



**UNIVERSITY OF NAIROBI
INSTITUTE OF DIPLOMACY AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES**

NATO AS AN INSTRUMENT OF U.S FOREIGN POLICY: A CRITICAL ANALYSIS

BY

**MAJID SHEIKH HARED
R51/88244/2016**

SUPERVISOR: DR. ROSEMARY ANYONA

**A RESEARCH PROPOSAL SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULLFILLMENT OF THE
AWARD OF MASTERS OF ARTS IN DIPLOMACY INSTITUTE OF DIPLOMACY
AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES**

NOVEMBER 2018

DECLARATION

I, the under signed, declare that this project is my original work and has not been submitted for any award to any other college, institution or university other than the University of Nairobi.

Signed..... Date.....

Majid Sheikh Hared

R51/88244/2016

SUPERVISORS APPROVAL

The project has been submitted for examination with my approval as the university supervisor.

Signed..... Date.....

Dr. Rosemary Anyona

DEDICATION

Wish to dedicate this research to my mum whose sacrifice and prayers as well as my late dad's input and sacrifices have helped me reach this stage where I am today. Secondly and most notably, I also wish to dedicate this research to my two dear brothers who also helped me immensely in the absence of my dad and made sure I didn't dropped out of school because of lack of fees. Finally, I wish to dedicate this research to the Ambassador of Slovakia and permanent Representative to the United Nations in New York H.E Michal Mlynar for his genuine help and guidance all through our fruitful meetings and discussions.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I wish to sincerely thank my supervisor Dr. Rosemary Anyona whose unwavering support, guidance, cooperation, motivation and mentorship went a great deal in ensuring the success of this research project. I also wish to thank my lecturers from the Institute Of Diplomacy and International Studies who in the course of my bachelor's studies widened my understanding of the subject matter of this study. Further I wish to thank my family for giving me the peace of mind I needed during the pursuit of this project and especially my two wonderful brothers, Abdullahi and Mohamed. Not to forget my dear and immediate former classmates i.e. Hamud, Ahmed, Aden, Hassan, Shukri and Stella Muthoni who always encouraged me wherever things went wrong. Finally, my sincere gratitude to the university for having given me the admission and opportunity to pursue this course.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEDICATION.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENT	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS	v
ABSTRACT.....	viii
LIST OF ABBREVIATION.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
CHAPTER ONE	1
INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY.....	1
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Statement of the Research Problem	3
1.3 Objectives of the Study	4
1.4 Literature Review	4
1.4.1 Intergovernmental Military Alliances	5
1.4.2 The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO).....	7
1.4.3 U.S Foreign Policy and NATO.....	9
1.5 Justification of the Study.....	11
1.6 Theoretical Framework	12
1.7 Hypotheses	14
1.8 Methodology	14
1.8.1 Data Collection.....	14
1.8.2 Data Analysis.....	16
1.9 Chapter Outline	16
CHAPTER TWO	18
HISTORY AND PURPOSE OF NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION (NATO)	18
2.1 Introduction.....	18

2.2 History of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)	19
2.3 Signing of the Brussels Treaty	21
2.4 Purposes of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO).....	24
2.5 NATO’S Strategic Concept.....	25
2.6 An Alliance of Common Interests.....	27
2.7 An Alliance of Collective Vision	28
2.8 A Political Alliance	30
2.9 Creating Stability across the Euro-Atlantic Region	32
2.10 Conclusion.....	33
CHAPTER THREE	35
NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION AS A TOOL FOR U.S FOREIGN POLICY – THE CASE OF 2011 NATO INTERVENTION IN LIBYA	35
3.1 Introduction	35
3.2 The United States and NATO in Libya.....	36
3.3 The Role of U.S and NATO in Libya	38
3.4 The Political Perspective of the U.S and NATO in Libya	40
3.5 Political Instrument in Libya Intervention	42
3.6 The U.S Strategic Relation in NATO.....	45
3.7 Conclusion.....	48
CHAPTER FOUR.....	49
A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF NATO AS AN INSTRUMENT OF U.S FOREIGN POLICY	49
4.1 Introduction	49
4.2 Power Politics: The United States, NATO and Libyan Intervention	50
4.3 Assessing Involvement of NATO in Libya.....	54
4.4 Scope of NATO and U.S Relation	58

4.5 Precedential Value: NATO Intervention.....	61
4.6 The Conflict Perspective – U.S and NATO Partnership.....	62
4.7 Conclusion.....	65
CHAPTER FIVE	66
CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	66
5.1 Introduction.....	66
5.2 Collective Interests.....	67
5.3 NATO – U.S Partnership	68
5.4 Key Findings	69
5.4.1 The Political Factor	70
5.4.2 The Security Environment.....	71
5.5 Realignment within NATO.....	72
5.6 Recommendations	74
5.7 Conclusion.....	75
REFERENCES.....	77

ABSTRACT

The formation of North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) paved way for an alliance of collective security, defense and share interests. The U.S was pivotal in the establishment of NATO and took up the leadership role through providing the necessary funds and structures required to manage the organization. Through the years, the U.S has maintained its support for NATO especially in funding as it is the biggest contributor of funds for running the alliance. It is within the context of leadership and funding that the political aspect of the U.S relation in NATO emerges. A stable Europe is vital for the U.S in advancing its foreign policy of peace and democracy.

The U.S has been able in multiple occasions to advance its foreign policy through NATO. The aftermath of 9/11 attacked led to an attack on Afghanistan which was meant to disintegrate terrorist groups that had harbored in the country. NATO was integrated by the U.S in the war and was critical in forming a stable Afghan security and supported reconstruction efforts. On the other hand, the attack on Libya as initiated by the U.S was then approved by the U.N and NATO. NATO led in the attack in a war that was first approved by the U.S. The purpose of NATO has been to serve as an Atlantic forum for consultations on issues that are of vital interests which include possible developments that pose risks for the security of member states.

The purpose of this research study is to examine the how NATO has been used as an instrument of foreign policy. The study objectives that guide this study included: to examine the role of intergovernmental military alliances in foreign policy of states; to examine how NATO has been used as an instrument of United States foreign policy; to examine challenges and prospects for the United States in using NATO as an instrument of foreign policy. Data sourcing and content analysis was based on realizing the objectives as depicted above. Data sourcing and content

analysis was based on realizing the set objectives as defined above. The study incorporated multiple case studies that were key sources of information and a guide to the literature review on the basis of the study objectives. The theoretical framework is adopted within the literature review to define different variables such as the U.S foreign policy, NATO, and the metrics that define the relation between the U.S and NATO. The study realized the criteria set in the research objectives. According to the study findings, NATO is used to advance U.S foreign policy. The study findings may prove useful to in defining the scope of alliances and relations within the international realms.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

1.1 Background

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) was set up to provide European security as well as establish a strategic base for United States foreign policy in Europe. In the years leading to the Cold War, the Soviet Union had enlarged its communist sphere in order to influence China, countries of Eastern Europe, Vietnam and Korea. The Soviet Union would thus gain much influence in economic, political and social spheres. The United States took a lead role in the establishment of NATO. It was able to increase its capability and legitimacy in providing security and creating a force that could be able to manage the Soviet Union.¹

The United States faces challenges globally from organizations or countries with conflicting interests. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) was established to assure and ensure transatlantic security and peace after the World War II by deterring Soviet aggression and maintaining peace across Europe. This meant that the U.S pursued its interests within NATO in order to protect and advance its security.² NATO was therefore formed as a way of mitigating the spread of Soviet Union influence abroad.

The North Atlantic Treaty tied the U.S to Europe. This means that the U.S had to undertake security operations with its allies. The treaty incorporated the provision for mutual defense between western European allies and the USA. Countries with common security national interests forge alliances with the aim of strengthening defense and security across the region. NATO depicted such a scope where the member states had common interests. The U.S. foreign policy has

¹ Duignan, P. (2010). *NATO: It's Past, Present, Future*. NY. Hoover Press.

²Cox, M. (2015). *The U.S foreign policy after the Cold War: superpower without a mission?* New York. Pinter Publishers Ltd.

normally focused on protecting U.S. globally and in the recent years, this has been hampered by increased threat to its security. The rise of terrorist groups such as Al-Qaida, ISIL, and Hezbollah among other groups has posed serious challenge to the U.S. interests especially in its focus on securing its citizens.³ The U.S has therefore been enhancing its foreign policy through involving allies such as NATO in order to ensure that it meets security standards of its citizens.⁴

In the last fifteen years, NATO has continued to reinvent itself by expanding its vision and scope to crises outside the European member states. The gravest danger to the U.S. security is terrorism. The U.S. therefore faces a critical challenge as terrorist groups and hostile governments have material ability and expertise to harm the U.S. security interests. These define some of the key elements that have transformed the security scope of NATO as the U.S remains a key player in providing security leadership within the organization.⁵

The USA has continued to incorporate its NATO allies and together amass equipment, skills and expertise in ensuring collective defense and security⁶. There has been increased change in warfare across the world and this has prompted the U.S to be keen on the mandate of NATO in providing and enhancing security. The U.S has been vocal in ensuring it protects its citizens through NATO as a key ally.⁷ The U.S. has continued to make use of its technological opportunities in its defense spending and plans to transform its military forces within NATO in order to dominate potential threats to security. This study therefore focuses on the role of NATO in providing a platform for the U.S in pursuing its foreign policy.

³Pillar, P. R. (2014). *Terrorism and United States foreign policy*. Brookings Institution Press.

⁴Mead, W. R. (2013). *Special providence: American foreign policy and how it changed the world*. New York. Routledge.

⁵Thompson, K. W. (2015). *NATO Expansion*. Lanham, Md: University Press of America.

⁶Lippmann, W. (2016). *The Cold War: A study of United States foreign policy*. New York. Harper.

⁷Patrick, S., & Forman, S. (Eds.). (2012). *Multilateralism and US foreign policy: ambivalent engagement*. NY. Lynne Rienner Publisher.

1.2 Statement of the Research Problem

The U.S foreign policy dictates the country's interaction with other states in the global system. During the Cold War, the key role of NATO was to protect Western Europe against the Soviets. However, the threat to security as a result of terrorism has further shifted the role of NATO to safeguarding its member states against external terrorist threats. Even with the change of focus, the U.S has the key mandate of maintaining its defense and security and this forms its background on its use of NATO in order to advance its security interests.⁸

The agenda of U.S foreign policy through NATO has shifted to emphasize on its political, social and economic agenda. NATO is therefore pivotal for the U.S in advancing its agenda and interests across Europe. The recent events such as the migration crisis in Syria, and Russia's actions in Ukraine, Crimea enhance the debate on the role of NATO within the U.S foreign policy. The context of Europe's collective security has shifted to become a strategic priority with the changing scope of security issues.

NATO is a key influential apparatus used by the U.S in connecting with the most stable economies and governments in the world.⁹ The U.S foreign policy has ensured that other global regions do not affect its partnerships with its loyal allies within NATO. The U.S has maintained its power within NATO since its inception and continues to fulfill its leadership role in the organization. NATO has the capability and experience, primarily supported by the U.S military readiness to assure of security to member states.

As a result of the transforming strategic environment, this study examines the context in which the U.S continues to advance its foreign policy through NATO. NATO's purpose during its

⁸Thompson, K. W. (2015). *NATO Expansion*. Washington DC. Lanham, Md: University Press of America.

⁹ Magnus Peterson. (2015) *The U.S-NATO Debate: From Libya to Ukraine* New York: Bloomsbury Academic.

establishment was to ensure security of its member states. Realization of its core purpose defines the context on whether the U.S pushes its foreign policy interests through NATO. The key question in this study therefore lies in the structure and role of NATO in facilitating the U.S to push for its national agenda across Europe. The key therefore lies on whether the U.S could have been able to push for its national interests across Europe without NATO.

A strong role of the U.S in NATO provides the country with the link to the most stable governments in the world and serves as a key policy mechanism through which it can be able to influence European countries. Its role in NATO provides an avenue for freedom and legitimacy of global action. This study therefore aims to explore the role of United States in NATO and how its relation within the alliance has continued to define its foreign policy.

1.3 Objectives of the Study

- i. To examine the role of intergovernmental military alliances in foreign policy of states.
- ii. To examine how NATO has been used as an instrument of United States foreign policy.
- iii. To examine challenges and prospects for the United States in using NATO as an instrument of foreign policy.

1.4 Literature Review

The literature in this study will be divided into three sections. Section one will review literature on intergovernmental military alliances. The first section of literature review will cover the context of intergovernmental military alliances. Section two of this literature review will review literature on what defines the U.S foreign policy. This section will cover the tenets of U.S foreign policy especially with a perspective of Europe. The third section will review literature on how U.S foreign policy has been advanced through NATO. This section covers literature on how NATO has been used as an avenue to push for the U.S agendas.

1.4.1 Intergovernmental Military Alliances

Military alliances depict an international agreement that concerns national security. The contracting parties engage in an agreement that defines mutual support and protection in case of a security crisis. Military alliances are linked to collective security systems. However, it is important to note that the agreement differs depending on the approach of the member states. Alliances can be designed to advance nationalistic interests of the respective parties and provide for joint military action in the event that one of the parties as per the objectives becomes involved in war.¹⁰

The other context of military alliances depicts a collective security arrangement which is directed against any aggression. This means that it emphasizes on strengthening the balance of principle but not shifting the balance of power. The motivation towards establishing military alliances is to offer protection against threats from other states. The alliances also emphasize on strengthening of ties with other states and managing conflicts especially those directed at member states. The nature of military alliances is therefore defined by their formation structure and cohesiveness and therefore provides a decisive understanding on how national interests are embedded in intergovernmental alliances.¹¹

Intergovernmental military alliances emerge from utilitarian grounds where the served interests are within a common trans-boundary concern. NATO member states share common security and defense interests. It is within these interests that the alliance was established and still continues to play a decisive role in safeguarding the interests of member states in the U.S and

¹⁰ Gilpin, R. (2016). *The political economy of international relations*. Princeton. New Jersey. Princeton University Press.

¹¹ Young, T.-D., & Army War College (U.S.). (1998). *Reforming NATO's military structures* Carlisle. Barracks, Pa: U.S. Army War College.

across Europe. NATO consensus meant that the agreement of member states formed new interactions.¹²

The historical context of military alliance can be defined as a treaty that is based on combined action, offensive or defensive, or both. The alliances are directed at particular objects and carefully defined within a treaty. The scope of a military arrangement extends beyond the national security as the need for common interests emerge. The military, legal, political and international implications of a military alliance require in-depth consideration especially on the effectiveness of the alliance and possible consequences that may result if the alliance is consummated in its present form.

After the end of World War II, the U.S developed the Marshall Plan that was meant to support the European countries rebuild their economies. The plan would provide them with monetary support and resources and thereby help integrate Europe into an economic hub. On the other hand, the Soviet Union had dominated Eastern Europe and consolidated its control in these area through the Warsaw pact. Moscow had sponsored governments of countries in Eastern Europe and this was meant to enhance the communist political activity. The context of the Marshall Plan and that of Warsaw Pact were all meant to unite Europe which was thus seen as a key region for both the U.S and Soviet. These two forces wanted to influence and control Europe through trying to form an alliance. The U.S was able to redefine Europe through forming an intergovernmental military alliance and this triggered the disintegration of Soviet as it gradually lost control of Europe.

¹² Kashmeri, S. A. (2011). *NATO and the E.U Common Defense and Security Policy: Intersecting* Carlisle PA: Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College.

The Marshall Plan facilitated the integration of European economy while at the same time promoting the concept of shared interests as well as cooperation between Europe and the U.S.¹³ It is within the plan that the U.S was able to penetrate through Europe and advance its interests across the continent. The intervention of the U.S into Europe at this time enhanced the division and tension as the Soviet countries did not engage in the Marshall Plan. The Warsaw Pact that had been spearheaded by Soviet did not withstand the force created by the U.S through the Marshall Plan and thereby led to the establishment of NATO as a defense and security platform.

