# Relations With "Global Partners" in the Framework of NATO's New Partnership Policy

## NATO'nun Yeni Ortaklık Politikası Çerçevesinde "Küresel Ortaklar" ile İlişkileri

Arif BAĞBAŞLIOĞLU[*]

**Abstract**

*The aim of this article is to discuss all aspects of NATO's approach to global partners, as well as how the Alliance's new partnership policy can affect relations with these countries. This article examines the implications of the change in US foreign policy for NATO and it asserts that the impact of the financial crisis on defence budgets of NATO member states and the shifting American strategic focus to the Asia Pacific region will also force NATO to focus on finding new global partners from this region where there is no possibility for Alliance expansion in the short to medium term. Clearly, in an age of austerity, and with its new partnership policy, NATO aims to focus more on developing its relations with global partners.*

**Key Words:** *NATO's Partnership Policy, Asia Pacific, Global Partners, American Foreign Policy, Smart Defence.*

***Öz***

*Bu makalenin amacı, NATO'nun küresel ortaklar ile geliştirdiği ilişkileri ve İttifak'ın yeni ortaklık politikasının söz konusu ilişkileri nasıl etkileyeceğini tüm yönleriyle tartışmaktır. Makale ABD dış politikasındaki değişimlerin NATO'nun ortaklık politikasına yönelik*

---
[*] Assist. Prof. Ph D., Ahi Evran University, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Department of International Relations. E-mail: abagbaslioglu@ahievran.edu.tr

*yansımalarını ele almaktadır ve NATO'nun yeni ortaklık politikasının dünyanın çeşitli bölgelerinde ve özellikle İttifak'ın kısa vadede genişleme imkânının olmadığı Asya Pasifik Bölgesi'nde yeni küresel ortaklar yaratacağı iddiasındadır. ABD'nin stratejik önceliklerini Asya Pasifik Bölgesi'ne kaydırması, NATO'nun bu bölgeden küresel ortaklar bulmasını sağlayacaktır. Makalede bu süreç Transatlantik ilişkilerin bir ayrışmadan ziyade bir değişim süreci içerisinde olduğunun kanıtı olarak değerlendirilmektedir.*

*__Anahtar Kelimeler:__ NATO, NATO'nun Ortaklık Politikası, Küresel Ortaklar, Asya Pasifik, Amerikan Dış Politikası, Akıllı Savunma.*

### Introduction

The post-Cold War era brought about a new international system requiring the reorganization and reconstruction of international institutions. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), in being affected by this process, has attempted to alter its capabilities, interests and activities. This process has also provided a reason for the establishment of NATO's partnerships (Partnership for Peace (PfP), Mediterranean Dialogue (MD), and Istanbul Cooperation Initiative (ICI)) in different geographic regions to underpin NATO's changing role as an alliance that has taken on security roles beyond the treaty area. In addition to these formal partnership frameworks, NATO also cooperates individually with countries outside the Euro-Atlantic area who contribute to allied missions, such as Australia, Japan, Republic of Korea, and New Zealand which are not part of NATO's other partnership frameworks. These states have pledged troops and have committed financial contributions to the NATO-led operations (especially to the International Security Assistance Force-ISAF) even at a time when some important NATO members were unwilling to do this. The increasing value of these countries to NATO is also reflected in changing terminology to describe them. These states had formerly been referred to as "contact countries"; however after the Riga Summit in 2006, they were also named "partners across the globe" or often simply as "global partners". After the Lisbon Summit in November 2010, Pakistan, Iraq,

Afghanistan, and Mongolia were included in this classification.

Adopted at the Lisbon Summit, the New Strategic Concept raised the profile of partnerships by promoting cooperative security to the level of one of the Alliance's three "essential core tasks", alongside collective security and crisis management.[1] At the summit, Allied leaders also declared their intention, as part of a focused effort to reform NATO's partnerships policy, to better engage with global partners.[2] Following up on the Lisbon decisions, Allied foreign ministers endorsed the new partnership policy at their meeting in Berlin on 15th April 2011. Allies also restated their goal of achieving cooperative security through partnership during NATO's Chicago Summit in May in 2012. This heightened emphasis on partnership reflected a growing realization that partners are essential in addressing the increasingly global security challenges NATO currently confronts, as well as the emergence of a broad consensus within the Alliance that both existing and prospective partnerships must become more functional.[3] As such, NATO's partnership policy has become one of the most important tasks of the Alliance, at least in terms of the official discourse.

This article examines all aspects of the relations between NATO and countries regarded as "global partners" and the role of US foreign policy on the building and enhancing relations between NATO and global partners. This article asserts that NATO's new partnership policy can create new global partners in various regions of the world, especially in the Asia Pacific region where there is no possibility of Alliance expansion in the short to medium term. In this framework, the study tries to answer following questions: How can NATO's new partnership

---

[1] North Atlantic Council, "Active Engagement, Modern Defence: Strategic Concept", 20 November 2010, http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_68580.htm, (Access date: 20.02.2014).
[2] NATO, "Lisbon Summit Declaration", 20 November 2010, http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_68828.htm, (Access date: 20.02.2014).
[3] Rebecca R. Moore, "Lisbon and the Evolution of NATO's New Partnership Policy", *Perceptions,* Vol:7, No:1, 55-74, p. 56.

policy affect the relations with global partners? If new countries are described as global partners by NATO, what will be the results in terms of international security? Would upgrading the relationship between NATO and global partners be diluting the Transatlantic bond under which has historically been at the core of NATO? Before trying to answer these questions, we first highlight which circumstances NATO partnerships (PfP, MD, and ICI) were initiated and the role of the US in this process. This will be done as the article claims that the change of US foreign policy is the leading factor in the process.

### The Evolution of Partnerships

NATO's partnership policy was a main component of the Alliance's reinvention of the post-Cold War era. Since the early 1990's, NATO has maintained multiple partnership frameworks which have over the time served several functions. As Moore clearly expressed, partnership initially constituted an essentially political means of integrating and democratizing Europe.[4] At that time, partnership was more related to the Alliance's enlargement process. Since the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks, NATO has focused more on addressing global threats, which would likely stem from areas beyond the North Atlantic area. Due to this reason, NATO expected all partners to contribute to NATO's military operations. Furthermore, this expectation caused NATO to start the relations with global partners, which had initially been regarded as "contact countries". Before handling these relations, there are a few general points that can be mentioned regarding NATO's formal partnerships.

NATO's first partnership program, PfP, was launched in 1994 and it paved the way for practical co-operation between NATO and the states of Central and Eastern Europe, including former Warsaw Pact members. PfP was an effective tool of NATO's enlargement policy

---

[4] Rebecca Moore, "Partnership Goes Global" Gülnur Aybet and Rebecca Moore (eds.), *NATO in Search of a Vision*, Georgetown University Press, Washington, 2010, 219-242, pp. 232-233.

that is basically a security commitment and diplomatic embrace, rather than a military effort. PfP offered a tailored solution between an enlargement and maintaining stability in Europe and aimed to establish cooperative relationships with new democracies surviving transition periods. In this context, NATO created a wide range of practical mechanisms, including the Individual Partnership Action Plan (IPAP) and the Planning and Review Process (PARP), and activities to promote cooperation with partner countries. In the enlargement process, PfP would serve as an important instrument to foster security reform and prepare the partner countries for accession to the Alliance through these frameworks. In this respect, it can be expressed that this program has reached one of the important goals since twelve of the PfP countries are NATO members today.[5]

Cooperative security arrangements and initiatives like PfP, Mediterranean Dialogue (MD) (in 1994) and Istanbul Cooperation Initiative (ICI) (in 2004) were launched towards the Middle East.[6] They have been developed at different moments and for different reasons, some more obvious than others, and some linked to the lobbying of a few countries rather than a shared strategy. Due to their lack of substance or a well-defined goal, MD and ICI's success are far behind in comparison to PfP's success. While conceptually allowing for significant military cooperation, they have, in practice, been fairly limited in scope. Many partners involved in both these efforts have

---

[5] PfP has been an important institution in and of itself for non-NATO countries in northern and central Europe as well as being a mechanism for engagement at varying levels for countries of Eastern Europe, the Balkans, the Caucuses, and central Asia. PfP was employed to prepare the twelve nations incorporated as full members between 1999 and 2009: Albania, Bulgaria, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, and Slovenia. Following states are still members of PfP: Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bosnia, Finland, Georgia, Ireland, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Macedonia, Malta, Moldova, Montenegro, Russia Federation, Serbia, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, and Uzbekistan.
[6] MD members are Algeria, Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Mauritania, Morocco, and Tunisia. Bahrain, Kuwait, Qatar, and the United Arab Emirates are members of the ICI.

been underwhelmed by the outcomes.[7] Briefly, none of them has had the impact of PfP. Although some of them were defined as little more than "a diplomatic talking shop"[8], all these formal partnerships allowed NATO to build institutional relationships with countries that were strategically important but not candidates for membership.

