**NATO in an Era of Strategic Competition**

**AY 2024 Syllabus**

**Instructors:**

**Dr. Todd Robinson**

Office Phone: 953-5410

Cell Phone: (217) 840-7541

Office: Rm 220

Email: todd.robinson.4@au.af.edu

**Wing Commander Robin Kemp**

Office Phone: 953-9547

Cell Phone: (344) 649-3969

Office: Rm 245A

Email: robin.kemp.uk@au.af.edu

**Description:** The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) was founded in 1949 in response to a unique set of challenges facing the United States and Europe. The creation of NATO can be viewed as the introduction of an international security organization whose primary role was enabling its member states to organize their military forces for the purpose of collective defense against the common threat of Soviet-backed aggression. That said, and from its very inception, NATO was created to overcome the division of Europe, meant to promote regional stability and democratic culture, and to promote a western-based international liberal order. In the post-Cold War era, a changing threat environment accelerated the process of reform and the Alliance became increasingly involved in the practice of collective security. The process of post-Cold War enlargement along with other reforms, such as the pursuit of out-of-area operations, introduced numerous tensions among member states, exposing significant divisions and leading some critics to question the continued utility of the Alliance. This course explores the emergence of European identity and how/if it impacts NATO’s role in European security. It also examines the re-emergence of the Russian threat and the impact of its decision to invade Ukraine. In short, the end of the Cold War served as the catalyst for a new period of institutional change and instability both within and external to NATO, and illuminates why the allies have struggled to adapt to an increasingly complex security environment. The course helps students evaluate NATO’s ongoing contributions to international security as they analyze the changing strategic environment, most recently characterized as one of “strategic competition,” especially in light of recent Russian aggression and out of area crises like the ongoing war in Syria.

**Thesis and scope:** This elective will help students develop an appreciation for the evolution of NATO and the ongoing role of the Alliance in the international environment, a context critical in evaluating the use of airpower.

**Format:** Lecture, guided discussion, and independent student research.

**Evaluation Instruments:**

1. Class participation (20% of grade).
2. NATO Member Background Paper (20% of grade) - Each will prepare a 3-4 page background paper on a NATO member-country that will assess its current standing within the alliance. Due by COB Sept. 28, 2023.
3. NATO Member Briefing Book (40% of grade) - Each student will prepare a 7-8 page briefing book that will serve as the basis for their participation in the course’s culminating NATO planning exercise. Due by COB on November 17, 2023.
4. Participation & performance in NATO Planning Exercise (20% of grade)

**Required Texts:**

Cameron Thies, *Why NATO Endures*

Kaplan, *NATO Divided, NATO United*

Hehir & Murray, *Libya: The Responsibility to Protect and the Future of Humanitarian Intervention*,

***Course Schedule and Reading Assignments***

**DAY 1**

**August 9, 2023**

**Origins and History of NATO PT1**

**CONTACT HOURS**: 3 hour seminar

**Lesson Overview:** This seminar discusses the origins of NATO, and a potted history up to the 1969 Harmell Report

**Required Reading:** approx. 109 pp (advised to read in the following order)

* Thies, *Why NATO Endures*, Chapter 3, (40 pages)
* *The North Atlantic Treaty*, [https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official\_texts\_17120.htm (2](https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_17120.htm%20%282) pages)
* Spofford, *NATO’s Growing Pains*, 1952, Foreign Affairs, (14 pages, provided by instructor)
* Spaak, *New Tests for NATO*, 1959, Foreign Affairs, (8 pages, provided by instructor).
* Thies, Chapter 6, p 202-222, (20 pages)
* Kahn, *Our Alternative to Europe*, Foreign Affairs, 1966, (18 pages, provided by instructor)
* *The Harmell Report*, 1969 (provided by instructor, 7 pages)

**DAY 2**

**August 16, 2023**

**History of NATO PT2**

**CONTACT HOURS**: 3 hour seminar

**Lesson Overview:** This seminar will discuss NATO’s history from the 1970s to the Ukraine Conflict.

**Required Reading:** approx. 105 pp.

* Betts, *NATO’s Mid-Life Crisis*, 1989, Foreign Affairs. (20 pages, provided by instructor)
* Kaplan, *NATO Divided, NATO United*, Chapter 6. (22 pages)
* *NATO’s Success in Kosovo*, 1999, Foreign Affairs, (6 pages, provided by instructor)
* Daalder and Goldgeier, *Global NATO*, 2006, Foreign Affairs. (13 pages, provided by instructor)
* Hehir & Murray, *Libya: The Responsibility to Protect and the Future of Humanitarian Intervention*, Chapter 9. (31 pages)
* Breedlove, *How to Handle Russia and Other Threats*, 2016, Foreign Affairs (13 pages, provided by instructor)