1.4.2 The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) is a military organization that was created on April 4, 1949 through the agreement of the North Atlantic Treaty in Washington. The Washington Treaty initially agreed by 12 states namely; Italy, Denmark, Belgium, Canada, Netherlands, Luxembourg, U.S, France, U.K, Portugal, Norway and Iceland. Later on, the alliance expanded its membership to a total of 29 countries.¹⁴

According to the Treaty of 1949, NATO's key focus was on ensuring security for its member countries.¹⁵ The means for realizing its purpose was through political and military interventions. NATO maintains the collective elements of individual liberty, democracy, peaceful resolutions of conflicts, rule of law, and promotes all these values across the Euro-Atlantic area. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization aims at providing a platform within which the states from Europe and North America can be able to exchange ideas and solutions to security issues that are

¹³ Kashmeri, S. A. (2011). *NATO and the E.U Common Defense and Security Policy: Intersecting* Carlisle PA: Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College.

¹⁴ James. M. Goldgeier. (February, 2010) *The Future of NATO International Institutions and Global Governance Program*. New York: Council on Foreign Relations.

¹⁵North Atlantic Treaty Organization. (2010). *NATO North Atlantic Treaty Organization handbook: Strategic Information and Developments*.

of common interest.¹⁶ The alliance was established based on the concern of security among the member states. It is important to note that NATO was established based on inter-governmental unit where the member states were entitled to maintain their sovereignty.

NATO remains the principle security instruments for transatlantic community and forms the basis for expression of shared democratic values. NATO is the practical means within which the security of Europe and North America is permanently tied together. The context of Article 5 of the Washington Treaty forms one of the core elements of NATO as it depicts a promise and agreement of collective defense.¹⁷ Security matters that are of common interests are shared and discussed where the alliance has transformed from the defined threat of Soviet to the critical mission of tackling emerging security threats such as nuclear weapons, piracy and terrorism. In addition to its core role of territorial defense of allied states, NATO conducts security training exercises and provides security support to its partners across the globe.

The North Atlantic Council is the organ charged by NATO states to bring together member states for consensus and decision making. The organ brings together the representatives from member states who include heads of governments and state, ambassadors and ministers. Each member state is entitled to participate fully in decision making based on equality; each member is equal regardless of size, military, political or economic strength.¹⁸

Although NATO was established as a form of defense in the aftermath of Cold War, it has lasted beyond the conflict as even the membership has increased to include even some former

¹⁶ North Atlantic Treaty Organization. (2010). *NATO North Atlantic Treaty Organization handbook: Strategic Information and Developments*.

¹⁷ Kashmeri, S. A. (2011). *NATO and the E.U Common Defense and Security Policy: Intersecting* Carlisle PA: Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College.

¹⁸ Wenger, A., & Möckli, D. (2010). *Power Shifts and New Security Needs: NATO, European Identity, and the Reorganization of the West* Routledge Handbook of Transatlantic Security.

Soviet countries. It has remained as the biggest peacetime military alliance across the globe.¹⁹ The emphasis is now on countering emerging threats through using collective defense, encouraging cooperative security, and managing crisis situations as outlined in its strategic concept.²⁰ Chapter two will cover in-depth the formation and structure of NATO and its current systems with regards to its role.

1.4.3 U.S Foreign Policy and NATO

The U.S and NATO member states have continued to share common values and national interests. America's foreign policy is based on its national interests. Joseph Nye (1998) asserts that the national interests depict the fundamental building blocks of foreign policy. The national interests are shared priorities that regard the relations of a country with the rest of the world.²¹ The U.S. foreign policy is based on building and sustaining a democratic, prosperous and secure world that benefits the American people as well as the international community. The U.S focuses on rebuilding alliances such as NATO in order to meet common challenges that engulf the 21st century. The U.S is able to push and foster changes when it liaises with strong partners such as NATO.

The U.S realizes its foreign policy principles through preserving and maintaining its national security.²² Expanding diplomatic presence through NATO means that the country adopts diplomacy and enhances its global cooperation in mitigating security threats.²³ Generally, building partnerships remains the core goal of the country's administration as it seeks to affirm prosperity

¹⁹ Young, T.-D., & Army War College (U.S.). (2008). *Reforming NATO's military structures: The long-term study and its implications for land forces* Carlisle. Barracks, Pa: U.S. Army War College.

²⁰ Mead, W. R. (2013). *Special providence: American foreign policy and how it changed the world*. Routledge.

²¹ Joseph Nye. (1998) Redefining the National Interests *Foreign Affairs* 78, No. 4: 23.

²² Jerel A. Rosati, James M. Scott. (2011) *The Politics of the United States Foreign Policy* Cengage Learning.

²³ Hamilton, D. S. (2014). *Transatlantic transformations: Equipping NATO for the 21st century*. Thomas Rid.

and stability. Democracy, security and peace are key objectives that formed the engagement and involvement of the U.S in NATO.²⁴

The United States National Security Strategy defines America`s role as a global leader in creating platforms for international order while collaborating with regional and international states and organizations.²⁵ It defines the national interests as securing its citizens and those of its allies. NATO remains the primary military mechanism that protects the U.S economic interests as Europe remains America`s largest trading partner. Security is key in any economy as threat to security destabilizes economic growth and development. NATO has helped to assure of a safe economic environment through which the U.S has used as an avenue to pursue its economic agenda.²⁶ The U.S membership in NATO serves this interest through providing the U.S with access to stable governments and democracies. The partnership creates the ability of the U.S to mentor and support nascent democracies across Eastern Europe and ensure countries have a secure environment through which democracy can prevail.

The National Security Strategy as currently defined reaffirms the relationship between the U.S national interests and NATO. NATO is the largest global security network that has managed to incorporate several countries in providing defense and security.

NATO has proven to be a reliable contributor to U.S-led military alliances and regional security.²⁷ The U.S intelligent agencies have uniquely benefited from its active cooperation and participation with the European counterparts. This has for a long time provided rich insights in the

²⁴ Duignan, P. (2010). *NATO: It`s Past, Present, Future*. Hoover Press.

²⁵ Lippmann, W. (2016). *The Cold War: A study in US foreign policy*. NY. Harper.

²⁶ Krasner, S. D. (2008). *Defending the national interest: Raw materials investments and US foreign policy*. Princeton. New Jersey. Princeton University Press.

²⁷ Remaly, S. E. (2014). *NATO transformation: Finding relevance in coping with the asymmetric threat of terrorism*. Carlisle. Barracks, Pa: U.S. Army War College.

service of America's national security decision-making. Europe's most essential component to the success of U.S foreign policy has been the aspect of liberal democracy, prosperity and peace. It is within these components that the U.S has been able to spearhead for its political and economic interests across Europe. A divided Europe would have made it difficult for the U.S to push for its agenda especially on security and trade.

The description put forth in formation of NATO revolves round the Soviet Union and the defensive factor. Security remains the key to formation and longevity of NATO. However, it is important to note that even though the Soviet Union was a key factor in establishment of NATO, the alliance was not entirely a continental bulwark against the concept of Soviet militarism. It has proven to be a conscious effort aimed at breaking the cycles of interstate conflicts that continued to derail growth and development across Europe. The First and Second World Wars were catastrophic to Europe and the formation of NATO proved key to ensuring European States remain committed to peace and democracy.²⁸ Chapter four will examine in-depth of the relation between the U.S national interests and hoe they are embedded within NATO.

1.5 Justification of the Study

The scope of NATO and the dynamics of the U.S foreign policy provide a unique dimension of the relation between countries and regions. It defines the basic tenets within which countries interact especially within the context of national interests. This study is thus necessary in adding value in the knowledge of international relations especially within the context of interactions across countries and forging alliances. The study findings will be important to policy

²⁸ Kashmeri, S. A. (2011). *The North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the European Union's common security and defense policy: Intersecting* Carlisle PA: Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College.

makers in defining national interests and understanding the basics of interactions and relations in international platforms.

The study findings will be imperative and of usefulness to governments, policy makers, international law and international relations scholars among others. The study findings on the part of U.S foreign policy will help in understanding both the potential political and economic consequences and effects of alliances. From this perspective, international law and policy makers will be better positioned to make informed and effective policies as regards to foreign policy.

1.6 Theoretical Framework

This study will be based on the theory of realism. Realism is a theory of international relations that asserts that states work at increasing their own power and control relative to other states.²⁹ According to realism, the world is designed to be a dangerous and harsh place where the only certainty is power.³⁰ In this case, the powerful states outlast and outdo the weaker competitors. Within the international realms, military power is the most reliable and effective form of power. NATO aims at providing a platform within which the states from Europe and North America can be able to exchange ideas and solutions to security issues that are of common interest.³¹ With such force and influence, the U.S can be able to use NATO as a tool for advancing its influence within the international realms.

The interests of states normally incorporate military security, self-preservation, economic prosperity as well as influence over other states.³² The interests of the U.S are therefore driven

²⁹ Wenger, A., & Möckli, D. (2010). *Power Shifts and New Security Needs: NATO, European Identity, and the Reorganization of the West* Routledge Handbook of Transatlantic Security.

³⁰Viotti, P. R., & Kauppi, M. V. (2013). *International relations theory: realism, pluralism, globalism*. New York: Macmillan.

³¹Duignan, P. (2010). *NATO: It's Past, Present, Future*. Hoover Press.

³²Gilpin, R. (2016). *The political economy of international relations*. Princeton. New Jersey. Princeton University Press.

within NATO with the focus being on exerting power and control. This means that it is through advancing national interests that the U.S is able to change the course of NATO and use it to advance its foreign policy.

The concepts of power and security define the political system as viewed by realist theorists. Realism in the study of international relation depicts the state as the most essential actor in international relations. The system of international relations is dominated by the state. In this case, the economic and military power of the U.S ensures that it exerts its influence in NATO and takes a lead role in decision making. The strength of a state is therefore a key factor in defining its influence in the international system.³³

Realist theorists also assert that the state is a rational and unitary actor.³⁴ The unitary actor as defined by the state identifies preferences and goals and determines their relative importance. This factor will help to define how U.S national interests have been forged across Europe through NATO.

Realists assert that the political system results to competition for power where the objective of each state is power and security. States are therefore compelled to arm themselves which can be depicted as a provocative act. The risk of destruction and attack means that countries with common interests must seek to unite in order to manage threats. The formation of NATO was a significant step for the U.S in maintaining its power against the threat posed by the Soviet Union. The context of security and power as defined by realist theorists will therefore prove important in understanding the context within which the U.S has remained in NATO over the years.³⁵

³³ Krasner, S. D. (2008). *Defending the national interest: Raw materials investments and US foreign policy*. Princeton. New Jersey. Princeton University Press.

³⁴ Viotti, P. R., & Kauppi, M. V. (2013). *International relations theory: realism, pluralism, globalism*. New York: Macmillan.

³⁵ Viotti, P. R., & Kauppi, M. V. (2013). *International relations theory: realism, pluralism, globalism*. New York: Macmillan.

This study chose realism theory based on the fact that it focuses on providing a wider view on the basis of decision making among states. It expounds of the concepts of power, security and control as key elements that define the political nature and decision making basis. The study finds realism theory as essential for understanding how the elements of national interests influence a country towards how it engages with other states or alliances.

1.7 Hypotheses

The following are the study`s hypotheses:

The U.S has been advancing its foreign policy interests through NATO.

The U.S has not been vocal in advancing its foreign policy interests through NATO.

The U.S foreign policy is not confined within NATO`s role.

1.8 Methodology

This section presents an account of how the study will be done. It displays a plan of the study and this includes the research design, how relevant data will be collected and from whom, and the data analysis technique that will be adopted to analyze the data in order to generate the findings of the study.

1.8.1 Data Collection

Data collection will incorporate primary data collection and secondary data collection. The first context will involve secondary data collection. Secondary data will be collected from government sponsored studies, books, journal articles and magazines, and news articles. This research methodology will thus seek facts, historical background and general information in contextualizing the topic and formulating an argument.

Data collection will encompass extracting meaning from large amount of data. The secondary data collection model will entail knowledge gathering from data and pattern analysis which will lead to knowledge discovery from the secondary sources. The study will emphasize on academic journals that will help to add professionalism and credibility to a source. The secondary data collection will therefore incorporate peer reviewed scholarly articles, academic journals, newspaper archives, university library, and government sources. The study will therefore involve accessing information from published resources and non-published sources.

The study will also incorporate primary data. Primary data sources will involve interviews with 32 respondents at the U.S Embassy, Denmark embassy, Poland embassy and Germany embassy in Kenya; 8 from each embassy. A sample of 32 respondents will form the basis of primary sources for this study. An introductory letter explaining the importance and purpose of the study will accompany the questionnaires especially in the relevant embassies. The U.S has been vocal in NATO and understanding the formation and structure and current setting of the organization through the embassy presents a clear picture on how the organization proves crucial for the U.S. This study will formulate questions that will form the basis of the study`s survey. The questions that will form the platform of the interview at the U.S embassy will focus on understanding the scope of its foreign policy, its security needs and its role in NATO especially in terms of political and economic. The questions will be used to interview 24 respondents will be based on the establishment and role of NATO in general, its current model, and the U.S foreign policy. The primary and secondary sources will provide the foundation of this study arguments and supports the conclusion and recommendations provided in the last chapter.

1.8.2 Data Analysis

This research examines facts, relevant general information and the historical background to contextualize the topic and formulate an argument within the realms of the U.S use of NATO to advance its foreign policy initiatives and interests. Content analysis will be employed, where the qualitative data will be coded thematically and analyzed and inferences made descriptively. Themes will be developed as per the study objectives, and data from the various tools synthesized and triangulated. Information will be extracted from the sources to determine patterns, trends and outcomes. The fieldwork will form the basis for content analysis. Information sources from the questionnaires as part of qualitative data will be analyzed. The results from content analysis will be presented organized in themes and presented in narrative forms, discussions and citations through the model of transcription. This model means that multiple data sources will be integrated together to interpret and draw meaning to the research study.

1.9 Chapter Outline

This study will be organized into five chapters. Chapter one contains the background, the statement of the research problem, objectives of the study, the literature review, the justification of the study, the theoretical framework, , hypotheses, and methodology of the study.

Chapter two will focus on intergovernmental military alliances. It will discuss the nature and purposes of these alliances. This chapter will also cover the importance of NATO to the U.S.

Chapter three will look at the scope of NATO. It will also examine how the US has used NATO as an instrument of its foreign policy over time and in what key areas has it been able to advance its national interests.

Chapter four will be a critical analysis of the U.S use of NATO as its instrument of policy and what this has meant in terms of the organizations role of maintaining peace and security.

Chapter five will present conclusions and recommendations.

CHAPTER TWO

HISTORY AND PURPOSE OF NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION (NATO)

2.1 Introduction

Chapter two examines the history and purpose of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. The chapter reflects on the activities that led to the idea of formation of NATO, the structure of NATO and the role it has played within the Euro-Atlantic region. The era of Cold War pushed for the agenda of an international security system with increased threat from Soviet. In the years leading to the cold war, the Soviet Union had worked on enlarging its communist sphere in order to influence other countries such as China, Eastern Europe, Vietnam and Korea. This would mean that the Soviet Union would gain much influence in terms of economic, political and social spheres.

The United States led the effort to establish incorporate development into NATO's mission in order to increase its capability and legitimacy in providing security and manage the Soviet Union. Throughout the years, NATO has transformed to managing the changing security needs across Euro-Atlantic region. However, NATO remains the principle security instruments for transatlantic community and forms the basis for the expression of common democratic values. NATO is the practical means within which the security of Europe and North America is permanently tied together. Security matters that are of common interests are shared and discussed where the alliance has transformed from the defined threat of Soviet to the critical mission of tackling emerging security threats. This chapter looks into the history, purposes and scope of NATO. It also covers on the importance of NATO especially with its transformation in order to manage the emerging security needs globally.

2.2 History of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization was established in 1949 by Canada, the United States, and several Western European countries to provide joint security against the Soviet Union.³⁶ It signified the first military alliance the U.S entered into outside the Western Hemisphere. The destruction caused by World War II created a gap where European countries struggled to rebuild and establish their economies and security. The European countries required massive aid to assist the war-torn regions re-establish industries as well as produce food for the increased population. In the meantime, the U.S required assurances against the resurgent Germany and incursions from the Soviet Union.³⁷

The U.S at this time was viewed as economically robust and strong. An integrated Europe would be vital for the U.S in mitigating communist expansion within the continent. This signified the focus of the U.S in trying to push its foreign policy through NATO as a key alliance across Europe. It is within this time that the Secretary of State Marshall George created a program that was meant to provide large-scale economic support to the European countries. The Marshall Plan facilitated the integration of European economy while at the same time promoting the concept of shared interests as well as cooperation between Europe and the U.S.³⁸ It is within the plan that the U.S was able to penetrate through Europe and advance its interests across the continent. The intervention of the U.S into Europe at this time enhanced the division and tension as the Soviet countries did not engage in the Marshall Plan.³⁹

³⁶ Schmidt, P. (2002). Partners and rivals: NATO, WEU, EC and the reorganization of European security policy: Taking stock. In *The Midst of Change: On the Development of West European Security and Defense Cooperation, Baden-Baden: Nomos.*

³⁷ Duignan, P. (2010). *NATO: It's Past, Present, Future.* Santa Barbara, California: Hoover Press.