At this point, the question of whether the partnership concept is an original idea for NATO may arise. The partnership concept originated in bilateral contacts between the US and Soviet Union in 1990 during discussions over how to manage post-Cold War European security. The partnership concept is consistent with an effort by the US to use bilateral and multilateral relationships to consolidate American primacy in the international system.[9] The concept was also imported from US foreign policy to the NATO agenda in order to build relations to non-NATO states. With this, formed partnerships have served as a key mechanism for American grand strategy since the end of the Cold War and NATO has been at the core of a growing and complex partnership dynamic. It is obvious that US demands are the ones most likely to be considered when attempting to determine common policy positions in NATO. Indeed, this trend is not a new development within NATO. In fact, this has been the case since NATO was established and which all the members of the Alliance accepted implicitly by signing

---

[7] Franklin D. Kramer, *NATO Global Partnerships: Strategic Opportunities and Imperatives in a Globalized World,* Atlantic Council, Washington, 2013, p.7; For a similar approach see, Tarık Oğuzlu, *NATO Ortaklıkları ve Türkiye: Barış İçin Ortaklık, Akdeniz Diyaloğu, İstanbul İşbirliği Girişimi,* İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, İstanbul, 2013, p. 23.

[8] Helle Malmvig, "From a Diplomatic Talking Shop to a Powerful Partnership? NATO's Mediterranean Dialogue and the Democratisation of the Middle East," *DIIS Brief,* DIIS, Copenhangen, May 2004, p. 4.

[9] For more information about the relationship between American national security objectives and the use of partnerships as a tool for managing the international security environment, see Sean Kay, "Partnerships and Power in American Grand Strategy", Hakan Edstrom et. al. (eds.), *NATO: The Power of Partnerships,* Palgrave, Hampshire, 2011, 18-39, pp. 18-25.

the North Atlantic Treaty.[10] However, it is still insufficient to account for NATO's partnership policy with only the willpower of US to that effect. During that time, European allies also endorsed this policy. The very basic reason behind such attitudes is that EU countries attached importance to the continuation of NATO in an environment where they could not easily establish their own security organizations. The EU enlargement and EU's attempts to establish a Common Foreign and Security Policy had effects on NATO's enlargement process. The enlargements of NATO and EU were parts of the same process. In this regard, European countries also endorsed the partnership policy, which was an important element of the Alliance enlargement then.

Based on interoperability in NATO-led operations, the idea of the development of relations with countries, which are not part of any of NATO's formal partnership frameworks, has also been shaped by the needs and demands of the US, especially regarding the support of Afghanistan engagement. The September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks caused the US to focus intensely on tackling the global threats with "war on terror" and "preemptive war" discourses. Ideas adopted especially by the US such as "the perception of threat to NATO must undergo a change of perspective" and "threats coming outside the Transatlantic region must be prevented before they are turned into attacks" were also reflected in NATO's partnership policy. As mentioned above, the role of NATO's partnerships also shifted according to the new needs. Since the onset of the US War on Terror,

---

[10] According to Webber, almost every major change has been the consequence of American action and no change has been possible without American support in NATO. Webber states that there are at least three ways in which the reality and significance of American dominance within NATO has been manifest over the time. The first is of historic interest, namely the manner in which the US set the terms of NATO's formation. Second, once NATO was established, the US would come to play a leading role in its institutional development. The third way in which US dominance has been exercised concerns NATO policy initiatives. For more details, see Mark Webber, "NATO: The United States, Transformation and The War in Afghanistan", *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations,* 2009, Vol: 11, No:1, 46-63, pp. 49-50.

the need has become predominantly operational. In this context, the existing partnership programs were supported by the mechanisms, including IPAP, Partnership Action Plan Against Terrorism (PAP-T), and Partnership Action Plan on Defence Institution Building (PAP-DIB), to improve interoperability in NATO-led operations. A new partnership program (ICI) has also been prepared for regions from which threats may emerge. Furthermore, not surprisingly, these developments provided an opportunity to improve relations with some Asia Pacific countries which are not part of any of NATO's formal partnership frameworks but are willing to support these policies for different purposes. Relations with these countries have been improved in order to ensure the operational support which is needed especially in Afghanistan and which cannot be adequately received from European allies.

In the 2000s, NATO's partnership policy began to be questioned.[11] There are two main reasons underlying the questioning. First is the effectiveness of this policy, the fact that varying goals of participating countries affect the level of success of such programs. Second reason is that there are countries, which contribute much more to NATO operations in comparison to others, though they are not in institutional partnership programs as well as the future of relations with these countries.

**The Formation of the Discourse of Global Partners**

NATO's partnership policy can be considered as a complement to NATO's transformation. The aim of NATO's transformation is the requirement to adapt rapidly to the changing global security environment and play an active role in shaping the security environment at a time when the raison d'être of NATO (that of Soviet threat) has vanished. However, that this active role was committed beyond NATO's traditional geographical area (the territory of the member states) has made divisions and disagreements over this subject within NATO

---

[11] Ron Asmus, "Rethinking NATO Partnerships for the 21st Century", *NATO Review*, 2008 No:1, http://www.nato.int/docu/review/2008/03/ART4/EN/index.htm, (Access date: 20.02.2014).

members more visible. The "old Europe - young Europe" classification that was first used by then-US Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld in January 2003 to refer to European countries that did not support the 2003 invasion of Iraq, specifically France and Germany[12], was the most prominent indication of the divisions and disagreements. Similar disagreements were also seen in the NATO-led operation in Afghanistan.[13] The fact that these disagreements became more apparent has increased the contributions of Australia, South Korea, Japan, and New Zealand to the NATO-led operations. These countries wished to improve relations generally with NATO but particularly with the US and had fewer qualms about US policies. Thus, as a result, the US frequently began to stress the need to transform "from static alliances" to "dynamic partnerships," and the need to build and expand global partnerships in its official texts.[14] Likewise, some US analysts further developed the idea and argued that NATO should be transformed into a global community of democracies by extending membership to these like-minded countries.[15]

---

[12] US Department of Defense, "Secretary Rumsfeld Briefs at the Foreign Press Center", 22 January 2003, http://www.defense.gov/transcripts/transcript.aspx?transcriptid=1330, (Access date: 20.02.2014).

[13] Although NATO's ISAF mission is not the first time the allies have debated the responsibilities they have to each other beyond the territorial defense of their own territories, this mission displayed very openly disagreements amongst allies over this issue. Furthermore, ISAF initially operated in the relative safety of the capital and its environment, but then the force has steadily expanded its responsibility and reached throughout Afghanistan, including into the dangerous southern part of the country. This development caused the burden-sharing problem amongst allies. See Benjamin Schreer, "The Evolution of NATO's Strategy in Afghanistan", Hakan Edström and Dennis Gyllensporre (ed.), *Pursuing Streategy: NATO Operations from the Gulf War to Gaddafi,* Palgrave, Hampshire, 2012, 139-156, pp. 143-147.

[14] See US Department of Defense, 2006 Quadrennial Defense Review, 6 February 2006, http://www.defense.gov/qdr/report/report20060203.pdf, p. vi, (Access date: 20.02.2014).

[15] Ivo Daalder and James Goldgeir, "Global NATO", *Foreign Affairs*, 2006, Vol: 85, No: 5, 105-111, p. 106.