**DAY 3**

**August 23, 2023**

**ELB-502 (S) Alliances**

**CONTACT HOURS**: 3 hour seminar

**Lesson Overview:**

**Required Reading:** approx. 150 pp.

* Snyder, Glenn Herald. "Alliances in a multipolar international system," in *Alliance Politics*. Cornell University Press, 2007. (on canvas)
* Mansoor, Peter R., and Williamson Murray, eds. Grand strategy and military alliances. Cambridge University Press, 2016. (on canvas)
* Morrow, James D. "Alliances: Why write them down?." *Annual review of political science* 3, no. 1 (2000): 63-83.
* Tertrais, Bruno. "The changing nature of military alliances." *Washington Quarterly* 27, no. 2 (2004): 133-150.

**DAY 4**

**August 30, 2023**

**Revisiting NATO’s Post-Cold War Enlargement**

**CONTACT HOURS**: 3 hour seminar

**Lesson Overview:** This lesson will re-examine both the decision to enlarge and the consequences of NATO enlargement after the fall of the Soviet Union and the conclusion of the Cold War.

**Required Reading:**

* Waltz, Kenneth N. “NATO Expansion: A Realist’s View.” Contemporary security policy 21.2 (2000): 23–38.
* Mehrotra, O. N. “NATO Eastward Expansion and Russian Security.” Strategic analysis 46.2 (2022): 248–255.
* Goldgeier, James M. “NATO Expansion: The Anatomy of a Decision.” The Washington quarterly 21.1 (1998): 83–102.
* Itzkowitz Shifrinson, Joshua R. “NATO Enlargement—Was There a Promise?” *International security* 42.1 (2017): 189–192.
* Shifrinson, Joshua R. Itzkowitz. “Deal or No Deal? The End of the Cold War and the U.S. Offer to Limit NATO Expansion.” *International security* 40.4 (2016): 7–44. Web.
* Sarotte, M.E. “How to Enlarge NATO: The Debate Inside the Clinton Administration, 1993–95.” International security 44.1 (2019): 7–41.
* Marc Trachtenberg. “The United States and the NATO Non-Extension Assurances of 1990: New Light on an Old Problem?” International security 45.3 (2020): 162–203.

**Supplementary Reading:**

* Shifrinson, Joshua R. Itzkowitz. “Eastbound and down: The United States, NATO Enlargement, and Suppressing the Soviet and Western European Alternatives, 1990-1992.” *Journal of strategic studies* 43.6-7 (2020): 816–846.
* Lanoszka, Alexander. “Thank Goodness for NATO Enlargement.” International politics (Hague, Netherlands) 57.3 (2020): 451–470.
* MCCGWIRE, MICHAEL, and MICHAEL CLARKE. “NATO Expansion: ‘a Policy Error of Historic Importance.’” International affairs (London) 84.6 (2008): 1281–1301.
* Poast, Paul, and Alexandra Chinchilla. “Good for Democracy? Evidence from the 2004 NATO Expansion.” International politics (Hague, Netherlands) 57.3 (2020): 471–490.
* Barany, Z. “NATO Expansion, Round Two: Making Matters Worse.” Security studies 11.3 (2002): 123–157.
* Weber, Steven. “A Modest Proposal for NATO Expansion.” Contemporary security policy 21.2 (2000): 91–106.
* Skålnes, Lars S. “From the Inside Out: NATO Expansion and International Relations Theory.” Security studies 7.4 (1998): 44–87.
* Marten, Kimberly. “Reconsidering NATO Expansion: a Counterfactual Analysis of Russia and the West in the 1990s.” European journal of international security 3.2 (2018): 135–161.

**DAY 5**

**September 6, 2023**

**NATO and the Search for Relevance in the Post-Cold War World - Humanitarian Intervention**

**CONTACT HOURS**: 3 hour seminar

**Lesson Overview:** While the current crisis in Ukraine has brought NATO back to the forefront of geopolitics, it hasn’t always been the case. In periods when its traditional military mission is not being relied upon to the extent that it is now or has been in the past, should NATO seek to find other ways to contribute, such as in things like humanitarian intervention and post-conflict reconstruction? Or should it focus specifically on warfighting? Students will assess the merits of expanding NATO’s mission beyond a traditional military one.

