THE FUTURE OF NATO: HOW VALUABLE AN ASSET?

HEARING

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED TENTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

JUNE 22, 2007

Serial No. 110–86

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Affairs

Available via the World Wide Web: http://www.foreignaffairs.house.gov/

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

36–210PDF WASHINGTON : 2007

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Internet: bookstore.gpo.gov Phone: toll free (866) 512–1800; DC area (202) 512–1800
Fax: (202) 512–2250 Mail: Stop SSOP, Washington, DC 20402–0001

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

TOM LANTOS, California, *Chairman*

HOWARD L. BERMAN, California
GARY L. ACKERMAN, New York
ENI F.H. FALEOMAVAEGA, American Samoa
DONALD M. PAYNE, New Jersey
BRAD SHERMAN, California
ROBERT WEXLER, Florida
ELIOT L. ENGEL, New York
BILL DELAHUNT, Massachusetts
GREGORY W. MEEKS, New York
DIANE E. WATSON, California
ADAM SMITH, Washington
RUSS CARNAHAN, Missouri
JOHN S. TANNER, Tennessee
GENE GREEN, Texas
LYNN C. WOOLSEY, California
SHEILA JACKSON LEE, Texas
RUBÉN HINOJOSA, Texas
JOSEPH CROWLEY, New York
DAVID WU, Oregon
BRAD MILLER, North Carolina
LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ, California
DAVID SCOTT, Georgia
JIM COSTA, California
ALBIO SIRES, New Jersey
GABRIELLE GIFFORDS, Arizona
RON KLEIN, Florida

ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, Florida
CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, New Jersey
DAN BURTON, Indiana
ELTON GALLEGLY, California
DANA ROHRABACHER, California
DONALD A. MANZULLO, Illinois
EDWARD R. ROYCE, California
STEVE CHABOT, Ohio
THOMAS G. TANCREDO, Colorado
RON PAUL, Texas
JEFF FLAKE, Arizona
JO ANN DAVIS, Virginia
MIKE PENCE, Indiana
JOE WILSON, South Carolina
JOHN BOOZMAN, Arkansas
J. GRESHAM BARRETT, South Carolina
CONNIE MACK, Florida
JEFF FORTENBERRY, Nebraska
MICHAEL T. MCCAUL, Texas
TED POE, Texas
BOB INGLIS, South Carolina
LUIS G. FORTUÑO, Puerto Rico
GUS BILIRAKIS, Florida

ROBERT R. KING, *Staff Director*
YLEEM POBLETE, *Republican Staff Director*
DAVID FITE, *Senior Professional Staff Member*
GENELL BROWN, *Full Committee Hearing Coordinator*

CONTENTS

THE FUTURE OF NATO: HOW VALUABLE AN ASSET?

FRIDAY, JUNE 22, 2007

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC.

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:03 a.m., in room 2172, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Tom Lantos (chairman of the committee) Presiding.

Chairman LANTOS. NATO was the great military alliance of the 20th century. The question before the committee today is whether it will retain this distinction in the 21st century.

For decades, NATO was the powerful military defensive line against the ambitions of the Soviet Union. A show in solidarity against the totalitarianism and degradations of the Communist East and the tripwire for the use of nuclear weapons by the United States.

Without NATO, tanks could have rolled from Moscow to the Mediterranean or to the Atlantic.

Today, had there been no NATO, we would be discussing the Soviet Socialist Republic of Belgium or the Soviet Socialist Republic of Portugal.

Not only did NATO prevent a European red tide, but it has actually reclaimed much of the Soviet Bloc. NATO's founders 58 years ago never could have dreamed that some of the alliance's most stalwart and enthusiastic members in 2007 would be those same Central and Eastern European nations the Soviets had dominated and occupied and that the alliance would have grown organically from 12 members to 26.

But for all of its success, NATO was never actually tested in battle, a true blessing given the devastating consequences of a possible thermonuclear conflict.

Now, in the early 21st century, the world has thrust an entirely new identity upon NATO, one that many of its members seem reluctant in the extreme to assume.

The alliance is involved in its first real combat in the mountains of Afghanistan, a real shooting war. While soldiers of some NATO countries are fighting and dying in Afghanistan, many more countries are doing little more than hunkering down in their secure bases, marking time, while their brothers and sisters in arms confront the real battle.

But some European governments ought to wake up and realize that the moment of truth is at hand for the entire enterprise of NATO.

NATO and its member nations face a stark choice. The alliance could evolve into a reliable global military alliance, halting terrorism and rogue regimes that threaten both Europe and the United States and democracies everywhere, or it could evolve into a conglomeration of governments that are only rhetorically committed to the common defense; a coalition of the partially or feebly willing whose individual nations may or may not tackle the security challenges of the post-9/11 planet.

The grand NATO alliance, once a bright light for freedom and democracy, either will flicker and then fade into the dark night, or it will shine brighter than ever.

The results in Afghanistan are an early indicator of which road NATO will take. NATO's efforts there since 2001 demonstrate that the United States and the Europeans are willing to conduct tough combat operations and do so in a country outside of Europe. But the treadmill in Afghanistan is going faster and faster under our feet, demanding more and more of every country's efforts. The Taliban is back and is organized, and it is bearing down on the southern part of the country.

To allow a resurgence of the Taliban would be to allow a state-sponsored launching pad for terror and a state sponsor of narco trafficking. The twin threat of a terror state and a narco state wrapped into one would be disastrous for the people of Afghanistan, for the fight against terror and for the entire world.

But it will also be a devastating blow to the future of NATO because it would represent the failure of NATO's most ambitious mission since its founding in 1949.

We will not let Afghanistan fail. But the question is whether the United States will present—will prevent its failure with only some of our allies or with the full concert of all NATO members.

Europe must be our full partner in our mission if NATO is to be redeemed.

So far, European nations have only partially fulfilled their part of the bargain. Dutch, British, Danish and Canadian troops have been among the most brave, standing shoulder to shoulder with United States troops fighting the Taliban daily.

But we need German and French and other European troops, whose grandparents we freed from Nazi tyranny in World War II, to fight on the front lines, too.