Improving relations with Australia, South Korea, Japan, and New Zealand can be considered as a manifestation of the desire for the transformation of NATO from a collective defense organization to a global security organization. However, to say that this desire is shared at the same level by each NATO member is an extremely optimistic appraisal. In the run up to NATO's Riga Summit in 2006, Anglo-Saxon allies lobbied for the establishment of an institutionalized "global partnership forum" with these countries. This new approach was different from the previous partnership concept in two key areas. First, it was not oriented politically towards maintaining order, but rather had a security focus. Second, it was based on the principle of military capability.[16] This proposed forum represented a significant departure from NATO's existing partnership structures in so far as it followed a functional rather than a geographical approach.[17] At this point, it can be expressed that the concept of global partners is a concerted effort with the US intention to turn NATO into a militarily useful and politically more obedient coalition of the willing[18], because these countries supported the operations without reservation.

Some NATO member countries have expressed their concern about the prospect of establishing more formal ties with these countries because this forum might have been simply a first step toward a global NATO or a NATO with global membership. As Tanner points out for a global role, NATO would need the political empowerment of all its member states (most of which are also EU member states), whose societies have to accept the significant costs entailed by NATO's structural adjustments and capability improvement.[19] Moreover, this

---

[16] Karl-Heinz Kamp, "'Global Partnership' A New Conflict Within NATO?" *Analysis and Arguments,* no 29/ 2006 Konrad Adenauer Foundation, May 2006, p. 4.

[17] Rebecca R. Moore, "Lisbon and the Evolution of NATO's p. 63.

[18] Yoshikazu Hirose, "The Prospects of Japan-NATO Cooperation" 08 June 2010, http://www.worldsecuritynetwork.com/NATO-Japan/Hirose-Yoshikazu/The-Prospects-of-Japan-NATO-Cooperation, (Access date: 20.02.2014).

[19] Fred Tanner, *Is NATO Going Global?,* GCSP Policy Brief No: 14. Geneva: Geneva Center for Security Policy, 2007, p. 3.

was not a situation easily accepted by these states, so the forum did not acquire the expected popularity among the majority of European allies. A concern arose among European members of NATO, especially Germany and France, that a more formal framework could distract the US from the Alliance's collective defense mission and could dilute the natural solidarity between Europeans and North Americans.[20] Another concern expressed was that a more formal framework with like-minded states in the Asia Pacific region could potentially lead to needless friction with a rising China.[21] Thus, these concerns hampered a possible consensus on a more formal framework with the Asia Pacific countries.

Although a global partnership forum could not be established during the Riga Summit, the emphasis on the importance of the relations with these countries and the "Comprehensive Political Guidance (CPG)" which was the document adopted at the Summit, were significant indicators displaying the will of global NATO. In the CPG, there was focus on the necessity of the ability to conduct and support multinational full range operations far from home territory, and it suggested enhancing Alliance ability to meet the challenges from wherever they may come. In the document, terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction were put forward as the principal threats to the Alliance that must be prevented. Although CPG reaffirmed Article 5 as the core mission of the Alliance, it noted that future attacks might originate from outside the Euro-Atlantic area.[22] Given these subjects, which were handled in the document similarly declared in the New Strategic Concept of NATO in 2010, we can say that France and Germany's opposition prevented just the establishing of global partnership

---

[20] Rebecca Moore, "Partnership Goes Global" pp. 228-230.
[21] François Heisbourg, "Why NATO Needs To Be Less Ambitious*", Financial Times,* 22.11.2006, http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/3a657376-7a01-11db-8d70-0000779e23 40.html#axzz2Mn2OzlJT, (Access date: 20.02.2014).
[22] See North Atlantic Council, *Comprehensive Political Guidance,* 29 November 2006, http://www.nato.int/cps/en/SID-BE7F4F92-5E137DFF/natolive/official_texts_ 56425.htm, (Access date: 20.02.2014).

forum at that period, but not the moves for the transformation of NATO from a collective defense organization to a global security organization. Briefly, during the Riga Summit it was adopted that NATO's challenges are more global than regional in nature, meaning that NATO has a strong imperative to improve relations with these countries.

These countries have been called "partners across the globe" or "global partners" since the Riga Summit. At the 2008 Bucharest Summit, NATO developed "Tailored Cooperation Packages" (TCPs) with Australia, New Zealand, Japan, and South Korea, which focused on a range of activities, joint exercises, intelligence, and technology exchange. Similar to the Individual Cooperation Programmes offered to MD and ICI partners, TCPs were essentially lists of cooperation activities tailored to serve both the interests of partner states and NATO's priorities.[23] Moreover, regular staff talks with these countries were held, usually involving representatives from the foreign and defense ministries of these states together with the NATO International Staff, International Military Staff and the strategic commands as appropriate. These steps aimed mainly at enhancing interoperability with these countries in NATO led-operations. However, it can be expressed that interoperability with these countries was limited to the Afghanistan operation in practice.

At this point, the relations between NATO and these countries before NATO's new partnership policy adopted in 2011 should be briefly noted. Among the countries, which are regarded as global partners, Australia's relationship with NATO is by far the most advanced. Australia is regarded as a "natural partner" for the Alliance by some NATO texts[24] because of its cultural and political closeness to both

---

[23] See North Atlantic Council, "Bucharest Summit Declaration", 03 April 2008, http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_8443.htm?selectedLocale=en, (Access date: 20.02.2014).

[24] NATO Parliamentary Assembly "Contributions of Non-NATO Members to NATO Operations," Report by Sverre Myrli (Rapporteur), Sub-Committee on Future Security and Defence Capabilities, Defence and Security Committee, 15 November 2008, (159

European and North American countries. Although political and military ties between Australia and NATO reach back to the Cold War, they have been strengthened since 2001. During the Cold War, and mostly through bilateral cooperation with Anglo-Saxon NATO allies, Australian Defence Force personnel more closely adopted NATO doctrine and operation procedures than the other global partners' military personnel did. During the 1990's, Australia participated in several UN operations alongside NATO members and deployed troops to the NATO led Stabilization Force (SFOR) in Bosnia and Herzegovina in 1996. Yet all these interactions were limited until the operation in Afghanistan, which became the focal point of increased political, operational and technical cooperation.[25] Australia contributed to the hard security aspects of ISAF with a contingent that is based in the troubled southern province of Uruzgan and assisted with reconstruction, logistics, and liaison personnel in Kandahar and Kabul. According to the latest figures, Australia is the second largest non-NATO contributor to ISAF overall, currently ranking 10th out of 50 participating nations.[26] The point needs to be emphasized that as a non-member of any formal partnership frameworks of NATO, non-European, and non-NATO country, Australia contributed to the operation far more than some NATO member countries, both in terms of actual participation and in terms of ratio between troops in Afghanistan and overall number of military personnel.

Relations between New Zealand and NATO developed in a similar way to the relations between Australia and NATO. During the 1990's, New Zealand deployed troops to UN operations in Bosnia and Herzegovina and took part in SFOR. NATO and New Zealand have

---

DSCFC 08 E rev.1). http://www.nato-pa.int/Default.asp?SHORTCUT=1475 , (Access date: 20.02.2014).

[25] Benjamin Schreer, "Beyond Afghanistan: NATO's Global Partnerships in the Asia-Pacific", **Research Paper,** No: 75, NATO Defense College, Rome, 2012, pp. 3-4.

[26] ISAF, "ISAF: Key Facts and Figures", 19 February 2013, http://www.nato.int/isaf/ docu/epub/pdf/placemat.pdf, (Access date: 20.02.2014).

had regular contact since 2001. New Zealand's involvement in the NATO-led ISAF mission has considerably improved relations between NATO and New Zealand.

