

# **NATO in the 60th Anniversary of the North Atlantic Treaty**

**Challenges and strategic  
divergences from national  
perspectives**

**edited by Andrea Carati  
and Carlo Frappi**

**FrancoAngeli**

**ISPI**

ISTITUTO PER GLI STUDI DI POLITICA INTERNAZIONALE



I lettori che desiderano informarsi sui libri e le riviste da noi pubblicati possono consultare il nostro sito Internet: [www.francoangeli.it](http://www.francoangeli.it) e iscriversi nella home page al servizio "informazioni" per ricevere via e-mail le segnalazioni delle novità o scrivere, inviando il loro indirizzo, a: "FrancoAngeli, viale Monza 106, 20127 Milano".

**NATO in the  
60th Anniversary  
of the North  
Atlantic Treaty  
Challenges and strategic  
divergences from national  
perspectives**

**edited by Andrea Carati  
and Carlo Frappi**

**FrancoAngeli**



Founded in 1934 upon the initiative of a group of companies and scholars from the Universities of Milan and Pavia, ISPI is one of the oldest and most prestigious research Institutes in Italy.

The vocation of the Institute is to promote the study of international affairs and strategic problems, train young men and women intending to work in international surroundings, as well as supply a forum for discussion and debate at a high level.

In particular ISPI's Research Area carries out studies in the fields of international politics and economics, strategic studies and history of international relations, whose aim is to further awareness and broaden understanding of international relations and foreign policy.

Copyright © 2009 by FrancoAngeli s.r.l., Milano, Italy.

*L'opera, comprese tutte le sue parti, è tutelata dalla legge sul diritto d'autore. L'Utente nel momento in cui effettua il download dell'opera accetta tutte le condizioni qui sotto previste. All'Utente è concessa una licenza d'uso dell'opera secondo quanto così specificato:*

1. L'Utente è autorizzato a memorizzare l'opera sul proprio pc o altro supporto sempre di propria pertinenza attraverso l'operazione di download. Non è consentito conservare alcuna copia dell'opera (o parti di essa) su network dove potrebbe essere utilizzata da più computer contemporaneamente;
2. L'Utente è autorizzato a fare uso esclusivamente a scopo personale (di studio e di ricerca) e non commerciale di detta copia digitale dell'opera. Non è autorizzato ad effettuare stampe dell'opera (o di parti di essa).  
Sono esclusi utilizzi direttamente o indirettamente commerciali dell'opera (o di parti di essa);
3. L'Utente non è autorizzato a trasmettere a terzi (con qualsiasi mezzo incluso fax ed e-mail) la riproduzione digitale o cartacea dell'opera (o parte di essa);
4. è vietata la modificazione, la traduzione, l'adattamento totale o parziale dell'opera e/o il loro utilizzo per l'inclusione in miscellanee, raccolte, o comunque opere derivate.

## *Index*

<b>Abbreviations</b>	pag.	9
<b>Preface</b>	»	13
<b>1. Transformation and Enlargement: Costs of NATO's Survival</b> , by <i>Andrea Carati</i>	»	17
1. Nato: an Alliance <i>sui generis</i>	»	17
2. Enlargement and Transformation: Costs and Opportunities	»	21
3. NATO Put to the Test: Military Interventions in Bosnia, Kosovo and Afghanistan	»	30
Conclusions	»	38
	»	
<b>2. Transformation and Enlargement: Challenges for NATO in the Wider Black Sea Area</b> , by <i>Carlo Frappi</i>	»	39
Introduction	»	39
1. NATO and the Wider Black Sea Area	»	40
2. Challenges Arising for NATO within the WBS Region	»	45
3. Needs and Pitfalls in Developing a Comprehensive Regional Strategy	»	56
Conclusions	»	63
<b>3. Italy and NATO: New Threats, Old Internal Constraints and More Obligations</b> , by <i>Arturo Varvelli</i>	»	65
1. Italian Security and National Interests during the Bipolar Age	»	65
2. Italy and NATO after 1989: External Threats		