Mothers in Nebraska and New Jersey are no more eager to have their sons die in Kabul than mothers in Berlin and Bordeaux. If NATO had a more robust commitment in Afghanistan, the Taliban would be defeated in a short time, particularly if the civilian infrastructure would move along as capably as NATO is.

That brings me to the future of NATO after Afghanistan.

If NATO is to be revitalized, its member nations must come to grips with the expanding definition of the term "invaded," whereby terror groups can invade a country without a standing army.

It must come to grips with the expanding geographic reach of dangerous countries developing weapons of mass destruction, like Iran, the greatest planetary threat today.

NATO and its member nations must define what role the alliance is able or willing to perform in military conflicts outside of the relatively peaceful confines of Europe.

We should consider seriously NATO's own expansion beyond the borders of Europe and North Africa. Why not allow firmly democratic nations, such as South Korea, New Zealand, Australia and Israel, to join the world's greatest military alliance? Their interests and their ideas are joined with ours.

When the North Atlantic Treaty was signed here in Washington in April 1949, its founder and the great Canadian Prime Minister Lester Pearson marked out the crucial mission of NATO that echoes forcefully today, and I quote:

> "This treaty, though borne of fear and frustration, must lead to positive social, economic and political achievements if it is to live."

Indeed, if NATO is to live, if we are to rejuvenate it, if it is to fulfill its promise in this century, all its partners must be committed steadfastly to the social and economic and political principles this great democratic military alliance symbolize.

I now turn to my good friend and distinguished colleague, Ranking Member Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, to make any comments.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a carefully thought out, utterly fascinating and captivating opening statement that I would like to ask to be made part of the record so that we can go on with our witnesses.

I just want to say, thank you, to them both. I have known them a long time. Thank you to Ambassador Fried, and as you know, Mr. Chairman, although General Craddock has many wonderful parts of his resume, what really stands out is that he is a former Miamian because he was the head of SOUTHCOM, located right in my home town of Miami, Florida. Once a Miamian, always a Miamian. Come back.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Ros-Lehtinen follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF FLORIDA

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I welcome our two witnesses today: Assistant Secretary of State for Europe and Eurasia Dan Fried and United States Army General Bantz Craddock, Supreme Allied Commander in Europe.

What value does the NATO Alliance hold for the United States today, fifteen years after the end of the Cold War?

That is the general question posed by our hearing today.

Perhaps a good way to answer that question is to ask ourselves what Americans would lose—and Europeans as well, since they are our partners and have a big stake in the answer—if NATO ceased to exist.

First, the United States would lose a major means of influencing trends and policies in Europe.

It might lose access to a source of military manpower that is of proven use in peacekeeping missions.

It would lose bases and facilities that are a force multiplier for the American military.

Above all, it would most likely lose a stable Europe once NATO dissolved.

That stability is also the most important thing our European allies might stand to lose if NATO were to cease to exist.

It is easy to forget today that, after centuries of European conflict and two world wars, trust and cooperation between major European states did not always come easy or last long.

It is also easy to forget that instability in Europe led to American involvement in two world wars.

Reconciliation between France and Germany seemed an impossible concept in the late 1940s, but look at how well they cooperate and consult today.

An independent Poland, lying between Germany and Russia, faced invasion and dissection at the hands of its neighbors in the late 1700s and again before World War II.

What do we see today?

Poland as a comfortable neighbor of Germany, its new ally—a Poland that does not overly fear a possible, future Russian aggression, knowing that it has the support of the United States and the leading states of Europe.

I would suggest that, if NATO were to end tomorrow, the European states' historic distrust might well rise again, and, within a short time, the integration and unity that blossomed behind NATO's shield would begin to unravel.

Some observers say that the awareness of these obvious benefits do not mean that, in the absence of a common threat, NATO won't fade away in any event.

Time will tell if they are right.

It seems obvious that we do indeed see a problem in NATO in the sense that Americans and Europeans have differing views on the threats that now face them and how to address them.

Whether it is terrorism, proliferation of weapons and technology of mass destruction, or conflicts in other regions that might cause instability and allow trans-national criminal networks and terrorists to gain ground—many in Europe do not see those threats in the same way that the United States does.

And, if threats are not seen in the same way, a common strategy cannot really be developed.

Without a common strategy, military capabilities in turn tend to be ignored and start withering away.

We have seen that general weakening of military capabilities among the European NATO allies since the end of the Cold War—to a degree that, when the United States led the NATO operation against Serbia in 1999, the extent to which its success relied on American military force and technology came as a disappointing surprise to the United States.

Many of us today look at the United States mission in Iraq and the reluctance of some of the major states of Western Europe to have NATO more actively support the invasion and stabilization of that country as a first sign of divergence within NATO.

In fact, however, the NATO experience in the Balkans in the 1990s had already led American officials to worry that many European NATO allies' general lack of readily-deployed military capabilities meant that they would not be that useful if NATO engaged in major military operations in other regions.

Following the Kosovo operation, the United States chose to take the lead in the invasion of Afghanistan, with NATO taking command of the peacekeeping force there only after more than a year and a half had subsequently passed.

As a result of the sharp differences over Iraq, some again see NATO, as potentially splintering.

But, let's recall just a few of the other serious disagreements that NATO has survived:

- French opposition to West German rearmament in the 1950s;
- US opposition to the British and French military operation in the Suez canal area of Egypt in 1956;
- US and European differences over support for Israel in the 1973 Yom Kippur War.

Yes. There are serious issues that the NATO allies now need to address.

But let's recall those past disagreements that NATO survived and also look at what has gone right in NATO since the end of the Cold War.

- The American commitment to NATO has allowed the peaceful reunification of Germany;
- NATO's expansion has promoted the consolidation of democracy in Eastern Europe;
- The US commitment to NATO has provided the reassurance within Europe that there will be no rebirth of the old geopolitical divisions within Europe.
- The strengthening of the European Union has continued, while American has stayed in NATO.

Both the United States and its European NATO allies have tough questions confronting them.

