

**Chapter 1 : Enlargement of NATO - Wikipedia**

*The Future of NATO takes a sober look at what the alliance and its members must do to maintain NATO's relevance in the face of today's strategic environment. The result is an important work that.*

The visit of President Donald J. There is clearly much contention over the future direction and nature of NATO. One thing that almost everyone can agree on is that the status quo is unsustainable. This brief analysis considers the nature of that coming change and what is driving it, as well as the balance between protection and projection, security and defence, value and cost that the Alliance will need to strike if it is to maintain the defence of citizens from Tartu in the east to Vancouver in the west, Tromsø in the north, and Messina in the south. Protection and Projection It is hard to see how NATO can project the influence, power and effect vital to the defence of citizens without Alliance societies themselves becoming much more resilient. So many of the threats faced by the nations of the Alliance are credible because of the very openness of Western societies. Whilst the Alliance and its nations are rightly proud of the values implicit in such openness it also renders society far more open to attack than hitherto. Western openness has also enabled ostensibly weaker powers and actors to better exploit those vulnerabilities. Russia is a state with very little soft power at its disposal and because of that tends to over-emphasise hard military power in its foreign and security policy. However, the terrible twins of Internet and social media have given Moscow new hard soft power tools with which to destabilise the West, not least through the effective use of fake news and disinformation campaigns designed to keep the Alliance and its nations politically off-balance. Cyber warfare is also a part of the new spectrum of escalation as the relationship between mass-disruption and mass-destruction becomes both more intimate and more dangerous with infrastructures critical to the functioning of society now open to non-kinetic attack. Information warfare and cyber-attacks for part of a hybrid warfare paradigm that is not just the novel preserve of classical illiberal states. It is also empowering Salafist Jihadi groups such as Al Qaeda and Islamic State to penetrate deep into changing immigration-shaped societies, particularly in Europe. Recruitment of Alliance citizens to undertake terrorist attacks on their fellow-citizens is here to stay and will consume much of the security policy energy of Allied nations. The former tended towards the preservation of social order and borders. Security was by and large the preservation of domestic intelligence services and police forces, whilst defence was the stuff of armed forces and power projection. Today, security and defence have merged into a spectrum. Several factors have driven this shift but the most pronounced has been the globalisation of crime and terrorism, their interaction, allied to the establishment of links between such groups and illiberal states. Consequently, states that continue to see a distinction, say, between criminal intelligence and military intelligence are missing an important new reality. Understanding threat can only come first from a better understanding of the nature of the new threat spectrum in which the big picture is married to the local picture. A notable facet of late in what passes for the Alliance defence and deterrence posture these days looks more like a counsel of despair. In the wake of the less-than-successful campaigns in Iraq, Afghanistan, Libya, and Syria the Alliance and its nations have effectively retreated behind a very thin wall hoping for the best whilst hopelessly confusing values and interests at the same time. A Degree Alliance? The Warsaw Summit placed much store on the creation of a Degree Alliance. The interactive matrix of failing states, uncontrolled hyper-migration, Islamist terrorism, competing militias and their links with transnational organised crime, allied to the potential for regional-strategic war across the Middle East and North Africa pose a real and present danger to Europe. And yet the kind of future force NATO needs, and at what level of capability and capacity and to do what, remains not just a profound dilemma for NATO force planners, but also a source of deep contention between the Allies. Cost and Value Of course, underpinning the strategy debate the resource debate. NATO clearly needs more and better forces. Given the money being spent on armed forces elsewhere in the world it is also clear that, whilst in NATO Europeans stopped cutting defence budgets and saw some very modest increases, NATO Europe needs to spend more and spend better. This begs another question. Just what value are summit declarations if NATO allies sign up to commitments they have no intention of keeping? As each day passes the security and defence of the Alliance and its nations becomes ever-more

threadbare, and its peoples ever more vulnerable. To put that vulnerability in strategic context one need merely consider the potential game changers faced by the Alliance. Perhaps the least threatening is Brexit. Strategic common sense suggests that a deal will be done that will establish a new and equitable relationship between post-Brexit Britain and the EU. Unfortunately, rhetoric on both sides suggests otherwise. If the British people come to believe they are being punished by the EU and its member-states for democratically and legitimately withdrawing from what is meant to be a voluntary association of states then it will not only the EU that will be damaged. Then there is the issue of US military over-stretch. The growing power of the forces of illiberal states the world over means US military dominance is being eroded. It will soon be hard to imagine the Americans able to fight two major wars and a major stabilisation campaign in the three theatres simultaneously. At the very least the Americans have the right to expect their European allies to be effective first responders in Europe. If Europeans do not rise to that burden-sharing challenge the impact on NATO will be profound and negative. And there is the issue of future war or hyper war. Advances being made by the US, China and Russia in the use of artificial intelligence, advanced autonomous weapons systems, big data and a host of other developments suggest a quantum leap in the speed of conflict and war in the twenty-first century. It will need to a thinking NATO that better understands the strategic environment it serves, is better able and quicker to see signs of trouble, better able to decide fast what to do about it, and better resourced and equipped to deploy the forces and tools needed to meet and mitigate any threat. A NATO that is ready and able to develop and exploit new technologies and science. This would not only mean strengthening the protection of deployed Allied forces, and their command and logistics systems, vital though the need for such modernisation. It would also mean the Alliance working with the nations to make society and critical infrastructures more resilient so that no single strike by an enemy could effectively render NATO unable to respond. No capacity to respond means no deterrence, no deterrence means no defence. Future NATO would also need to be a power projection NATO able to deploy and sustain forces far beyond its own borders, including protection of vital sea-lines of communication and the global commons. It would also need to be a NATO with a far stronger sense of the place of space in strategy and defence. Future NATO also needs to be a strategic hub force for such a force is the only way the Degree Approach could be realised. That means a future NATO force big enough, agile enough and manoeuvrable enough to support the nations to the south, east, and north across a range of crises, possibly at the same time. The relationship with the EU and other partners and institutions the world-over will be vital because the utility of force in many crises will be linked to economy of force in support of civilian leadership and resources. Above all, future NATO will need to actively assist the European nations to better balance efficiency and effectiveness with affordability. Here, the NATO-EU relationship will be particularly important as much of the future European force will emerge not only from more and better investment and procurement, but from deeper political and military integration. A new Harmel report.