³⁸ Kashmeri, S. A. (2011). *The North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the European Union's common security and defense policy: Intersecting* Carlisle PA: Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College.

³⁹ Lippmann, W. (2016). *The Cold War: A study in US foreign policy.* Farnham, Surrey, England: Harper Press.

In 1947-1948, there were a series of events that caused the countries in the West to become cautious about their political and physical security and the U.S intervention in European affairs.⁴⁰ The tensions in Turkey and civil war in Greece triggered President Harry Truman to declare that the U.S would provide military and economic aid to these countries and any other European country that was struggling.⁴¹ This meant that the U.S was becoming closely involved in the affairs of Europe and could then have the bargaining power to push for its interests abroad.

The Soviet sponsored a coup in Czechoslovakia which resulted in the creation of a communist government within the borders of Germany.⁴² The focus also shifted to Italy where there were elections and the communist party had made gains among the Italian voters. There were also concerns with the events in Germany. This was based on the fact that the governance and occupation of Germany after World War II had been disputed. In mid-1948 the Soviet premier Joseph Stalin implemented a blockage against West Berlin that was under the control of joint U.S, French and British. The area was surrounded by the Soviet-controlled East Germany.⁴³

The Berlin Crisis created a conflict between the Soviet Union causing the U.S administration to be wary of the prospect that the states of Western Europe could manage the security concerns by engaging in agreements with the Soviets.⁴⁴ In this way, the U.S would not be able to push for its agenda within Europe and thus become insignificant. The U.S was aware that if the Soviets managed to penetrate Europe then its power and influence in world economics and

⁴⁰ Kashmeri, S. A. (2011). *The North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the European Union's common security and defense policy: Intersecting* Carlisle PA: Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College.

⁴¹ Wenger, A., & Möckli, D. (2010). *Power Shifts and New Security Needs: NATO, European Identity, and the Reorganization of the West* Routledge Handbook of Transatlantic Security.

⁴² Hamilton, D. S. (2014). *Transatlantic transformations: Equipping NATO for the 21st century*. Thomas Rid.

⁴³ Remaly, S. E. (2014). *NATO transformation: Finding relevance in coping with the asymmetric threat of terrorism*. Carlisle. Barracks, Pa: U.S. Army War College.

⁴⁴ Duignan, P. (2010). *NATO: It's Past, Present, Future*. Santa Barbara, California: Hoover Press.

politics would decrease significantly. To counter such a turn of events, President Truman administration engaged in negotiations and measures that would help establishing a European-American alliance that would obligate the U.S to bolster security across Western Europe.⁴⁵

2.3 Signing of the Brussels Treaty

The European countries in the West were willing to commit themselves to a collective security solution. The officials from several states in Western Europe responded to the increased security concerns and tension by creating a robust military alliance in Brussels.⁴⁶ In March 1948, Great Britain, Belgium, Netherlands, Luxembourg and France signed the Brussels treaty. The treaty emphasized on collective defense where an attack on one country would mean the other member states to unite and help to defend it.⁴⁷

It is at this time that the Truman administration developed a peacetime draft which emphasized on increasing military spending and called on the U.S Congress to agree on a military alliance with Western Europe. In May 1948, Republican Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg recommended a resolution requesting the President to engage in a security treaty with the Western Europe that would meet the standards of the United Nations Charter.⁴⁸ The treaty also had to exist outside the scope of the Security Council as the Soviet Union had veto power. The resolution passed and paved way for negotiations of the North Atlantic Treaty.

However, the negotiations took a long time as there was need to clarify and agree on the terms of engagement. The U.S Congress had agreed on the international alliance pact but was

⁴⁵ Wenger, A., & Möckli, D. (2010). *Power Shifts and New Security Needs: NATO, European Identity, and the Reorganization of the West* Routledge Handbook of Transatlantic Security.

⁴⁶ Duignan, P. (2010). *NATO: It's Past, Present, Future*. Santa Barbara, California: Hoover Press.

⁴⁷ Thompson, K. W. (2015). *NATO Expansion*. Lanham, Md: University Press of America.

⁴⁸ Hamilton, D. S. (2014). *Transatlantic transformations: Equipping NATO for the 21st century*. Thomas Rid.

concerned on the wording of the treaty. The countries in Western Europe sought assurances that the U.S would automatically intervene if there was an attack on any member state of the alliance. However, within the U.S Constitution the authority to declare war was part of the Congress mandate. The negotiations therefore centered on finding the right words that would assure European states and would not mandate the U.S to act against its own laws.⁴⁹

In addition, the European push for collective security would mandate large-scale military support from the U.S to assist in rebuilding its defense capabilities. As the European countries sought for individual aid and grants, the U.S was focused on supporting a joint alliance and making the aid restrictive on regional coordination. The third hurdle dealt with the issue of scope. The U.S pushed for inclusivity in order to forge a larger alliance that would be able to provide robust defensive capabilities. They pushed for the inclusion of Canada, Denmark, Portugal, Iceland, Norway and Ireland. These countries were able to form a robust territory that would facilitate military action when necessary.⁵⁰

These extensive negotiations resulted to the signing of North Atlantic Treaty in 1949. The agreement asserted that the U.S, Belgium, Canada, Iceland, France, Italy, Luxembourg, Portugal, Norway, Denmark, United Kingdom, and the Netherlands would work together in defending each other.⁵¹ In case one country was under attack then the other countries would come in and support. The agreement therefore defined that an attack against any one member state was an attack on all. The agreement incorporated consultations about defense matters and threats.⁵²

⁴⁹ Duignan, P. (2010). *NATO: It's Past, Present, Future*. Santa Barbara, California: Hoover Press.

⁵⁰ Kashmeri, S. A. (2011). *The North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the European Union's common security and defense policy: Intersecting* Carlisle PA: Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College.

⁵¹ North Atlantic Treaty Organization. (2010). *NATO North Atlantic Treaty Organization handbook: Strategic Information and Developments*.

⁵² Duignan, P. (2010). *NATO: It's Past, Present, Future*. Santa Barbara, California: Hoover Press.

This collective defense structure and arrangement would apply to signatories of the treaty across Europe or North America. However, the treaty did not cover conflicts within colonial territories. The signing of the agreement paved way for a number of states requesting the U.S for military aid. At the end of 1949, President Truman developed a military assistance program. The U.S Congress later in October passed the Mutual Defense Assistance Program and appropriated \$1.4 billion dollars with the focus being on building the Western European defenses.⁵³

Immediately after the establishment of NATO, there was the outbreak of the Korean War in the 1950s that resulted to integration and coordination of the member states defense forces. They therefore sought a centralized headquarters that could pave way for enhanced management of defense resources and manpower. The attack on South Korea by North Korea was viewed as being triggered by Moscow to enforce the communist aggression. The U.S bolstered its military personnel and equipment's in asserting its commitments. It therefore provided assurances to Europe against the Soviet aggression within the European continent.⁵⁴

The collective defense structures in NATO proved effective in serving the region across Western Europe under the U.S. Later in 1950s, there emerged the first military doctrine within NATO that pledged for massive retaliation through large scale military attack by the U.S in case any member state was attacked. The response of such level against threat by the Soviet would deter their aggression across Europe. Although NATO was established in order to manage the USSR, it has lasted beyond the Cold War conflict and the membership has increased to include even some

⁵³ Hamilton, D. S. (2014). *Transatlantic transformations: Equipping NATO for the 21st century*. New York. Thomas Rid.

⁵⁴ Remaly, S. E. (2014). *NATO transformation: Finding relevance in coping with the asymmetric threat of terrorism*. Carlisle. Barracks, Pa: U.S. Army War College.

former Soviet countries. It has remained as the biggest peacetime military alliance across the globe.⁵⁵

2.4 Purposes of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)

The key purpose of NATO has been to safeguard the security and freedom of its members through military and political means.⁵⁶ The Collective defense is at the core of the alliance as it develops the spirit of cohesion and solidarity among its member states. NATO has been working on securing a lasting peace across Europe on the basis of common values of individual democracy, liberty, rule of law and human rights. As an outbreak of conflicts and crises beyond the borders of member states can jeopardize such an objective, the alliance is also charged with the responsibility of contributing to stability and peace through partnerships and crisis management operations. This means that while NATO defends the territory of member states, it goes beyond its task to project its values further afield, prevent and manage conflict scenarios and support reconstruction.⁵⁷

NATO forms the core of the transatlantic link where the security of North America is tangled to Europe`s security. It depicts an intergovernmental unit that provides a platform where its members can be able to consult together on issues and make decisions on military and political matters that affect their security. In such a platform, no individual member state is forced to only rely on its national capabilities in meeting its key national security objectives. This means that the resulting spirit of shared security among the member states contributes significantly to the stability across the Euro-Atlantic area.⁵⁸

⁵⁵ Young, T.-D., & Army War College (U.S.). (2008). *Reforming NATO's military structures: The long-term study and its implications for land forces* Carlisle. Barracks, Pa: U.S. Army War College.

⁵⁶ Remaly, S. E. (2014). *NATO transformation: Finding relevance in coping with the asymmetric threat of terrorism*. Carlisle. Barracks, Pa: U.S. Army War College.

⁵⁷ Michael E. Brown (2015) *European Security: The Defining Debates* Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.

⁵⁸ Hamilton, D. S. (2014). *Transatlantic transformations: Equipping NATO for the 21st century*. New York. Thomas Rid.

During the Cold War, the alliance emphasized on collective defense as well as protecting its member states against potential external threats especially from the Soviet Union. The collapse of Soviet Union shifted the scope as the alliance changed its focus to the emergence of new security threats. Terrorism is regarded as a key security threat that requires countries to consolidate their intelligence in order to assure their security. This means that the shift in threat from Soviet to emerging security threats has meant that NATO continues to shape its scope within its strategic concept. The emphasis is now on countering emerging threats through using collective defense, encouraging cooperative security, and managing crisis situations as outlined in its strategic concept.⁵⁹

2.5 NATO'S Strategic Concept

NATO was founded and acted on the platform of strategic concept developed in response to the political changes across Europe and especially Eastern Europe. The creation of the Atlantic Alliance combined the military goal of deterring the threat of Soviet to Europe based on the political goal of binding the member states based on shared commitments to the values of liberty, market economies and democracy. The Washington Treaty and the Harmel Report identified NATO's main role that revolves round the need "to maintain adequate military strength and political solidarity to deter aggression" and the need "to pursue the search for progress towards a more stable relationship in which the underlying political issues can be solved."⁶⁰ With the threat of Soviet Union on invading Europe at the expense of the U.S, NATO's remaining purpose has shifted. The focus of the U.S within NATO emphasizes on overcoming Europe's economic and

⁵⁹ Mead, W. R. (2013). *Special providence: American foreign policy and how it changed the world*. Routledge.

⁶⁰ Remaly, S. E. (2014). *NATO transformation: Finding relevance in coping with the asymmetric threat of terrorism*. Carlisle. Barracks, Pa: U.S. Army War College.

political divisions through enlarging the link of market democracies to incorporate states of eastern and central Europe.

NATO has focused on exporting security to the rest of Europe with the basis of ensuring democracy, stability, and prosperity across the Euro-Atlantic area. The commitment to export security provides states in eastern and central Europe with the necessary incentive to take the challenging economic and political steps to transition secure and stable market democracies.

NATO has been able to provide indispensable foundations for a stable European environment that can be able to assure growth in democratic institutions as well as commitment to peaceful resolution of conflicts. The formation of NATO meant that no state would coerce or intimidate any European country or impose hegemony through use of force or threat. NATO has been able to serve as an Atlantic forum for consultations on issues that are of vital interests which include possible developments that pose risks for the security of member states. Article 4 of the North Atlantic Treaty provides an avenue for appropriate coordination of efforts within the fields of common concern.⁶¹

NATO emphasizes on securing members states at both regional and national levels. NATO together with all its arms protects the citizens and their surrounding from all threats and crises by use of power projections like military might, political power, economic power and diplomacy. Some of the elements, (major), include military security, political security, economic and environmental securities, with military security being in the top of the list. NATO serves a great purpose of defending nation states against any threat of aggression.

⁶¹ Kashmeri, S. A. (2011). *The North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the European Union's common security and defense policy: Intersecting* Carlisle PA: Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College.

A united Europe has created a strong force globally that has been able to manage and deal with issues that affect the globe. NATO has been a key set-up that has helped preserve the balance within Europe. The strategic balance across Europe has proved useful in positioning Europe to cultural globalization which has resulted to exchange of ideas, values, and attitudes across the region. The strategic balance has been achieved within NATO through globalization which has proved to be an important process of integration and global influence of cultures and economies across the region.

2.6 An Alliance of Common Interests

The North Atlantic Cooperation Council provides a platform for formal interaction on matters of common concern. Through the years, NATO has been transforming its engagement to make it more concrete especially with the creation of the Partnership for Peace (PfP) that focused on enhancing security and stability across Europe. The partnership emphasized on defense-related cooperation but within the defense goal, the U.S has incorporated its foreign policy and used NATO as a tool for that. The cooperation between the U.S and European countries through NATO emphasizes on expanding and intensifying military, political and economic elements.⁶² It also promotes commitment among member states to democratic principles that cater for the alliance. The NATO platform through the PfP is designed to provide the platform for NATO`s enlargement through preparing countries within the Euro-Atlantic area to be part of the organization and confirm their membership.⁶³

⁶² Cox, R. W. (2011). Social forces, states and world orders: beyond international relations theory. *Millennium* 10(2).

⁶³ Wenger, A., & Möckli, D. (2010). *Power Shifts and New Security Needs: NATO, European Identity, and the Reorganization of the West* Routledge Handbook of Transatlantic Security.

The enlargement of NATO that was heavily influenced by the U.S started at the Madrid Summit in 1997 when the allied leaders invited Hungary, Poland, and Czech Republic to join the alliance.⁶⁴ The decree emphasized that the future membership was open for European countries that had the common vision of NATO. The requisite criteria emphasized on the need for countries wishing to join NATO. In this dispensation, the U.S would be in a better position to negotiate for its agenda within a wider spectrum of European countries with more inclusion of other states. In this case, the U.S would emphasize on integrating new democracies, deter conflicts, eliminate old hatreds among European countries and provide necessary confidence for economic recovery.⁶⁵

The transformation of NATO over the years has focused on building a strong alliance with common interests that revolve round economic, political and social realms. The Founding Act emphasize on NATO “to build together a lasting and inclusive peace in the Euro-Atlantic area on the principles of democracy and cooperative security.”⁶⁶ NATO`s guiding principle as part of ensuring common interests emphasized on securing Europe through a comprehensive security structure that is based on shared values, commitments and interests of all member states.⁶⁷ In this case, there was need for member states to remain committed and focus on areas of common interests as the U.S used such a platform to build issues of common interests across Europe.

2.7 An Alliance of Collective Vision

The existence of NATO lies in its ability to have a common vision. It is within the common vision of enhancing security and mitigating threat from the Soviet that first pushed for the establishment of the alliance. With the U.S as a key ally, it is important to examine how the

⁶⁴ Thompson, K. W. (2015). *NATO Expansion*. Lanham, Md: University Press of America.

⁶⁵ Cox, M., & Stokes, D. (Eds.). (2018). *US foreign policy*. Oxford University Press.

⁶⁶ North Atlantic Treaty Organization. (2010). *NATO North Atlantic Treaty Organization handbook: Strategic Information and Developments*.

