

PRAGUE TRANSATLANTIC TALKS 2013

NATO in Afghanistan and Beyond: Search for a Mission, Quest for Capabilities

International roundtable conference organized by the Association for International Affairs (AMO) with the kind support of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Czech Republic and NATO Public Diplomacy Division.

Under the auspices of **H. E. Karel Schwarzenberg**, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Czech Republic.

Wednesday, 24 April 2013

Mirror Hall, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Czech Republic,
Loretánské náměstí 5, Prague, Czech Republic



**Asociace
pro mezinárodní
otázky**
Association
for International
Affairs



Ministry of Foreign Affairs
of the Czech Republic

Conference Synopsis

Even though the threat of a conventional attack ceased to be a major security concern for the Euro-Atlantic community with the end of the Cold War, the need for keeping and developing up-to-date, modern military capabilities remains at the top of NATO's agenda. The experience of ethnic warfare in the Balkans and, even more so, the operations which followed the 9/11 attacks, along with other, less prominent contingencies, highlighted the need for the development of a new type of military forces: deployable, capable of rapid reaction, flexible and versatile.

However, the allocation of resources necessary to accomplish this task has been a constant challenge for the Alliance's member states' governments. Military spending became largely unpopular among general public after the end of Cold War, especially in Europe, and even the shocks of the 'new wars' after 1990 or the terrorist attacks of 2001 did not reverse this trend. The current economic crisis accompanied by vast cuts in social welfare made the financial means spent for the purpose of enhancing military capabilities even more unjustifiable in the eyes of the public.

What we can therefore witness in most of the countries that comprise the Euro-Atlantic community is a certain clash between the strategic, military rationale to keep and further develop necessary capabilities on the one hand, and the reluctance of political representatives to allocate scarce funds for these purposes on the other. In a situation of economic scarcity, democratic governments feel obliged to cut defence budgets, despite potentially dire strategic consequences. The looming threat of 'sequestration' in the U.S. underlined this problem and signals, that even the most robust defence spender has run into difficulties maintaining the level military expenditures.

It thus seems clear that new ways of constructing but also publicly defending defence spending are needed, along with innovative approaches which should eliminate existing redundancies and inefficiencies. NATO's Smart Defence initiative is a welcome step in this direction but the continuing economic problems and political difficulties stemming from them suggest that NATO governments will need to get substantially 'smarter' if the Alliance is to preserve its position as a preeminent political-military force in global affairs.

The debate on defence spending has, naturally, profound effects on the scope and intensity of military operations which NATO conducts and plans. This notion is very much apparent in the case of Afghanistan, theatre of a major NATO mission. Despite the gradual shift from peacekeeping and peace building to large-scale counterinsurgency, the ISAF forces have not been able to crush the insurgency in the country. Although lack of an overwhelming success is also a product of the peculiar nature of the conflict, the lack of necessary manpower and resources play a role in this development as well.

The fourth round of Prague Transatlantic Talks will discuss these developments and attempt to formulate a set of recommendation to provide policy guidance for these transformative times.

Policy Paper: NATO and Liberal Interventionism: Don't Back Off

Policy Recommendations

- Liberal interventionism as an underlying doctrine of NATO's out-of-area military operations is a controversial concept whose implementation has hardly been perfect. Nevertheless, it is by far the safest alternative for maintaining the Alliance's global relevance and influence. NATO leaders should continue emphasizing the benefits of engaging threats, quelling conflict and promoting humanitarian concerns beyond the territory of the member states, including the need for proper budgetary back-up.
- While saving budgetary resources, NATO should by all means prioritize power-projection capabilities on which the possibility of intervening abroad materially depends. Further progress in pooling and sharing, joint procurement and other common projects in this area is essential.
- Exerting influence outside the NATO territory is by no means limited to military capabilities. Just as the Alliance served as a political instrument of countering Soviet diplomatic offensives during the Cold War, it should provide more support for the non-military aspects of its activities. Investing in human resources, intelligence gathering capabilities and military liaisons is both economic and prudent, since human capital and information is crucial for winning asymmetrical confrontations NATO is likely to face in the future. If the Alliance wishes to prevent large-scale deployments in the fashion of Afghanistan, it will need to know more, react faster and with greater precision.
- In 'light footprint' operations, NATO will need to rely more on regional and local partners. It needs to develop and operationalize its existing institutional ties, such as the ICI or the Mediterranean Dialogue, and establish new ones if necessary. Sub-Saharan Africa may be one of the targets of such an effort.
- When dealing with local partners, NATO must respect the limits of such cooperation, including the respect for and acknowledgment of inevitable divergence of interests. Counterterrorist, counterinsurgency and security sector reform missions need to work with a built-in training component which emphasizes the underlying values on which such operations rest in the first place.
- Arguably, the most serious failure in Afghanistan has been a mismanaged and underestimated mission creep. 'Lite' interventions are not exempt from this danger, so NATO representatives and member states should devote serious attention to spelling out the limits of their engagement and the reasons for abandoning a mission.