and Domestic Limits	pag.	69
3. The Alliance's Transformation: Italy and NATO's "Crisis Management"	»	72
4. NATO's Enlargements and Italy	»	75
5. Present Problems: Italy's Interests and Choices	»	79
Conclusions. The Alliance's Future	»	82
<b>4. NATO at 60: an American Perspective, by Joseph R. Wood</b>	»	86
1. The End of the Cold War	»	88
2. The Clinton Years	»	90
3. The Bush Years	»	93
4. Afghanistan	»	95
5. Broader Questions of Belief	»	96
6. NATO Enlargement	»	98
7. A Dangerous Global Scene	»	99
8. A Better 60th Anniversary	»	100
<b>5. NATO at the Heart of French-American Relations Strategies, Geopolitical Relations and Security Stakes, by Jean-Sylvestre Montgrenier</b>	»	101
1. At the Origins of NATO	»	102
2. France's Withdrawal from NATO's Integrated Military Structure	»	106
3. "New NATO" and Oppositions between Paris and Washington	»	110
4. Key Perspectives and Conclusions	»	115
<b>6. NATO's Transformation and Turkey, by S. Gulden Ayman</b>	»	117
1. Nature of Turkey's Intentions	»	117
2. Threats to Turkish Security	»	118
3. US-Turkish Relations	»	119
4. NATO Enlargement and Turkey	»	120
5. Complementarities between the EU-NATO and Turkey's Challenges	»	122
6. Georgian and Ukrainian Membership	»	125
7. Missile Defense	»	129
8. Out of Area Involvement	»	130
9. Towards a New Concept	»	133

10. Global NATO	pag.	134
Conclusions	»	136
<b>7. Poland in NATO (1999–2009): between Historical Memory and Challenges of the Future</b> , by <i>Stefan Bielanski</i>	»	138
1. Nato in the Polish Historical Memory of the “Cold War” Period and the Transitions after 1989	»	138
2. Access (1990s) and Polish Decade in NATO (1999–2009): Facts and Events with Their Interpretations Accession to NATO	»	142
3. Decade of Poland’s NATO Membership	»	146
4. Poland and the Concept of the Euro-Atlantic Zone	»	151
5. Poland and the Further Process of Enlarging NATO	»	155
<b>8. Evolution of Relations between NATO and Romania</b> , by <i>Paul Duță</i>	»	159
1. Romania after 2 April 2004	»	161
2. Romania and Poland – the Main Pillars of “The New Europe”	»	163
3. The Doctrinaire Framework and the Reform of Security Structures	»	165
4. The Objectives for Romania as NATO Member State	»	168
5. What Romania Expects from NATO Nowadays and in the Future	»	176
<b>9. The Geopolitics of Georgian Security: NATO’s Unfinished Business in the Southern Caucasus</b> , by <i>Tedo Japaridze</i>	»	179
1. A Methodological Inquiry	»	179
2. Knocking on NATO’s Door	»	180
3. Why Georgia Needs NATO and NATO Needs Georgia?	»	183
4. NATO and the Building of a Broader Europe: Time to be More than just «Visible Mais Absent»	»	186
5. A Role for NATO’s Forward Engagement	»	187
6. New Threats Require New Mechanisms	»	189
7. NATO and the Future of Georgian Democracy	»	190



<b>10. Ukraine in NATO: an Inconsistent Recipe for a Troublesome Country</b> , by <i>Serena Giusti, Tomislava Penkova</i>	pag.	193
1. From the Soviet Union to Where?	»	194
2. The Evolution of NATO-Ukraine Relationship	»	198
3. Crimea: Another Obstacle on the Way to NATO	»	204
4. Defence Reform's Pace and Shortcomings	»	205
5. A Reluctant Public Opinion	»	209
Conclusions	»	213
<b>11. NATO and Russia in the Post-Wall Europe</b> , by <i>Sergei Medvedev, Igor Tomashov</i>	»	216
1. The Early 1990s: a Partnership that Wasn't	»	217
2. The Mid-1990s: End of Illusions, Start of Debate	»	219
3. Kosovo: Testing the New World Order	»	222
4. The Early 2000s: Re-establishing Partnership?	»	224
5. Mid- and Late 2000s: the Return of Geopolitics	»	226
6. Overview of the Institutional Forms of Cooperation	»	229
Conclusions	»	232
Contributors	»	234