⁶⁷ Duignan, P. (2010). *NATO: It`s Past, Present, Future*. Hoover Press.

common vision has transformed over the years and the current vision as entrenched in the alliance. It would be difficult for the U.S to push for its foreign policy in a disunited alliance. A united alliance that keeps the common vision alive is key for the U.S foreign policy. NATO as an alliance of common vision rests on three key arguments:⁶⁸

First, an alliance and a pact that is formed and exists to counter the dangers and threats that disintegrate along the way will weaken and wither unless new missions and visions are incorporated to offer a new sense of purpose.⁶⁹ In this case, there was huge chance that NATO would disintegrate with the collapse of Soviet Union. However, the U.S has been vocal in ensuring that the alliance remains strong in its transformed course of security. As a top funder of the alliance, there would also be likelihood that NATO would wither keeping in mind the huge resources needed to keep the alliance alive.⁷⁰

The U.S has managed to influence member states to think beyond NATO and in light of post-war realities. According to Christoph Bertram, NATO can only survive if it transforms its common purpose beyond maintaining military assets for use in case of a threat.⁷¹ This means that NATO has to keep on transforming with the changing needs in order to ensure its stability.

Secondly, in today`s relatively peaceful and prosperous Europe, the common purpose focuses on enlarging and strengthening the reach of the values and principles that have continued to unite its members. The current threat to security lies in the uncertainty of the economic and

⁶⁸ Lippmann, W. (2016). *The Cold War: A study in US foreign policy*. New York. Harper.

⁶⁹ Young, T.-D., & Army War College (U.S.). (1998). *Reforming NATO's military structures: The long-term study and its implications for land forces* Carlisle. Barracks, Pa: U.S. Army War College.

⁷⁰ Lippmann, W. (2016). *The Cold War: A study in US foreign policy*. New York. Harper.

⁷¹ Cox, M. (2015). *US foreign policy after the Cold War: superpower without a mission?* Pinter Pub Ltd.

democratic transitions of the east and central European states. In addition, it depicts the inevitable instability within which the process has endangered.

The participation of NATO in peace operations continues to depict a stabilizing influence within the transition process. According to former U.S. Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbott, the U.S membership in NATO provides the country with a base to influence democratic elements and greater willingness to manage disputes peacefully.⁷² The stability and peace across Europe will most likely reign when the states in the region are managed and governed democratically. It is important to note that democracies mostly adhere to established codes of conduct and as such, a Europe that upholds democracy will most certainly remain strong and stable. Democratic societies ensure peace and this forms the backbone of NATO.

According to Immanuel Kant, democracies are not likely to get into war against each other. At a time when there was need to restructure the purpose of NATO, Strobe Talbot asserted that Europe will be safer if it maintains its harmonious relations as entrenched within NATO.⁷³ In this case, social influence is exerted when the United States makes use of social power to transform the behavior or attitudes of other states to a particular direction on the basis of its foreign policy.

2.8 A Political Alliance

An alliance that is based on collective defense is narrow and does not provide sufficient scope for sustaining NATO`s dynamic, large and increasingly flexible military capabilities whose existence incorporates crucial capabilities for supporting the allied security goals. It is within this context that we examine the political intrigues behind the establishment and existence of NATO

⁷² Cuccia, P. R. (2010). *Implications of a changing NATO*. Carlisle, PA: Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War.

⁷³ Cox, M. (2015). *US foreign policy after the Cold War: superpower without a mission?* Pinter Pub Ltd.

with the view that the U.S is a core partner within the alliance.⁷⁴ An alliance that is based on collective interests can be at risk over which interests to defend, how and whether these interests are threatened, and the appropriate and effective responses to the threats. An alliance that incorporates collective security may likely dilute core military foundation of the alliance through shifting the scope of the alliance into a peacekeeping unit where the ability for collective defense as well as other commitments would atrophy.⁷⁵

Even though these strategic purposes cannot be able to support NATO on their own, together they contain essential ingredients for a united vision for the Atlantic Alliance in the 21st century. The realms of today`s politics continue to shape the scope of NATO especially with the extended view by President`s Trump administration concerning the alliance. Specifically, NATO`s core purpose for the future should incorporate the fulfillment of George Marshall`s original vision and scope of a Europe that is guided by the concepts of “united in peace, freedom, and prosperity.”⁷⁶ The alliance pushes for democratic form of governance where the norms, human rights, and individual liberty are upheld and protected. This provides an expanded platform for enhancing the welfare of citizens across the Euro-Atlantic area.⁷⁷

The purpose of NATO can still be upheld by extending the stability and security of its members as they have long enjoyed. The growth and development of the Euro-Atlantic region is therefore crucial for both economic and social gains. Without close cooperation they it can be difficult for the region in future to command global trade. With the U.S at the helm of the

⁷⁴ Wenger, A., & Möckli, D. (2010). *Power Shifts and New Security Needs: NATO, European Identity, and the Reorganization of the West* Routledge Handbook of Transatlantic Security.

⁷⁵ Michael E. Brown (2015) *European Security: The Defining Debates* Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press

⁷⁶ Cuccia, P. R. (2010). *Implications of a changing NATO*. Carlisle, PA: Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War.

⁷⁷ Schmidt, P. (2002). Partners and rivals: NATO, WEU, EC and the reorganization of European security policy: Taking stock. In *In the Midst of Change: On the Development of West European Security and Defense Cooperation, Baden-Baden: Nomos*.

leadership at NATO, the political scope continues to change especially within the context of the current dispensation where the U.S is pushing for more participation and finances from European countries.⁷⁸ Even in such a scenario, the fundamental principles that helped form and maintain NATO are robust enough to withstand the political dispensation that is going on in America as well as across Europe.

In addition, the integrated and flexible command structure coupled with the interoperability of its troops and the norm of contingency planning and cooperative defense provides NATO members with a robust foundation for collective military actions. It is within this context that the political intrigues continues to defend NATO and ensure that the alliance is able to defend its territory, enforce European norms and rules and defeat the threats that derail common interests among NATO members.⁷⁹

2.9 Creating Stability across the Euro-Atlantic Region

NATO member states have maintained unity in order to withstand the challenges in the 21st century and beyond. NATO has created stability across Euro-Atlantic region as the allies have been able to enhance their efforts in helping non-member states to successfully realize the transition to robust market democracies.⁸⁰ This needs an increased dedication to realizing the success of various initiatives, programs and bodies such as the NATO-Ukraine Council, the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council, the Partnership for Peace, and the Permanent Joint Council. These

⁷⁸ Wenger, A., & Möckli, D. (2010). *Power Shifts and New Security Needs: NATO, European Identity, and the Reorganization of the West* Routledge Handbook of Transatlantic Security.

⁷⁹ Remaly, S. E. (2014). *NATO transformation: Finding relevance in coping with the asymmetric threat of terrorism*. Carlisle. Barracks, Pa: U.S. Army War College.

⁸⁰ Duignan, P. (2010). *NATO: It's Past, Present, Future*. Hoover Press.

initiatives are designed enhance security assistance and cooperation in Europe and provide fundamental means in which NATO can remain significant in the 21st century.⁸¹

The U.S through NATO has been able to induce positive changes economically, militarily and politically in non-member countries through keeping membership open to European countries. The criteria for membership is based on Article 10 of the Washington Treaty. In this case, the accession of Hungary, Poland and Czech Republic provides that platform for future membership for new entrants.⁸²

NATO`s fundamental role as a political alliance reflects on maintenance of stability and security across Europe.⁸³ However, this should not undermine its unique military foundation. The foundation of NATO provides a dynamic basis for a joint military action that enforces the norms, rules, and codes of conduct while at the same time solving Europe`s longstanding security challenges. The joint defense operations and planning provide a channel for national military capabilities to be upgraded and assure of the much needed security among its citizens. However, it is important to understand even with the focus being on security and stability across the North Atlantic region, there are political powers that define the structures of NATO.

2.10 Conclusion

In sum, the structure of NATO is geared towards providing a flexible and sound basis for joint action in defense interests and other humanitarian interests. The commitment of member states within NATO depicts the key element that holds the organization together. A divided Europe

⁸¹Wenger, A., & Möckli, D. (2010). *Power Shifts and New Security Needs: NATO, European Identity, and the Reorganization of the West* Routledge Handbook of Transatlantic Security.

⁸² Wenger, A., & Möckli, D. (2010). *Power Shifts and New Security Needs: NATO, European Identity, and the Reorganization of the West* Routledge Handbook of Transatlantic Security.

⁸³ Remaly, S. E. (2014). *NATO transformation: Finding relevance in coping with the asymmetric threat of terrorism*. Carlisle. Barracks, Pa: U.S. Army War College.

would be catastrophic for the stability of Europe and the U.S. The threshold of the 21st century demands that NATO's principle purpose must be to influence and enlarge the concept of democracy within states across the Euro-Atlantic region while at the same time providing the needed military foundation for defense and stability of their common territory. The military foundation is extended beyond and this forms a greater platform for the U.S to push for democratic states as part of its foreign policy. The new strategic concept considers the changing political nature and address the emerging needs throughout the Euro-Atlantic area. NATO member states are guided by common interests, values and principles with democracy and peace being a key element that has sustained the alliance.

CHAPTER THREE

NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION AS A TOOL FOR U.S FOREIGN POLICY – THE CASE OF 2011 NATO INTERVENTION IN LIBYA

3.1 Introduction

Chapter two of this study examined the history and purpose of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. The chapter reflected on the activities that led to the formation of NATO, the structure of NATO and the role it has played within the Euro-Atlantic region. This chapter examines the key areas of American foreign policy that are advanced through NATO. The emphasis is on understanding the scope of American foreign policy and then creating an inference into how its advanced within NATO with the focus being on how America's national interests are advanced across Europe. The core function of the United States government encompasses conducting relations with other nations across the world. The influence of the U.S over global matters is widespread. Its foreign policy determines its relations and interactions with other countries. This means that the U.S foreign policy is designed to push for the realization of certain goals.

This chapter presents both primary and secondary data that focuses on how the U.S makes use of NATO to advance its foreign policy. A case study will be used to examine the influence of the U.S in NATO specifically in advancing its foreign policy. The chapter will examine the context of the 2011 NATO military intervention in Libya. This section examines how the U.S strategically aligned itself in order to gain from the NATO intervention in Libya. The primary data sourced from four Embassies in Kenya will be vital in providing expert analysis and a different perspective of NATO as an instrument of U.S foreign policy.

3.2 The United States and NATO in Libya

Gaddafi was depicted as a dictator as a group of Libyans rebelled against him. He responded by attacking them with modern artillery, airplanes and tanks as government forces slaughtered the rebels. The government forces indiscriminately attacked the areas they thought supported rebels and killed many civilians.⁸⁴ The rebels requested for foreign intervention with the U.S being at the center of the issue. The U.S convened the U.N and requested approval for the intervention. The U.N then requested NATO to support in the intervention, a move that was spearheaded by the U.S.⁸⁵ NATO approved the request and joined the U.S in fighting Gaddafi's regime. NATO airstrikes were imminent as they member states provided planes, artillery guns and tanks.⁸⁶

The war as advanced by the U.S was based on the principle of enforcing a democratic government in Libya based on its foreign policy concept of democracy.⁸⁷ Based on the country's commitment to a constitutional government, the U.S has been favoring and supporting countries that practice democracy. The U.S intervenes to mitigate harsh political movements and dictatorial regimes as entrenched in its foreign policy objectives. The support of NATO therefore came in handy to help the U.S spearhead its foreign policy objectives of democracy and influence Libya to work towards having a regime that does not massacre its citizens.⁸⁸

⁸⁴ Scott Wilson. March 28, 2011 Obama: U.S. had responsibility to act in Libya *Washington Post*. Retrieved from https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/obama-us-had-responsibilityto-act-inlibya/2011/03/28/AF6fkFrB_story.html?utm_term=.e2eb8ca57029&noredirect=on

⁸⁵ Pillar, P. R. (2014). *Terrorism and US foreign policy*. Santa Barbara, California: Brookings Institution Press.

⁸⁶ Remaly, S. E. (2014). *NATO transformation: Finding relevance in coping with the asymmetric threat of terrorism*. Carlisle. Barracks, Pa: U.S. Army War College.

⁸⁷ Cox, M., & Stokes, D. (Eds.). (2018). *US foreign policy*. Basingstoke, Hampshire; New York, NY Oxford University Press.

⁸⁸ Hamilton, D. S. (2014). *Transatlantic transformations: Equipping NATO for the 21st century*. New York. Thomas Rid.

The other context of the war in Libya was that the rebels had embarked on a recruitment process and their only way to win the war was on increasing its numbers and working with Islamists.⁸⁹ According to Agata from the Polish Embassy, the initial revolution may have been to create a secular democracy but the push may have been overtaken by the urge to transform Libya into an Islamic theocracy.⁹⁰ In this case, Obama was keen on first ensuring support from NATO with the focus being in this case on managing the conflict and deterring Islamic factions from getting into government.⁹¹ The support would define the war in Libya as legal. A respondent from the Danish Embassy asserted that Obama had to first seek the support of NATO member states as well as the U.N based on the cost of the war in Afghanistan.⁹² The consequences of the U.S intervention in Libya would mean that the U.S spearheads its reconstruction. Politically, the U.S was not willing to pay the full cost as asserted by the respondent.

The strategic interest of the U.S in intervening in Libya was based on mitigating the killing of civilians by Gaddafi's regime.⁹³ By working with the U.N and NATO, the U.S would be able to garner the necessary support to advance its foreign policy interests of democracy in Libya. The U.S foreign policy pledges responsibility of preventing civilian killing and this prompted the U.S to intervene and help Libyans. This was after Gaddafi pledged brutal response against civilians in rebel-held areas. The context on NATO being used as an instrument of U.S foreign policy is thus depicted in the initial response of America in responding to the issue and then seeking approval and support of both U.N and NATO. Democracy, security and peace are key objectives that formed

⁸⁹ Scott Wilson. March 28, 2011 Obama: U.S. had responsibility to act in Libya *Washington Post*. Retrieved from https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/obama-us-had-responsibility-to-act-in-libya/2011/03/28/AF6fkFrB_story.html?utm_term=.e2eb8ca57029&noredirect=on

⁹⁰ Agata Piotrowska, Second Secretary. Polish Embassy.

⁹¹ Pillar, P. R. (2014). *Terrorism and US foreign policy*. Santa Barbara, California: Brookings Institution Press.

⁹² Danish Respondent. (2018) *Attaché* Danish Embassy

⁹³ Jentleson, B. W. (2014). *American Foreign Policy: the dynamics of choice in the 21st century*. New York: Norton.

the engagement and involvement of the U.S in NATO.⁹⁴ The command of the Libyan response military operation was transferred to NATO later after the inception of the intervention by the U.S.

The U.S emphasized on its need to respond to the Libyan crisis and seek support of NATO. According to Obama, the U.S as a world leader ought to support countries when their governments are engaged in atrocities. The President cites the responsibility of America in ensuring governments abide by the rule of law and influences its foreign policy context of democracy to be adopted across the world. This is the reason as to why Obama felt that the U.S could not afford to remain quiet while the Libyan government attacked and killed civilians.⁹⁵ Not intervening in the case would mean betraying on its key mandate of ensuring democracy.

3.3 The Role of U.S and NATO in Libya

In defining its foreign policy of democracy and defending human rights, the U.S intervened in Libya with the aim of overthrowing Muammar Qaddafi and restoring a regime that would uphold human rights and democracy.⁹⁶ According to a Polish respondent, the U.S pushed its European counterparts within NATO to support the intervention and invoke Article 5 which covers an attack on the member states.⁹⁷ In this case, no member state had been attacked and therefore NATO did not have the mandate to intervene in the Libya case according to its set doctrines. This means that the intervention of NATO in Libya was defined as a political factor as NATO worked beyond its confinements in Euro-Atlantic area.

⁹⁴ Duignan, P. (2010). *NATO: It's Past, Present, Future*. Santa Barbara, California: Hoover Press.

⁹⁵ Scott Wilson. (March 28, 2011) Obama: U.S. had responsibility to act in Libya *Washington Post*. Retrieved from https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/obama-us-had-responsibility-to-act-in-libya/2011/03/28/AF6fkFrB_story.html?utm_term=.e2eb8ca57029&noredirect=on

⁹⁶ Scott Wilson. (March 28, 2011) Obama: U.S. had responsibility to act in Libya *Washington Post*. Retrieved from https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/obama-us-had-responsibility-to-act-in-libya/2011/03/28/AF6fkFrB_story.html?utm_term=.e2eb8ca57029&noredirect=on

⁹⁷ Polish Respondent. (2018) *Attache* Polish Embassy.