Policy Paper

Authored by Lenka Filípková, Jan Kužvart, Tomáš Karásek and Jakub Záhora

NATO as an Instrument of Liberal Interventionism

In the sphere of international politics, the doctrine of liberal interventionism, as practiced by the Euro-Atlantic community, is a peculiar hybrid, being both underpinned by certain (largely Western) values on one hand, and guided, as often pointed by its virulent critics, by material interests on the other. As for the former, calls for intervention in foreign countries are rooted in a conviction that state sovereignty, and state interests in general, should not overshadow pressing humanitarian issues like mass murder or large-scale human suffering. Some acts are said to be simply too appalling to be ignored, and in such cases even the sacrosanct principles of international order can be legitimately breached. The international community as a whole has largely accepted this logic, albeit in a muted fashion, through the concept of Responsibility to Protect (R2P).

Despite the concerns over the inviolability of state sovereignty by external intervention, it is actually the ‚liberal‘ denominator which is the most controversial in the whole concept – i.e., the conviction that liberal democracy, despite its deficiencies, is the best way to bring about lasting peace, stability and prosperity. First of all, it inevitably puts its proponents in conflict with other actors who do not share the zeal for, or even interest in, the promotion of the Western ideals of democracy, rule of law, protection of human rights and free trade. Secondly, the concept is problematic for the West itself because it has not yet figured out an efficient and sustainable way of transferring its preferred form of political order to its ‚end-users‘.

At the same time, it is hard to ignore the non-normative stakes inherently present in Western countries’ incursions into other states’ domestic affairs, since interventions, although underpinned by liberal values, remain military acts and tools of foreign policy guided by national interest. There is a plethora of motives which have bearing on Western policy-makers’ decisions to launch specific operations, ranging from promoting ‚crude‘ power interests (by removing hostile, overtly active regimes) to furthering economic goals. Indeed, stabilization, one of the alleged products of the introduction of democratic system in foreign countries mentioned above, often effectively works in favour of the intervening state(s) in the economic sphere as well: It helps ensure steady supply of natural resources and provides calm along trade routes. Nevertheless, it should be pointed out that material and/or power interests guiding incursions in third countries are not necessarily in contradiction with the value-oriented, normative aspects of the liberal interventionism doctrine, and that these elements can often easily coexist.

Policy Paper

All that being said, it can be argued that NATO with its superb set of military capabilities has for the past twenty years acted as a prominent entity which the Western community utilized to carry out liberal interventions. After the threat of a massive Eastern Bloc attack evaporated with the dissolution of the USSR, NATO quickly adapted to the new international environment, which was firstly manifested by series of Alliance operations in Bosnia and Herzegovina in the early 1990s during the bloody civil war. These piecemeal and cautious inroads into a new territory gradually developed into a more or less coherent doctrine of out-of-area operations which, in practical terms, became the dominant part of NATO activities. This change of goals and overall purpose was sealed by the Alliance's operations in Kosovo, Afghanistan and, lately, Libya.

Imperfect Concept, Sloppy Implementation – But Still the Best We Have

Despite numerous deficiencies, some of them scrutinized further down this paper, the Euro-Atlantic community and NATO in particular were right to embrace the concept of liberal intervention as one of its foreign policy tools. It is tempting to be critical towards the idea of the 'export of democracy' by military means, but at the same time it must be asked if there was any other way how to alleviate humanitarian distress, resolve civil strifes and enact peace in the crises in which NATO has intervened since the beginning of 1990s. After careful examination, it seems an intervention from the outside was the most benign solution. While operations in third countries do not achieve all stipulated aims, they are still successful to a degree which provides them with a high level of legitimacy.

Although the situation in countries which experienced Western intervention often remains volatile (a glimpse at Bosnia almost two decades after the end of the civil war is illustrative in this regard), these operations have undoubtedly helped stop the suffering, ease the transition towards a post-conflict political order and – which is by no means unimportant - increased the influence of the Euro-Atlantic community in the given areas. Physical presence, along with ideological foundations underpinning newly introduced institutions, work effectively to make local population and leaders more susceptible to Western values and goals.

Operations with a normative agenda conducted by NATO also serve to disseminate Western values globally. Even though various interventions have been fiercely criticized on different grounds, including their denouncement as an insensitive imposition of Western way of life on others, it was the actual practice of the doctrine that led to a certain convergence in opinions on the limits of state prerogatives and significance of humanitarian issues. The R2P has been at least rhetorically embraced by practically all countries in the world which means that, at least theoretically, state sovereignty does no longer shield country leaders from being widely criticized for domestic human rights abuses.

