 of the Washington Treaty following the 11 September Attacks against the United States." Published October 4, 2001. Accessed April 20, 2016. <http://www.nato.int/docu/speech/2001/s011004b.htm>.

NATO Press Release. "Statement by the North Atlantic Council." Published September 11 2001. Accessed April 11, 2017. <http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/2001/p01-122e.htm>.

NATO Press Release. "Statement by the North Atlantic Council." Published September 12, 2001. Accessed April 20, 2016. <http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/2001/p01-124e.htm>.

Record, Jeffrey. "Bush Doctrine and war with Iraq." *Parameters* 33/1 (Spring 2003): 4-21.

Reichard, Martin. *The EU-NATO Relationship: A Legal and Political Perspective*. Burlington, USA: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2006.

Res, H. J. "114 — 107th Congress: Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002." www.GovTrack.us. Published 2002. Accessed May 12, 2017. <https://www.govtrack.us/congress/bills/107/hjres114>.

Rishikof, Harvey. "The United States Supreme Court: The Cult of the Robe in the National Security Enterprise." In *The National Security Enterprise: Navigating the Labyrinth*, edited by Roger Z. George and Harvey Rishikof, 247-266. Georgetown: Georgetown University Press, 2011.

Risse-Kappen, Thomas. "Public Opinion, Domestic Structure, and Foreign Policy in Liberal Democracies." *World Politics* 43 (4) (July 1991): 479-512.

Rosenwasser, Jon J. and Michael Warner. "History of Interagency Process for Foreign Relations in the United States: Murphy's Law?" In *The National Security Enterprise:*

Navigating the Labyrinth, ed. Roger Z. George and Harvey Rishikof, 11-30. Georgetown: Georgetown University Press, 2011.

“Selected Speeches of President George W. Bush 2001-2008.” Accessed April 5, 2017. https://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/infocus/bushrecord/documents/Selected_Speeches_George_W_Bush.pdf.

Sloan, Stanley R. *Permanent Alliance? NATO and the Transatlantic Bargain from Truman to Obama*. London, UK: The Continuum International Publishing Group Inc, 2010).

Tarzi, Shah M. “The Folly of a Grand Strategy of Coercive Global Primacy: A Fresh Perspective on the Post-9/11 Bush Doctrine.” *International Journal on World Peace* 31/3 (September 31, 2014): 27-52.

“The Constitutions of the United States of America.” Accessed April 8, 2017. <http://constitutionus.com>.

The White House. “President Bush Outlines Iraqi Threat.” Published October 7, 2002. Accessed April 20, 2016. <http://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2002/10/20021007-8.html>.

The White House. “President Delivers State of the Union Address.” Published January 29, 2002. Accessed April 9, 2017. <https://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2002/01/20020129-11.html>.

U.S. Department of State. “The National Security Strategy of the United States of America.” September 2002. Accessed October 18, 2016. <https://www.state.gov/documents/organization/63562.pdf>.

United States House of Representatives. “Party Divisions of the House of Representatives.” Accessed April 8, 2017. <http://history.house.gov/Institution/Party-Divisions/Party-Divisions/>.

United States Senate. “Party Division.” Accessed April 8, 2017. <http://www.senate.gov/history/partydiv.htm>.

US Government Publishing Office. "Public Law 107-40-Sept. 18, 2001." Published September 18, 2001. Accessed April 20, 2016. <https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/PLAW-107publ40/pdf/PLAW-107publ40.pdf>.

Walker, Dinah. "Trends in U.S. Military Spending." Council on Foreign Relations. Published July 15, 2015. Accessed April 20, 2017. <http://www.cfr.org/defense-budget/trends-us-military-spending/p28855>.

Warburg, Gerald Felix. "Congress: Checking Presidential Power." In *The National Security Enterprise: Navigating the Labyrinth*, edited by Roger Z. George and Harvey Rishikof, 227-246. Georgetown: Georgetown University Press, 2011.