The U.S had for long been against Muammar Qaddafi regime as he exerted more power and control especially within the African continent. According to the U.S the intervention would help create a regime supported by its citizens and cautious of human rights.⁹⁸ The military intervention was focused on having a ceasefire in Libya and an end to attacks of civilians which the U.S regarded as crimes against humanity. The U.S implemented a no-fly-zone and sanctions on Muammar Qaddafi and his supporters.⁹⁹

American involvement in Libya consisted of sanctions and diplomatic initiatives. This paved way for implementation of a no-fly zone, diplomatic relations with rebels and humanitarian aid. The U.S intensified its military capabilities to destroy Gaddafi and provided diplomatic support to the rebels.¹⁰⁰ The U.S in March 2011 dropped bombs in about 100 targets within Libya. It was able to influence NATO to intervene in Libya through seeking support from the U.N and thus able to influence the invocation of Article 5. In June 2011, France provided its military ware for the war; Other NATO members followed and provided military assistance to toppling of Gaddafi's regime.¹⁰¹

The regime change and the war in Libya was initiated by the U.S which then influenced NATO states to come in and support the mission on grounds that the Gaddafi regime violated human rights. According to Fielder, the political context of NATO intervention in the U.S led crisis management in Libya and the U.S as the main contributor to NATO budget and activities could be able to advance its interests and seek the backing of NATO in toppling Gaddafi's

⁹⁸ Jentleson, B. W. (2014). *American Foreign Policy: the dynamics of choice in the 21st century*. New York: Norton.

⁹⁹ Pillar, P. R. (2014). *Terrorism and US foreign policy*. Santa Barbara, California: Brookings Institution Press.

¹⁰⁰ Scott Wilson. (March 28, 2011) Obama: U.S. had responsibility to act in Libya *Washington Post*. Retrieved from https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/obama-us-had-responsibility-to-act-in-libya/2011/03/28/AF6fkFrB_story.html?utm_term=.e2eb8ca57029&noredirect=on

¹⁰¹ Michael E. Brown (2015) *European Security: The Defining Debates* Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.

regime.¹⁰² The strength of the U.S therefore dictates its power and influence within NATO and thereby defined the intervention in Libya.

3.4 The Political Perspective of the U.S and NATO in Libya

The U.S was able to push its NATO allies to support the military intervention in Libya citing human rights abuse and lack of democracy. According to Agata Piotrowska, Second Secretary from the Polish Embassy, the political context of American foreign policy depicts that there are good wars and bad wars. Agata asserted that, “bad wars are campaigns meant to overthrow a despot. The good wars incorporate nation building missions that are meant to stabilize a foreign country which includes counterinsurgency and peacekeeping.”¹⁰³ The U.S military has adopted a tradition whose core mission has emphasized on fighting conventional wars against any foreign dictators. In this case, it can deduced that the information given by the respondent that the U.S advanced its foreign policy through NATO in toppling a dictatorial regime in Libya. The invocation of Article 5 is one of the main proofs that the U.S influenced NATO to exceed its main agenda as set force in its structures. A respondent from the U.S Embassy emphasized that there are increased calls for the world to forge a common ground to fight terrorism as they determine overall strategies of combating terrorism both at home and in the Middle East. There has been increased need to penetrate, destroy and disrupt radical Islamic networks in a concentrated manner and the rise of Libya was seen as a threat to security due to the radical nature of Gaddafi.¹⁰⁴

The context of the Libyan war can be examined from the lens of war against foreign dictators and nation building operations. A Danish respondent echoed the assertion that the U.S could not manage to intervene in Libya as it had done in Afghanistan due to the cost of rebuilding.

¹⁰² Joern Fielder. (2018) *Attaché* Germany Embassy. Interview of Monday 19th November, 2016 at 6 pm.

¹⁰³ Agata Piotrowska, Second Secretary. Polish Embassy. Interview on Tuesday 20th November, 2016 at 6 pm.

¹⁰⁴ Respondent. (2018) *Attaché* United States Embassy. Interview of Monday 19th November, 2016 at 2 pm.

This means that the American foreign policy from a political context embraces regime change but hates to deal with the consequences of civil war and reconstruction. This can well define the intervention in Libya. This then elicits the question on what was the motive behind regime change in Libya and the involvement of NATO in the war.

In the U.S modern conflicts, regime change provides the pressure to escalate and influence NATO to act in a certain way. The consequences of the war in Libya is not popular in Europe. According to Fielder, Europe are suffering from their intervention in Libya as the NATO intervention and regime change destabilized the country and led to the current consequences of immigrants and arms smuggling from Libya to Europe.¹⁰⁵ Libya is currently used as the main route to get access to Europe from Africa.

The context of America's intervention in Libya reflects on the country's foreign policy on counterinsurgency and nation building. According to Joern Fielder, the German respondent, "Regime change missions result from the idealistic context of American society that makes campaigns against the Taliban, Gaddafi, or Saddam seem noble crusades against the evils."¹⁰⁶ The logic behind the idealist approach to international relation is that the conditions within a state can be projected into international politics; that the values and principle of their own society can be replicated elsewhere. By adopting these principles, the U.S government declared itself ready to establish links with all members of the international community through the policy of universality which was an attempt to de-ideologize foreign policy so that relations could be establish with European countries without implying support for their internal or external policies.¹⁰⁷ As the above

¹⁰⁵ Joern Fielder. (2018) *Attaché* Germany Embassy. Interview on Monday 19th November, 2016 at 6 pm.

¹⁰⁶ Joern Fielder. (2018) *Attaché* Germany Embassy Interview on Wednesday 21st November, 2016 at 6 pm.

¹⁰⁷ Mark P. Lagon, (February 2011) Promoting Democracy: The Why's and How's for the United States and the International Community: A Markets and Democracy Brief *Council on Foreign Relations*. Retrieved at <http://www.cfr.org/democratization/promoting-democracy-whys-hows-united-states-international-community/p24090>

suggests, at the international level, the U.S objectives were to influence world politics, to help ensure that the world is more secure, peaceful, democratic, humane, equitable and people-centered.¹⁰⁸ In this case, it was able to influence NATO through its membership to support the mission in Libya.

3.5 Political Instrument in Libya Intervention

The American foreign policy emphasizes on getting rid of radicalized dictators where then liberty reigns. It is within this context that the U.S was able to portray the perspective of Libya as a failed state as NATO found a platform to intervene and support regime change. NATO proved to be a political instrument for the U.S as it provided a balance of power in Libya. The military conflict that was imminent initially was postponed by diplomatic and skilful alliances that replaced the game and context of power. The U.S was able to convince member states and invest in the alliance thereby emerging as a key leader of the engagement. In the power game, there is normally fear and suspicion.¹⁰⁹ According to Agata, “self-imposed commitments and shared values in NATO assure that the member states gets something in the engagement.”¹¹⁰

There is mandatory work imposed that is geared towards a common strategy and a common goal. The U.S was able to set a model of international order where the aggressive power was controllable through the alliance that countervailed power.¹¹¹ Libya as directed by Gaddafi’s regime had amassed more power and control which was viewed as a threat to world order. The new dispensation as initiated by the U.S in NATO created a harmonious political universe that was governed not by force but through voluntary adherence to norms and principles. According to a

¹⁰⁸ Pillar, P. R. (2014). *Terrorism and US foreign policy*. Santa Barbara, California: Brookings Institution Press.

¹⁰⁹ Smith, A. D. (2010). *The concept of social change: A critique of the functionalist theory of social change*. London: Taylor & Francis Ltd.

¹¹⁰ Agata Piotrowska, Second Secretary. Polish Embassy. Interview of Monday 19th November, 2016 at 10 am.

¹¹¹ Cox, M., & Stokes, D. (Eds.). (2018). *US foreign policy*. Basingstoke, Hampshire; New York, NY Oxford University Press.

Polish respondent, the values encompassed preserving the way of life of the West and containing Gaddafi's regime that had gained immense control and power and at the same time violated human rights and democracy.¹¹²

A respondent from the United States Embassy defined the U.S intervention in Libya and the support of NATO in the intervention as political and the context of terrorism was used to define the intervention.¹¹³ He depicted terrorism as an act of nihilism and barbarism that encompasses lust for power, total disregard for freedom and human rights, rejection of modernity and values that are universal. In this case, the U.S convinced the U.N and NATO that the Libyan case was a terrorism issue and thus the need to intervene and manage the radicalization in the country.

NATO depicts a political instrument where its role and mandate is based on the support of member states.¹¹⁴ An alliance of collective security is different from an alliance of collective defense. This is based on the fact it undertakes not only the defense role of securing member states against external enemies but it also strives to mitigate infighting. One of the key American foreign policy touches on peace and security.¹¹⁵ In this case, the alliance would help dictate peace across Libya and so forge a region that is stable and can be able to reflect on other areas of democracy, trade and economy. The power game approach provides a non-competitive environment within the alliance through political cooperation. The concept of collective security as envisioned by the U.S within NATO disentangles the existing powers from conflicting obligations and this proves to be one of the most essential means of establishing order.¹¹⁶

¹¹² Polish Respondent. (2018) Attache Polish Embassy Interview of Monday 19th November, 2016 at 1 pm.

¹¹³ Respondent3 *Attaché* United States Embassy Interview of Monday 19th November, 2016 at 3 pm.

¹¹⁴ North Atlantic Treaty Organization. (2010). NATO North Atlantic Treaty Organization handbook: Strategic Information and Developments.

¹¹⁵ Hunt, M. H. (2009). *Ideology and US foreign policy*. New Haven. Connecticut. Yale University Press.

¹¹⁶ Lippmann, W. (2016). *The Cold War: A study in US foreign policy*. Farnham, Surrey, England: Harper.

The United States defines its foreign policy in war on the basis of two options: regime change with a plan to effect peace; and second is not going to war.¹¹⁷ It only goes to war if there is a viable plan that will result to its success in toppling the regime. Agata asserts that the risk posed by the U.S in attacking Libya required America to seek the support of NATO especially in managing the consequences of the invasion.¹¹⁸ Libya is strategically placed and any invasion by the U.S would only be viable if it seeks the support of NATO members. The U.S foreign policy from a political context is therefore inclined on the assertion that it can't topple a tyrant if the outcome is anarchy.

A respondent from the U.S Embassy attested that the operation in Libya was highly scrutinized by the U.S administration keeping in mind the invasion in Iraq had cost the country where regime change took eight years, many Americans as well as Iraqi's lost their lives, and cost nearly \$1 trillion.¹¹⁹ The U.S could therefore not afford to go into war in Libya without first seeking the approval and support of its allies in NATO. The U.S acted decisively after securing international cooperation from NATO and later transferred its command and control to European allies.

Incorporating NATO in Libyan intervention to protect civilians was the core focus of Obama.¹²⁰ According to a U.S respondent, Obama emphasized on linking American values with its foreign policy priorities.¹²¹ The issue with the intervention and another political context on why

¹¹⁷ Cox, M., & Stokes, D. (Eds.). (2018). *US foreign policy*. Basingstoke, Hampshire; New York, NY Oxford University Press.

¹¹⁸ Agata Piotrowska, Second Secretary. Polish Embassy. Interview of Monday 19th November, 2016 at 9 am.

¹¹⁹ Respondent4. Attache United States Embassy Interview of Monday 19th November, 2016 at 7 pm.

¹²⁰ Scott Wilson. (March 28, 2011) Obama: U.S. had responsibility to act in Libya *Washington Post*. Retrieved from https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/obama-us-had-responsibility-to-act-in-libya/2011/03/28/AF6fkFrB_story.html?utm_term=.e2eb8ca57029&noredirect=on

¹²¹ U.S Respondent. (2018) *Attaché* United States Embassy. Interview of Tuesday 20th November, 2016 at 11 am.

the U.S had to seek for NATO support was on the Arab league support. Going alone would mean that the U.S would fracture its coalition and unity with Arab and European support. The cost of the intervention and consequences after regime change would be left on the U.S alone. The support by European and Arab league would then dictate that the U.S foreign policy is geared towards independence of countries as well as protecting civilians.

The U.S has for a long time been guided by its belief in self-determination and supporting liberation movements; maintaining the concept of national sovereignty; and respecting territorial integrity of countries¹²². NATO was therefore a push for intra-alliance peace for managing the fierce contest for control and power in Libya. According to a German respondent, it proved to be a security instrument as well as a political instrument for the U.S. in Libya intervention.¹²³

3.6 The U.S Strategic Relation in NATO

NATO has transformed over the years to become a key platform to manage the political problems that had envisaged the globe. The U.S has continued to take the leadership role and elicited the support of NATO in its interventions in scenarios that threaten its foreign policy of security and democracy. The U.S is a key country with economic and political potential to stop the infighting and threat from the Libyan regime. This move to manage the crisis in Libya created a vicious cycle as America took the lead role. America continues to be promoted to the rank of super-power as it exerts its influence across the globe and especially in Europe.¹²⁴

¹²² Jentleson, B. W. (2014). *American Foreign Policy: the dynamics of choice in the 21st century*. New York: Norton.

¹²³ German Respondent. (2018) *Attaché Germany Embassy Interview of Monday 19th November, 2016 at 7 am.*

¹²⁴ Patrick, S., & Forman, S. (Eds.). (2012). *Multilateralism and US foreign policy: ambivalent engagement*. Basingstoke, Hampshire; New York, NY. Lynne Rienner Publisher.

The American foreign policy is driven by a number of values.¹²⁵ These values included the promotion of human rights and the rule of law; peace and cooperation between states. The idea behind the adoption of these principles makes the U.S the principle theatre of civilization and to take part constructively in multilateral organization. The U.S became a dominant economic and military actor in the Euro-Atlantic region. Aware of its successful and exemplary political transition and economic dominance, the U.S pledged to assume leadership role on the globe. The U.S intervention and seeking support from U.N and NATO was therefore informed by the country's advancement of democracy as one of the key pillars of its foreign policy.

The U.S government had to register a decisive normative and moral break with the past and assume challenging new responsibilities relating to nation- building, democratic governance and institutional restructuring based on the wider scope of NATO.¹²⁶ This meant crafting a new foreign policy toward engaging with a globalizing environment. In lines with this new policy, the government articulated several principles which would underpin America's future. These principles have been further elaborated depending on the changing national needs and interests especially with regime change across the U.S.

According to Fielder, the U.S provides special recognition to a number of themes within its foreign policy doctrines and relations with NATO; human rights, democracy, the rule of law; peace and cooperation between states.¹²⁷ The U.S therefore wanted to infuse the practice of international affairs with an orientation towards the promotion of civil liberties and democratization in Libya. The U.S approach was also informed by the desire to promote regional

¹²⁵ Smith, A. D. (2010). *The concept of social change: A critique of the functionalist theory of social change*. London: Taylor & Francis Ltd.

¹²⁶ Viotti, P. R., & Kauppi, M. V. (2013). *International relations theory: realism, pluralism, globalism*. New York: Macmillan.

¹²⁷ Joern Fielder. (2018) *Attache Germany Embassy Interview Monday 19th November at 8 am*.

development and to participate constructively in multilateral institutions.¹²⁸ The development of the U.S was therefore tied in its active engagement with European countries. Realist adherents are motivated by the desire to prevent wars and build a peaceful world. They concentrated on the ‘ought to be’ and in doing so seek to change ‘what is’.¹²⁹ Realism stresses the importance of moral values, legal norms, internationalism and harmony of interests as guides to foreign policy making, rather than the considerations of national interest and power.¹³⁰ Realists emphasize on the need for peace and the peaceful settlement of disputes; they believe that peace is both achievable and indivisible; and they are advocates of collective security. This is the reality experienced. The context of realist in the U.S case mean that the emphasis was on enforcing a regime that would uphold the rule of law and ensure democracy and protection of human rights.

Agata asserted that, “The goal of NATO in Libya was to force Gaddafi to uphold regime change and leave power. The contentious issue was on the rebuilding of Libya and how NATO would engage with the rebel opposition.”¹³¹ This elicited the question as to whether the U.S would still take the lead role in supporting reconstruction and the role of NATO thereafter. On March 2011, Hillary Clinton met with the opposition leaders where representatives of the European Union were present.¹³² The meeting was meant to provide information as the EU and U.S developed relations with the National Transitional Council in order to push for its goals. The U.S was vocal

¹²⁸ Cox, M., & Stokes, D. (Eds.). (2018). *US foreign policy*. Basingstoke, Hampshire; New York, NY Oxford University Press.

¹²⁹ Joseph, J. (2013). *Social theory: Conflict, cohesion and consent*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

¹³⁰ Cox, R. W. (2011). Social forces, states and world orders: beyond international relations theory. *Millennium* 10(2).