Policy Paper

The ongoing conflict in Syria is a case in point: Even though Russia and China, 'traditional' opponents of meddling into states' domestic affairs, are far from suggesting an international intervention, they do not shy away from being critical towards Assad's policies. The normative underpinnings of the Euro-Atlantic community's post-Cold War operations, while – and through - being object of heated discussions all over the world, have thus obtained considerable level of international salience and recognition.

Last but emphatically not least, interventions carried out during last twenty years by NATO, regardless of their normative overtones, have proved to be critical in the removal, mitigation, or at least containment of various security threats. Countering these at the area of their origin is arguably more effective, and from Western countries' and their citizens' point of view also preferable, to fighting them at home. Interventions in often distant areas are thus indispensable for tackling various challenges which might possibly endanger the Euro-Atlantic community should they spiral out of control.

While defending the use of liberal interventionism by the Euro-Atlantic community, it is clear that the continuation of liberal interventionism, as conducted by NATO so far, faces numerous obstacles. Most notably, recent mixture of financial crises, economic recessions and budgetary austerity has vividly exposed the scarcity of resources allocated to the defence sector in NATO countries, a factor which had already been visible before 2008 and which has a profound negative impact on options of respective Western governments to conduct complex operations in third countries. Secondly, a fatigue visibly sets in among the citizens and political elites of Western countries after two decades of practically continuous deployment in the Balkans, Afghanistan and elsewhere, whose inconclusive results undermine the will to carry on with overseas operations. Finally, continuing shifts in the power structure of global political and economic order raise the question whether the relatively permissive international environment for Western interventions – which, in its extreme, provoked only rhetorical and widely ineffective reactions to an intervention so controversial as the one in Iraq – can endure.

These and other problems inherent in overseas deployments have been sharply highlighted by recent experiences from NATO's missions in Libya and Afghanistan. The following parts of the paper therefore offer closer look at these missions and their implications for future NATO operations and liberal interventionism in general.

Beware the Heavy Footprint: Lessons from Afghanistan

NATO's gradual withdrawal from Afghanistan after 11 years of deployment triggers many questions regarding not only the ISAF mission's success (or lack of it) and the country's troublesome future but also broader implications for future NATO operations, especially under the long shadow cast by continuing budgetary austerity.

Policy Paper

A brief glance at the results of NATO's engagement in Afghanistan is not reassuring: The human toll on both sides of the conflict, the intricate transition of power to Afghan security forces and their highly uncertain ability to ensure stability of and control over the country do not point to a 'mission success' assessment. The peace-building and nation-building efforts, the main component of the mission, which should have improved the life of the ordinary Afghans, hardly look more positive. Neither does the poor record of civil rights protection, high levels of corruption and prevalent violence which prevent the people from living at least a relatively normal life and the country from functioning and prospering. A cynical observer might utter that the only success of the long-term NATO effort has been to solidify Afghanistan's position as a 'global superpower' in the production of opium. On top of that, the country's development after NATO forces leave, the looming possibility of a civil war, possible disintegration and/or its fall back to the hands of Taliban loom large on the evaluation sheets, questioning even the only clear, tangible and undisputed positive outcome of the Western intervention.

The realization of such gloomy scenarios would undoubtedly prove devastating to NATO's prestige and relevance, not to mention their grisly effects on the country and its population. Recent Foreign Policy poll on 'What Went Wrong in Afghanistan' offers a multitude of reasons and culprits for NATO's (and, more generally, international community's) travails in the country. On the other hand, more focused accounts of the development on the ground continue to stress numerous improvements and often rapid progress which Afghanistan achieved during the decade of NATO's presence. The list could start with the removal of one of the most retrograde regimes which the world had encountered since the end of Cold War, as well as the uprooting of Al-Qaeda presence in the country. It might continue with pointing to the material improvement in the lives of countless Afghan citizens, as well as their opportunity to participate for the first time in decades in the political process which, though corrupted and crude, still seems better than the fighting which wracked the country's prospects in mid-1990s. Finally, it needs to be emphasized that the security of the country, while still haphazard from the point of view of 'standard' statehood, has improved to levels which might, with financial backing by the international community, be sufficient to prevent the aforementioned worst-case scenarios. Moreover, it must be noted that the ISAF mission itself or its misconducts cannot be blamed for the current state of affairs in Afghanistan alone, as it was launched in a country which easily topped various failed state indices and had more than twenty years of fighting behind it.

Nevertheless, there are critical conclusions and lessons to be drawn from the ISAF mission, from which the NATO can benefit in the long term. These lessons have more to do with the particular character of the mission and structural processes within the organization than with the mission's setting. Put simply, the ISAF mission effectively demonstrates potential shortcomings and hubris of liberal interventionism – not disqualifying the concept itself but setting clear limits to its applicability and usefulness. On a general level, these conclusions can be summed up as the lessons learned concerning

Policy Paper

'heavy footprint' operations with extensive presence of foreign troops, conducting intensive operations near the higher end of the spectrum of non-conventional warfare.