Japan has the largest population, the largest economy, the largest military budget, and the most active overseas development programs amongst the countries referred to as global partners. The first NATO-Japan exchange took place in 1990 and initiated subsequent biannual exchanges. ISAF also played an important role for NATO and Japan to work together. Although it is not a troop contributor to ISAF due to the restraints on troop deployments imposed by its Constitution, Japan politically and financially supported the operation and provided funds to support many projects carried out in the country.[27] In addition to its involvement in Afghanistan, Japan has also worked alongside NATO member countries in a variety of operations across the world since 2001, reflecting the globalized nature of converging security concerns.[28] In the context of NATO's comprehensive approach to crises, Japan began to use NATO as a way of demonstrating its range of contributions to conflict resolution, including financial assistance and reconstruction.[29] In addition to Japan being already a significant financial contributor to NATO operations, it has significant technical expertise in both military and security areas that are highly valued in the types of contingencies in which NATO could become involved. For instance, Japan, along with Australia and South Korea, has missile defence cooperative programs with the US.[30] This cooperation might have implications for NATO missile defence systems in the short term.

---

[27] Michito Tsuruoka, "NATO and Japan: View from Tokyo". *RUSI Journal,* 2012, Vol: 156, No: 6, 62-69, pp. 64–65.

[28] Randall Schriver and Tiffany Ma, *The Next Steps in Japan- NATO Cooperation*, The Project 2049 Institute, 2010 p.5, http://project2049.net/documents/next_steps_in_japan_nato_cooperation_schriver_ma.pdf, (Access date: 20.02.2014).

[29] Glen D. Hook et.al., *Japan's International Relations Politics, Economics and Security,* Third Ed., Routledge, Wiltshire, 2012 p. 304.

[30] US Department of Defense, Missile Defense Agency "International Cooperation", http://www.mda.mil/system/international_cooperation.html, (Access date: 20.02.2014).

NATO and South Korea initiated a dialogue in 2005 and since then, relations have evolved through regular high-level dialogue with the Republic of Korea's authorities. Similarly, the Afghanistan engagement also was the driving force for increased operational cooperation. South Korea leads a Provincial Reconstruction Team in Parwan province, which has helped build the capacity of the provincial government in the areas of health, education, rural development, and governance. South Korea has also provided financial support to the Afghan National Army Trust Fund.[31]

To summarize, the conceptualization of the course of war on terror as a global threat by US foreign policy became a facilitator for these countries, which had already desired to develop relations with the US and to build and expand relations with NATO. Immediately afterwards, the commencement of the Afghanistan operation was a catalyst for greater relations between NATO and these countries. These relations have been evaluated as another means of cooperation with the US by global partners despite the fact that these countries are a very diverse group of nations who vary in size, foreign policy orientation, and overall international influence. In this context, NATO, with its political as well as military capabilities, has become a complement for these countries to the US Alliance relationship.

**NATO's New Partnership Policy and its Approach to Global Partners**

Barack Obama's coming into power as the new US President in 2009 and the full reintegration of France into NATO's command structure, which had been left during the De Gaulle period, relatively facilitated the establishment of a consensus on the renewal of the Strategic Concept within NATO, which had not been reached during Bush's presidency. At the NATO Summit in Strasbourg/Kehl in April 2009, a group of experts chaired by Madeleine Albright was appointed

---

[31] NATO, "NATO-Republic Korea Cooperation" http://www.nato.int/cps/en/SID-4143343E-C27FB0F4/natolive/topics_50098.htm, (Access date: 20.02.2014).

by Secretary General Anders Fogh Rasmussen to lay the groundwork for a new Strategic Concept for NATO. Six months prior to the November 2010 Lisbon Summit, this report entitled "NATO 2020: Assured Security; Dynamic Engagement" was presented to the North Atlantic Council. Redefining NATO's jurisdiction in cases where cooperation becomes necessary in different geographies with non-member countries, as well as determining the procedures through which such relations will be maintained are the elements discussed in this report.[32] As seen in this report, there are debates regarding the future of the NATO partnerships which began in the 2000s and became intensified in 2006 during the Riga Summit and, in this context, whether relations with global partners which focused mainly on the Afghanistan operation would transform into a more institutional structure at the end of that operation. As a result of this, these uncertainties appeared as questions to be answered in the Strategic Concept. The most important question, which had to have been answered in the New Strategic Concept, was whether there would be established an institutional structure between NATO and global partners, such as other formal partnership frameworks (PfP, MD and ICI).

NATO's new Strategic Concept entitled "Active Engagement, Modern Defence: Strategic Concept" was adopted at the Lisbon Summit on 19 November 2010. Taking into account the above outlined developments regarding partnerships, the New Strategic Concept identifies "cooperative security" as one of NATO's three essential core tasks. Partnership falls under this task. Here, what should be made explicit is the fact that disputes regarding the future and functions of partnerships in fact emanate from the differences of opinion within the Alliance concerning the main mission of NATO. Notwithstanding those who consider the New Strategic Concept as an element of balance

---

[32] NATO, *NATO 2020: Assured Security; Dynamic Engagement-Analysis and Recommendations of the Group of Experts on a New Strategic Concept for NATO,* Public Diplomacy Division, Brusselss, 2010, pp. 5-11, http://www.nato.int/strategic-concept/expertsreport.pdf, (Access date: 20.02.2014).

between NATO's regional (collective defence) and global missions[33], in our view, the document increases the possibility for NATO to be perceived as a global security organization. Although strategic concepts are documents in which different expectations for the future and different goals are settled, the fact that threats are being perceived at different levels both nationally and geographically among NATO member countries should not be overlooked. However, it should be stressed that the emphasis of the document concerned the fact that possible threats to the security of the Alliance are affected by the developments occurring beyond the Transatlantic area. The emphasis influenced the document to a great extent, as well as it is clear that the US's will was more dominant than that of NATO's European members in the creation of the emphasis.

In the New Strategic Concept, the necessity of maintaining cooperation with countries and organizations beyond the borders so as to ensure the security of NATO members was also emphasized. It was stated that partners would be allowed to participate in the decision-making processes of NATO operations they supported and partnerships would be further improved on this basis. In this regard, we can say that the New Strategic Concept gave an impetus to realize this aim of the document. Before adopting the New Strategic Concept, Allied leaders had also decided to establish a Political and Partnerships Committee (PPC) to be the centre for implementation of the reform in April 2010.[34] Within this framework, NATO Foreign Ministers endorsed the new partnership policy developed and agreed upon with partners in the NATO Foreign Ministers' Meeting, which took place in Berlin on April 14-15 2011. In the meeting, two documents called the "Berlin Package" were issued with the aim of deepening and broadening NATO's existing partnerships. Berlin Package also identifies emerging security challenges as a strategic objective of the Alliance's partnership, namely terrorism,

---

[33] Alessandro Marrone, "The Equilibrium of the 2010 NATO Strategic Concept", *The International Spectator* 2011, Vol: 46 No: 3, 93-111, pp. 93–94.
[34] NATO, "Political and Partnerships Committee (PPC)", http://www.nato.int/cps/en/ SID-DB81B0BC-339C89C0/natolive/topics_79430.htm,   (Access date: 20.02.2014).

cyber attacks, problems related energy security (including maritime security) and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. NATO's new partnership policy was actualised within these two documents.

We shall review the policy in detail. With this policy, while preserving the institutional partnership programs (PfP, MD, ICI), all partners are offered access to the whole spectrum of partnership activities NATO offers. This means that no new institutional structure was set forth that would include the countries supporting NATO operations as global partners. However, all partnership tools made available by NATO to institutional partners have been practically opened up to all countries that would like to cooperate with NATO on any matter within the scope of this new policy. It is clear that new partnership policy envisages more political cooperation with partner countries. "Political Military Framework For Partner Involvement In NATO-Led Operations" is one of the documents of Berlin package, which provides for full consultation, cooperation, and transparency with operational partners and as appropriate potential operational partners, on all relevant aspects of the operation throughout its life cycle.[35] This means that partners will have a bigger say in the preparation of operational planning decisions than before, although the North Atlantic Council alone still has the last word in decision-making in NATO-led operations.[36] Accordance with this approach of broad consultation, NATO invited 13 operational partners (Australia, Austria, Finland, Georgia, Japan, Jordan, Republic of Korea, Morocco, New Zealand, Qatar, Sweden, Switzerland, and the United Arab Emirates) to the Chicago Summit.