¹³¹ Agata Piotrowska, Second Secretary. Polish Embassy.

¹³² Scott Wilson. (March 28, 2011) Obama: U.S. had responsibility to act in Libya *Washington Post*. Retrieved from https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/obama-us-had-responsibility-to-act-in-libya/2011/03/28/AF6fkFrB_story.html?utm_term=.e2eb8ca57029&noredirect=on

in ensuring that its foreign policy interests were entrenched in the talks where recommendations were presented to U.N and NATO for approval.

3.7 Conclusion

In sum, the U.S has been a key entity in the creation and further development of NATO. The case of Libya proves to be a key scenario within which the U.S pushed for its foreign policy through NATO. The Gaddafi regime had violated human rights and democracy and this pushed the U.S to initiate an operation that was meant to topple Gaddafi's government. The role of U.S in NATO and generally in global affairs has provided a unique scope to its foreign policy. The U.S as guided by its foreign policy tenets sort to take the leadership of NATO and invest its resources in ensuring the strength and realization of goals of the alliance. As the largest contributor in NATO, the U.S is therefore at a decisive political position to exert its influence and interests through NATO. It is an engagement that depicts certain political institutions and values to establish and define collective security across the globe. The U.S incorporates the model of alliances such as NATO in order to bring stability in the globe and this was evident in Libya.

CHAPTER FOUR

A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF NATO AS AN INSTRUMENT OF U.S FOREIGN POLICY

4.1 Introduction

Chapter three provides a case study of how the U.S uses NATO to advance its foreign policy. Chapter four expounds more on Chapter three as it provides a critical reflection on the NATO intervention in Libya and the role of U.S in spearheading its foreign policy in Libya through the alliance. The chapter provides a pathway within which the U.S uses to advance its foreign policy especially with the organizational view of NATO. It also examines in-depth the organizations role in maintaining peace and security and how the U.S is entangled in this role within the realms of its foreign policy. This is in reflection to the case of U.S and NATO intervention in Libya. In the case, the U.S has been pivotal in influencing NATO to support in its interventions. The U.S foreign policy seeks the power and authority to project and protect its national interests across the globe. The national interests shape the country`s foreign policy and cover beyond an array of political, military, ideological, economic and humanitarian concerns.

The U.S has always been a key player within NATO in terms of funding, mobilizing expertise and all the necessary resources for the accomplishment of the organizations goals. The U.S is at the center of NATO and within its powers and influence it has been able to push for its agenda across Europe and globally. This chapter examines the route towards interventions in Libya to answer the question on how the U.S uses NATO to advance its foreign policy. Without influence then it could be difficult for the U.S to exert power on Europe and for it to influence on some of its foreign policy agenda. The key emphasis of this chapter revolves on the role of U.S within NATO and the influence of U.S through NATO in spearheading for its agendas with the case of Libya

4.2 Power Politics: The United States, NATO and Libyan Intervention

NATO intervention in Libya against Muammar Gaddafi's regime presents a unique dimension on the role of U.S in advancing its interests through NATO. This is based on the fact that the intervention explicitly exceeded the parameters that were originally set forth in 1973 in a UN Security Council resolution. The resolution authorized the use of force at international standard to develop a "no fly" zone in Libya and protection of civilians.¹³³ However, there was no mention of government overthrow or regime change although this can be translated as a political issue which would certainly emerge after the intervention. NATO supported militias that were opposed to Gaddafi's regime even as main NATO members had asserted that the goal was not to remove Gaddafi out of office.¹³⁴ According to a Polish respondent, the U.S was able to push NATO to force the Security Council to implement Libya arms embargo.¹³⁵ However, Libyan rebels have been armed meaning that NATO ignored the stipulation.

The Security Council on an international platform noted the escalating tension in Libya and increased killing of civilians.¹³⁶ The European Council (EC) also expressed its concern about the attacks on civilians and therefore resolved to push Gaddafi to relinquish power and address human rights and democracy issues.¹³⁷ The EC also asserted on the need to protect Libyans against Gaddafi's regime and pushed for member states to use all necessary options in demonstrating the

¹³³ North Atlantic Treaty Organization, 'NATO Secretary General's statement on Libya no-fly zone' Press Release (2011) 035 <http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/news_71763.htm>.

¹³⁴ Barack Obama, David Cameron, and Nicolas Sarkozy, 'Libya's Pathway to Peace' *The New York Times* (New York, 14 April 2011) <<http://www.nytimes.com/2011/04/15/opinion/15iht-edlibya15.html>>

¹³⁵ Respondent Polish Embassy Interview of Monday 19 November, 2018.

¹³⁶ North Atlantic Treaty Organization, NATO and Libya (Archived) (9 November 2015) <http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/topics_71652.htm#>.

¹³⁷ European Council Declaration (11 March 2011) [6-7] <https://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/ec/119780.pdf>.

need to support the country. The intervention was led by the U.S in portraying the purpose and the need for a united front that could be able to salvage Libyan civilians.

The intervention in Libya provided a different dimension with regards to international law as well as the U.S law. According to a U.S respondent, the Obama administration settled on the decision to be active participants in the war without due authorization by the Congress.¹³⁸ It waited for an extended period of time before it could seek the approval. By this time, the U.S had already engaged in the war. This meant that the administration violated the 1973 War Powers Resolution. This presents a legal battle that incorporates a political perspective of the war thus defining the context in which the U.S advances its foreign policy interests. The political factions supporting the war assert that the shortcoming of the legal contexts pave way for the higher purpose of intervening powers. This perception presents a clear-eye examination of the U.S interests in the war. As the U.S initiated the war, NATO found it prudent to support America but it is important to examine the interests that were advanced in the intervention.

NATO's intervention can be viewed from the perspective of moralistic concerns as well as the human rights abuses and Gaddafi's repression.¹³⁹ This presents the context of NATO's motivation for the Libyan intervention. It is important to note that the United States, the UK and France maintained a close relationship with Gaddafi until it was doubtful whether he could be able to hold on to power. The U.S relation with Gaddafi was not only based on mere diplomatic pleasantness but extended to sensitive issues such as intelligence collaboration and advanced military equipment. This collaboration was closely shared by France and British intelligence

¹³⁸ Respondent United States Embassy Interview of Tuesday 20 November, 2018.

¹³⁹ Payandeh and Ved Nanda. (2013) *The Future Under International Law of the Responsibility to Protect After Libya and Syria* (2013), 21 *Journal of International Law and Practice*.

services. The Western support on Gaddafi's regime also included British, French, United States and Italian oil companies. These companies established robust relationships with Gaddafi.

The turn of events can therefore be defined as a political issue where in 2011 the U.S began to view Gaddafi's regime from a different dimension. Initially, Gaddafi was regarded as a respectable and key member of European and the U.S elite. The U.S grew discontent about Gaddafi's governance and this prompted the intervention from a political perspective. Gaddafi incorporated a dictatorial approach to governance and increased violation of human rights and attack on civilians. The U.S as a global leader and a key ally of NATO had to intervene and break ties with Libya. It is important to note that even with breaking the Libyan ties, the European countries still traded with Libya and this proved difficult for the U.S to exert any intervention in the country. The sale of arms by France and investments in oil in Libya by Italy and France still meant that the U.S had a long way to go in enforcing its foreign policy interests of democracy and protection of human rights.

In addition, the legal hurdles involved in the issue meant that it could be difficult for the U.S to go into war in Libya without the support of NATO. The intervention was therefore made possible when the U.S pushed for the approval of resolution by the U.N Security Council which then prompted the support of NATO in Libya. Based on the above context, the U.S was pivotal in ensuring it seeks the support of NATO in the war in Afghanistan. According to a respondent from the U.S Embassy, the U.S did not seek the approval of NATO first and this created a political assertion on the issue.¹⁴⁰ This defines the influence of the U.S in NATO. In this context, the U.S

¹⁴⁰ Respondent *Attaché* United States Embassy Interviewed on Monday 19th November.

may have felt that its military power surpasses that of Europe and so could be able to go into the war alone. NATO and the U.N were included later in supporting the U.S in the intervention.

Threats to national security within NATO are those factors that happen to implicate the state of the national security and they include such things as terrorism, espionage, proliferation and foreign intelligent activities among others.¹⁴¹ The threats can be described as collective expressions of viewpoints that are largely supported by a large group of people and especially along a religious or cult line or political or economic perspective and especially negative or misguided by their beliefs. In this case, an attack on the U.S as its key ally meant that NATO had to be used by the U.S to advance its foreign policy tenets of peace.

Undoubtedly, Europe to a greater extent needs active involvement and commitment of the United States across its borders.¹⁴² The U.S has for many years been a fundamental component and key to continental balance of programs and powers. In this case that the U.S had initiated war in Afghanistan, it was able to influence NATO to support it in its quest. A stable and robust Europe is captured in the United States' political, economic, and security interests. The common threats that continue to confront both Europe and the U.S certainly define that through effective utilization and leadership of NATO, the U.S remains a fundamental actor in the security and affairs of Europe for a significant time to come. The shared values therefore prove critical in reinforcing the commitment of Europe within NATO and for the U.S to use the alliance as part of its foreign policy.¹⁴³

¹⁴¹ Pillar, P. R. (2014). *Terrorism and US foreign policy*. Santa Barbara, California: Brookings Institution Press.

¹⁴² Hamilton, D. S. (2014). *Transatlantic transformations: Equipping NATO for the 21st century*. New York. Thomas Rid.

¹⁴³ Gilpin, R. (2016). *The political economy of international relations*. Princeton. New Jersey. Princeton University Press.

The political influence of the U.S in the international realms can be understood by its influence on NATO. Troubled by widespread violence, the U.S initiated a resolution backed by France, Germany, and the United Kingdom. The draft resolution was presented to the Security Council to address the situation in Libya. Even though the intervention in Libya was depicted as an essential consolidation of the responsibility to protect, debates surrounding the context of NATO intervention in Libya triggered by the violence elicit mixed reactions. This is depicted in the responsibility to protect civilians and the future of Chapter VII resolutions that authorizes the use of force.

The influence of the U.S in the Security Council was depicted when other member states refused to vote and were against the intervention. Russia asserted that the Resolution 1973 did not permit the intervention as the activities appeared more offensive in context that the authorized defensive civilian protection mandated in the Resolution.¹⁴⁴ In addition, the Chinese government among other states critiqued the operations in Libya shortly after the military intervention began. There were excessive civilian casualties and excessive use of force which was against Resolution 1973. The Arab League's Secretary-General, Amr Moussa, supported China's concern on civilian deaths. He asserted that the Resolution 1973 only authorized for the protection of civilians and not regime change. Civilian casualties increased after NATO began the offensive against Gaddafi's forces.¹⁴⁵

4.3 Assessing Involvement of NATO in Libya

NATO's interest in Libya presents an in-depth perspective on the reasons for intervention. First, the U.S interest was to advance its foreign policy of human rights, peace and

¹⁴⁴ S/PV.6498 (n 11).

¹⁴⁵ Amr Moussa, 'The Goal in Libya Is Not Regime Change' *The New York Times* (New York, 23 March 2011) <<http://www.nytimes.com/2011/03/24/opinion/24iht-edmoussa24.html>>.

democracy and this necessitated it to seek the support of NATO. NATO was then presented with an opportunity to showcase its weaponry and this was aimed at increasing its overseas arms sales. Even though we can deduce that arms sales was not the key motive for the U.S and NATO involvement in Libya, it may have been one of the least motives. The U.S and NATO counterparts may have sought to sway international arms purchasers by defining the scope of arms and planes in the Libyan intervention.

The U.S interests may have therefore been supported by NATO as member states found it a viable platform to portray a political mileage in advancing economic interests. For instance, Dassault Corporation together with the French government introduced a war plane, the Rafale in Libyan intervention.¹⁴⁶ The sale of this plane failed to kick off as the French government before the Libyan intervention attempted to sell the plane to the Libyan government but the deal never materialized. However, the intervention portrayed a new dimension of the weaponry as the French introduced the war plane in countering the Libyan forces. After the war, the export prospects of the plane increased significantly and the prompt change was as a result of the Libyan intervention. At this time, the U.S and its European counterparts were eager to engage in arms sales in order to offset the increased unemployment linked to the 2009 recession. Such an assertion depicts the military idea of Keynesianism brought about by the weakness of economic recovery.

Another key element in the Libyan intervention can be examined from the budgetary perspective. The European militaries have been facing budgetary dilemmas.¹⁴⁷ This has been caused by reduced revenues resulting from recession. Multiple European countries have experienced revenue deficits and their governments had reacted with massive budget cuts. This

¹⁴⁶ French military air-dropped arms to Libya rebels' *Agence France Presse* (29 June 2011) <<http://www.france24.com/en/20110629-french-military-confirms-airdropping-arms-libya-kadhafi-rebel>>.

¹⁴⁷ Payandeh and Ved Nanda. (2013) The Future Under International Law of the Responsibility to Protect After Libya and Syria' (2013), 21 *Journal of International Law and Practice*.

presented a challenge on how could the U.S advance its foreign policy interest in Libya with the European countries focusing on budgetary cuts. It therefore took the power of the U.S to convince NATO of the need to engage in the Libyan war but the critical reflection focuses on advancing U.S foreign interests.

The level of U.S influence in NATO is immense especially when reflecting on the idea of budgetary cuts at the time. A notable case was the UK Royal Navy that experienced budget cuts. However, the Royal Navy used the Libyan intervention to protest the budget cuts and when the Navy intervened in Libya, the naval cuts were reconsidered. The force also gained political benefits as it created a political environment essential for military spending. The intervention in Libya therefore made it easier for progressives in the U.S supporting the intervention to justify military spending in the U.S and across Europe.¹⁴⁸

Finally, the question of oil constitute some interests in Libya. Libya can be depicted as a sizeable producer of oil with oil reserves across the country. Conoco-Phillips of the United States, BP of Britain, Total of France, and ENI of Italy were some of the companies that had invested in Libyan oil. During the uprising against Gaddafi, there was prospect of anxiety about the possibility of a political breakdown and thereby a negative impact in oil circles. There were threats to oil investments and reserves. The intervention in this case by the U.S may have been a stabilizing factor for the Libyan oil. According to a U.S respondent, the U.S may have revisited Gaddafi's rise in power and this may have signified a political factor that he could use the oil and control the valuable Persian Gulf.¹⁴⁹

¹⁴⁸ Payandeh and Ved Nanda. (2013) The Future Under International Law of the Responsibility to Protect After Libya and Syria' (2013), 21 *Journal of International Law and Practice*.

¹⁴⁹ Respondent. *Attaché* United States Embassy Questionnaire answered Monday 19th November, 2018.

The intervention in Libya was at a critical time when the Arab world exerted some control over world economy and politics. The intervention may have been necessitated by the U.S as a show of force to the Arab world and demonstrate that it still exerts control and powers. According to a Polish respondent, the U.S have been relying on military interventions with the aim of protecting and opening up investment opportunities overseas.¹⁵⁰ This context then presents a wider dimension of the wars the U.S have engaged in and what the motivation has been. Libya was therefore a key illustration to the basic corporate tendency.

The U.S and NATO countries may have invested their individual military expertise and capabilities with the aim of augmenting their participation in the Libyan oil. The U.S was vocal as France, a largest investor of oil in the country joined in. A U.S respondent asserted that Italy's hesitant in joining the intervention could have undermined its oil interests in Libya. Politically, oil was indeed a key factor that forms a key basis for decision making in the intervention in Libya as a result of interests by the U.S as well as the European counterparts.

The commitment of member states within NATO is therefore based on the values within which the U.S upholds including: rule of law and principles of sovereignty, protection of human rights, demonstration to peaceful intentions, peace and democracy.¹⁵¹ The U.S. foreign policy is based on building and sustaining a democratic, prosperous and secure world that benefits the American people as well as the international community.¹⁵² The reports presented by the media in the U.S and NATO's intervention in Libya describes the intervention by European countries as an

¹⁵⁰ Respondent *Attaché* Polish Embassy Questionnaire answered Monday 29th November, 2018.

¹⁵¹ Wenger, A., & Möckli, D. (2010). *Power Shifts and New Security Needs: NATO, European Identity, and the Reorganization of the West* Routledge. Handbook of Transatlantic Security.