## *Abbreviations*

ABM	Anti-ballistic Missile
ACO	Allied Command Operations
ACT	Allied Command Transformation (NATO)
AFSOUTH	Allied Forces Southern Europe (NATO)
BLACKSEAFOR	Black Sea Naval Cooperation Task Group
BSEC	Black Sea Economic Cooperation
CDC	Community of Democratic Choice
CEEC	Central and Eastern European Countries
CJTF	Combined Joint Task Force
CFE	Conventional Forces in Europe
CFSP	Common Foreign and Security Policy (EU)
CIS	Commonwealth of Independent States
CSCE	Commission Security and Cooperation in Europe (see also OSCE)
CSDP	Common Security and Defense Policy (EU)
DC	Democrazia Cristiana (Christian Democratic Party, Italy)
DPC	Defense Planning Committee (NATO)
DS	Democratici di Sinistra (Democrats of the Left, Italy)
EaP	Eastern Partnership (EU)
EAPC	Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (NATO)
EAPC	Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (NATO)
ECSC	European Community of Coal and Steel
EDC	European Defense Community
EEC	European Economic Community
ENP	European Neighbourhood Policy
EPP-ED	European People's Party-European Democrats
ESDI	European Security Defense Initiative

ESDP	European Security and Defense Policy
EU	European Union
EUFOR RD Congo	European Union Military Operation in Congo
EUPM	European Union Police Mission
EUPOL Kinshasa	European Union Police Mission in Kinshasa
FRG	Federal Republic of Germany
FSU	Former Soviet Union
GUAM	Georgia Ukraine Azerbaijan Moldova
GUUAM	Georgia Ukraine Uzbekistan Azerbaijan Moldova
ICBSS	International Centre for Black Sea Studies
ICI	Istanbul Cooperation Initiative
ID	Intensified Dialogue
IFOR	Implementation Force (NATO)
INF	Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces
IPAP	Individual Partnership Action Plan (NATO)
ISAF	International Security Assistance Force (NATO)
KFOR	Kosovo Force (NATO)
MAP	Membership Action Plan (NATO)
MD	Mediterranean Dialogue
MoD	Minister of Defense
MP	Member of Parliament
NAAC	North Atlantic Cooperation Council (NATO)
NAC	North Atlantic Council (NATO)
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization (see also OTAN)
NPG	Nuclear Planning Group (NATO)
NRC	NATO-Russia Council
NRF	NATO Response Force
NTM-I	NATO Training Mission in Iraq
OAE	Operation Active Endeavour (NATO)
OBOP	Osrodek Badania Opinii Publicznej (Center for Republic Opinion Research, Poland)
OSCE	Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (see also CSCE)
OTAN	Organisation du Trait� de l'Atlantique Nord (see also NATO)
PAP	Partnership Action Plan
PAP-T	Partnership Action Plan against Terrorism
PAP-DIB	Partnership Action Plan on Defense Institution Building

PARP	Planning and Review Process
PCA	Partnership and Cooperation Agreement (EU-UN)
PCI	Partito Comunista Italiano (Italian Communist Party, Italy)
PD	Partito Democratico (Democratic Party, Italy)
PDS	Partito Democratico della Sinistra (Democratic Party of the Left, Italy)
PfP	Partnership for Peace (NATO)
PiS	Prawo I Sprawiedliwość (Law and Justice Party, Poland)
PJC	Permanent Joint Council
PKK	Partiya Karkerén Kurdîstan (Kurdish Workers Party)
PO	Platforma Obywatelska (Civic Platform, Poland)
PSC	Political and Security Committee (EU)
ROE	Rules of Engagement
SACEUR	Supreme Allied Commander Europe
SECI	Southeast European Cooperative Initiative
SFOR	Stabilization Force (NATO)
SHAPE	Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe
TAF	Turkish Armed Forces
UN	United Nations
UNPROFOR	United Nations Protection Force
UNSC	United Nations Security Council
US	United States
USA	United States of America
USSR	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
WBSC	Wider Black Sea Country
WEU	West European Union
WMD	Weapons of Mass Destruction
WTO	World Trade Organization



## *Preface*

After sixty years of existence, the Atlantic Alliance remains the most reliable security organization for Euro-Atlantic security. NATO represents, both for the United States and its European allies, the chief institutional framework to handle security and defence issues. Such a role could not have been taken for granted twenty years ago, when the Soviet Union disintegration and Warsaw Pact dissolution seemed to call into question the Alliance's *raison d'être*. On the contrary, since the end of the Cold War, NATO has succeeded in adapting itself to the new international scenario, providing a credible response to the new security and political challenges. Indeed, starting from the '90s, NATO has undergone a deep evolution, both in quantitative and qualitative terms.