The United States still does not know how to best persuade its European allies to devote the resources necessary to ensure that so-called "out of area" NATO operations can be effective.

The United States also cannot agree that its ability to protect its vital interests from terrorist attack must be constrained through often-slow consensus decision-making, such as that used within NATO.

European states still have to come to grips with the meaning for them of the terrorist attacks that have taken place in Europe and the plots for other attacks that have been foiled.

Europe also has to come to an understanding of what the potential radicalization of parts of its growing Muslim minority communities might mean for its security.

As allies, we should work to find answers to these and other truly difficult questions.

I hope that our witnesses today will give us some insights as to how those answers may be found.

Chairman LANTOS. Thank you very much, and I will make a normal introduction of our two most distinguished witnesses.

But I think the most useful way to proceed in view of the couple of votes on the floor will be to introduce the chairman of our Parliamentary NATO group, my good friend Congressman Tanner, for whatever opening remarks he wants to make. Then we will take a brief break, and then we will hear our two distinguished witnesses.

Mr. TANNER. I don't know if that was intentional that they cut my microphone off or not.

Welcome, General Craddock and Secretary, we have had many conversations before about NATO. I want to just welcome you both here and to express from the NATO PA delegation the fact that we believe now NATO might well be in fact more important than even it was in the Cold War, because it is the—if not premier—maybe the sole international, clearly international, organization that has the ability to both go into a place that is in chaos and restore some order and do it with a military presence that is able and capable.

And so I think that this hearing not only is important for NATO, but it is important for our country. We need the help that NATO can potentially give us, and I would just like to talk about maybe what your ideas are when we get back from the votes, a policy that coordinates the policy of the United States with the NATO policy as it relates to engagement with countries in the neighborhood of Afghanistan.

This is the largest, as both of you well know, out-of-area military expedition NATO's ever undertaken. And in that light alone, it seems to me that failure is not an option, as they say. We have to make this work for the future, not only of NATO, but for the alliance and what it means to the United States.

So thank you both, and I look forward to when we get back from voting.

Thank you.

Chairman LANTOS. The committee will stand in a few minutes' recess. We apologize to our witnesses.

[Recess.]

Chairman LANTOS. The committee will resume. We will have an opening statement by Congressman Smith.

Mr. SMITH OF NEW JERSEY. I do have a full statement I would ask to be made part of the record.

And I welcome our very, very distinguished witnesses today and thank them and commend them for their extraordinary service. I

would like to raise one issue and commend the General and Ambassador Fried for the work that they have done in the area of human trafficking.

NATO, I remember when we were trying to get Nicholas Burns, who did take the lead to try to take the Bush policy of zero tolerance to NATO, and there was pushback. I remember meeting with a few of the top people. I will never forget. One of the top admirals said, what happens when my guys offload in Greece, and they are on R&R. I said, they don't have entitlement, in my opinion, to go and rape and abuse young women. And I pointed out to him that both my wife and I had just left a shelter in Athens, two shelters, as a matter of fact, where we found a number of woman who had been trafficked and who had been abused in the most horrific ways, raped day in and day out, and unfortunately, servicemen of various nations had been part of that complement of people who had abused them.

Thankfully that, I hope and I believe, is changing, the TIP report has made it very clear that progress is being made. The zero tolerance policy is becoming part and parcel of all that NATO is doing.

Obviously, we need to take the lead when it comes to respect for women, and it seems to me that NATO is making a Herculean effort in that regard.

So thank you.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Smith of New Jersey follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and good morning to everybody. First of all, I'd like to propose my answer to the question this hearing proposes: NATO, how valuable an asset? Very, very valuable, today as yesterday.

In fact I'd like to commend our President and present and recent Secretaries of State and Defense for improving cooperation with so many of our NATO allies since the difficult years of 2003 and 2004. I'd like to commend you for your success in moving the alliance through its transition from a regional into a global security organization, and from an alliance prepared to defend us against massive conventional and nuclear Soviet aggression—aggression which, I thank God, never took place—to one preparing to meet the much more elusive threats of terrorism, nuclear proliferation, and instability in failed states.

This transition is a tremendous undertaking, and, in working so hard to promote it, our President and his Cabinet have shown the courage to make difficult decisions.

Second, and this connects to respect for human rights, one of the things we have to do in enlarging NATO is integrate not just militaries but military cultures.

After World War II, we made great efforts to ensure that the new West German army would not continue the old Germany military culture, which was harsh and emphasized blind obedience to any order, no matter how cruel. We worked with the new democratic West German government to create a new military culture, which respected the conscience and dignity of soldiers and civilians. What a success that effort was! How deeply the German military reformed! Now the German army is, from the perspective of respect fro human rights, in peacekeeping and in combat, a model NATO military.

Many of our new NATO allies come to us with military cultures about which we should ask hard questions—I am thinking here about the involvement of the armies of East-Central Europe in terrible anti-Semitic abuses during World War II. I am skeptical whether, during their forty years in the Warsaw Pact, the communist dictators of Eastern Europe reformed their country's military cultures.

So I will say now, I am going to be asking you later: What we are doing about the military cultures of our new allies?

Third, two weeks ago I read, in the Trafficking in Persons Report for 2007, that our State Department gives a very *positive report* of the measures being taken by

NATO to prevent both military and civilian personnel under its authority from engaging in human trafficking or sexual exploitation and abuse.

I am very glad to be able to say this. I look forward to exploring those measures in more detail with our witnesses, including how those practices might serve as best practices for other military entities.

Chairman LANTOS. Thank you very much.

Any other colleague would like to make an opening comment?

If not, it is my extraordinary pleasure and honor to introduce our two most distinguished witnesses.

General John Craddock is one of the most accomplished military officers in the United States. He serves as NATO's Supreme Allied Commander in Europe. In this role, he is the top military commander for the entire alliance, and he is responsible for the security of all member states.

Among his many career distinctions, let me just mention that he was Commander of United States forces for the initial all-important historic mission in Kosova. He served as Commander of U.S. Southern Command. It is a long list of extremely important military assignments.