¹⁵² Krasner, S. D. (2008). *Defending the national interest: Raw materials investments and US foreign policy*. Princeton. New Jersey. Princeton University Press.

extremely rare invitation for NATO military forces on Arab territory.¹⁵³ In sum, a geographically diverse set of States supported Security Council action to protect civilians within Libya. This is a true indication that the U.S was able to influence NATO to support its interests in Libya.

NATO emphasizes on securing members states at both regional and national levels.¹⁵⁴ NATO together with all its arms protects the citizens and their surrounding from all threats and crises by use of power projections like military might, political power, economic power and diplomacy. Some of the elements, (major), include military security, political security with military security being in the top of the list. NATO serves a great purpose of defending nation states against threat of aggression. The interventions in Libya were meant to protect NATO allies as the U.S in both cases it was decisive in seeking the intervention of NATO. In both cases, the U.S is able to penetrate through member states with the assertion that it is an ally and not a threat.¹⁵⁵ As a superpower, it is able to influence member states to take diverse stands on various issues that revolve along the lines of political, social and economic. NATO ensures accountable capability of member state to achieve success in fighting all the different threats that concern its people.¹⁵⁶

4.4 Scope of NATO and U.S Relation

NATO has proven to be a reliable contributor to U.S-led military alliances and regional security. The U.S intelligent agencies have uniquely benefited from its active cooperation and participation with the European counterparts. This has for a long time provided rich insights in the

¹⁵³ Ethan Bronner and David Sanger, (12 March, 2011) Arab League Endorses No-flight Zone Over Libya' *The New York Times*. New York.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2011/03/13/world/middleeast/13libya.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0>. 17
S/PV/6498 (n 11).

¹⁵⁴ Hamilton, D. S. (2014). *Transatlantic transformations: Equipping NATO for the 21st century*. New York. Thomas Rid.

¹⁵⁵ Jentleson, B. W. (2014). *American Foreign Policy: the dynamics of choice in the 21st century*. New York: Norton.

¹⁵⁶ Hamilton, D. S. (2014). *Transatlantic transformations: Equipping NATO for the 21st century*. New York. Thomas Rid.

service of America's national security decision-making. Europe's most essential component to the success of U.S foreign policy has been the aspect of liberal democracy, prosperity and peace. Functional theory asserts that the society is a whole unit that is made up of different interrelated parts working together.¹⁵⁷ This is the case with NATO where different countries form an alliance that is based on common interests. The society becomes normal when all parts that make up the society fulfill their basic functions.¹⁵⁸ Functional perspective emphasizes on social order as a system of parts as the main aim encompasses analyzing the effect of particular processes on the entire system. Conflict perspectives emphasizes on conflicts and tensions created within the system parts. In this scenario, NATO has managed to exist for all those years based on the commitment of member states and working together for the common interests that continue to hold them together.

However, the annexation of Crimea by Russia in 2014 depicted the latest note of Russia's rejection of post-Cold War European and U.S security order.¹⁵⁹ A different perspective of the scenario asserts that Russia had no choice but to accept NATO's expansion. Russia never regarded the expansion as fair and legitimate but considered it as a betrayal on Western promises and assault on Russian interests and prerogatives. Through alienating Russia, the expansion of NATO undercut American and Western goals in Europe.¹⁶⁰ However, the expansion of NATO in one sense is depicted as a gain for America in pushing for its economic, social and political interests

¹⁵⁷ Jentleson, B. W. (2014). *American Foreign Policy: the dynamics of choice in the 21st century*. New York: Norton.

¹⁵⁸ Joseph, J. (2013). *Social theory: Conflict, cohesion and consent*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

¹⁵⁹ Michael E. Brown (2015) *European Security: The Defining Debates* Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.

¹⁶⁰ Michael E. Brown (2015) *European Security: The Defining Debates* Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.

abroad. However, it can also be regarded as a blunder keeping in mind the immense resources needed to finance NATO's budget with about 80 % of the finances coming from the U.S.¹⁶¹

The change in scope as triggered by the disintegration of Soviet Union did not deter further expansion and unity within NATO and across Europe. British Prime Minister Margret Thatcher supported the expansion of NATO and echoed on the need for that alliance to preserve its strategic balance in Europe.¹⁶² It is important to note that as per the strategic concept, NATO is a key avenue for the U.S in democratizing states as well as pushing for its political and economic gains. The expansion of NATO offers a means of solidifying the transitions from communism as well as opening new economic gains through enhanced connections across the European Union.¹⁶³

The U.S has been pivotal in pushing Europe to act multilaterally as projected stability beyond the borders of the U.S is important. This is based on the fact that the U.S as a super power pushes for international order which is a key element in ensuring its national interests are covered beyond its boundaries.¹⁶⁴ The stability of Europe is important for the security of the U.S. As part of its foreign policy of ensuring democracy, the U.S was and remains vocal in the affairs of NATO as its budgetary allocation echo its U.S foreign policy concept.

Russia's aggression to erode the European and U.S unity while doubting the legitimacy of NATO by a combination of propaganda and force continues to be countered by the U.S.¹⁶⁵ This is based on the fact that America's economic interests are engrained as the central and core element

¹⁶¹ Hamilton, D. S. (2014). *Transatlantic transformations: Equipping NATO for the 21st century*. New York. Thomas Rid.

¹⁶² Jentleson, B. W. (2014). *American Foreign Policy: the dynamics of choice in the 21st century*. New York: Norton.

¹⁶³ Thompson, K. W. (2015). *NATO Expansion*. Lanham, Md: University Press of America.

¹⁶⁴ Patrick, S., & Forman, S. (Eds.). (2012). *Multilateralism and US foreign policy: ambivalent engagement*. Basingstoke, Hampshire; New York, NY. Lynne Rienner Publisher.

¹⁶⁵ Remaly, S. E. (2014). *NATO transformation: Finding relevance in coping with the asymmetric threat of terrorism*. Carlisle. Barracks, Pa: U.S. Army War College.

as to why it continues to maintain the treaty and commitment to a secure and stable Europe. Europe is important to the U.S agenda and way of life and this is deeply entrenched in the economic relationship between the two.

4.5 Precedential Value: NATO Intervention

Many facets of the U.S intervention in Libya define the Resolution as lawful. However, there is a different dimension where the U.S was able to influence NATO to provide assistance to anti-Gaddafi rebels. This exceeded Security Council mandate where the focus was to be on protecting civilians and not focusing on regime change. By supporting anti-Gaddafi militants, then NATO was overstepping its mandate as outline by the Security Council. However, the intervention as spearheaded by the U.S present relevant dimension of legal precedent.

First, Libya intervention prompted China and Russia to be more cautious about approving force within Chapter VII especially in future cases.¹⁶⁶ Libyan intervention by the U.S therefore created a precedence at to the Syrian intervention which has so far not been agreed upon by the Security Council. Secondly, the responsibility to protect rests with the U.S as it influences NATO to support in protecting civilians. Reflecting on the U.S foreign policy, the safety of Americans may not have been threatened directly but the American values and interests were. The common humanity and security was threatened and this justified the U.S to advance its foreign policy through NATO.¹⁶⁷ Thirdly, the long civil war that has ravaged Libya following NATO intervention makes the precedential value of the intervention in the country difficult to assess. If the power

¹⁶⁶ Walter Russell Mead, 'The Wilsonian World Order Has Once Again Been Postponed' *The American Interest* (5 October 2011) <<http://www.the-american-interest.com/2011/10/05/the-wilsonian-world-orderhas-once-again-been-postponed/>>

¹⁶⁷ Payandeh and Ved Nanda. (2013) *The Future Under International Law of the Responsibility to Protect After Libya and Syria* (2013), 21 *Journal of International Law and Practice*.

vacuum left by Gaddafi had been filled with a representative and democratic government, then we would have in future have a comparable Chapter VII Resolutions.

4.6 The Conflict Perspective – U.S and NATO Partnership

The conflict perspective derives from the thoughts and ideas of Karl Marx, who asserted that the society constitutes a dynamic entity that undergoes constant change that is driven by conflict of class. While functionalism defines the society as a complex structure that strives for equilibrium, conflict perspective understands that social life is a competition. The U.S interests within NATO are key in ensuring the stability of the organization. As the U.S funds the organization by about 80 %, then it is important we examine how the member states integrate on the basis of NATO`s interests and national interests.

The changing context of NATO meant that it emphasizes on crisis management and prevention in place of deterrence.¹⁶⁸ For instance, the disintegration of Yugoslavia back in 1991 depicted the dangers of ethnic conflict and instability in the former communist states. In this case, the U.S had less influence as the country was a communist state. The U.S could not influence its foreign policy elements of democracy, rule of law and peaceful elections on a state that was a former communist country. The U.S intervened in what happened to Yugoslavia by influencing key elements within NATO in order to widen its scope of influence. It is at this time that NATO in 1992 enforced the decision and agreement of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe.¹⁶⁹

¹⁶⁸ Schmidt, P. (2002). Partners and rivals: NATO, WEU, EC and the reorganization of European security policy: Taking stock. In *In the Midst of Change: On the Development of West European Security and Defense Cooperation, Baden-Baden: Nomos.*

¹⁶⁹ Michael E. Brown (2015) *European Security: The Defining Debates* Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.

By the end of 1992, NATO enforced its influence on Bosnia by monitoring and then enforcing the U.N's embargo on weapons against the former Yugoslavia.¹⁷⁰ This meant that the U.S was vocal in creating a stable Europe and it therefore influenced the U.N to support NATO's aim. From a general commitment towards supporting political and economic transition, NATO through the intervention of the U.S moved to incorporate countries that were part of the Warsaw Pact within its councils. In this way, the U.S could widen its influence across Europe and so exert its foreign policy elements.

Conflict perspective in this case asserts that the society is made up of individuals who compete for the limited resources available.¹⁷¹ Social relationships compete on daily basis over the scarce resources. Competition in place of consensus is a key feature to human relationships. Wider social structures reflect the competition for limited resources as inequality competition sets in. Some states within NATO have more resources than others and thereby use those resources to bargain and maintain their power and positions in the region. Power and influence is directly related to abundance of resources. We can deduce that the economic power of the U.S as a member of NATO places it as a position where it can be able to bargain for its interests on the basis of its foreign policy.

According to Karl Marx, social structures develop based on the conflicts between conflicting interests.¹⁷² The development of social structures result to a differential of power between the social classes. Karl Marx focuses on power, distribution of resources, and inequality

¹⁷⁰ Hamilton, D. S. (2014). *Transatlantic transformations: Equipping NATO for the 21st century*. New York. Thomas Rid.

¹⁷¹ Viotti, P. R., & Kauppi, M. V. (2013). *International relations theory: realism, pluralism, globalism*. New York: Macmillan.

¹⁷² Smith, A. D. (2010). *The concept of social change: A critique of the functionalist theory of social change*. London: Taylor & Francis Ltd.

when examining conflict perspective. Conflict theory focuses on change while functionalism focuses on stability. According to conflict theory as coined by Karl Marx, the society is in constant conflict over resources as social change is driven by conflict. In conflict perspective, there is change brought about by conflict between different competing interests, not adaptation or consensus. In this case, the common interests of security and democracies define the commitment of member states to the alliance.

Conflict theory provides a framework for defining social change and addresses the problems linked to functionalist perspective. The functionalist perspective focuses on the social order and which elements make the society relatively stable. In this case, the common interests continue to stabilize the alliance. However, it is important to note that as the U.S is a major stakeholder in NATO both in mobilization of resources and capacity, its interests may override interests of countries that are not strong both economically and politically. The U.S faces the weighty task of meeting security obligations and international priorities. The U.S national interests abroad remains key in its commitment to NATO. Europe attracts criticism for its low levels on defense spending. Its anchor and position for prosperity and peace proves to be the cornerstone of America's national interests.

The domestic realities pave way for concrete policy recommendations that ensure the U.S is able to tackle crises in a decisive and conclusive manner. The U.S focuses on the common international security interests and threat perceptions shared with European countries. Progress emphasizes on mitigating the shared fears between countries within NATO and deal with key disagreements separately in bilateral track.

4.7 Conclusion

The commitment of member states within NATO depicts the key element that holds the organization together. A divided Europe would be catastrophic especially for the U.S. foreign policy. The U.S foreign policy forms the basis of its leadership and defines the country's cooperation and collaboration with multilateralism and allies. In the case of intervention in Libya, the U.S has been able to influence NATO to support its course. This means that NATO incorporates key European countries where the U.S has interests spanning from economic, social and political. NATO therefore serves the U.S a great deal in terms of creating structures and basis of cooperation and integration. The politics of economy play a key role in defining the scope of intervention by the U.S as well as NATO. The intervention in Libya presents more of a political context especially where before the intervention the U.S and several European countries had engaged in relations with Gaddafi's regime. The change in tune happened abruptly as the U.S was able to influence the U.N and NATO member states in intervening on the basis of humanitarian crisis as well as democracy.

By understanding the purpose of NATO in securing the Euro-Atlantic area, we can then confirm that there are other vested interests of foreign policy based on the fact that the disintegration of Soviet Union could pave way for the end of NATO. The key roles of NATO therefore provide the background within which the U.S has been able to push for its agenda across Europe. This is based on the common interests, values and principles of member states with democracy and peace being a key element that has sustained NATO.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

Chapter four examined the context within which the U.S advanced its foreign policy through NATO in Libya. Chapter five provides conclusions and recommendations. The formation of NATO provides a unique dimension on how the organization has been beneficial to the U.S. The transformation of NATO then presents new functions of the organization which plays a key role in maintaining the alliance. It is within the regular transformations that NATO continues to find its purpose while the U.S remains in the alliance based on its foreign policy interests.

Overtime, the U.S link within NATO has been shaped by both its foreign policy as well as political realignment.¹⁷³ The scope of U.S interaction within the alliance has been changed by the emergence of a new threat – terrorism. The case of U.S intervention in Libya presents a case of U.S advancing its foreign policy through NATO. However, regime change in the U.S has always presented a unique dimension as to the country`s engagement externally. The foreign policy document to some extent is guided by the administration in power as politics take center stage. With the European Union further facing key challenges especially with the exit of Britain, it remains to be seen how the U.S will continue to advance its foreign policy through NATO. This chapter therefore summarizes the key findings and sources. It looks into the in-depth alignment within NATO and provides a summary into how NATO has been an instrument of U.S foreign policy. It also examines into the future insight of the organization especially with political realignment in the U.S.

¹⁷³ Cox, M. (2015). *US foreign policy after the Cold War: superpower without a mission?* Mason, OH: South-Western. Pinter Pub Ltd.

5.2 Collective Interests

The key threat to the U.S. interests has been the issue of terrorism. The U.S. foreign policy has normally focused on protecting U.S. globally and in the recent years, this has been hampered by increased threat to its security.¹⁷⁴ The U.S. foreign policy has focused on working with NATO partners in alleviating hostilities and restoring stability. The U.S. has been applying strategic principles in its approach by: investing resources and time in building global institutions such as NATO and relationships that help in managing local crises and predicaments when they emerge; and move decisively in helping European nations manage internal conflicts that may escalate and pose global security threats.¹⁷⁵

The U.S has been developing and adopting agendas that support cooperative actions with key players of global power – NATO. The U.S. has strengthened more its strategies with coalitions which include the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the European Union (EU). Stronger cooperation with allies ensures creation of a highly mobile and specialized training forces and military equipment's that are able to respond to threats effectively.

Generally, managing economic, political and security challenges requires the U.S to create and maintain coalitions that help to advance American interests abroad. The U.S. has streamlined and enhanced the flexibility of command frameworks within NATO to meet the changing operational demands that are linked to requirements of integrating, training and experimenting with new economic, political and security configurations.¹⁷⁶ The U.S. has been making use of its

¹⁷⁴ Hunt, M. H. (2009). *Ideology and US foreign policy*. New Haven. Connecticut. Yale University Press.

¹⁷⁵ Jerel A. Rosati, James M. Scott. (2011) *The Politics of the United States Foreign Policy* Santa Barbara, California: Cengage Learning.

¹⁷⁶ Cox, M., & Stokes, D. (Eds.). (2018). *US foreign policy*. Basingstoke, Hampshire; New York, NY Oxford University Press.

economies of scale and technological opportunities in its defense spending and plans to transform its military forces and those of its allies such as NATO in order to dominate potential aggressors of terrorism and diminish vulnerabilities as a result of terrorist activities.¹⁷⁷

In addition, Europe remains a key economic hub for U.S. American has continued to engage in trade with European countries and NATO has helped in creating and sustaining such links. An assurance of peace and security within Europe through NATO has been vital for the countries in engaging in trade. Security poses a key challenge to growth and development of markets and trade across Europe. As a key contributor of NATO budget and resources, the U.S is therefore able to penetrate within the European countries and forge trade lines that have proved beneficial for the U.S economy over the years.