With this new policy, NATO's specialized programmes, IPAP and PARP, which were previously limited to PfP countries, is now

---

[35] NATO, *Political Military Framework For Partner Involvement In NATO-Led Operations*, 15.04.2011, p.2, http://www.nato.int/nato_static/assets/pdf/pdf_2011_04/20110415_110415-PMF.pdf, (Access date: 20.02.2014).
[36] Heidi Reisinger, *Rearranging Family Life and a Large Circle of Friends: Reforming NATO's Partnership Programmes*, Research Paper No: 72, Rome: NATO Defense College, 2012, p. 4.

open to all partners. All partners with which NATO has an individual programme of cooperation have access to a new Partnership Cooperation Menu, which comprises some 1600 activities, ranging from training in maritime operational planning to crisis response operations and courses on arms control, non-proliferation and terrorism. With this single pool of activities, the different approval procedures for the various work plans disappear. Furthermore, the Individual Partnership and Cooperation programme (IPCP) is regarded as only one generic partnership document for all partners – in particular those which are not part of any partnership frameworks. IPCPs are two-year programmes, which are drawn up from the extensive Partnership and Cooperation Menu, according to each country's specific interests and needs.

IPCPs were included in the scope of this new policy in order to enable relations between NATO and global partners to be improved more elastically on a case-by-case basis. Since no country's name is directly stated in the "Berlin Package", it is understood that these mechanisms are open to all countries that would like to work together with NATO as its global partner. In fact, it can be said that with such an attitude, the policymakers in the Alliance are aiming to prevent the relations to be developed with global partners from being perceived by any country (especially China) as an implicit or explicit threat. After the adoption of this new policy, along with Australia, South Korea, Japan, and New Zealand, countries such as Pakistan, Iraq, Afghanistan, and Mongolia appeared as global partners on NATO's official website. Further, it was stated that mechanisms set forth in the new policy of partnership might include China, India, Singapore, Indonesia, Malaysia, and Colombia or Brazil as well.[37] After the adoption of NATO's New Partnership Policy, on 19 March 2012, on 4 June 2012, on 20 September and 24 September 2012, on 21 February 2013, and on 6 May 2014 Individual Partnership and Cooperation Programme accords were signed respectively with Mongolia, New Zealand, South

---

[37] NATO, "Partnerships: A Cooperative Approach to Security". http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/topics_84336.htm, (Access date: 20.02.2014).

Korea, Iraq, Australia, and Japan. These accords focus on promoting political dialogue and practical cooperation in a number of joint priority areas, including response to terrorism, multinational peace support operations and science for peace and security.

Abolishment of all practical differences among partners with NATO's new partnership policy has also rendered meaningless the question of whether a separate institutional partnership ought to be established with Asia Pacific countries, which were previously defined by NATO as contact countries. As stated above, given the influential role of the US regarding decisions made within NATO, some predictions can be made regarding which countries would constitute the new global partners of NATO. In this context, the first countries that come to mind are the US Major Non-NATO Allies.[38] This designation has been granted to 15 countries from different parts of the globe. The list includes Argentina, Afghanistan, Australia, Bahrain, Egypt, Israel, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Morocco, New Zealand, Pakistan, the Philippines, South Korea, and Thailand. Amongst these states, just Argentina, the Philippines, and Thailand are not regarded as NATO partners, having no partnership bond with NATO.

Reminding ourselves of the fact that US strategic priorities have shifted to the Asia Pacific region, we can say that Thailand and Philippines will possibly become new global partners. Given the contribution from Asia Pacific region to ISAF operation,[39] Malaysia and Singapore can also be evaluated as likely new global partners of NATO. International public opinion was reminded of the point that the US's interests have been connected to the developments in the Asia Pacific region since the decision to withdraw troops from Afghanistan by 2014. Obama's official statement following the agreement between

---

[38] First established in 1989 as a revision to the 1961 Foreign Assistance act, the US Major non-NATO Ally is a designation to acknowledge American partners that contribute to US security, defense, and broader geopolitical goals, but are not members of NATO.

[39] ISAF, "ISAF: Key Facts and Figures",

the US and Australia signed on November 17 2011 concerning the intensification of American military presence in Australia and the improvement of military cooperation between the two countries is the most significant indicator of this change. Obama stated that his goal is to ensure that "the United States will play a larger and long-term role in shaping Asia-Pacific and its future".[40] In a November 2011 article for *Foreign Policy*, US former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton described the 21st century as America's Pacific century.[41] The fact that, after winning reelection, Obama made his first visit abroad to the region (Thailand, Myanmar, and Cambodia) in November 2012, along with his similar statements in the region cannot be interpreted as coincidence. The approach in question is exactly reflected in the new US Defense Strategic Review entitled "Sustaining United States Global Leadership: Priorities for 21st Century Defined", issued in January 2012. Focusing heavily on areas outside of Europe, this paper emphasizes the shifting American strategic focus to the Asia Pacific region. In its own words: "US economic and security interests are inextricably linked to developments in the arc extending from the Western Pacific and East Asia into the Indian Ocean region and South Asia, creating a mix of evolving challenges and opportunities. Accordingly, while the US military will continue to contribute to security globally, we will of necessity rebalance toward the Asia Pacific region."[42]

Detaching the geographical element from the basis of NATO partnerships and enabling case-by-case basis cooperation will ensure partnership accords between NATO and other countries from various regions around the world, particularly the Asia Pacific region. Other

---

[40] The White House, Remarks by President Obama to the Australian Parliament, Parliament House, Canberra, Australia, November 17, 2011, http://www.whitehouse. gov/the-press-office/2011/11/17/remarks-president-obama-australian-parliament, (Access date: 20.02.2014).

[41] Hillary Clinton, "America's Pacific Century", *Foreign Policy*, 2011, Vol: 189, pp. 56-63.

[42] US Department of Defense, *Sustaining US Global Leadership: Priorities for 21st Century Defense,* 3 Jan 2012, Washington:US Department of Defense, p.2, http://www.what thefolly.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/01/Defense_Strategic_Guidance.pdf, 20.02.2014.

than Iraq, all countries that signed partnership accords with NATO and considered as global partners either have a border with China or are Asia Pacific countries. Furthermore, our predictions of likely global partners Thailand, the Philippines, Malaysia, and Singapore have similar characteristics as well. However, more concrete statements on NATO's official website than "such relations are open to China as well" will be needed in order to prevent China from perceiving the possible partnership accords between NATO and these countries as a blocking movement against themselves.[43] Suffice it to mention that such developments may ignite a new Cold War unless their aims are explained clearly.

**A New Name for an Old Challenge: Smart Defence and its Relevance to Global Partners**

Given the developments above taken together, we can say that NATO and its relations with global partners are integral to the Obama administration's Asia Pacific policy. At this point, the question arises whether expanding the relationship between NATO and global partners and looking beyond Europe would dilute the Transatlantic bond, which historically has been the core of NATO. Before answering this question, another implication of the shifting American strategic focus to the Asia Pacific region for NATO, that of smart defence, can be made here.

The New Strategic Concept draws attention to the variety of threats against NATO's security. These threats include the proliferation of ballistic missiles and nuclear weapons, terrorism, cyber attacks, and fundamental environmental problems. It is necessary at this point to focus attention on the economic conjuncture which restricts fighting against the threats in practice contrary to this variety emphasis. Especially since 2008, the negative effects of the global financial crisis on countries' defence capacities can be more profoundly observed

---

[43] Arif Bağbaşlıoğlu, "Beyond Afghanistan NATO's Partnership with Central Asia and South Caucasus: A Tangled Partnership?", *Journal of Eurasian Studies,* 2014 Vol: 5 No:1, p. 95 http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1879366513000274, (Access date: 20.02.2014).

particularly in Europe. According to the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) report, in 2011, world military expenditures did not show any rise for the first time since 1998. In fact, military expenditures of Western European countries decreased by 1.9% compared to the previous year and this trend will continue in the coming years.[44] Defence spending by the European members of NATO fell 7% in real terms between 2006 and 2010. As NATO Secretary General Rasmussen points out, a decade ago, the US accounted for just under half of NATO members' total defence spending. Today, the American share is closer to 75% and this trend will continue to grow.[45] In this framework, the concept of smart defence can be regarded as one of the solution efforts produced in order to eliminate or mitigate negative effects of these conditions, which can reflect on the Alliance at a time when global threats increase but resources, and more importantly shared willpower to combat these, decrease.