**Required Readings:**

* Timo Noetzel and Benjamin Schreer, “Does a multi-tier NATO matter? The Atlantic Alliance and the process of strategic change”, International Affairs, (March 2009), Vol. 85, n°2, pp. 211-226.
* Sten Rynning, “Coalitions, institutions and big tents: the new strategic reality of armed intervention”, International Affairs, Vol. 89, n°1, (January 2013), pp. 53-68.
* Simon Chesterman, “Leading from Behind”: The Responsibility to Protect, the Obama Doctrine, and Humanitarian Intervention after Libya”, Ethics & International Affairs, (2011), Vol. 25, n°3, pp. 279-285.
* Ivo H Daalder and James G. Stavridis, “NATO's Victory in Libya: The Right Way to Run an Intervention”, Foreign Affairs, (March/April 2012), Vol. 91, n°2, pp. 2-7. Dana H. Allin and Erik Jones, “As Good as it Gets?”, Survival, (June–July 2011), Vol. 53, n°3, pp. 205-216.
* Alan J. Kuperman, “A Model Humanitarian Intervention? Reassessing NATO’s Libya Campaign”, International Security, (Summer 2013), Vol. 38, n°1, pp. 105-136.
* Alexander B. Downes and Jonathan Monten, “Forced to Be Free: Why Foreign-Imposed Regime Change Rarely Leads to Democratization,” *International Security* 37/4 (Spring 2013): 90-131.

**DAY 6**

**September 13, 2023**

**Reassessing the 2010 Strategic Concept in Light of Russia’s Annexation of Crimea**

**CONTACT HOURS**: 3 hour seminar

**Lesson Overview:** NATO’s 2010 Strategic Concept is a document that both assesses the past and attempts to foretell the future. This lesson asks students to reassess its effectiveness at both endeavors in lights of the historical record.

**Required Reading:** approx. 105 pp.

* NATO 2010 Strategic Concept
* Subotic, Jelena. “Russia, NATO and the View from the East.” International politics (Hague, Netherlands) 60.1 (2023): 259–263. Web.
* Sperling, James, and Mark Webber. “NATO and the Ukraine Crisis: Collective Securitisation.” European journal of international security 2.1 (2017): 19–46. Web.
* Ringsmose, Jens, and Sten Rynning. “Now for the Hard Part: NATO’s Strategic Adaptation to Russia.” Survival (London) 59.3 (2017): 129–146. Web.
* Antonenko, Oksana, and Igor Yurgens. "Towards a NATO–Russia strategic concept." Survival 52, no. 6 (2010): 5-11.

**DAY 7**

**September 27, 2023**

**NO CLASS!**

**RESEARCH AND WRITING DAY**

**September 28, 2023**

**Background Paper DUE!!!**

**DAY 8**

**October 4, 2023**

**NATO: Burden Sharing or a Shared Burden?**

**CONTACT HOURS**: 3 hour seminar

**Lesson Overview:** One of the primary tenants of the NATO alliance is the shared burden of collective defense, both in terms of resources and in willingness to act if need be. It is a strong example of the old adage, “all for one and one for all.” While an equitable sharing of the burden across the various member states was both the idea and the goal, critics, including Former President Trump, have pointed out that the United States shouldered most of the load in the alliance’s recent history. Students will discuss the concept of burden-sharing and assess whether NATO burden-sharing needs alteration, either in policy or in practice.

**Required Reading:** approx. 105 pp.

* Robison, Rebecca R. “NATO Burden-Sharing: A Comprehensive Framework for Member Evaluation.” Comparative strategy 39.3 (2020): 299–315. Web.
* Oma, Ida M. “Explaining States’ Burden-Sharing Behaviour Within NATO.” Cooperation and Conflict 47.4 (2012): 562–573. Web.
* Becker, Jordan, and Edmund Malesky. “The Continent or the ‘Grand Large’? Strategic Culture and Operational Burden-Sharing in NATO.” International studies quarterly 61.1 (2017): 163–180. Web.
* Andrew J. Bacevich -- Donald Trump and NATO : historic alliance meets a-historic president in Gavin, Francis J. et al. “Chaos in the Liberal Order : the Trump Presidency and International Politics in the Twenty-First Century.” Ed. Francis J. Gavin et al. New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 2018. Web.
* Richter, Andrew. “NATO in the Age of Trump: Alliance Defense Spending During the Trump Presidency.” Comparative strategy 40.3 (2021): 285–304. Web.

