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The role of regional and international organizations in conflict resolution:
The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)
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Abstract: The current Thesis main concept is to investigate the North Atlantic Treaty Organization’s (NATO) role in Conflict-Resolution. Furthermore, it is sought to demonstrate the effect that International Regional Organizations have, and more specifically the one that the NATO has, in guaranteeing the Security pillar in the inquiry conflict case studies. The adopted methodology of this research work follows the hypothesis of hegemonic norm in the framework of the international society of states based on the approach of the English school of International Relations scientific paradigm as a suitable theory which can better explain the past and potentially the future. NATO evolved its strategy from a Transatlantic-European to a Global dimension. The legal/compatible status of the NATO with the United Nations Organization (UNO) is based on its inclusion in the collective self-defense system. Therefore, any forcible actions without a justification under Chapter VII of the Charter are prohibited, according to the international compulsory / mandatory law (jus cogens). The so-called UN “franchising system” is located at the top of the crisis-management pyramid of armed conflicts, and a prominent position in its gallery is occupied by the NATO. The multilateral diplomacy takes place in a controlled environment based on a set of rules where the consensual decision-making at the highest administrative body of the Alliance, merges Great Powers’ RealPolitik with the Idealistic equivalence of each member-state of the Covenant. Hence, whenever NATO reaches agreement, this is an expression of the collective will of twenty-eight sovereign states. Implementing the NATO decision-making “method” is intended to bridle Hobbes’ Leviathan imposing momentum, in the absence of a “global social contract”, in the hegemony’s military campaigns. Further analyzing the aforementioned teleology, of reconciling Realism with Idealism, we acknowledge the transformation of NATO, as a consequence of the collapse of communism and the USSR, from an organization / covenant of collective defense into an international society system of states of collective security and defense. This international society of 28 states is theoretically fulfilling the desirable Order of the English School of International Relations’ scientific field. The NATO manages international high power political issues primarily in two ways in relation to the allegorical pendulum of the international society. In the first case either by consolidating an ex ante or ex post legitimate jurisdiction of international law, otherwise its member states are acting individually, out of any context of international law.
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2491 Words
On NATO: Foundation

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)\(^2\) was founded on April 4, 1949 with the Washington Treaty\(^3\) and is consisted of 28 member states from North America and Europe. The origins of the Alliance are identified in the East-Soviet bloc threat against the security and the sovereignty of the mainly western European states as well as versus Greece and Turkey.\(^4\) The risk of expansion of the Communist Iron Curtain (Churchill, 1946)\(^5\) at the start of the Cold War was visible and real. During the period 1946-49 the civil war was raging in Greece while the communist guerrillas were pursuing its absorption within the soviet sphere of influence at first and on the autonomy of a Macedonian communist state at the later.\(^6\) In Turkey, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) postulated to establish military bases in the Strait of Bosporus.\(^7\) In Romania, Bulgaria, Albania and Yugoslavia communist regimes had had been recently established.\(^8\)

As a western diversion, the Brussels Treaty,\(^9\) which led to the founding of the Western European Union (WEU),\(^10\) was the initial step in the creation of the NATO in the following year.\(^11\) While the strategy of containment of Soviet expansionism had the European continent as the main strategic priority area, at the peak of the Cold War and the West-East confrontation on the Korean peninsula and the namesake War of the period 1950-53, as a consequence this strategy evolved from a Transatlantic-European to a Global dimension.\(^12\)

---

\(^2\) The terms Covenant, Treaty, Organization and Alliance appear in rotation at the text with exactly the same meaning and they referred to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, i.e. the NATO.