The character of the Afghan mission was unique in many respects and the most crucial shortcomings of the mission stem from its distinct nature. First of all, in the beginning the mission was set as a retaliatory action of the USA for the 9/11 attacks. Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty was invoked and, almost without pondering what the mission would entail and for how long the troops would be deployed, NATO members prepared for their engagement. Rather than being the main driving force, the normative motive, i.e. the dismantling of the Taliban regime for the sake of the Afghan people, was only used for the mission's justification. Only later came the realization that peace-building and reconstruction efforts need to be systematically implemented to prevent the Taliban and other insurgents from taking over again. Eventually, the changing goals of the mission have gradually transformed it into a complex large-scale operation to include, besides the immense counterinsurgency force, also the civilian, nation-building component. Happy-go-lucky mission creep can thus be easily singled out as the most important culprit of the Alliance's shortcomings.

Secondly, the mission has taken place in a completely new environment for most NATO members that brought with it many cultural as well as operational challenges due to the mission's scale. Furthermore, the number of troops deployed by various countries – some with relatively limited capacities – represented a great challenge of cooperation and coordination on the ground. As a result, over the years the ISAF mission has become loaded with bureaucracy. The example of Provincial Reconstruction Teams (PRTs) demonstrates that in certain areas a functioning coordination among partners has never been fully achieved. Every state has perceived the concept differently and the countrywide systematic coordination among teams has not existed. Last but not least, the longer the operation draws on, the more its legitimacy and overall sustainability decreases. Political and financial pressures led to hasty decisions that generated more political problems and additional costs.

The Afghan mission has first and foremost revealed the limitations of NATO to carry out large-scale, complex missions. Certain degree of failure was clearly inevitable for NATO to realize where it stands and what its limitations are. The main goals of the mission should have been clearly stated from the beginning to allow comprehensive preparation and planning.

Based on this experience, it is not hard to imagine that unrealistic political motives will be curbed in launching future operations. That NATO has been learning from its Afghan lessons can be deduced from the shape of its Libyan mission. While not repeating the old mistakes, any organization is, however, susceptible to making new ones – especially those stemming from correcting the course too far.

Policy Paper

The Perils of ‘Intervention Lite’: From Libya to Mali

NATO’s operation Unified Protector in Libya was substantially different from the Alliance’s endeavour in Afghanistan – not the least because it was the first out-of-area deployment conceived in the new age of austerity. It is worth noting, however, that while NATO fully accomplished its basic goal of protecting Libyan civilians, and ventured decidedly beyond it by overthrowing the Qaddafi regime, Libyan turmoil did not stop with the end of NATO engagement and subsequently spilled over to Mali in a crisis that provoked yet another Western intervention in the region. Whereas the ultimate outcome of the war in Libya was decisively – if somewhat unwillingly – altered by the NATO intervention, the Alliance has left its consequent Malian ‘spill-over conflict’ to its fate.

Both the war in Libya and the intervention in Mali, despite NATO ostentatious absence, illuminate the contours of ‘light footprint’ operations of the future. It is thus not only relevant to consider both conflicts as intimately connected but also talk about Mali even if NATO has not been directly involved there.

The lack of political will to commit NATO (or EU) troops in a combat role demonstrates the limits of hands-off, lite operations – which is especially true given the Sahel’s role as the weak underbelly of Maghreb where the influence of Jihadist extremists and existence of terrorist safe-havens has much more direct consequences for European security than the situation in Afghanistan. There are, of course, perfectly understandable reasons why NATO conducted the Libyan mission in a limited manner (and the EU, while formally announcing a peacekeeping force, never launched an operation there), and why it abstained from engaging directly in Mali where the European Union deployed a training mission with a limited mandate, leaving the actual fighting to French units. While not denying the underlying rationale, it is nevertheless necessary to critically assess the implications of this newly found reluctance to intervene in a more robust manner.

First of all, the impact of budgetary austerity in Europe, but also the United States, coincides with the exact moment when the Islamist threat and state failure in the Sahel region (e.g. Nigeria, Mali, CAR, Niger and Burkina Faso) is actually growing and spreading to neighbouring countries. Bloody hostage crisis in Amenas, Algeria gas plant, was an alarming proof of these developments. This, combined with the destabilizing effects of the Arab Spring in the region, creates a situation where asymmetric limited conflicts like the one in Mali are much more probable than the opportunity to challenge conventional opponents in a Libya-style fashion.

If we accept that continued foreign presence in cases of vital interest is better than the alternative ‘hit-and-run’ approach, we should nevertheless admit that in the Sahel this idea faces several challenges. In the first place, Mali proves that it is impossible to control the whole vast territory of a state. Attacks in Libya against Western targets after the end of

Policy Paper

NATO mission also indicate that foreign presence can be politically and culturally unacceptable for local population even if the West literally saved its lives. It was, after all, in Libyan Benghazi, a city saved by NATO intervention from the looming horrors of Qaddafi's wrath, which later saw an attack against the U.S. consulate and still serves as a base for local Islamist factions who challenge the authority of the provisional government and are hostile to the West.