Over the course of the last decade, the Alliance concluded the admission of twelve new members and developed a series of mechanisms to foster relationships with aspirants and partners. Thus, the enlargement, from being an occasional choice, during the last fifteen years has turned out to be an enduring *open door* policy. It emerged as an instrument to ease the European transition toward a new geopolitical order and, at the same time, it redefined the boundaries of the Euro-Atlantic security space. On the other hand, the Alliance transformation consisted, first of all, in the update of strategic goals resulting in the endorsement of two new Strategic Concepts in 1991 and 1999. The new strategic posture paved the way for new *crisis management* tasks and for the NATO stabilization role, even beyond its borders. In turn, changes in the Alliance's strategic priorities entailed the development of new military means, a new Command Structure and new partnership frameworks.

As a result, NATO's evolution ended up in a shift from a traditional military pact to a new cooperative organization, moving from a defensive posture to a new expeditionary role. The depth of these processes entailed a

reconsideration of NATO identity, rising new political and security challenges both in the *out of area* projection and in the internal debate. The first military missions in its history – in Bosnia, in Kosovo and in Afghanistan – have represented at the same time the outcome and test-cases for NATO's transformation. In this regard, the Balkans experience substantiated the effectiveness of the Alliance role in *crisis management* and post-conflict stabilization, while the intervention in Afghanistan still represents a challenge to NATO's efficacy and credibility.

The magnitude of NATO's enlargement and transformation generated setbacks in internal cohesion regarding the changing strategic posture and the commitment to *out of area* operations. As a matter of fact, NATO's evolution inevitably implied a degree of heterogeneity within the Alliance - the deeper the process has gone, the higher the differences among Allies' national perspectives have surfaced. The starting point of this book is precisely the need to investigate the relationship between evolution and internal cohesion.

In this view, the book offers not a traditional standpoint on the recent history of NATO, but several national perspectives on its evolution. Instead of choosing one single point of view, it provides a multidimensional analysis on NATO's enlargement and transformation. In other words, the Alliance's evolution is investigated through the lenses of different member countries and partners, taking into account the different positions they have had *vis à vis* the Alliance as old members, new members or partners.

The following essays reveal both common features and dissimilarities in the national perceptions on NATO's enlargement and transformation. On the one hand, since the end of the Cold War, Allies and partners have shared a common view about the necessity of transforming and opening the Alliance to new members. On the other hand, differences have emerged regarding the width and the scope of Alliance's enlargement and transformation. The uncertainty and unpredictability characterizing the post-bipolar security scenario have deeply affected the security perceptions of the Allies and partners. New and old security demands have blurred complicating the common understanding of NATO's role and nature. Different security concerns – depending on national strategic priorities – have brought about dissimilar views on what transformation and enlargement concretely mean and how should be handled.

In this context, the US played the leading role fostering the shift towards a *new* NATO with a broader external projection and capable of dealing with the new security threats. The US overall interest, even in the post-Cold War

scenario, has remained that of preserving its special relationship with Europe while engaging Central and Eastern European countries. At the same breath, US encouraged a new NATO geopolitical stance, more consistent with the global dimension of the new security threats. In doing so, the US urged a move from an exclusively European-centred alliance to an expeditionary NATO with a flexible notion of *out of area* operations – which, over the course of few years, broadened from South-East Europe to Central Asia.

The old members have been, in general, more cautious facing NATO's post-bipolar evolution. The main interest of old members seemed to be the safeguarding of their security priorities. Hence, they looked at NATO's evolution mainly through the of their security concerns. Sometimes their interests and strategic priorities overlapped with lenses the American ones, sometimes the national perspectives differed. Chapters devoted to Italy, France and Turkey show how all three countries have been similar in the reaffirmation of their Atlantic commitment, intending NATO evolution in a way similar to the US expectations. However, during the last twenty years, they have constantly balanced their engagements in NATO's evolution with their national main concerns. For Italy and France such concerns were primarily linked to the development of the EU defence and foreign policies. Instead, in the case of Turkey, it was the geographical proximity to major crisis areas which shaped its national perspective on NATO's enlargement and transformation.