\(^5\) The neologism “Iron Curtain” was first introduced by Winston Churchill in 1946 in his famous speech “Sinews of Peace” on March 5, 1946 where he was referring to the destruction of the sovereignty of the countries of Eastern Europe that were under the influence of the USSR. [http://www.hpol.org/churchill/](http://www.hpol.org/churchill/)[19 December 2010]


\(^10\) The Brussels Treaty originally provided only to “Cooperation” between the signatory parties, through the consultative “Council of Western Union”, and did not establish an international organization. The WEU was its transformation which is also referred to as the Brussels Treaty Organization. Today, its vast majority of powers have been transferred to the NATO and the EU. Naskou-Perraki, P. (b2005). *The Law of International Organizations: its institutional dimension*, 4th ed., Athina: Ant. N. Sakkoula. [In Greek], pp. 330-333 & 338-342.

\(^11\) Korean war caused a leading rift between these two coalitions of states and ideologies. NATO. (c2006). Ibid p. 17

Legality/Compatibility NATO: UNO

The legal/compatible status of the NATO with the United Nations Organization (UNO) is based on its inclusion in the collective self-defense system under Chapter VII, Article 51\textsuperscript{13} of the Charter of the United Nations (UN).\textsuperscript{14} The reference in this article on the inherent right of collective self-defense is the legal basis of the Washington Treaty to which Article 5 of the NATO Treaty explicitly leaves the legality of its substance.\textsuperscript{15}

Article 51 even though the initial deliberations of the UN conference in San Francisco for the international organization had been intended to fall within Chapter VIII under the relevant title \textit{Local Agreements}, eventually it was split "by this group of provisions and included in the previous Chapter VII [...] precisely in order to gain some autonomy".\textsuperscript{16} Falling under the relevant heading \textit{Action with Respect to Threats to the Peace, Breaches of the Peace, and Acts of Aggression}, article 51 get one absolute use of the "natural" right of individual or collective self-defense by the Member States of the Organization in all cases of \textit{armed attack} against them, with a right of implementation that lasts forever, i.e. the exercise of the right of defense is continuous, regardless of whether or not other provisions of the UN Charter exist for the same reason at all.\textsuperscript{17}

---

\textsuperscript{13} Charter of the United Nations, Chapter VII, \textit{Action with Respect to Threats to the Peace, Breaches of the Peace, and Acts of Aggression}, Article 51:

\textit{Nothing in the present Charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defence if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken measures necessary to maintain international peace and security. Measures taken by Members in the exercise of this right of self-defence shall be immediately reported to the Security Council and shall not in any way affect the authority and responsibility of the Security Council under the present Charter to take at any time such action as it deems necessary in order to maintain or restore international peace and security.}


\textsuperscript{14} The Charter of the UN was signed in San Francisco on June 26, 1945 [came into force on October 24, 1945] in the end of the united nations-states’ conference for the "international organization". Initially it was founded by 51 countries. At the time compiling these lines, the UNO is consisted by 192 member-states, thus underlining the UN as the only truly global organization, both conceptually and factually. In Greece it was ratified by the Law 585/1945, Government’s Journal A’ 242 & 286 and the Ministerial Decision 5.3.1973, Government’s Journal A’ 77. For the official text of the Treaty: Naskou-Perraki, P. (2005), Ibid pp. 19-53.

\textsuperscript{15} The North Atlantic Treaty, Washington D.C., 4 April 1949, Article 5:

\textit{The Parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all and consequently they agree that, if such an armed attack occurs, each of them, in exercise of the right of individual or collective self-defence recognised by Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, will assist the Party or Parties so attacked by taking forthwith, individually and in concert with the other Parties, such action as it deems necessary, including the use of armed force, to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area.}

\textit{Any such armed attack and all measures taken as a result thereof shall immediately be reported to the Security Council. Such measures shall be terminated when the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to restore and maintain international peace and security.}


The reference of the aforementioned article in an armed attack is underlined to avoid any misinterpretations. The lessons of the past, with a focus on the inertia and inability of the League of Nations during the interwar period (1919–1939) which led to the Second World War (1939–1945) with the millions of victims’ massacre, in principle of the content of Article 51 are heard. Nevertheless, the predominantly paralysis of the functionality of the Security Council (SC) of the UN during the Cold War period (1945–1989) and the potential conversion of a sui generis case, where a state or group of states have the right of self-defense with the use of military force, into a general rule of international law is essential to clarify. Therefore, any forceful actions without a justification under Chapter VII of the Charter are prohibited, according to the international compulsory / mandatory law (jus cogens).