The concept of smart defence was first presented to the international public at the Munich Security Conference in February by NATO Secretary General Rasmussen. In his speech, smart defence was described as a specific means of "ensuring greater security, for less money, by working together with more flexibility" in the age of austerity.[46] From this date, the purposes and details of the concept were described in various environments by Rasmussen and his special envoys. At the 2012 NATO Summit in Chicago, smart defence officially became a part of the Alliance's defence strategy.

The concept of smart defence is a new way to express the old idea, summarized as "to achieve maximum impact with limited resources allocated to defence". The 1999 Defence Capabilities Initiative and the

---

[44] Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), *SIPRI Yearbook 2012: Armaments, Disarmaments and International Security, Summary*. SIPRI, Solna, 2012, p. 8.
[45] Anders Fogh Rasmussen "NATO After Libya", *Foreign Affairs*, 2011, Vol. 90, No. 4.
[46] Anders Fogh Rasmussen, "Building Security in an Age of Austerity". Keynote speech at the 4 February 2011 Munich Security Conference http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/opinions_70400.htm, (Access date: 20.02.2014).

2002 Prague Capabilities Commitment can be shown as the documents, which display the same will within NATO. Similarly, the idea of providing military needs for less cost by working together is also a familiar practice for European countries. The concept of smart defence is based on the principle of "pooling and sharing" which is also a component of the EU Security and Defence Policy. But here it can be stated that smart defence is a more developed version of the principle of "pooling and sharing".[47]

Three constituents of smart defence are described in NATO's formal texts, namely multinational cooperation, prioritization and specialization.[48] Smart defence requires enhanced multinational cooperation in the development of defence capabilities, better prioritization of scarce resources more closely with NATO's capability goals, and role specialization, which could be described as an attempt for small and medium size countries to build specific strengths in capability sets. As clearly stated by Alexandra Gheciu, in essence, the smart defence approach rests on a couple of assumptions that could be more difficult to apply in practice than one might think.[49] Defence sectors are still seen as a purely national issue and governments do not want to be directed on how and where to invest their resources. Particularly, specialization is very difficult to be realized because of its high impact on states' sovereignty. Governments would have to invest in existing areas of excellence, while giving up capability in other areas, a shift which, would need to be coordinated through NATO.[50]

---

[47] Cristina Bozgeanu, ""Pooling and Sharing" and "Smart Defence" Beyond the Concept". Paper presented in the International Scientific Conference with the theme Complex and Dynamic Nature of the Security Environment, 22-23 November 2012. Bucharest: Carol I National Defence University p. 412.

[48] NATO, "Smart Defence", http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/topics_84268.htm, (Access date: 20.02.2014).

[49] Alexandra Gheciu, "In Search of Smart Defense in The Euro-Atlantic Area", *CIPS Policy Brief,* September 2012, No 20, p. 3.

[50] Bastian Giegerich, "NATO's Smart Defence: Who's Buying?", *Survival,* June-July 2012, Vol: 54, No: 3, 69-77, p. 70.

According to the European Defense Agency (EDA), 72.9% of all defense equipment procurement by EU member states in 2011 was spent on national programs that do not involve international collaboration.[51] Although there is a slight increase compared to 2010, it is obvious that national rather than EU priorities are reflected in defense equipment programs. While the principle of "pooling and sharing" cannot be implemented adequately even in a supranational organization such as the EU, which depends on the delegation of sovereign authority, the question remains how it can be implemented successfully in the age of austerity in NATO, which is not a supranational organization and lacks of an enforcement mechanism. What is it that makes smart defence worth pursuing and distinguishes smart defence from its predecessors? We can look for the answers in Rasmussens's speeches.

Analyzing Secretary General's speeches, we can say that Rasmussen treats smart defence as the solution of a problem emanating to a great extent from European countries. In our opinion, Rasmussen has felt the necessity to remind European countries that the time has come to maintain the security of their region by their own means. Smart defence is seen as an opportunity to compensate the shrinking of defence expenditures and to reduce the dependence of European countries on the US in terms of military. The NATO campaign in Libya has shown that European allies are still highly dependent on US military assets to conduct an operation, such as air-to-air refuelling, airborne intelligence surveillance and reconnaissance, and long-range drones. In the post-Cold War era, the pressure applied on the European allies to allocate more resources to cover the costs of NATO is a well-known effort just as the concept of smart defence. The main reason behind the elevation of this well-known idea to the most important element of NATO's defence policy is the fact that the US has clearly shifted their strategic priorities beyond Europe.

---

[51] European Defense Agency, "Defense Data 2011", http://www.eda.europa.eu/info-hub/news/2013/07/22/defence-data-2011, (Access date: 20.02.2014).

Global partners and smart defence discourses can be seen as the manifestations of the change in the strategic priorities of the US. However, this does not imply the dissolution of the Transatlantic bond, which constitutes the essence of NATO. Rasmussen considers "smart defence", the "Transatlantic ties" emphasis, and "enhancing NATO's connections with other global actors" to be solutions that would prevent the economic crisis from turning into a possible crisis of security.[52] It would not be appropriate to interpret the Transatlantic relations and the development of relations with global partners as being opposed to each other. The smart defence concept, one which entails European countries taking more responsibility for the defence of the old continent, can be interpreted as an effort aimed at increasing Transatlantic cooperation in the new road map revised by NATO in the direction of the evolving economic and political conjuncture.

**Conclusion**

In the post-Cold War era, by implementing preventive defence policies instead of fixed ones, NATO has intervened in crises both inside and outside the European-Atlantic region. The more active role played by NATO in international politics can be read also as a reflection of the change experienced in US foreign policy. Concepts used in US foreign policy as well as the American perception of problems and providing solutions have been adapted in a manner that would best suit the policies of the Alliance and the interests of the European allies as well. Partnership policy, which began to be shaped in the 1990s, changes in the perception of the out of area, and the discourse of global partners developed in the framework of the Afghanistan operation are among the most important examples of this observation. NATO's new partnership policy is a reflection of an intention to render more functional those NATO partnerships established based on geographical borders. With this new policy, the legal framework has been established

---

[52] Anders Fogh Rasmussen, "NATO After Libya", *Foreign Affairs,* 2011, Vol: 90, No:4, 2-11, p.6.

within NATO to enable the establishment of relations with countries located in different regions of the world to work together with NATO. In this regard, this policy is an expression of the will of a regional defense organization to become a global security organization.

There are a few important points that can be made regarding the likely implications of the new partnership policy. First, it is obvious that NATO's new partnership policy has been transformed from a supply to a demand orientation. In other words, NATO tends to see it as the responsibility of the partner to make partnership effective. The impact of the financial crisis on the defence budgets of NATO member states is one of the most important causes of this transformation. Second, we can say that, with its new partnership policy, NATO focuses more on developing its relations with global partners. In fact, this is directly related to both the change in international conjuncture and the Asia Pacific trend in US foreign policy, which occurs in compliance with this change.

Smart defence concept, on the other hand, is a policy shaped for European countries to reduce their military dependence on the US in maintaining security across their own continent and to share responsibility at a time when the US has clearly shifted their strategic priorities beyond Europe. In this context, in the coming years it will be more common to see global partners that have the will and capability to support NATO in implementing Smart Defence projects. There are complementary goals of the discourse of smart defence and global partners within NATO. NATO decision-makers aim both to share their global security responsibilities with the actors outside of NATO and to strengthen relations with the US within the Alliance and among European allies. The shifting American strategic focus to the Asia Pacific region will force NATO to focus on the regions at a strategic distance and find new global partners from this region. However, this does not suggest that transatlantic relations are completely drifting apart. Clearly, NATO no longer deals with just North Atlantic issues and missions, since the security environment is becoming more global and the US is shifting its defense commitments towards the Asia Pacific region.