## Chapter 2 : The Future of NATO

*President Donald Trump is scheduled to meet with members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization starting on Wednesday. He's been outspoken about his disdain for the military alliance.*

Western leaders have respected the rights of new immigrants to love the cultures from which they have come. This trend needs to end. Unless the leadership of Europe decides to stop the transformation of the continent with the same determination expressed by some extremist leaders that appear to want to transform it, its future is all too clear. Trump tends to state what many in the world are saying but few are willing publicly to express: Standing next to UK Prime Minister Teresa May, he stated his conviction that European immigration policies are changing the "fabric of Europe" and destroying European culture. It is a warning. Europe, in fact, is being flooded with millions of migrants, often from cultures that are openly anti-democratic. Moreover, some Muslim leaders are encouraging immigrants to resist assimilation into European cultures. Such deliberate non-assimilation has created cultural clashes across Europe. The reality is that fundamentalist Islamic cultures are, in many ways, at odds with secular Western values. Such political and cultural transformation of Europe seems quickly to be forming a huge cultural, social and political collision course at odds with European values. Such a possibility should no longer be considered a forbidden subject of "polite" conversation. They also joined forces because they shared cultural, political and economic goals -- and Judeo-Christian, humanistic values, all uniting factors and consistent with the values of NATO. If the current trend of Islamization continues, it will not be long before politically correct Europe elects Muslim heads of State who demand adherence to sharia law and tolerance of jihad. Turkey, a NATO member since , when it was a very different Turkey, has been increasingly radicalized for more than a decade by its president, Recep Tayyip Erdogan. Erdogan has also been steadily abrogating NATO commitments , such as, "uphold[ing] democracy, including tolerating diversity," and that members "must be good neighbors and respect sovereignty outside their borders. Currently, Turkey is holding an American pastor, Andrew Brunson first in prison and now under house arrest , on charges of "dividing and separating [Turkey], by means of Christianization," as well as false charges of espionage. The articles printed here do not necessarily reflect the views of the Editors or of Gatestone Institute. No part of the Gatestone website or any of its contents may be reproduced, copied or modified, without the prior written consent of Gatestone Institute. Get Free Exclusive Gatestone Content:

## Chapter 3 : NPR Choice page

*A theoretically informed, empirical account and analysis of NATO's recent evolution, this volume will appeal to both security scholars and practitioners from the policy community.*

## Chapter 4 : Trump and the future of NATO – Defence-In-Depth

*In this sense, the NATO performance was just a tip of a dangerous iceberg imperiling world order, but also the future of responsible and responsive governance in a period of grave danger and.*

## Chapter 5 : What a NATO Exit Would Mean for the U.S. and Europe - Knowledge@Wharton

*Peter M. Robinson is the Murdoch Research Fellow at the Hoover Institution, where he writes about business and politics, edits Hoover's quarterly journal, the Hoover Digest, and hosts Hoover's video series program, Uncommon Knowledge. We Shot the War: Overseas Weekly in Vietnam, edited by Lisa.*

## Chapter 6 : The future of NATO after Brussels - Burhanettin Duran - Daily Sabah

*NATO, The EU And The Future Of Europe NPR's Lulu Garcia-Navarro talks with Edward Lucas of the Center For*

*European Policy Analysis about the future of NATO and the European Union.*

### Chapter 7 : Does Turkey Belong in the Future of NATO?

*The future of NATO: jointly before the Subcommittee on European Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Subcommittee on Coalition Defense and Reinforcing Forces of the Committee on Armed Services, United States Senate, One Hundred Third Congress, second session, February 1 and 23,*

### Chapter 8 : The future of NATO

*Romania Energy Center in partnership with the Faculty of History and University of Bucharest have the pleasure to invite you to THE first lecture by the reno.*

### Chapter 9 : The Future of NATO's Mediterranean Dialogue | The German Marshall Fund of the United States

*Perspectives on the Future of NATO Ivo Daalder and Barry Posen discussed NATO's current role and how it will change in the future during a recent event in New York City. The Charles Koch Institute hosted an event on Trans-Atlantic Relations and the Future of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) in New York City last month.*