Does swift handover of the mission to the locals solve the problem? Mali suggests that 'staying through partners' may sometimes be the only viable option. Rather than conforming to the hit-and-run view, such an approach works alongside a more considerate hit-lock-leave process, which may be 'lite' in the use of military personnel but certainly requires 'heavy' diplomatic engagement, hard work of military liaison officers and active use of intelligence services, all underpinned by extensive regional expertise and human capital. That said, NATO is well placed to go this direction, thanks to its web of institutionalized regional partnerships, such as the Istanbul Cooperation Initiative (ICI) and the Mediterranean Dialogue (MD), as well as working relations with the UN, EU or the African Union. Establishing the position of a NATO Special Representative for the Sahel might be a possible next step in this direction.

Mali also proves that 'intervention lite' is no less susceptible to the change of scope and length of the mission. Strategic foresight is by definition limited, and by starting a limited intervention NATO (or the EU) may inadvertently trigger a chain of events which will result in calls for more robust engagement – a situation known to decision-makers from Vietnam to Afghanistan. The only prevention to the ever-present threat of mission creep is thus not a more diligent planning at the military level but clearly set boundaries of the interests involved – something that collective bodies like the Alliance or the Union may find even more difficult to achieve than traditional state actors but still need to strive for.

Finally, relying more on local actors and forces generates dangers of its own. These are, on the one hand, technical: the need to build the army and the police from scratch highlights the difficulties of the process, from Afghanistan to Mali. It took the European powers and the USA centuries to build a well functioning military machine, and it is utterly misplaced to expect that the process can be sped up into years or even months without leaving out some crucial elements. Which points to the second aspect of this issue, that of the value-based foundations of liberal interventionism: While the Western forces are not immune from abusing the noble principles in whose name they fight, the expectation that these ideals will be respected by local leaders and their soldiers and policemen may be seriously flawed. Planners of the operations should always take into account the law of unforeseen consequences, including the risks that carelessly transferred know-how and weaponry can easily end up being used against our wishes and, more importantly, interests.

Policy Paper

Conclusion: The Way Ahead

After the exhaustion from Afghanistan and the imposition of budgetary austerity, NATO cannot simply go back to the practices established in 1990s and after 9/11. It is reasonable to expect that manpower-heavy, intense, protracted operations like ISAF will be avoided at almost any cost. At the same time, limited interventions, such as the one in Libya, when a conventional foe was targeted by superior air power, should not be treated as a panacea. If NATO wants to remain capable of conducting non-Article 5 military operations, it needs to learn the right lessons which will frame a more modest yet sufficiently robust doctrine of value-based interventions.

First of all, NATO needs to maintain a credible power projection capacity. This will inevitably require more intense pooling and sharing of key capabilities, such as those providing strategic sea and air lift. Besides these, NATO members (especially the European ones) should clearly invest in the development of remote surveillance and strike capabilities (including drones and special forces), in order to cover wider territory and sustain operations in remote areas. Heavy fighting in the vast deserted mountainous terrain of the northern Mali is a timely reminder that more limited missions may not be less demanding in this regard.

In the light of recent developments in the Sahel, it is safe to claim that counterinsurgency will remain as relevant in the future as it turned out to be in Afghanistan. Since NATO is no longer ready to commit vast intervention armies of its own, counterinsurgency operations will by necessity rely on the cooperation with local and regional partners (e.g. ECOWAS in the context of western Africa) or civilian experts. The trend towards mixed military-civilian teams, as started and formalized through PRTs and other arrangements in Afghanistan, will continue. While from the military-technological perspective it may make sense to talk about network-centric warfare, it is reasonable to expect that NATO's future operations will be equally importantly human-centric. This will require systematic investment in human resources within the Alliance, and in building up human capital in potential theatres of future operations. NATO needs to realize that a well connected special forces officer or intelligence operative with long-nurtured local contacts can be as valuable and productive as an aircraft carriers. Put simply, if NATO (and the Euro-Atlantic community in general) wants to remain relevant and prevent security threats outside its territory while reducing defence budgets, it needs to enhance its spending on diplomacy, military liaisons and further sources of regional expertise. Heavy on information, light on actual deployments – such could be the translation of NATO's 'smart defence' concept for the purpose of out-of-area operations.