At this point, departing from the facts that NATO still lacks an official policy for the Asia Pacific Region and ISAF's mission will end by the end of 2014, no matter to what extent cooperation and political discourses overlap in other areas, a question arises concerning what plain the relations between NATO and global partners which are practically limited to the Afghanistan operation will continue. It is very obvious that a clear answer to that question is connected to the answer to be given to the question "What is the main task of NATO?" However, it should be expressed that the new policy of partnership indicates the fact that the continuation of relations between NATO and the mentioned countries is really a matter being taken seriously. Agreements signed with global partners after the adoption of new partnership policy show that case-by-case basis relations will be developed with each of these countries.

When analyzing the relations with global partners, it should be taken into consideration that although these countries have some common interests in working with NATO, they differ dramatically in terms of their degree of cooperation with NATO and their level of ambition in taking the relationship further. Because of the fact that partners have different aims and interests, NATO's policy makers decided that NATO's new partnership policy must be flexible and variable. Yet, this objective also bears the risk that NATO may turn into a developed coalition of the willing led by more powerful states in the Alliance. For this reason, NATO must be much clearer about the aims of its partnerships and how they can contribute to Alliance as well as partner interests. If the new partnership policy fails to achieve its objectives or acts as a mere developed coalition of the willing, NATO's necessity can be brought into question. To remain viable and relevant, NATO must establish a consensus about what it wants to achieve with partners.

## Özet

Soğuk Savaş sonrasında NATO'yu göreli olarak işlevsel kılan İttifak'ın ortaklık politikası, söz konusu dönemde İttifak'ın dönüşümünün de önemli tezahürlerinden birisi olmuştur. Ortaklık

politikası, kolektif savunma ve kriz yönetimi ile beraber 2010 Lizbon Zirvesi'nde ilan edilen Stratejik Konsept dâhilinde İttifak'ın üç resmî görevinden biri olarak belirlenen iş birliğine dayalı güvenlik anlayışının özünü temsil etmektedir. Genel olarak NATO üyesi olmayan ülkeler ile ilişkilerin geliştirilmesini amaçlayan ortaklık politikasının önemi ve anlamı, İttifak'ın doğuya doğru Rusya Federasyonu'nu rahatsız etmeyecek ölçüde genişleme ihtimalinin azaldığı günümüz uluslararası konjonktüründe daha da artmıştır.

NATO'nun operasyonel yeteneği İttifak'ın Barış İçin Ortaklık (BİO), Akdeniz Diyaloğu (AD) ve İstanbul İş Birliği Girişi (İİG) gibi kurumsal ortaklıkları dışındaki ülkeler ile de ilişki kurması için bir çerçeve oluşturmuştur. Özellikle Afganistan Operasyonu'na verdikleri destek sonrasında başlangıçta "temas ülkeleri" olarak anılan ancak bugün "küresel ortaklar" olarak ifade edilen devletlerle bireysel bazda ilişkiler kurulmuştur. NATO'nun kurumsal ortaklık programları içerisinde yer almayan ancak İttifak liderliğinde gerçekleştirilen operasyonlara katkı sağlayan devletleri tanımlayan küresel ortaklar sınıflandırmasına ilk dâhil olan devletler Avustralya, Güney Kore, Japonya ve Yeni Zelanda'dır. Nisan 2011'de NATO'nun yeni ortaklık politikasının ilanından sonra Irak, Afganistan, Pakistan ve Moğolistan da küresel ortaklar arasında sayılmıştır. Bu çalışmanın amacı NATO'nun küresel ortaklarla geliştirdiği ilişkileri ve İttifak'ın yeni ortaklık politikasının söz konusu ilişkileri nasıl etkileyeceğini tartışmaktır.

Bu çerçevede, makalede öncelikle NATO ortaklıklarının tarihsel gelişimi ve İttifak'ın küresel ortaklar ile ilişkilerinin evrimi ele alınmıştır. Bu kısımda, küresel ortaklarla ilişkilerin kurulması açısından dönüm noktası olan Afganistan operasyonu, söz konusu ilişkilerin Amerikan inisiyatifiyle kurumsal kılınma çabaları ve bu çabalara karşı Almanya ve Fransa'nın tutumları değerlendirilmiştir. Daha sonra NATO'nun yeni ortaklık politikasının oluşturulmasında etkili olan faktörler incelenmiş ve politikanın getirdiği yenilikler ele alınmıştır. Uluslararası güvenlik tehditlerinin çeşitliliği, küresel finansal krizin NATO ülkelerinin savunma bütçelerine yönelik olumsuz etkisi, NATO ortaklıklarının etkinlik kabiliyetleri, kurumsal ortaklık programlarının içerisinde olmamalarına rağmen bazı NATO üyelerine nazaran NATO

operasyonlarına çok daha fazla katkı sağlayan küresel ortaklar ile ilişkilerin geleceği gibi faktörler NATO'nun kendi ortaklık politikasını yenilemesini gerektirmiştir. NATO'nun son stratejik konseptinin tamamlayıcı bir unsuru olan yeni ortaklık politikası NATO'nun küresel bir örgüte dönüşme iradesini yansıtmaktadır. Yeni politika coğrafi sınırlara dayalı olarak oluşturulan NATO ortaklıklarını daha fonksiyonel kılma isteğinin bir sonucu olarak da yorumlanabilir. Yeni politika ile dünyanın çeşitli bölgelerinden (pratikte Asya-Pasifik bölgesinden) NATO ile birlikte çalışmak isteyen ülkeler ile konu bazlı ilişkileri oluşturulması için NATO içerisindeki yasal çerçeve oluşturulmuştur.

Çalışmanın son bölümünde küresel tehditlerin arttığı fakat bunlarla mücadele edecek kaynakların azaldığı bir dönemde, koşulların İttifak'a yansıyabilecek olumsuz etkilerini ortadan kaldırmak ve Avrupalı devletlerin ABD'ye olan askerî anlamdaki bağımlılıklarını azaltmak için bir fırsat olarak addedilen akıllı savunma kavramı ile küresel ortaklar arasındaki bağlantı değerlendirilmiştir. Çalışmada yeni ortaklık politikası ve akıllı savunma kavramı, Amerikan dış politikasındaki Asya-Pasifik Bölgesi'ne kayan politik öncelik değişiminin NATO'ya etkileri olarak yorumlanmışlardır. Yeni ortaklık politikası, NATO ile söz konusu ülkeler arasında ilişkilerin devamının gerçekten önemsendiğinin bir işaretidir. Yeni ortaklıklar politikasının kabulünden sonra küresel ortaklarla imzalanan anlaşmalar bu ülkelerin her biriyle konu bazlı olarak ilişkilerin geliştirileceğinin bir işareti olarak kabul edilebilir. 2014 yılı sonunda ISAF'in görev süresinin sona erecek olmasından hareketle, farklı alanlarda da iş birliği ya da politik söylem uyuşması olsa bile, pratikte Afganistan operasyonu ile sınırlı olan NATO ve küresel ortaklar arasındaki ilişkilerin nasıl bir düzlemde devam edeceği temel soru olarak gündemdeki yerini almıştır. Bu hususların açıklığa kavuşturulması, NATO'nun görevleri ile ilgili bir öncelik sıralaması konusunda üye ülkeler arasında kesin bir uzlaşının sağlanması ile doğrudan bağlantılıdır.

**Bibliography**
**Books**
HOOK, Glen D., Julie Gilson, Christopher W. Hughes and Hugo Dobson, *Japan's International Relations Politics, Economics and Security.*, Third Ed. Routhledge, Wiltshire, 2012.

KAY, Sean, "Partnerships and Power in American Grand Strategy", *NATO: The Power of the Partnerships*, Eds. Hakan Edström, Janne Haaland Matlary ve Magnus Petersson, Palgrave, Hampshire, 2011.

KRAMER, Franklin D., *NATO Global Partnerships: Strategic Opportunities and Imperatives in a Globalized World,* Atlantic Council, Washington.

MOORE, Rebecca R., "Partnership Goes Global: The Role of Nonmember, Non-European Union States in the Evolution of NATO", *NATO in Search of a Vision,* eds. Gülnur Aybet and Rebecca Moore. Georgetown University Press, Washington, 2010.