While old members seemed to share the basic understanding of NATO's evolution as a way to handle post-Cold War security threats, new members and partners perception has been relatively different. As a matter of fact, the containment of the Russian influence represented their main security concern and the main drive behind their cooperation with NATO. Moreover, cooperation with NATO played for these countries an important role in identity terms as well as in anchoring the post-communist transition and state-building process to Euro-Atlantic frameworks. Such a goal, fully achieved by the countries that joined the Alliance after 1999, is still an open issue for Ukraine and Georgia, which risk to find themselves entrapped in a "grey zone" between the enlarging Alliance and the traditional Russian sphere of influence. In the end, the "Russian factor" is one of the most important issue the Alliance has to tackle in order to substantiate its post-bipolar role. As highlighted in chapter 11, Russia is both a necessary and *sui generis* partner. Its relations with NATO have been ambivalent, oscillating from a close cooperation to the rhetoric of the Cold War. Indeed, NATO's enlargement has been perceived by Moscow as



a direct threat but, on the other hand, the Alliance has successfully played a role in interfacing between Russia and the West, engaging Russia in a dialogue on security, military and political issues.

This book is the result of a research project funded by the Institute for International Political Studies (ISPI). It was carried out in the first half of 2009 involving experts from the analyzed countries. The analysis focuses on three different levels - old members, new members and partners – in order to provide an appraisal of convergences and divergences on NATO's recent evolution. Accordingly, the book is structured in four parts. The first one offers an overview of NATO post-Cold War evolution, providing an assessment of enlargement and transformation processes (Chapter 1) and an appraisal of challenges for the Alliance in the crucial area of the Wider Black Sea (Chapter 2). The second part deals with national perspectives of old member countries, focusing on the US, Italy, France and Turkey (Chapters 3 to 6). Similarly, the third and fourth parts respectively analyse the national perspectives of Poland and Romania as new member states (Chapters 7 and 8) and Ukraine, Georgia and Russia as partners (Chapters 9 to 11).

A.C. C.F.

# 1. *Transformation and Enlargement: Costs of NATO's Survival*

by *Andrea Carati*

## 1. **NATO: an Alliance *sui generis***

As any alliance, NATO is based on a promise of mutual military assistance. Indeed, despite the different forms an alliance can assume, none can avoid producing reciprocal expectations of security among its members<sup>1</sup>. From this point of view, NATO is not an exception.

The North Atlantic Treaty, signed on 4th April 1949, is similar to other alliances for the type of reason which had produced it. At the origins of an alliance there is always a threat to the security of its members, and it is far too evident the role the Soviet threat played in the North-Atlantic Alliance's establishment<sup>2</sup>. Taking a broader view, Paul Schroeder observed that behind any alliance there are three sorts of rationales: (a) the opposition to an external threat; (b) the accommodation of a threat through a "pact of restraint"; or (c) a great power policy over weaker states<sup>3</sup>. The North Atlantic Treaty met all these demands: it offered security guarantees against the Soviet Union; it reduced the likelihood of intra-bloc conflicts in the Western world; and it provided the institutional framework through which the United States could deal with its European counterparts.

In addition, NATO has been characterized by another alliance's traditional feature: it has been a *military* organization. Indeed, it is the

---

<sup>1</sup> Colombo A., *La lunga alleanza. La Nato tra consolidamento, supremazia e crisi*, Milano, FrancoAngeli, 2001; Walt S.M., *The Origins of Alliances*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca, NY and London, 1987; Wolfers A. (ed.), *Alliance Policy in the Cold War*, Hopkins Press, Baltimore, 1959.

<sup>2</sup> Clementi M., *La Nato, dal mondo diviso in due alla minaccia del terrorismo globale*, Il Mulino, Bologna, 2002; Frydrych E.K., *The Debate on NATO Expansion*, «Connections», 7, 2008, pp. 1–41; Walt S.M., *The Origins of Alliance*, cit., pp. 149.

<sup>3</sup> Schroeder P.W., *Alliances, 1815-1945: Weapons of Power and Tools of Management*, in Knorr K. (ed.), *Historical Dimensions of National Security Problems*, University Press of Kansas, Lawrence, 1976, pp. 227–262.

military dimension which makes a distinction between an alliance and other international organizations in which the cooperation's purpose is economic, political, humanitarian or cultural, but not military<sup>4</sup>. Even today, while NATO's tasks are profoundly changed and encompass civilian activities, its military capability remains essential<sup>5</sup>. This is proved not only by the main military interventions of the last fifteen years, but also by the significance attributed to the process of transforming the military means, and by the debate on the capability gap between the United States and European allies<sup>6</sup>.

However, beyond its most traditional features, NATO has some peculiarities which distinguish it from other alliances. Among them three are particularly significant for the role they have played for NATO's evolution in the post-Cold War scenario: (a) its exceptional longevity; (b) its high level of institutionalization; and (c) its ideological nature.