Policy Paper

Working with regional and other partners will inevitably remain part of the pattern. NATO already has an experience with de facto coalitions of the willing conducting operations under its banner (e.g. in Libya) but it should consider formalizing this practice and the 'lead nation' concept, while actively preventing the possibility its missions will only serve as a cover for particularistic national interests of its members. The second way is to join forces with international and regional partners like the EU or AU which are both currently present in Mali in the form of missions EUTM Mali and MISMA. NATO has officially emphasized global partnerships as the third pillar of its activities, and it needs to continue building practical capabilities on the existing institutional links, and create new ones if necessary.

While 'outsourcing' the out-of-area operations such as the fight against terrorism or security sector reform to regional partners and local actors, NATO should not focus solely on the issue of combat effectiveness but also stress the message of democratic control of armed forces and respect to human rights. Mali provides a chilling reminder how the lack of such a component can backfire: It was the Malian national forces trained by U.S. experts who ignored democratic norms, overthrew the legitimate government and ultimately led the country to a state of near collapse. Furthermore, it was probably the Malian army which has committed abuses during regaining the country's north and thus hampered efforts for national reconciliation. Widespread corruption and claims of abuses of power by armed and police forces in Afghanistan provide another proof. It would be quixotic to expect that the security apparatus in post-conflict societies or failed states will conform to the same code of conduct as the one emphasized in Europe and North America, but while respecting the need for flexibility on the ground, NATO should never lose from its sight the normative underpinning of its actions. Paradoxically, 'lite' operations could more easily lead to heavy human rights abuses by local partners – something which NATO needs to prevent by all means available.

Last but not least, NATO and its member countries need to remain active at home, conducting efficient PR strategies to convince the sceptical electorates that military operations far beyond the borders of their countries are essential for maintaining their security and the influence of the Euro-Atlantic community. While the number of conflicts and their casualties continue to drop, the world is far from being a safe place. NATO's absence from it would either lead to more conflict situations getting out of hand and security threats mushrooming, or to rising influence of other global powers – hardly a scenario we should accept lightly.

Panels

Panel I: The Endgame in Afghanistan and the Future of NATO Operations

The panel will focus on the Euro-Atlantic community's operations conducted in third countries, using primarily Afghanistan as a case study. It seems clear enough that an appetite for intense counterinsurgency campaigns has withered among NATO members under more than ten years lasting Afghanistan experience, which leaves open the question of the alternatives in similar future scenarios. The 'lite' footprint in Libya may suggest an answer. The relative success of the operation Unified Protector does not, however, lift the weight off the questions concerning the desirable 'endgame' in Afghanistan: Can the upcoming NATO withdrawal still be framed as an overall strategic success? How should the Alliance ensure that its effort to stabilize the country and jump-start its development is not reverted by the anti-government forces in the country? Indeed, is there a way through which NATO can still turn the democratization and stabilization of Afghanistan into a positive legacy? The conference participants will thus discuss possible scenarios and endgames in the country, as well as broader implications of the outcome of the ISAF mission for future NATO operations.

Panel II: Developing NATO Capabilities under Public Disapproval and Economic Austerity

It is clear that the issues concerning NATO overseas deployments must be seen in a context of the current financial and economic crisis which resulted in imposition of severe constraints on public spending. The second panel will therefore investigate impact of austerity measures on defence sector in NATO countries. The main issue to be discussed is a tension between the need for public savings and the need for maintaining certain level of defence expenditure, which would enable if not development, then at least preserving the current level of defence capabilities. Obvious questions are then how (and if at all) can be this tension possibly overcome, and which arguments can be brought forward to avoid further decline of military readiness. It can be further asked if the defence establishment can enter more forcefully into the debate on budget cuts, and if this would be truly helpful in the matter of persuading public about need to maintain military capacities. Nevertheless, since all these efforts aiming to change public opinion can be only partially successful at best, a truly pressing task is to come up with ways how to retain reasonable capabilities despite shrinking resources. The panel is therefore going to deal not only with the cuts in the defence budget and accompanying heated discussions, but also with strategies which could mitigate impact of austerity measures.

Programme

9:00 – 9:30 REGISTRATION and COFFEE

9:30 – 9:45 WELCOME REMARKS

Pavel Fischer, Political Director, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Czech Republic
Tomáš Karásek, Director of the Research Center, Association for International Affairs

9:45 – 10:15 PRESENTATION OF POLICY PAPER

**10:15 – 11:45 PANEL I – The Endgame in Afghanistan and the
Future of NATO Operations**

Mark Clegg, Teaching Fellow, Post-war Reconstruction and Development Unit, University of York

Luba von Hauff, Associate Fellow, German Council on Foreign Relations

Barbara Zanchetta, Researcher, Finnish Institute of International Affairs

Chaired by **David B. Edwards**, Professor, Williams College; Visiting Professor, Charles University in Prague

11:45 – 12:45 BUFFET LUNCH

12:45 – 13:15 KEYNOTE SPEECH

Hüseyin Diriöz, Assistant Secretary General for Defence Policy and Planning, NATO