**Supplementary Reading:**

* Kaufman, Joyce P. “The US Perspective on NATO Under Trump: Lessons of the Past and Prospects for the Future.” International affairs (London) 93.2 (2017): 251–266. Web.
* Schuette, Leonard August. “Why NATO Survived Trump: The Neglected Role of Secretary-General Stoltenberg.” International affairs (London) 97.6 (2021): 1863–1881. Web.

**DAY 9**

**October 11, 2023**

**Assessing the 2022 NATO Strategic Concept**

**CONTACT HOURS**: 3 hour seminar

**Lesson Overview:** As was the case with the 2010 NATO strategic concept, the 2022 document attempted to take the lessons of the immediate past, including Russia’s illegal annexation of Crimea, and predict the future in order to prepare itself for the kinds of challenges that might be faced over the coming decade. Given hindsight, students will comprehend the logic behind the 2022 strategic concept and assess whether its drafters did a good job in predicting the future environment and setting policy accordingly.

**Required Reading:** approx. 105 pp.

* Ringsmose, Jens, and Sten Rynning. "NATO’s next strategic concept: Prioritise or perish." Survival 63, no. 5 (2021): 147-168.
* Yost, David S. "NATO's evolving purposes and the next Strategic Concept." International affairs 86, no. 2 (2010): 489-522.
* Moller, Sara Bjerg, and Sten Rynning. "Revitalizing Transatlantic Relations: NATO 2030 and Beyond." The Washington Quarterly 44, no. 1 (2021): 177-197.
* Becker, Jordan, Michael Duda, and Douglas Lute. "From context to concept: history and strategic environment for NATO’s 2022 strategic concept." Defence Studies 22, no. 3 (2022): 489-496.
* Gottemoeller, Rose et al. “Engaging with Emerged and Emerging Domains: Cyber, Space, and Technology in the 2022 NATO Strategic Concept.” Defence studies 22.3 (2022): 516–524. Web.
* 2022 NATO Strategic Concept

**DAY 10**

**October 18, 2023**

**NO CLASS!**

**RESEARCH AND WRITING DAY**

**DAY 11**

**October 25, 2023**

**NATO: A Deterrence Alliance or a Nuclear Alliance?**

**CONTACT HOURS**: 3 hour seminar

**Lesson Overview:** During the Cold War, the nuclear component of NATO and its importance was unquestioned. After the fall of the Soviet Union, it was, logically, de-emphasized. The emergence of a new Russian threat has brought nuclear deterrence back to the fore of NATO, perhaps in a way never seen before. Students will assess the utility of the NATO nuclear sharing mission and assess whether the focus should be on nuclear deterrence specifically or strategic deterrence more broadly.

**Required Reading:** approx. 105 pp.

* Michaels, Jeffrey H. “‘No Annihilation Without Representation’: NATO Nuclear Use Decision-Making During the Cold War.” Journal of strategic studies (2022): 1–27.
* Egeland, Kjølv. "Spreading the burden: How NATO became a ‘nuclear’ alliance." Diplomacy & statecraft 31, no. 1 (2020): 143-167.
* Bernstein, Paul. Rethinking Deterrence and Assurance. Rome, Italy: Research Division, NATO Defense College, 2015. Print.
* Binnendijk, Hans, and David Gompert. “Decisive Response: A New Nuclear Strategy for NATO.” Survival (London) 61.5 (2019): 113–128. Web.
* Kubai, Danylo. “Military Exercises as a Part of NATO Deterrence Strategy.” Comparative strategy 41.2 (2022): 155–161. Web.
* Lutsch, Andreas. “Merely ‘Docile Self-Deception’? German Experiences with Nuclear Consultation in NATO.” Journal of strategic studies 39.4 (2016): 535–558. Web.
* Lasconjarias, Guillaume. Deterrence through Resilience : NATO, the Nations and the Challenges of Being Prepared. Rome: Research Division, NATO Defense College, 2017. Print.
* McCrisken, Trevor, and Maxwell Downman. “‘Peace through Strength’: Europe and NATO Deterrence Beyond the US Nuclear Posture Review.” International affairs (London) 95.2 (2019): 277–295. Web.