We are honored to hear directly today from NATO's top commander about the future of the alliance.

General Craddock, we are delighted to have you, and the floor is yours.

STATEMENT OF GENERAL BANTZ J. CRADDOCK, COMMANDER, U.S. EUROPEAN COMMAND, SUPREME ALLIED COMMAND OF EUROPE, UNITED STATES ARMY

General CRADDOCK. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Lantos, distinguished members of the committee, thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today.

Before providing you a few thoughts on the future of NATO, I would like to highlight the current operations in which the alliance is involved.

By doing so, I believe I will provide you with the strategic context through which NATO's future is entwined.

Mr. Chairman, I submitted a written statement and ask that it be made an official part of the record.

Chairman LANTOS. Without objection.

General CRADDOCK. The 50,000 deployed NATO military forces are a visible and effective demonstration of NATO's resolve to collectively meet the security challenges.

The men and women of the alliance, plus 17 other contributing nations, are redefining the role of NATO and operations across Afghanistan, the Balkans, the Mediterranean, Iraq, the Baltics and Africa.

The International Security Assistance Force, or ISAF, in Afghanistan remains NATO's most important and challenging mission with over 40,000 personnel from 37 nations. The alliance has responsibility for ISAF operation throughout the entire country, working alongside U.S.-lead coalition forces of Operation Enduring Freedom and other international participants.

ISAF's mission is to provide a secure and stable environment in which Afghan institutions can develop and expand their influence.

NATO also continues its mission in the Balkans, notably Kosova, whose future status is currently under discussion in the United Nations.

Today NATO has over 15,500 well-trained capable personnel providing for a safe and secure environment in their province.

Operation Active Endeavor, NATO's only ongoing Article 5 mission, aims to disrupt, deter and defend against terrorism in the Mediterranean. In this operation, maritime forces are patrolling sea lines of communication, sharing relevant intelligence and information with littoral nations and, when required, conducting compliant boarding of suspect ships.

In Iraq, NATO nears completion of its training missions in support of the Iraqi Army. We are on track to turn over command and control of the officer training programs to the Iraqi army in July. Recently, the North Atlantic Council agreed to adapt this mission to include providing gendarmerie-type training for the leadership of the Iraqi national police with a target date of this fall to begin that effort.

In Africa, NATO also assists the African Union with its peace keeping mission in Sudan. The alliance has provided airlift for troop rotations, conducted staff capacity-building activities at key headquarters in Ethiopia and Darfur, and deployed mobile training teams to work with our AU counterparts.

The strategic partnership between NATO and the European Union has never been more important. With 21 of the 26 nations of the alliance, also members of the European Union, it is vital that we take a broad approach to the security challenges we collectively face.

With respect to NATO's future, the heads of state endorse the comprehensive political guidance at the 2006 Riga Summit. The guidance laid out broad parameters for how NATO should develop and respond to the challenges of the 21st century. I believe the document actually captures the future direction of the alliance. And I would like to highlight the key points from this document.

First, NATO will continue——

Chairman LANTOS. General, could you pull the mike a little closer to you, sir?

General CRADDOCK. Yes.

Chairman LANTOS. I want to be sure everybody hears you.

General CRADDOCK. First, NATO will continue to follow the broad approach to security outlined in the 1999 Strategic Concept. Second, the strategy calls for the alliance to perform fundamental security tasks, namely security, consultation, deterrence and defense, crisis management, and partnership.

The alliance will remain ready on a case-by-case basis and by consensus to contribute to conflict prevention and to engage actively in crisis management. This includes non-Article 5 crisis response operations.

While the focus for the Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe, SHAPE, headquarters is on successful execution of military operations on three continents, these operations are simultaneously helping NATO to achieve a more enduring goal for the alliance. And that goal is transformation.

The ambitious NATO transformation agenda includes development of more agile, flexible and expeditionary military forces.

A few of the major components of transformation are the NATO Response Force, strategic airlift, optimization of force structures and partnership.

The NATO Response Force is an initiative proposed by the United States and adopted by the alliance at the 2002 Prague Summit. It provides an adaptable, deployable force capable of responding to emergency crises and conducting the full range of military missions from crisis management to forced entry operations.

Another major component of NATO transformation is an ongoing effort to acquire dedicated strategic airlift. Long-term initiatives include the purchase of C–17 and A400 aircraft by consortiums within NATO.

The optimization of national force structures is a third transformational effort. This concept encourages alliance militaries to invest in special and high-demand capabilities in lieu of the traditional full spectrum of forces.

These investments are greatly needed within the alliance and are particularly viable options for member nations with smaller militaries.

Finally, NATO's Partnership for Peace, or PFP program, is an important transformational factor in bringing the 23 partner nations closer to the alliance. This program has been instrumental in assisting nations to move beyond their Cold War legacy and adapting their military forces to alliance norms.

In conclusion, the Alliance is confronted with an unstable world. NATO has demonstrated a growing capability to adjust to the rapidly changing global security challenges since the end of the Cold War. The leadership and the capabilities that our nation contributes to the alliance remain fundamental to preserving transatlantic partnership and security. The dedicated men and women of our militaries are committed to assuring our collective security both at home and at strategic distances.

It is imperative that the political leadership of NATO nations provide the resources and support required to accomplish accepted missions. Continued Congressional support for this alliance and its effort is essential.

Mr. Chairman, thank you for holding this hearing, and I look forward to responding to your committee's questions.

[The prepared statement of General Craddock follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF GENERAL BANTZ J. CRADDOCK, COMMANDER, U.S. EUROPEAN COMMAND, SUPREME ALLIED COMMAND OF EUROPE, UNITED STATES ARMY

Before providing you my thoughts on the Future of NATO, I would like to highlight current operations in which the Alliance is involved and by doing so, provide you with the strategic context through which NATO's future is entwined.

NATO OPERATIONS

The 50,000 deployed NATO military forces currently under my command in my other role as Supreme Allied Commander Europe (SACEUR) are a visible demonstration of NATO's resolve to collectively meet security challenges. While political consultations among nations help sustain unity of purpose, men and women of the Alliance, plus 17 other troop-contributing nations, are essentially redefining the role of NATO by their actions in operations across Afghanistan, the Balkans, the Mediterranean, Iraq, the Baltics, and Africa.