Ideally, the UN under the customarily procedure of Mandates assign, as a rule, on ad hoc coalitions of states or via International Regional Organizations (IRO), the implementation of any necessary measures to maintain international peace and security. These enforcement measures invoked whenever acts against peace and acts of aggression occur against a member-state of the organization. This so called UN “franchising system”, based on the principles of the Charter, the Resolutions of the SC and the Resolutions of the General Assembly (GA) of the UN, is located at the top of the crisis-management pyramid of armed conflicts, and a prominent position in its gallery is occupied by the NATO.

The NATO is categorized as an IRO having the nature of a Local Agreement for the geographical region of the north Atlantic. The NATO’s main objective is to maintain the international peace and security in consistent with the three Purposes and the seven Principles of the UN. Any activity undertaken is required to comply with

---

19 The UN Peacekeeping Missions-Operations (UN PKO) of the period 1948-88 were 15; on the contrary from 1988 up to date there has been a dramatic increase from five (5) ongoing classical-traditional type of PKO in 1988 to 17 in 1994, of which eight (8) falls under the new Multi-Dimension Missions (M-D PKO) doctrine of the UN PKO. Today the UN is folding along the globe with 15 PKO, including the five classical, among which is the United Nations peacekeeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP). In the modern M-D PKO dimension is included the United Nations interim administration Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK).
20 On the “obligation” dimension, jus cogens refers to an international legal rule – generally one of customary law, though perhaps one codified in treaty form – that creates an especially strong legal obligation, such that it cannot be overridden even by explicit agreement among states.
22 Charter of the United Nations, Chapter I, Purposes and Principles, Article 1: The Purposes of the United Nations are:

I. To maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace;
the obligations of its member-states to the UN, with the later, beyond the general principle of hierarchy, prevailing also on a basis of its statute and rules on any local agreement such as the NATO. In any case, a SC Resolution is sine qua non for any coercive measures taken in any hierarchical level, with the solitary valid exception concerning the exercise of the inherent right of self-defense, which was analyzed in article 51 afore. As such we refer to any legitimate coercion, including collective self-defense, measures of demonstrations, blockade, and other operations by air, sea, or land forces of Members of the United Nations.

A prominent principal-agent case study is the SC Resolution 1973/2011 on the basis of which the NATO is implementing an ongoing air exclusion zone in Libya. This is an air force coercive operation that has its origins on the neologism Responsibility to Protect.

---

2. To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace;

3. To achieve international co-operation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural, or humanitarian character, and in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion; and

To be a centre for harmonizing the actions of nations in the attainment of these common ends

Charter of the United Nations, Chapter I, Purposes and Principles, Article 2:

The Organization and its Members, in pursuit of the Purposes stated in Article 1, shall act in accordance with the following Principles.

1. The Organization is based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all its Members.

2. All Members, in order to ensure to all of them the rights and benefits resulting from membership, shall fulfill in good faith the obligations assumed by them in accordance with the present Charter.

3. All Members shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered.

4. All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations.

5. All Members shall give the United Nations every assistance in any action it takes in accordance with the present Charter, and shall refrain from giving assistance to any state against which the United Nations is taking preventive or enforcement action.

6. The Organization shall ensure that states which are not Members of the United Nations act in accordance with these Principles so far as may be necessary for the maintenance of international peace and security.

7. Nothing contained in the present Charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state or shall require the Members to submit such matters to settlement under the present Charter; but this principle shall not prejudice the application of enforcement measures under Chapter VII.


24 Charter of the United Nations, Chapter VII, Article 42:

Should the Security Council consider that measures provided for in Article 41 would be inadequate or have proved to be inadequate, it may take such action by air, sea, or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security. Such action may include demonstrations, blockade, and other operations by air, sea, or land forces of Members of the United Nations.