**13:15 – 14:45 PANEL II – Developing NATO Capabilities under
Public Disapproval and Economic Austerity**

Josef Braml, Resident Fellow, German Council on Foreign Relations

Tomas Jermalavicius, Researcher Fellow, International Centre for Defence Studies

Sylvie Matelly, Senior Research Fellow, Institut de Relations Internationales et Strategiques

Stephan de Spiegeleire, Senior Scientist, The Hague Centre for Strategic Studies

Chaired by **František Šulc**, Ministry of Defence of the Czech Republic

14:45 – 15:00 CONCLUDING REMARKS

Matyáš Zrno, Journalist, Lidové noviny (Czech daily)

Speakers

Josef Braml

Josef Braml is Resident Fellow of the Transatlantic Relations Program at the German Council on Foreign Relations (DGAP) and is Editor-in-Chief of the DGAP Yearbook. He was previously Research Fellow at the German Institute for International and Security Affairs in Berlin, Visiting Scholar at the German-American Center, consultant at the World Bank, and Guest Scholar at the Brookings Institution, among others. He earned a Ph.D. in political science, sociology, and French cultural studies from the University of Passau. His areas of expertise cover transatlantic relations, American security policies, and U.S. views on world order.

Mark Clegg

Mark Clegg is Teaching Fellow at the Post-war Reconstruction and Development Unit (PRDU) at the University of York, United Kingdom. Before joining the PRDU, he worked for the UK Cabinet Office as the national course director for the European Union Civil Protection Mechanism education programme. Prior to this appointment, he served for over 22 years as a senior military officer in the UK Ministry of Defence gaining practical and policy experience in international intervention issues, including operational deployments to the Balkans and wider-Middle East region. His current research interests include civil-military relations in humanitarian emergencies, reconstruction and development as part of national security strategies, and contemporary geopolitical challenges to international organizations aiming to enhance responses to complex emergencies.

Hüseyin Diriöz

Ambassador Hüseyin Diriöz joined the NATO International Staff as Assistant Secretary General for Defence Policy and Planning in 2010, and he is currently a member of the Secretary General's senior management team. The Division, which he directs and manages, has the lead on defence related issues such as defence transformation, defence capabilities, defence planning, and logistics. Ambassador Diriöz is a career diplomat who served Turkey for 30 years before he took his current position, his previous assignments reaching from Minister-Counsellor in the Turkish Embassy, Washington D.C., to Turkey's Ambassador to Jordan. He is a graduate of Ankara University, where he studied Political Sciences, and the University of Virginia, where he gained his M.A.

Speakers

David B. Edwards

David Edwards is anthropologist and Professor of Social Sciences at Williams College, Massachusetts, and graduate of Princeton University and the University of Michigan. His major interests relate to humanitarianism, post-conflict societies in Near East and South Asia with a special focus on Afghanistan, on which he has published number of articles and books. He is Visiting Professor at Charles University in Prague for the 2012/2013 academic year.

Pavel Fischer

Pavel Fischer currently holds a position of the Political Director at Czech Ministry of Foreign Affairs. He graduated from Charles University in Prague and has also studied at Centre International de Formation Chrétienne in Geneva and École Nationale d'Administration in Paris. He previously worked at Archdiocese of Prague, the Office of the President of the Czech Republic and served as Ambassador of the Czech Republic to France and Monaco.

Luba von Hauff

Luba von Hauff has been Associate Fellow at the German Council on Foreign Relations (DGAP) since 2010. Prior to that, she worked as Research Fellow at the DGAP's Berthold Beitz Center. She holds M.A. from King's College London. Her research interests focus on the engagement of international actors in Central Asia as well as on economic, political, and social developments in the region. She is currently completing her Ph.D. on the impact that the EU and China have on Central Asian governance structures at the Free University, Berlin.

Tomas Jermalavicius

Tomas Jermalavicius is Research Fellow at International Centre for Defence Studies, Tallinn. Before joining ICDS, he worked at the Baltic Defence College, first as the Deputy Director of the College's Institute of Defence Studies, and later as the Dean. He lectured and published articles on strategy, military theory, defence policy, and civil-military relations. He also worked at the Defence Policy and Planning Department of the Lithuanian Ministry of National Defence. He focuses on the issues pertaining to the utility and uses of military power, strategic foresight, and defence research and technology (R&T).

Speakers

Tomáš Karásek

Tomáš Karásek is Director of the Research Center of the Association for International Affairs. He earned his M.A. and Ph.D. at the Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University in Prague. Since 2004 he has been a lecturer at the Faculty's Department of International Relations, teaching courses on the resolution of international conflicts, security and integration in Europe, international security, and global terrorism. From September 2009 to June 2010 he was Fulbright Scholar at the Saltzman Institute of War and Peace Studies, Columbia University in New York.