Alliances are usually based on temporary agreements, seldom do they outlast their victory or their defeat, and even more rarely do they have the chance to survive a radical change in the structure of the international system. NATO, on the contrary, has shown an atypical persistence in time and a good ability to adapt. And, most important, NATO outlived its victory and the shift from the bipolar to the unipolar system - in other words, it outlived the collapse of the system which was its *raison d'être*<sup>7</sup>. Furthermore, in the post-bipolar scenario, NATO has avoided the risk of becoming a marginal or pointless alliance, but it has kept its stance as the most reliable multilateral organization for Euro-Atlantic security.

The second and most evident peculiarity of the Atlantic Alliance is its extraordinary institutional development. Since the early 1950s the North Atlantic Treaty has been integrated with a permanent organization<sup>8</sup>. Therefore, beyond the promise of mutual military assistance, member countries have provided the Alliance with executive committees, integrated

---

<sup>4</sup> Colombo A., *La lunga alleanza...*, cit., pp. 30–33.

<sup>5</sup> In the Strategic Concept approved immediately after the end of the Cold War is written: «[t]he political approach to security will [...] become increasingly important. Nonetheless, the military dimension remains essential» (<http://www.nato.int/docu/comm/49-95/c911107a.htm>, Part III, § 30).

<sup>6</sup> Edmunds T., *NATO and its New Members*, «Survival», 45, 2003, pp. 145–166; A.A. Michta A.A., *What Next for NATO?*, «Orbis», Winter 2007, pp. 155–164.

<sup>7</sup> It is worth noting that the shift from the bipolar to the unipolar system brought about an overall reshape of international alignments and alliances (Santoro C.M., *Il sistema di guerra. Studi sul bipolarismo*, FrancoAngeli, Milano 1988).

<sup>8</sup> Indeed, NATO was born in 1951, after the North Atlantic Treaty, as the organizational side of the Alliance (Clementi, M., *La Nato...*, cit., pp. 27–29).

forces, and a structure of command<sup>9</sup>. The high degree of institutionalization may be an essential advantage for the persistence in time of an alliance. Indeed, this is one of the most relevant factors which contributed to NATO's endurance after the end of the Cold War<sup>10</sup>. In particular, the development of supranational institutional bodies has created ambiguities about the role of NATO in the post-bipolar world: as an alliance, NATO has continued to offer security guarantees *against* someone or something; as an international organization, instead, NATO has pursued *inclusive* objectives, with a potential universalistic approach, and with a more political – rather than military – character<sup>11</sup>.

Finally, the Atlantic Alliance has been different from the main part of alliances for its ideological nature. The ideological rivalry during the Cold War, the longstanding democratic tradition of the United States, and the triumph of democracy as a principle of international legitimacy, have all contributed to identify NATO as a league of democracies<sup>12</sup>. Cultural and political homogeneity have strengthened the cohesion attained by pure strategic interests. In fact, the end of the bipolar system has not brought about the end of NATO, also because member countries shared – and still share – a common ideology which went beyond the only strategic concern of containing the Soviet Union. Furthermore, compared with other ideologies, democratic values have provided a unifying and open attitude based on liberal solidarity – this has created the conditions for survival rather than mere national interests<sup>13</sup>.

These peculiarities – NATO's long life, its institutionalization and its doctrinal character – have had several effects on the post-Cold War NATO's evolution. Not only because they determined the Alliance's endurance, but also because they have affected the transformation and enlargement processes.

NATO's long history has been a history of crises and adjustments in which the Alliance has developed adaptation and transformation capacities. Even though the drastic change occurring in 1989–1991 is not comparable with previous international changes, considering NATO during the Cold

---

<sup>9</sup> See NATO official website: <http://www.nato.int/structur/structure.htm>.

<sup>10</sup> Walt S.M., *Why Alliances Endure or Collapse*, «Survival», 39, 1997, pp. 156–179.

<sup>11</sup> Michta A.A., *What Next...*, cit.

<sup>12</sup> The Alliance democratic principles has been evident since its origins. In the Preamble of the North-Atlantic Treaty is stated that: «The Parties to this Treaty [...] are determined to safeguard the freedom, common heritage and civilisation of their peoples, founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty and the rule of law» (<http://www.nato.int/docu/basicxt/treaty.htm>).

<sup>13</sup> Walt S.M., *The Origins of Alliances*, cit., pp. 35–37.