The International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) remains NATO's most important and challenging mission. With over 40,000 forces from 37 nations, nearly 39,000 of which are contributed by the 26 NATO member nations, the Alliance has responsibility for ISAF security and stability operations throughout Afghanistan. Working alongside U.S.-led coalition forces of Operation ENDURING FREEDOM (OEF) and other international actors, ISAF's approach is to provide a secure and stable environment in which Afghan institutions can develop and expand their influence, while simultaneously supporting the development of an enduring Afghan capability to provide for their own security. The 25 Provincial Reconstruction Teams (PRTs) under ISAF leadership are at the forefront of NATO's efforts for reconstruction and stability.

NATO continues its mission in the Balkans, notably in Kosovo, whose future status is currently under discussion in the United Nations. Today NATO has over 15,000 well-trained and capable forces in Kosovo providing for a safe and secure environment. These forces maintain close coordination with the international and local authorities in Kosovo and are prepared to continue their military responsibilities in a post-status environment. They are equally prepared to address a broad range of contingencies or potential unrest associated with the determination of Kosovo's future status.

Operation ACTIVE ENDEAVOUR (OAE) is NATO's only on-going mission under Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty, the key article of the Treaty which considers an attack against one nation as an attack against all member nations. The OAE mission, launched in the aftermath of the attack on America in September 2001, aims to disrupt, deter, and defend against terrorism in the Mediterranean. Maritime forces of OAE are patrolling sea lines of communication, sharing relevant intelligence and information with littoral nations, and conducting compliant boarding of suspect ships, when required.

ACTIVE ENDEAVOUR is important for not only its anti-terrorism activities, but also as a catalyst for transformation as it works to implement a network-centric maritime monitoring capability, which provides for real-time tracking of maritime vessels and notification to national authorities. This network will make our operation more effective, and ultimately, should reduce the requirement for a physical maritime security presence.

In Iraq, the Alliance continues to provide essential training to the Iraqi security forces. Recently, the North Atlantic Council agreed to expand the Iraqi training mission to include providing gendarmerie-type training for the leadership of the Iraqi National Police. The Alliance continues to provide training opportunities for Iraqi Security Force personnel outside of Iraq, at national training facilities or NATO institutions such as the NATO Defense College in Rome, Italy and the NATO School in Oberammergau, Germany. We are on track to turn over command and control of the senior and midlevel officer training programs at the Iraqi Military Academy to the Iraqi Army in July. The second aspect of the Iraq mission includes assisting in the provision of equipment to the Iraqi armed forces. To date, NATO nations have provided arms and equipment ranging from small arms ammunition to T-72 tanks.

NATO has also assisted the African Union (AU) with its African Mission in Sudan (AMIS) peacekeeping mission. It has provided airlift for troop rotations of peacekeepers, provided staff capacity building activities at key AU headquarters in Ethiopia and Darfur, and deployed mobile training teams to work with our AU counterparts. NATO's capacity building approach to increase stability and security on the continent intends to deliver long-term effects with minimal, focused resources.

NATO-EU

The strategic partnership between NATO and the European Union (EU) has never been more important. With 21 of the 26 nations of the Alliance also members of the EU, it is absolutely vital that we take a broad approach to the security challenges we collectively face, where both military and civilian instruments are employed. The goal is to use the respective strengths of each organization to achieve the intended effects.

In implementing the Berlin Plus arrangements for NATO-EU cooperation, an EU liaison cell was activated within my headquarters in Belgium, communicating and coordinating with my staff on a daily basis those operational issues that affect both organizations. Our NATO commanders on the ground in the Balkans and in Afghanistan have developed practical mechanisms to communicate and coordinate their respective mandates with EU representatives on a routine basis.

Despite this pragmatic approach by our soldiers in the field, the institutional NATO-EU relationship still needs to adapt, with more robust, flexible and enduring

arrangements to promote more efficient, practical cooperation for our increasingly interdependent efforts. The ongoing operations in Afghanistan and anticipated roles in supporting the outcome of status talks for Kosovo should not be held hostage to institutional bureaucracy. Both organizations must focus on operations vice competition.

NATO'S FUTURE

With respect to NATO's future, Heads of State and Government endorsed "The Comprehensive Political Guidance" at the 2006 Riga Summit, laying out broad parameters for how NATO should develop in response to the challenges of the 21st Century. I believe the document accurately captures the future direction of the Alliance and I highlight for the committee the following key points from the document:

- The Alliance will continue to follow the broad approach to security of the 1999 Strategic Concept and perform the fundamental security tasks it set out, namely security, consultation, deterrence and defense, crisis management, and partnership.
- The Alliance will remain ready, on a case-by-case basis and by consensus, to contribute to effective conflict prevention and to engage actively in crisis management, including non-Article 5 crisis response operations. NATO needs to focus on ensuring that its own crisis management instruments are effectively drawn together. It also needs to improve its ability to cooperate with partners, relevant international organizations and, as appropriate, non-governmental organizations in order to collaborate more effectively in planning and conducting operations.
- The Alliance must have the capability to launch and sustain concurrent major joint operations and smaller operations for collective defense and crisis response on and beyond Alliance territory, on its periphery, and at strategic distance.
- Among qualitative force requirements, the following have been identified as NATO's top priorities:
  - — joint expeditionary forces and the capability to deploy and sustain them;
  - — high-readiness forces;
  - — the ability to deal with asymmetric threats;
  - — information superiority; and
  - — the ability to draw together the various instruments of the Alliance brought to bear in a crisis and its resolution to the best effect, as well as the ability to coordinate with other actors.

TRANSFORMATION

While the focus for the Supreme Headquarters, Allied Powers, Europe (SHAPE) is on successful execution of NATO's military operations on three continents, these operations are simultaneously helping NATO to achieve a more enduring goal for the Alliance, that of transformation.