If the "humanitarian intervention" is indeed an unacceptable abuse of the (state) sovereignty, (then) how should we react to a (potential new) Rwanda, to a Srebrenica - against flagrant and systematic violations of human rights that offend every sense of our common human nature?
Furthermore, the solely case ever a NATO member state invoked Article 5 of the North-Atlantic Treaty was on the post-mark of September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks on the United States of America (USA) soil, prompted by the fundamentalist Islamic Taleban regime in Afghanistan and the Al Qaeda’s terrorist network which had its core there. The Allies expressed their political and military solidarity towards the USA, culminating the formation of an International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) mission led by the NATO in Afghanistan.\(^{27}\) In contrast, it was only in 2003 with the UN SC Resolution 1510 that the United States-United Kingdom (US-UK) led mission with the code name *Operation Enduring Freedom* was legitimated with a clause in paragraph 2 where a *cooperation and further interaction with the ISAF* is being called.\(^{28}\)

*Leveraging NATO’s dogmatic past*

Leveraging the recent past, on the aftermath of the abolition of the Soviet threat, hence eliminating the ontological cause of existence of the NATO, we acknowledge the origins of the ongoing debate on the new doctrine / agenda of the Alliance. Restating the main concept and the purposes for a continuation of the existence of the Organization became a necessity, and for that reason with the “London Declaration in 1990, the NATO transformed”.\(^{29}\) In principle of article 5 of its founding treaty, the NATO continues providing for the common defense of its member-states. Furthermore, with the accession in the NATO’s core (North Atlantic Council (NAC)) and peripheral structure (Partnership for Peace (PfP)) of the former totalitarian regimes in eastern and southeastern Europe, NATO is becoming a stakeholder of the *New Europe* construction. Moreover, the NATO is seeking a democratic deepening and further expansions of the well established western bourgeois liberal democracy. The political pillar as well as the individual dimension of security advanced with the Washington Declaration in April 1999, where the new NATO doctrine was announced. Human security and asymmetric threats were the new terms included in this dogma, while the international terrorism enrolled in the fields of actions of the Alliance, producing into a self-fulfilling prophecy the air-jacked terrorist attacks on the twin towers in New York and the Pentagon in Washington two years later. Moreover, in the last summit for the new dogma of the NATO in 2010 in Lisbon, a focus on the micro level of security of the Alliance was re-introduced, i.e. Arms Control, Disarmament, and Non-Proliferation becomes a vital priority in the new strategic concept, and a re-opening to the east, i.e. Russia through the upgraded NATO-Russia council, and generally strengthening the ties, cooperation and enhanced liaison with other International Organizations such as the European Union (EU) as well as the UN is urged.\(^{30}\) The opportunities and threats of the new Alliance doctrine, inter alia France’s re-accession in the military branch and the evolving gapping between the USA and her European allies in utilizing effectively IT

\(^{27}\) ISAF was formatted on the basis of the UN SC Resolutions: S/RES/1386 (2001), S/RES/1413 (2002), S/RES/1444 (2002)

\(^{28}\) S/RES/1510 (2003), §2


technology and new rapid reaction forces along with maneuver war tactics in the battle field are addressed.  

**Internal Multilateral diplomacy**

The multilateral diplomacy takes place in a controlled environment based on a set of rules where the consensual decision-making at the highest administrative body of the Alliance, i.e. the NAC, merges Great Powers' RealPolitik, e.g. USA, UK, France and Germany, with the Idealistic equivalence of each member-state of the Covenant. Hence, whenever NATO reaches agreement, this is an expression of the collective will of twenty eight sovereign states. Thus, the causes of the US invasion in Iraq in February 2003, that was contacted unilaterally and not under the NATO auspices, tend to be more transparent. Nevertheless, the American leadership managed to accomplish its raison d'État in the region of the Gulf by decapitating Saddam Hussein’s regime only after organizing a so called Coalition of the Willing. This military campaign, that is well known as the second Gulf War with the synonymous code-name “Operation Iraqi Freedom”, was a flagrant violation of the UN Charter, a fact though that has no affect in any way NATO itself as a distinct international organization (IO).