5.3 NATO – U.S Partnership

As set out in the foreign policy agenda above, the U.S was a key partner in the formation of the alliance and has remained a key decision maker for NATO. The leadership of NATO has reflected on the U.S interests especially with the view that it is one of the main contributors to the organization. The alliance has emphasized over the years in carrying out security policies that includes maintenance of sufficient military capabilities that are geared towards preventing war and providing effective defense; overall capability of managing crises that affect the security of member states; and promoting active dialogue among nations. These elements have formed the pillar of NATO over the years as the U.S has continued to strategically place itself to remain core within the alliance. The alliance engages in fundamental security tasks as outlined below:¹⁷⁸

¹⁷⁷ Pillar, P. R. (2014). *Terrorism and US foreign policy*. Santa Barbara, California: Brookings Institution Press.

¹⁷⁸ Kashmeri, S. A. (2011). *The North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the European Union's common security and defense policy: Intersecting* Carlisle PA: Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College.

Security – Providing indispensable foundations for a firm and stable security environment across Euro-Atlantic.

Consultation – To serve as an important transatlantic forum as covered in Article 4 of the treaty.

Defense and Deterrence – To defend and deter against any aggression and threat vetted against member states as covered in Article 5 and 6 of the treaty.

Crisis Management – To remain steady by consensus and case-by-case to contribute to conflict prevention and engage actively in crisis response operations and activities.

Partnerships – To enhance wide-ranging cooperation, partnerships, and dialogue with other states within the Euro-Atlantic area. The focus of partnerships has been on enhancing mutual confidence, transparency, and capacity for common action within the alliance.

So far, NATO has proved decisive in carrying out its mandate as set above and this has been the core reason as to why the U.S has remained in the alliance as the main contributor. The U.S has worked since the inception of NATO for the establishment for a lasting and just peaceful order across Europe that is based on its values of human rights, democracy, and rule of law.¹⁷⁹

5.4 Key Findings

The in-depth analysis on how NATO has been a key organ in spearheading the U.S interests presents the state of interactions between the alliance and America. There are key points that emanate from the interaction that are based on interests. They include:

¹⁷⁹ Forsythe, D. P., McMahon, P. C., & Wedeman, A. H. (2015). *American foreign policy in a globalized world*. New York: Routledge.

5.4.1 The Political Factor

There are essential lessons we have learnt from the U.S relationship with its allies in Europe and the interaction among them. A key point to ponder is the fact that the person the Office of the President in the U.S has a direct impact on how other countries perceive America.¹⁸⁰ There has been change in attitudes among the Presidents in Office. For instance, the change in attitude can be noted from President Bush tenure to Obama and the current Trump.

NATO and the European allies may lose or regain confidence based on the administration policies and the individual in charge. The perception of European countries with the political realignment within the U.S sets the pace for interaction. President Trump has been vocal in pushing for European countries to invest more in NATO as the U.S has for the years contributed significantly in maintaining the alliance.

However, we cannot negate the fact that the U.S as a superpower still holds the belief in the significance of relationships – political, economic, and military. The tact used by the government in realizing these beliefs has been shaped by political dictates. For instance, after the 9/11 attacks, the U.S sort the help of the alliance in taming terrorism and it is at this juncture that America enhanced its support for NATO. However, President`s Trump administration continues to disparage the importance of NATO and sorted to deal with individual countries in pushing for U.S foreign policy interests especially in line with democracy.¹⁸¹

¹⁸⁰ Gilpin, R. (2016). *The political economy of international relations*. Princeton. New Jersey. Princeton University Press.

¹⁸¹ Mead, W. R. (2013). *Special providence: American foreign policy and how it changed the world*. Routledge.

The collapse of communism, the end of USSR, and the unification of Germany within NATO proclaimed a new era across Europe.¹⁸² It was regarded as one of the most important foreign policy achievements in American history. The departure of Britain from the European Union also poses a political factor with how NATO realigns itself. The EU has been a strong economic bloc for the U.S and its instability poses a challenge with the U.S interactions with its European allies both within NATO and the EU.¹⁸³

5.4.2 The Security Environment

NATO has been a security organ within the Euro-Atlantic area helping to maintain peace and security. Generally, we can deduce four interlocking challenges that have dramatically changed the scope of security across the region and continue to shape U.S foreign policy interests within Europe:¹⁸⁴

The deployment of U.S troops in Poland, Romania and Baltic States sends a deterrence signal to Russia especially with its seizure of Crimea and continued aggression on Ukraine and Georgia. Russia has also continued to harass the U.S forces in international waters and international airspace.

The dramatic weakened and fractured European Union which has been exacerbated by the departure of Britain. The United Kingdom has always been a key pillar of the EU and its exit poses

¹⁸² North Atlantic Treaty Organization. (2010). NATO North Atlantic Treaty Organization *Handbook: Strategic Information and Developments*.

¹⁸³ Schmidt, P. (2002). Partners and rivals: NATO, WEU, EC and the reorganization of European security policy: Taking stock. In the *Midst of Change: On the Development of West European Security and Defense Cooperation, Baden-Baden: Nomos*.

¹⁸⁴ Hamilton, D. S. (2014). *Transatlantic transformations: Equipping NATO for the 21st century*. New York. Thomas Rid.

potential threat to the U.S in terms of a unified Europe through which it could push for own agendas.

There has been widespread violence from North Africa and Levant to Europe itself. Widespread violence continues to derail implementation of U.S foreign policies in areas of violence especially within Europe.

The fourth factor is the uncertain and seemingly unconfident American and European leadership in resolving these combined challenges. There has been lacking workable links and trust among leaders and this has been detrimental to managing challenges that have engulfed Euro-Atlantic region.

5.5 Realignment within NATO

The dream of the U.S has always been a peaceful Europe. Even though this dream has continued to face challenges, the dream is attainable as through the formation of NATO the U.S was able to bring together European countries and influence its foreign policy. However, the current state of affairs within Europe requires a re-dedication to U.S bipartisan objectives – durable, strong, secure American links to Europe`s success and Europe`s future. This proves the reason as to why NATO remains important to America. A changed security scenario requires a bold and significant response by the U.S together with its European allies.

There has been increased need for NATO to rebuild their militaries. The altered strategic environment that has been triggered by the actions of Putin especially on Ukraine means that the U.S must forge a new defense strategy for Europe within NATO. There is need for reinvestments by NATO states as only few countries spend above the minimum requirements by NATO of two

percent of GDP of security and defense. The European allies insist that the aggression of Russia in Ukraine should be countered by the U.S lethal military assistance to help Ukraine defend itself.

However, we can ask one important question: why has NATO been unable to help Ukraine in defending its territory against Russia aggression? This can be answered on the basis of the U.S interests in the situation. States normally act and work within the metrics of national interests. The interests of states normally incorporate military security, self-preservation, economic prosperity as well as influence over other states.¹⁸⁵ The national interests of the U.S on the basis of its foreign policy shape its interaction with other countries. In the case of Ukraine it can be based on political reasons. This triggers the assertion that NATO ought to strengthen itself especially by its European counterparts in order to manage the influence of the U.S in its operations and decisions.

There is need for a stronger Germany to lead NATO within the new era. There is need for a stronger Britain, Poland, Italy, France, and Spain to enable NATO counter the emerging threats.¹⁸⁶ However, this may be a daunting task especially with an in-depth look at the U.S national interests. The principal aim of realists is that of national interest and sovereignty. “Realist theory proposes that anarchy is the characteristic of the international environment that makes international politics so dramatically different from domestic politics.”¹⁸⁷ Based on realism theory of international relations that asserts states work at increasing their own power and control relative to other states, the U.S may not push for self-governance within Europe where they take lead and control the alliance without the inclusion of it. This is based on the fact that if its influence is

¹⁸⁵ Viotti, P. R., & Kauppi, M. V. (2013). *International relations theory: realism, pluralism, globalism*. New York: Macmillan.

¹⁸⁶ Young, T.-D., & Army War College (U.S.). (1998). *Reforming NATO's military structures: The long-term study and its implications for land forces* Carlisle. Barracks, Pa: U.S. Army War College.

¹⁸⁷ Juliet Kaarbo, Jeffery S. Lantis and Ryan K.Beasley. (2013). *The Analysis of Foreign Policy in Comparative Perspective*. In: Ryan K.Beasley, Juliet Kaarbo, Jeffery S.Lantis, Michael T.SnarrForeign Policy in Comparative Perspective: Domestic and International Influences on State Behavior. 2nd ed. United States: Sage Publications.

decreased then it would not be able to push effectively for its foreign policy abroad. The realignment of NATO can therefore be effective if it lies within the U.S national interests.

The strongest foreign policy component that the U.S has been able to realize within Europe is democracy. However, the current challenge among the states is having to confront the wave of isolationist and extremist sentiments especially within the domestic political debates both within Europe and in America.¹⁸⁸ NATO requires a strong American leadership in order to counter its challenges. The American foreign policy emphasizes that isolation is not the solution to problems but alliances strengthen the U.S. NATO not only remains relevant but essential for the U.S in ensuring its political, economic, and security agendas are well addressed.

5.6 Recommendations

The need for US to actively peruse diplomacy and engage in a constructive diplomatic engagements with Russia so as to ease the security tensions in the eastern part of Europe and the Nordic states.

The need for US to halt its war games in Eastern Europe under the guise of "Forward enhancement policy from allied NATO nations" in order to also reduce the animosity tensions with Russia.

Rather than scapegoating NATO to achieve its national interests, US should open peaceful political channels with Russia and to immediately resume their annual NATO-RUSSIA council so as to build confidence and reduce confrontation. This council was suspended in 2014 on the "invasion" of Ukraine by Russia as alleged by US.

¹⁸⁸ Krasner, S. D. (2008). *Defending the national interest: Raw materials investments and US foreign policy*. Princeton. New Jersey. Princeton University Press.

As a hegemon, US should be steadfast in maintaining international order by initiating holistic programs in the universe which will establish peace and peaceful coexistence. Not the opposite by using international regimes such as NATO to advance their sole national interest and being instability in to the world. e.g. Libya.

For NATO To serve the purpose it was created in order to ensure the security stability of Europe, Canada and America, US must reduce its bullying nature witnessed under this current administration of America which bullies it allies to meet unbearable large amount of budgetary system which may not fiscally sustain some of this small nations within the allies with small GDP and hard fiscal policies.

U.S should resume the founding principles of the NATO charter and to commit the collective security of the regime. This current president has aired his reservations about the need for the US to going to war with small ally nation such as Montenegro sighting lack of commitment to the alliance. Re-commitment will however bolster the confidence of the allied nations in countering the effects of Russia from the east. The regime should seize to only act when US interest is at stake or when it want to use the regime for its own interest.

5.7 Conclusion

The U.S has become a dominant economic and military actor in the world and this is based on its successful and exemplary political transition and economic dominance. Since the establishment of NATO, it pledged leadership role and has continued to be vocal and ensure for the success of the alliance. NATO has transformed the security of Europe and through such measures, European cooperation and engagement has been strengthened. With peace and stability comes other benefits such as movement of people and goods which enhances social, political and economic elements. It is important to note that the U.S national interests define its engagement

within NATO. The benefits of a stable Europe to the U.S have been immense in areas of security, politics and trade.

The American foreign policy interests have also been key on creating democracies, rule of law and free and fair elections. The U.S has managed to influence such policy statements across Europe and this has contributed to increased cooperation of the U.S with European countries. NATO has therefore served as a conducive platform for the U.S in penetrating Europe and ensuring its interests are served there. However, with changing needs comes in place new foreign policy agendas. This calls for the transformation of NATO in order to deal with emerging challenges and ensure it keeps in line with the U.S foreign policy interests. Without the U.S., it would be difficult for NATO to sustain its capabilities. This research study has provided an in-depth analysis on why the U.S has been vocal in supporting NATO especially with its foreign policy elements in place. The study has provided the current basics of NATO and what is needed in order to remain an effective alliance in future. We can therefore assert to four key statements: NATO has been used as an instrument by the United States for its own interests; The influence and control of the United States within NATO has been immense; NATO has transformed over the years to become a key instrument of U.S foreign policy; and the role and mandate of NATO in the U.S and across Europe has been important in stabilizing the region.

REFERENCES

- Cox, M. (2015). *US foreign policy after the Cold War: superpower without a mission?* Mason, OH: South-Western. Pinter Pub Ltd.
- Cox, M., & Stokes, D. (Eds.). (2018). *US foreign policy*. Basingstoke, Hampshire; New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Cuccia, P. R. (2010). *Implications of a changing NATO*. Carlisle, PA: Strategic Studies Institute; U.S. Army War.
- Duignan, P. (2010). *NATO: It's Past, Present, Future*. Santa Barbara, California: Hoover Press.
- Gilpin, R. (2016). *The political economy of international relations*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Hamilton, D. S. (2014). *Transatlantic transformations: Equipping NATO for the 21st century*. New York: Thomas Rid.
- Hunt, M. H. (2009). *Ideology and US foreign policy*. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press.
- Jentleson, B. W. (2014). *American Foreign Policy: the dynamics of choice in the 21st century*. New York: Norton.
- Jerel A. Rosati, James M. Scott. (2011) *The Politics of the United States Foreign Policy* Santa Barbara, California: Cengage Learning.
- Joseph, J. (2013). *Social theory: Conflict, cohesion and consent*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

- Juliet Kaarbo, Jeffery S. Lantis and Ryan K. Beasley. (2013). *The Analysis of Foreign Policy in Comparative Perspective*. In: Ryan K. Beasley, Juliet Kaarbo, Jeffery S. Lantis, Michael T. Snarr *Foreign Policy in Comparative Perspective: Domestic and International Influences on State Behavior*. 2nd ed. United States: Sage Publications.
- Kashmeri, S. A. (2011). *The North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the European Union's common security and defense policy: Intersecting* Carlisle PA: Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College.
- Krasner, S. D. (2008). *Defending the national interest: Raw materials investments and US foreign policy*. Princeton. Princeton University Press.
- Lippmann, W. (2016). *The Cold War: A study in US foreign policy*. Farnham, Surrey, England: Harper Press.
- Mead, W. R. (2013). *Special providence: American foreign policy and how it changed the world*. Charlotte, NC: Routledge.
- Michael E. Brown (2015) *European Security: The Defining Debates* Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.
- North Atlantic Treaty Organization. (2010). *NATO North Atlantic Treaty Organization handbook: Strategic Information and Developments*.
- Patrick, S., & Forman, S. (Eds.). (2012). *Multilateralism and US foreign policy: ambivalent engagement*. Basingstoke, Hampshire; New York, NY. Lynne Rienner Publisher.
- Pillar, P. R. (2014). *Terrorism and US foreign policy*. Santa Barbara, California: Brookings Institution Press.

- Remaly, S. E. (2014). *NATO transformation: Finding relevance in coping with the asymmetric threat of terrorism*. Carlisle. Barracks, Pa: U.S. Army War College.
- Schmidt, P. (2002). Partners and rivals: NATO, WEU, EC and the reorganization of European security policy: Taking stock. In *In the Midst of Change: On the Development of West European Security and Defense Cooperation, Baden-Baden: Nomos*.
- Scott Wilson. March 28, 2011 Obama: U.S. had responsibility to act in Libya *Washington Post*. Retrieved from https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/obama-us-had-responsibilityto-act-inlibya/2011/03/28/AF6fkFrB_story.html?utm_term=.e2eb8ca57029&noredirect=on
- Smith, A. D. (2010). *The concept of social change: A critique of the functionalist theory of social change*. London: Taylor & Francis Ltd.
- Thompson, K. W. (2015). *NATO Expansion*. Lanham, Md: University Press of America.
- Viotti, P. R., & Kauppi, M. V. (2013). *International relations theory: realism, pluralism, globalism*. New York: Macmillan.
- Wenger, A., & Möckli, D. (2010). *Power Shifts and New Security Needs: NATO, European Identity, and the Reorganization of the West* Routledge Handbook of Transatlantic Security.
- Young, T.-D., & Army War College (U.S.). (2008). *Reforming NATO's military structures: The long-term study and its implications for land forces* Carlisle. Barracks, Pa: U.S. Army War College.