NATO is embracing an ambitious transformation agenda to develop more agile, flexible, and expeditionary military forces. Allied Command Transformation (ACT), NATO's strategic headquarters based in Norfolk, Virginia, has the lead role in developing concepts and managing NATO transformation programs. It is in our nation's interests to ensure that our collective efforts are complementary and contribute to joint and multinational interoperability.

NATO RESPONSE FORCE (NRF)

The NATO Response Force (NRF) is an initiative proposed by the U.S. and adopted by the Alliance at the 2002 Prague Summit. It is a vital part of the Alliance's ability to rapidly respond to emerging crises and conduct the full-range of military missions, from crisis management to forced entry operations, at strategic distances. The NRF is organized around a brigade-sized force whose units and capabilities are provided collectively by all members of the Alliance. This composite force maintains an increased level of readiness that allows portions of it to deploy on very short notice, with the entire force able to deploy no later than 30 days after notification.

This joint and multinational force further serves as a catalyst for transformation and interoperability, improving NATO's expeditionary capability in key areas such as multinational logistics and deployable communications. Following a comprehensive and successful live exercise (LIVEX) in June 2006, with further contributions of critical capabilities by nations, NATO declared at the Riga Summit the NRF to have attained Full Operational Capability (FOC). At FOC, the NRF is capable of

deploying at strategic distance and supporting the full range of potential Alliance missions, to include evacuations and disaster management, counter-terrorism and acting as an initial entry force for a larger, follow-on force. Despite the declaration of FOC at Riga, the future sustainability of the NRF, as it is currently structured, is at risk. For the upcoming NRF rotations, we are seeing repeated shortfalls across the spectrum of key capabilities such as logistics, combat support, strategic lift, and intelligence assets. With the high optempo of NATO operations, coupled with the commitment of forces by nations to other operations such as United Nations and European Union operations, it has become increasingly difficult to secure member nation commitments for the six-month rotations of the NATO Response Force. The financial costs of committing forces to the NRF, coupled with competing demands for our limited pool of military forces, are having a significant impact on nations' willingness to provide the necessary capabilities. NATO authorities are currently working to develop initiatives to improve the implementation of the agreed NRF Concept. These initiatives include a long-term force pledging plan, common NATO funding for strategic lift for short-notice NRF deployments and, potentially, linkages of NRF capabilities with NATO's strategic reserve forces.

STRATEGIC AIR LIFT

The utility and credibility of the NRF and our deploying forces depends on the quick and assured availability of strategic lift. Unfortunately, the current arrangements for strategic lift of NATO forces are inadequate, depending on assets generated through national contributions or contract arrangements with commercial carriers. With the strategic distances involved, the threat, and austere environment of many of our deployment destinations, charter airlift is often not a viable option.

It is imperative that we have the support of the nations for the two complementary initiatives aimed at providing NATO with strategic airlift capabilities. The first of these initiatives involves a group of 15 NATO nations, plus Sweden, currently involved in negotiations to acquire three C-17 aircraft, to be flown and maintained by multinational crews under multinational command from the participating nations. These planes would be used to support strategic airlift requirements, which could be NATO operations or national in character. The second of these complementary initiatives involves a consortium of 16 nations, led by Germany, to charter AN-124 aircraft to provide strategic lift.

INTEROPERABILITY

NATO's transformation depends in large measure on the ability of disparate units, headquarters and nations to work together. Interoperability is a key enabler and is recognized as an important force multiplier. Interoperability objectives cover the ability to communicate with each other, to operate with each other from a procedural perspective, and to have equipment that is compatible.

With accelerated advancements in technology, maintaining interoperable equipment is particularly difficult. Recent requirements for equipment to combat improvised explosive devices (IED) and increased needs for Intelligence, Reconnaissance, and Surveillance (ISR) capabilities highlight NATO's challenge.

Adaptation of NATO forces continues with an entire range of initiatives to increase the capacity of our forces to collectively address contemporary threats and challenges. While these initiatives are welcomed, we also recognize the realization of these projects is hampered by NATO's outdated procurement procedures that do not allow for the rapid purchase of emerging technologies.

Additionally, to completely achieve the transformational goal of providing rapidly deployable, expeditionary forces, there is a requirement for a commonly funded logistics system that has the agility to provide immediate and comprehensive sustainment support.

NATO is currently developing ideas to provide this common logistics support. In the last year, for example, the Alliance expanded its eligibility rules for common funding, to assist in theater-level logistics support of forces involved in deployments. Developing and approving the enduring concepts and procedures for common funding of multi-national logistics is currently on the Alliances' horizon.

Six broad initiatives for multinational logistic development and commitment of military capabilities were developed.

- Encourage more balance in the development and commitment of military capabilities
- Identify and reduce barriers to national contributions
- Further develop and enable multinational support capabilities
- Enhance logistics training and medical certification

- Enhance the use of contractor support capabilities to augment or where appropriate, replace military support capabilities
- Integrate the contributions of smaller nations into an optimized logistics support structure

OPTIMIZATION OF NATIONAL FORCE STRUCTURES

The cornerstone of NATO security is for Alliance members to maintain military capabilities that can provide mutual support to member nations. Consequently, nations (Iceland, which has no military, is an exception) have established force structures that are similar in design but with major differences in the relative size of each force. However, given the widely varying sizes of each nation's military and military budgets, it is challenging for the smaller nations to maintain a standing military that is modern, and capable of performing all military tasks across the land, sea, and air environments. This situation is currently manifested with the Baltic nations' inability to provide for their own air policing.

Given these conditions, it may be time for NATO to consider developing a more integrated and optimized force structure. The concept for this modified force structure could investigate asking Alliance nations to focus on development of specified military capabilities rather than attempting to provide all elements and organizations traditionally found in a national military. The advantages of this method for developing force structure include: allowing a nation to channel their research and development budget in a more focused manner; improves the ability for NATO to generate the necessary and often scarce niche-capabilities, such as rotary wing assets and medical support; and lastly would facilitate a more consistent security posture across the Alliance.