Sylvie Matelly

Sylvie Matelly is Senior Research Fellow at Institut de Relations Internationales et Strategiques since 2001. She also works at the Business School Léonard de Vinci (Paris La Défense) where she is Professor and Director of the department of economics, sustainable development, and international relations. After receiving M.A. at the School of Economic Sciences in Montpellier, she successfully pursued another degree in International Economy (post-graduate diploma) at the University of Pierre Mendès France in Grenoble. Her specialization focuses on issues of defense, particularly those regarding the economic variables of military expenditures, and arms industries, and restructuration.

Stephan de Spiegeleire

Stephan de Spiegeleire is senior scientist at The Hague Centre for Strategic Studies. He has M.A. from the Graduate Institute in Geneva and Columbia University in New York, as well as a C.Phil. degree from UCLA. He worked for the RAND Corporation for nearly ten years, interrupted by stints at the German Institute for International and Security Affairs and the WEU's Institute for Security Studies. He started out as a Soviet specialist, but has since branched out into several fields of international security and defense policy. His current work focuses on strategic defense management, security resilience, network-centrism, capabilities-based planning, and the transformation of defense planning. He is particularly active in HCSS's security foresight efforts to inform national and European security policy planning in the broader sense. He also teaches at Webster University in Leiden.

Speakers

František Šulc

František Šulc works as an advisor to the Minister of Defence of the Czech Republic and was responsible for coordination of preparation of the White Paper on Defence, a major official document outlining future development and aims of the Czech Armed Forces, published in 2011. Prior to joining the Czech Ministry of Defence, he worked as journalist, covering mostly security-related issues. He graduated from Charles University in Prague.

Barbara Zanchetta

Barbara Zanchetta is currently a researcher at the Finnish Institute of International Affairs, Helsinki, where she deals with U.S. foreign policy, transatlantic relations, and "out of area" security issues like Iran, Afghanistan, and Pakistan. In the past, she was Visiting Research Fellow at Geneva Centre for Security Policy and at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, Washington D.C., and also worked as Postdoctoral Research Fellow at the University of Tampere and Academy of Finland. She obtained Ph.D. from the University of Florence.

Matyáš Zrno

Matyáš Zrno is a renowned Czech journalist and expert on former Yugoslavia and other conflict regions. He had worked for various newspapers and magazines since 1997, most notably as head of Foreign Desk in Respekt weekly. In 2009, he started his career in the government service as an advisor to Deputy Minister for Labor and Social Affairs responsible for EU affairs. In 2010–2011, he worked as head of Civilian Part of Czech Provincial Reconstruction Team in Afghan province of Logar and afterwards was appointed the Deputy Director General of Human Rights Section in the Office of the Government, as well as an advisor to the Prime Minister. He recently became head of Saturday supplement of Lidové noviny, respected Czech newspaper.

Association for International Affairs

Association for International Affairs (AMO) is a preeminent independent think-tank in the Czech Republic in the field of international affairs and foreign policy. Since 1997, the mission of AMO has been to contribute to a deeper understanding of international affairs through a broad range of educational and research activities. Today, AMO represents a unique and transparent platform in which academics, business people, policy makers, diplomats, the media and NGO's can interact in an open and impartial environment.

In order to achieve its goals AMO strives to:

- formulate and publish briefings, research and policy papers;
- arrange international conferences, expert seminars, roundtables, public debates;
- organize educational projects;
- present critical assessment and comments on current events for local and international press;
- create vital conditions for growth of a new expert generation;
- support interest in international relations in the wider public domain;
- cooperate with like-minded local and international institutions.

Research Center

Founded in October 2003, AMO's Research Center has been dedicated to carrying out research and raising public awareness of international affairs, security and foreign policy. The Research Center strives to identify and analyze issues important to Czech foreign policy and the country's position in the world. To this end, the Research Center produces independent analyses; encourages expert and public debate on international affairs; and suggests solutions to tackle problems in today's world. The Center's activities can be divided into two main areas: Firstly, the Center undertakes [research and analysis](#) of foreign policy issues and comments on [AMO blog](#). Secondly, the Center fosters dialogues with policy-makers, experts and the broad public.

Contact

www.amo.cz

info@amo.cz

www.facebook.com/AMO.cz

www.twitter.com/AMO_cz

Organizer



**Asociace
pro mezinárodní
otázky**
Association
for International
Affairs

Partners



Ministry of Foreign Affairs
of the Czech Republic



Prague Transatlantic Talks 2013

Conference Coordinator: Jakub Záhora

Authors of Policy Paper: Lenka Filípková, Jan Kužvart, Tomáš Karásek, Jakub Záhora

Conference Team: Zuzana Brezinová, Daria Sandul, Vladka Votavová, Iveta Zetochová,
Dominik Židek

Association for International Affairs (AMO)

Žitná 27/608

CZ 110 00 Praha 1

Tel +420 224 813 460

info@amo.cz

www.amo.cz

© AMO 2013