Supplementary Readings:

* Yost David S. “The US Debate on NATO Nuclear Deterrence.” International affairs (London) 87.6 (2011): 1401–1438. Web.
* Corbett, Andy. Deterring a Nuclear Russia in the 21st Century : Theory and Practice. Rome, Italy: Research Division, NATO Defense College, 2016.
* Magula, Justin, Michael Rouland, and Peter Zwack. “NATO and Russia: Defense and Deterrence in a Time of Conflict.” Defence studies 22.3 (2022): 502–509. Web.

**DAY 12**

**November 1, 2023**

**NATO in the Aftermath of the Invasion of Ukraine & NATO Expansion Redux**

**CONTACT HOURS**: 3 hour seminar

**Lesson Overview:**

**Required Reading:** approx. 105 pp.

* Kendall-Taylor, Andrea, and Michael Kofman. “Russia’s Dangerous Decline: The Kremlin Wont Go Down Without a Fight.” Foreign affairs (New York, N.Y.) 101.6 (2022): 22–35. Print.
* Reid, Anna. “Putin’s War on History: The Thousand-Year Struggle Over Ukraine.” Foreign affairs (New York, N.Y.) 101.3 (2022): 54–7. Print.
* Kagan, Robert. “A Free World, If You Can Keep It: Ukraine and American Interests.” Foreign affairs (New York, N.Y.) 102.1 (2023): 39–53. Print.
* Sarotte, M E. “Containment Beyond the Cold War: How Washington Lost.” Foreign affairs (New York, N.Y.) (2021): 22–. Print.
* Dalsjö, Robert, and Michael Jonsson. “More Than Decorative, Less Than Decisive: Russian A2/AD Capabilities and NATO.” Survival (London) 63.5 (2021): 169–190. Web.
* Simons, Greg, Andrey Manoylo, and Philipp Trunov. "Sweden and the NATO debate: views from Sweden and Russia." Global Affairs 5, no. 4-5 (2019): 335-345.
* Alberque, William, and Benjamin Schreer. “What Kind of NATO Allies Will Finland and Sweden Be?” Survival (London) 64.6 (2022): 123–136. Web.
* Arter, David. “From Finlandisation and Post-Finlandisation to the End of Finlandisation? Finland’s Road to a NATO Application.” European security (London, England) ahead-of-print.ahead-of-print (2022): 1–19. Web.
* Alberque, William, and Benjamin Schreer. "Finland, Sweden and NATO Membership." Survival 64, no. 3 (2022): 67-72.

**DAY 13**

**November 8, 2023**

**NO CLASS!**
**RESEARCH AND WRITING DAY**

**DAY 14**

**November 15, 2023**

**NATO’s Next Challenge: China? Technology? Irrelevancy?**

**Lesson Overview:**

**Required Readings:**

* Hooker, R.D. “The State of NATO: An American View.” Survival (London) 64.3 (2022): 103–113. Web.
* Larsen, Henrik. “Adapting NATO to Great-Power Competition.” The Washington quarterly 45.4 (2022): 7–26. Web.
* Herold, Ernest, Olivierw Schmitt, and Stanley Sloan. "NATO’s strategic concept: responding to Russia and China." Defence Studies 22, no. 3 (2022): 558-563.
* Holslag, Jonathan. “China, NATO, and the Pitfall of Empty Engagement.” The Washington quarterly 42.3 (2019): 137–150. Web.
* Colby, Elbridge A., and Ian Brzezinski. “How NATO Manages the ‘Bear’ and the ‘Dragon.’” Orbis (Philadelphia) 65.1 (2021): 8–16. Web.
* Haroche, Pierre, and Martin Quencez. “NATO Facing China: Responses and Adaptations.” Survival (London) 64.3 (2022): 73–86. Web.
* Jacobsen, Jeppe T. “Cyber Offense in NATO: Challenges and Opportunities.” International affairs (London) 97.3 (2021): 703–720. Web.

**November 17, 2023**

**Briefing Book DUE!!!**

**DAY 15**

**November 29, 2023**

**NATO Consultation Exercise,**

**Lesson Overview:** Students will take part in a consultation exercise designed to mimic what occurs in crisis situations within the alliance.