MISSILE DEFENSE

Missile Defense is not a new issue within NATO. I believe that there is a shared perception amongst Allies that a threat from ballistic missiles exists, as well as a shared desire that any US system should be complementary to any NATO missile defense system, and visa versa.

The Alliance intends to pursue a three-track approach to missile defense. Firstly, it will continue an ongoing NATO project to develop, by 2010, a "theater missile defense" for protecting deployed troops from short- and medium- range missile threats. Secondly, NATO has committed to fully assessing the implications of the US missile defense system for the Alliance. The objective is to determine the possibility of linking the NATO and US defensive systems to ensure that all Alliance territory would be covered from missile threats. Finally, NATO is committed to continuing existing cooperation with Russia on theater missile defense, as well as consultations on related issues.

MEDITERRANEAN DIALOGUE

The Mediterranean Dialogue reflects the Alliance's view that security in Europe is closely linked to security and stability in the Mediterranean and is an important component of the Alliance's policy of outreach and cooperation.

Seven non-NATO countries of the Mediterranean region (Algeria, Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Mauritania, Morocco and Tunisia) participate in the Dialogue whose overall aim is to contribute to regional security and stability through practical cooperation and political dialogue and to achieve better mutual understanding.

Three of the Mediterranean Dialogue nations, Algeria, Morocco, and Israel, have indicated a willingness to participate at varying degrees in NATO's Operation ACTIVE ENDEAVOUR, which focuses on countering terrorism in the Mediterranean Sea. Three other nations have contributed military forces and assets to NATO-led operations in the Balkans and Afghanistan. Jordan is currently contributing to the ISAF mission in Afghanistan, Morocco contributes to the KFOR mission in the Balkans, and Egypt had contributed forces previously to NATO operations in Bosnia. Each of the initiatives strengthens the relationship with NATO, increases our interoperability and contributes to our mutual security.

NATO-RUSSIA

NATO has taken a very open, inclusive approach vis-&-vis Russia, recognizing Russia's legitimate national security interests, while showing a strong determination to build a new European security order together with Russia.

NATO and Russia have come a long way in the ten years since the NATO-Russia Founding Act, and the five years since the establishment of the NATO-Russia Council. There has been increasingly more cooperation between our respective military

forces. We have agreed on a comprehensive Action Plan on Terrorism as well as ambitious programs of technical cooperation in airspace management and theater missile defense. Just last month, the State Duma in Moscow ratified the Partnership for Peace Status of Forces Agreement (SOFA) between NATO and Russia, a step that will allow even closer practical cooperation and facilitate the potential exercise of Alliance and Russian military forces on Russian territory.

We understand that there are Russian concerns—about Missile Defense, about NATO enlargement, and about arms control. These are complex political and legal issues that will not be easy to resolve. But NATO Allies are committed to discussing them, in the NATO-Russia Council as well as in other international fora.

Clearly there is even more that we can do together—in making our forces more interoperable, contributing to peace support missions, in supporting each other in disasters and emergency situations, in fighting terrorism, and in consulting on new challenges such as defense against proliferation.

NATO ENLARGEMENT

Now let me turn to the topic of NATO Enlargement. Since the Alliance was created in 1949, its membership has grown from the 12 founders to today's 26 members—and the door to new membership remains open. At the 2006 Riga Summit, Heads of State and Government declared that the Alliance intends to extend further invitations to nations that meet NATO standards at the next Summit in 2008. Although no decision has been made on the next round of NATO expansion, three nations currently participate in NATO's Membership Action Plan (MAP)—Albania, Croatia, and Macedonia. In addition to the three aspirant countries already noted, two other nations, Ukraine and Georgia, participate in an intensified dialogue with NATO, an important step in the commitment to a closer relationship with the Alliance and its members.

While the Membership Action Plan (MAP) provides specific advice and practical support tailored to the individual needs of nations wishing to join NATO, NATO's Partnership for Peace (PfP) program has been an important, additional factor in bringing a number of the 23 Partner nations closer to, and more interoperable with, the Alliance. The PfP has been instrumental in helping Partner nations move beyond their Cold War legacy, assisting with a number of initiatives to restructure and reform Partner military institutions, to include disposing of redundant or obsolete weapons and reintegrate military personnel into civilian life. Increasingly, Partner nations are adapting their military forces to Alliance operational norms. PfP training initiatives and joint exercises have helped make Partner forces more interoperable with those of NATO, encouraging and enhancing their contribution to NATO-led operations.

CONCLUSION

NATO has demonstrated a progressive nature and capability to adjust to the rapid changes confronting European and global security since the end of the Cold War. The Alliance has been confronted with an unstable world, humanitarian crises, regional conflict, and terrorism on a multi-national scale simultaneously as the speed of global change, the impact of new threats and risks to our collective security—and the second and third order effects of these types of threats from events around the world—have increased in this interdependent, interconnected world. This is the reality of the 21st Century. NATO has responded with capabilities at hand and developed new capabilities, new policies, and new partnerships to address these challenges.

NATO is now entering its most challenging period of transformation, adapting not only to the realities of a changed Europe, but facing the multi-faceted demands of constantly adapting to a changing world. It is institutionalizing the Alliance's role as a modern instrument of security and stability for its members. NATO is taking important steps to complete its transformation from a static, reactive Alliance focused on territorial defense to an expeditionary, proactive Alliance working with nations to deter and defeat the spectrum of 21st Century threats confronting our collective security. The Alliance is overcoming institutional inertia, out-dated business practices, and Cold War era understandings of its role, thereby erasing self-imposed limits that directly reduce the security of its members and partners, individually and collectively. At the same time, the Alliance is assessing the threats we face, understanding better their interaction, and developing new capabilities and partnerships to successfully address these threats.

NATO was founded in 1949 as an Alliance based on democratic values and collective defense. Although the threat environment and our operational capabilities have changed significantly over the last, nearly 60 years, the core values we represent

and the need for cooperation and collective security have not changed. The NATO Alliance, its Partnerships and special relationships with other nations remain important to our own nation, now and into the future.

Chairman LANTOS. Thank you very much for a very comprehensive and thoughtful overview, General Craddock.