---

32 NATO. (c2006). Ibid p. 33
33 France and Belgium raised a threat of veto in the Military Committee, in the process of the tacit approval for military aid to Turkey pending an attack against Iraq, a position which Germany supported as well.
34 The Coalition of the Willing according to the White House during Bush presidency was comprised by 48 UN member-states.
IN addition: Appendix II: *Coalition of the Willing – Iraqi invasion, March 2003*
35 In September, 2004, ex-General Secretary of the UN Kofi Annan stated "(Yes), [the War] I have indicated it is not in conformity with the UN Charter, from our point of view, and from the Charter point of view it was illegal." UN News Center, *Lessons of Iraq war underscore importance of UN Charter*, 16 September 2004.
Regional international system of collective security and defense

International society system of states

Implementing the previous described NATO decision-making “method” is intended to bridle Hobbes’ Leviathan imposing momentum, in the absence of a “global social contract”, in the hegemony’s military campaigns. According to the theory of *hegemonic stability*, in the context of global and regional multilateral organization and the structures of diplomacy (UNO & NATO), medium-size allies (UK, France, Germany, Italy, Spain) surrounding one major power (U.S.A.) “may [...] achieve acting their counterweight role or critical alert position better, without which the unipolar structure of the international system is endangering to lead to unilateralism, especially when the great power has not yet chosen isolationism”. On the contrary, as demonstrated previously in the case of Iraq, whenever a consensus is not possible to achieve, the hegemonic power is acting unilaterally and not in the framework of the system of collective security, thus in NATO. Further analyzing the afore mentioned teleology, of reconciling Realism with Idealism, we acknowledge the transformation of NATO, as a consequence of the collapse of communism and the USSR, from an organization / covenant of collective defense into an *international society system of states* of collective security and defense. 

Attempting to clarify this teleology we incorporate in this analysis the *spectrum of international society of states* where the international systems through Man’s history are classified, beginning with the 1st Sumerian state system up to the modern uni-multi polar system of states, from “one more integrated imperial [far right] to [...] one more fragmented multi-independence aggregations [far left]”. 

---

36 Hobbes’ Leviathan justifies the absolute sovereignty of the one, i.e. the monarch, who in this analysis potentially is the one and only absolute great power, i.e. the U.S.A. For a graphical representation of the Biblical monster and its political philosophy see Appendix III: Reining Leviathan


38 We refer to institutions with the same conceptual meaning of the rule and the meaning “Like all systems or organizations, collective security is both a rule and a mean” Spyropoulos, G. M. (2010). *International relations. Realistic approach. Theory and Practice*, Athina: Quality. [In Greek]. p. 341.

39 Ibid p. 322

40 The term “international society system of states ” refers to the words “state system» (Wight, 1966:35, Butterfield, 1965 ref. in Watson, 2006:24-25) and “international society» (Bull, 1977:11 ) with the same significance, content and meaning [see footnote 41]. Additionally, in his introductory note to the Anarchic Society, Professor Panayiotis Ifestos states that “[T]he ‘state system’ by Hedley Bull, is developed in an ‘anarchic international society of (sovereign) states”’, see Bull, H. (2001). ref. p. 17

41 We refer to collective security and defense under the new doctrine / agenda of NATO. [see footnote 40].


On both ends, the pendulum swings between anarchism and totalitarianism, thus in the middle of the spectrum finds its origins the commonly named hypothesis of the hegemonic norm.\textsuperscript{44} This assumption ranks in the middle of the spectrum of the so called Hegemonic Concert (or multiple hegemonies). This audacious statement implies a natural order of things in world history where the hegemonic type of the international systems tends to be the norm in states’ international affairs.\textsuperscript{45}

The argument of this case is partly based on the systemic approach of Structural Realism theory of International Relations. According to this theoretical perception, the states in any international system are acknowledged having as their foremost ontological cause of existence to retain their independence and sovereignty.\textsuperscript{46} The states seek to maximize their chances of survival and hypostatic continuity as well as to maintain their relative power.