OĞUZLU, Tarık, *NATO Ortaklıkları ve Türkiye: Barış İçin Ortaklık, Akdeniz Diyaloğu, İstanbul İşbirliği Girişimi,* İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, İstanbul, 2013

SCHREER, Benjamin, "The Evolution of NATO's Strategy in Afghanistan" *Pursuing Streategy: NATO Operations from the Gulf War to Gaddafi*, eds. Hakan Edström and Dennis Gyllensporre. Palgrave, Hampshire, 2012.

Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), *SIPRI Yearbook 2012: Armaments, Disarmaments and International Security, Summary*. Solna: SIPRI, 2012.

**Papers**
ASMUS, Ron, "Rethinking NATO Partnerships for the 21st Century". *NATO Review*, 2008 http://www.nato.int/docu/review/2008/03/ART4/EN/index.htm, (Access date: 20.02.2014).

BAĞBAŞLIOĞLU, Arif, "Beyond Afghanistan NATO's Partnership with Central Asia and South Caucasus: A Tangled Partnership?", *Journal of Eurasian Studies,* 2014, Vol. 5 No.1 http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1879366513000274, (Access date: 20.02.2014).

BOZGENAU, Cristina (2012). ""Pooling and Sharing" and "Smart Defence" Beyond the Concept", Paper presented in the International Scientific Conference with the theme Complex and Dynamic Nature of the Security Environment, 22-23 November 2012, Bucharest: Carol I National Defence University, 2012.

DAALDER, Ivo ve James Goldgeier, "Global NATO", *Foreign Affairs*, 2006, Vol. 85, No.5.

GHECIU, Alexandra, "In Search of Smart Defense in the Euro-Atlantic Area*", **CIPS Policy Brief,*** 2012, No 20, http://cips.uottawa. ca/wp-content/uploads/2012/08/CIPS_PolicyBrief_Gheciu_Sept 2012.pdf, (Access date: 20.02.2014).

GIEGERICH, Bastian, "NATO's Smart Defence: Who's Buying?". *Survival*, 2012, Vol. 54, No. 3.

KAMP, Karl-Heinz, "'Global Partnership' A New Conflict Within NATO?", *Analysis and Arguments*, no 29/ 2006 Konrad Adenauer Foundation.

MALMVIG, Helle, "From a Diplomatic Talking Shop to a Powerful Partnership? NATO's Mediterranean Dialogue and the Democratisation of the Middle East", *DIIS Brief*, Copenhagen: DIIS, 2004.

MARRONE, Alessandro, "The Equilibrium of the 2010 NATO Strategic Concept", *The International Spectator*, 2011, Vol. 46, No. 3.

MOORE, Rebecca R., "Lisbon and the Evolution of NATO's New Partnership Policy", *Perceptions,* 2012, Vol. 17, No. 1.

RASMUSSEN, Anders Fogh, "NATO After Libya", *Foreign Affairs,* 2011, Vol. 90, No. 4.

REISINGER, Heidi, *Rearranging Family Life and a Large Circle of Friends: Reforming NATO's Partnership Programmes*, Research Paper No:72, Rome: NATO Defense College, 2012.

SCHREER, Benjamin, *Beyond Afghanistan: NATO's Global Partnerships in the Asia-Pacific*, Research Paper No: 75. Rome: NATO Defense College, 2012.

TANNER, Fred, *Is NATO Going Global?,* GCSP Policy Brief No. 14, Geneva: Geneva Center for Security Policy, 2007.

WEBBER, Mark, "NATO: The United States, Transformation and the War in Afghanistan", *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations,* Vol. 11, No. 1.

**Dailies and Periodicals**

HEISBOURG, François, "Why NATO Needs To Be Less Ambitious", *Financial Times,* 22.11.2006, http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/3a657 376-7a01-71db-8d70-0000779e2340.html#axzz2Mn2OzlJT, (Access date: 20.02.2014).

HIROSE, Yoshikazu, "The Prospects of Japan-NATO Cooperation", *World Security Network,* 08.06.2010, http://www.worldsecurity network.com/NATO-Japan/Hirose-Yoshikazu/The-Prospects-of-Japan-NATO-Cooperation, (Access date: 20.02.2014).

**Internet**

European Defense Agency "Defense Data 2011", http://www.eda. europa.eu/info-hub/news/2013/07/22/defence-data-2011, (Access date: 20.02.2014).

ISAF, *ISAF: Key Facts and Figures,* 19 February 2013, http://www.nato.int/isaf/docu/epub/pdf/placemat.pdf, (Access date: 20.02.2014).

NATO, *NATO 2020: Assured Security; Dynamic Engagement-Analysis and Recommendations of the Group of Experts on a New Strategic Concept for NATO*, Brusselss: Public Diplomacy Division, http://www.nato.int/strategic-concept/expertsreport.pdf, (Access date: 20.02.2014).

NATO, "Political and Partnerships Committee (PPC)", http://www.nato.int/cps/en/SID-DB81B0BC-339C89C0/natolive/topic s_79430.htm, (Access date: 20.02.2014).

NATO, *Political Military Framework For Partner Involvement In NATO-Led Operations*, 15 April 2011 http://www.nato.int/ nato_static/assets/pdf/pdf_2011_04/20110415_110415-PMF.pdf, (Access date: 20.02.2014).

NATO, "NATO-Republic Korea Cooperation", http://www.nato.int/ cps/en/SID-4143343E-C27FB0F4/natolive/topics_50098.htm, (Access date: 20.02.2014).

NATO, "Partnerships: A Cooperative Approach to Security", http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/topics_84336.htm, (Access date: 20.02.2014).

NATO, "Smart Defence", http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/topics_84268.htm, (Access date: 20.02.2014).

NATO Parliamentary Assembly, "Contributions of Non-NATO Members to NATO Operations," Report by Sverre Myrli, Sub-Committee on Future Security and Defence Capabilities, Defence and Security Committee, 15 November 2008,(159 DSCFC 08 E rev.1). http://www.nato-pa.int/Default.asp?SHORTCUT=1475, (Access date: 20.02.2014).

NAC, *Comprehensive Political Guidance*, 2006 http://www.nato.int/cps/en/SID-BE7F4F92-5E137DFF/natolive/official_texts_56425.htm, (Access date: 20.02.2014).

NAC, "Bucharest Summit Declaration", http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_8443.htm?selectedLocale=en, 20.02.2014.

NAC, *Active Engagement, Modern Defence: Strategic Concept,* http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_68580.htm, (Access date: 20.02.2014).

RASMUSSEN, Anders Fogh, "Building Security in an Age of Austerity". Keynote speech at the 4 February 2011 Munich Security Conference http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/opinions_70400.htm, (Access date: 20.02.2014).

SCHRIVER, Randall and Tiffany Ma, *The Next Steps in Japan-NATO Cooperation,* The Project 2049 Institute, 2010, http://project2049.net/documents/next_steps_in_japan_nato_cooperation_schriver_ma.pdf, (Access date: 20.02.2014).

The White House, Remarks by President Obama to the Australian Parliament, Canberra, Australia, November 17, 2011, http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2011/11/17/remarks-president-obama-australian-parliament, (Access date: 20.02.2014).

TSURUOKA, Michito (2012). "NATO and Japan: View from Tokyo". *RUSI Journal,* 2012, Vol. 156, No. 6.

US DOD, "Secretary Rumsfeld Briefs at the Foreign Press Center".
http://www.defense.gov/transcripts/transcript.aspx?transcriptid=1330,
(Access date: 20.02.2014).

US DOD, *Quadrennial Defense Review*, 6 February 2006,
Washington: US Department of Defense http://www.defense.gov/qdr/
report/report20060203.pdf (Access date: 20.02.2014).

US DOD, *Sustaining US Global Leadership: Priorities for 21st
Century Defense*, 2012, US Department of Defense, Washington
http://www.whatthefolly.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/01/Defense_
Strategic_Guidance.pdf, (Access date: 20.02.2014).

US Department of Defense Missile Defense Agency, "International
Cooperation". http://www.mda.mil/system/international_cooperation.html,
(Access date: 20.02.2014).