Further developing this argument is indicated that states major objective is achieved more effectively in a state of affairs of anarchy. This line of reasoning ends with the conclusion that, in addition to independence, these international actors pursues international order which is more effectively achieved under a state of affairs of imperialism. Consequently, the international political units are ambivalent between hammer and anvil. Therefore, aiming on the clarity of this issue of balancing the hegemonic pendulum, the stability of the international system is only achieved when we contextually integrate the concept of international society.\textsuperscript{47}

\textit{Power-Security-Order}

Considering that the idealistic cooperation is reflected on the one side of the coin of international relations, the realistic power is illustrated on the other side. Similarly, while the universal dimension depicts the peaceful conflict resolution process, the realistic approach shines the military intervention for conflict resolution.

It has long been ascertained in great concern that the interstate relations are consumed in wars, rivalries and conflicts as well as to intrastate clashes.\textsuperscript{48} Taking this argument into consideration, military hard power politics is equivalent with the hard currency of international politics. Referring to this strong currency of international relations, having as its crown to ensure peace and security in the area of responsibility of the organization, NATO is located in the right end of the spectrum which brings together the hard-power politics’ IRO.\textsuperscript{49}

NATO’s catalytic role is to produce the required forces to mobilize the necessary political will and genuine military participation of its member-states in the NATO-led Peace Keeping Operations round the globe.

\textsuperscript{44} Norm is interpreted with the sense of the model/pattern, the recurrent rule.
\textsuperscript{47} Watson, A. (2009). Ibid. p. xxv

In the opposite direction, to the left of the spectrum, are placed the soft power politics’ IRO who are primarily involved with issues such as culture-education-science (UNESCO), migration (IOM), labor (ILO) and process / handling matters (IATA).
Consequently, this international society\footnote{According to Hedley Bull: \textit{A Society of States - International Society} – exists, when a group of states being conscious of specific common interests and shared values shape a society in the sense that they perceive themselves to be linked to a common set of rules binding their relations and to participate in the functioning of common institutions. Bull, H. (2001). ibid p. 51} of 28 states is theoretically fulfilling the desirable Order of the English School of International Relations’ scientific field.\footnote{Professor Stanley Hoffman refers, fore wording  	extit{The Anarchical Society} as the most representative work of the English school of international relations theory, that 	extit{“the originality of this approach is that it considers international relations as a complex set of relationships between states that constitute an international society and not only a system of states”}. Bull, H. (2001). ibid p. 21.}

As characteristically summarized in the seminal writings of Professor Hedley Bull in “his” \textit{Anarchical Society}:

\textit{Order} as opposed to disorder (anarchy\footnote{International Anarchy in the sense of “de-centralized political power” Spyropoulos. G. M. (2010). p. 195}) [...] is defined as an actual or potential condition or state of affairs [...] (focusing) on continuing problems of human’s political organization or institutions [...] (considering) order as a situation which could be found and had been existed independently of international law and international organization.\footnote{Ibid pp. 31-35.}

\textbf{Conclusion}

In conclusion, as stated earlier about shifting the boundaries of the international management system from one more central to one closer to the right end of the spectrum, the United States, being an authentically superpower through her leadership in the hegemonic concert of the global system of states, in the framework of the common interests and shared values within an international society of twenty-eight international actors member-states of the NATO, manages international high power political issues primarily in two ways in relation to the allegorical pendulum of the international society:

1. In the first case, the American leadership rotates in the vicinity of the hegemonic medium whenever is implementing international military interventions that have either an ex ante or ex post legitimate jurisdiction of international law.

2. Otherwise, the U.S. deviate from the middle of the spectrum with enforcement trends of authoritarianism and acting as an autonomous surrogate of the international system of states out of any context of international law.
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