Our next witness is Ambassador Daniel Fried, who currently serves with great distinction as Assistant Secretary of State, the Bureau of European and Eurasian Affairs. He has been one of our most preeminent Foreign Service officers whose career in the diplomatic service began 30 years ago.

He witnessed the Cold War at close range, having been stationed in Belgrade in what was then called Leningrad and then with a distinguished diplomatic service as our Ambassador in Warsaw. He served in Warsaw from November 1997 until May 2000.

Prior to his current position, Ambassador Fried was Assistant to the President and Senior Director for European and Eurasian affairs at the National Security Council.

We are delighted to have you, Ambassador Fried.

The microphone is yours.

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE DANIEL FRIED, ASSISTANT SECRETARY, BUREAU OF EUROPEAN AND EURASIAN AFFAIRS, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Mr. FRIED. Thank you, Chairman Lantos, Ranking Member Ros-Lehtinen, and members.

I appreciate you giving my colleague, General Craddock, and myself the opportunity to share thoughts about NATO.

The title of this hearing asks a question: How valuable an asset, with respect to NATO? And I would like to start with a simple answer.

NATO has critical value to the United States. NATO is in action now and will be in the future. And if NATO did not exist, we would have to invent it. NATO, simply put, is the great security arm of the transatlantic alliance of democracies. To illustrate that, I will mention NATO's current operations and highlight also NATO's transformation, which is perhaps halfway through. We have done much to prepare NATO for its 21st century role; though more needs to be done.

Mr. Chairman, during the Cold War, NATO focused on Europe because that is where the dangers were. Now, without abandoning its core missions, NATO increasingly looks outward to dangers that can have roots far beyond Europe. These dangers can include terrorism, nuclear proliferation, failed states and insecurity of energy resources.

Protecting NATO members now requires building partnerships around the globe and developing new capabilities.

This shift is historic. Europe's western half, thanks in large part to NATO, has been at peace since 1945, the longest peace in Western Europe since Roman times and one now extended throughout Europe. Eleven states once behind the Iron Curtain are now democracies contributing to security within NATO. NATO's mission spans a wide geography and wide array of activities. That trend is only going to continue.

NATO's scope is demonstrated by NATO's two largest ongoing operations: Kosova and Afghanistan.

In Kosova, the alliance has over 15,000 personnel deployed, less than 10 percent of them American; 24 of 26 NATO nations contribute forces to KFOR and so do 11 non-NATO contributing countries.

When Kosova's status is resolved, which we believe will be soon, and through supervised independence, KFOR will continue to maintain a safe and secure environment during the critical period ahead. Every poll taken in Kosova shows NATO to be the single most respected institution there. Kosova is a challenge, but it is also a success story for the alliance. By proceeding with resolution of its status, we can move toward ending this post-conflict military involvement.

NATO's largest and most challenging mission is in Afghanistan, and the nature of that mission says a lot about NATO's transformation today.

Consolidation of the stable, democratic Afghanistan is a critical national interest for all our allies. The tools that NATO needs to succeed in Afghanistan, expeditionary capability, counter-insurgency capacity and, most important, an ability to combine security with governance and development, and to work with other organizations to that end will define the directions NATO must go in the future.

Reports on a Taliban offensive this spring were all of the journalistic rage for months. But this offensive never materialized thanks largely to the efforts and sacrifices of Afghan, United States and allied forces. Instead, it was NATO that took the offensive this spring with our own civil and military efforts: 37 countries, 26 allies, 11 non-NATO partners participate in the U.N.-mandated ISAF force; 40,000 troops, 24,000 are from our allies and partners and serve throughout all of Afghanistan.

As you did, Mr. Chairman, I would like to note especially the contributions of allies, such as the Canadians and the Dutch, who have fought and suffered casualties in the south. But NATO allies are doing their job throughout Afghanistan. Someone has to serve in the west and the north, and the Spanish, the Italians, and Germans are doing so.

We have continued to press allies to fulfill shortfalls in ISAF, and since last fall, allies and partners have pledged over 7,000 new troops, most without caveats. Half of those are American, but half are allied. Although some caveats remain a concern, allies have expressed a willingness to come to each other's aid should a need arise. We do believe there is a flexibility.

Today Afghanistan has a democratically elected President and Parliament. Five million refugees have returned. The number of children attending school has increased fivefold to 6 million, 2 million of those girls, who had no access to schools of any kind under the Taliban.

NATO faces the possibility that some of the world's most threatening and unstable regimes could develop nuclear weapons. Iran already possesses hundreds of medium-range and short-range ballistic missiles and is developing longer-range capabilities. The United States has proposed a long-range missile defense system in

Europe, and at April's meeting of NATO's ministers in Oslo, our NATO allies were nearly unanimous in support.

Secretary General de Hoop Scheffer has noted that United States missile defense plans do not upset a strategic balance of Europe as some outside NATO had charged and that NATO could help bolt together, his words, bolt together United States plans with allied plans and NATO's own plans, hopefully even in cooperation with Russia.

As has always been the case in NATO, ours and other national defense efforts contribute to the security as a whole. Security, as we learned the hard way, in the 20th century is indivisible. If Europe is not secure, the United States is not secure.

NATO is also transforming. In 1994, NATO had 16 members and no partners. It had never conducted a military operation. At the end of 2005, the Alliance was running eight military operations simultaneously and had 26 members and partnership relations with 20 other countries around the world. Developing the capabilities so NATO can launch and sustain such missions takes political will and resources, and here NATO has much to do yet.

The Riga Summit last November marked an important step forward in NATO's transformation to meet these new challenges. At Riga, the NATO Response Force was declared to have reached full operational capability. This is a 25,000 soldier-strong land, air and sea force, and NRF can act as a quick-reaction expeditionary force with as little as 5 days warning time.

The Strategic Airlift Initiative is an important step in addressing one of NATO's chronic weaknesses, the lack of dedicated strategic lift and a key capability as NATO increasingly operates thousands of miles from Europe.

NATO Special Operations Force Initiative will improve the coordination of interoperability of allied special operations forces.

And NATO's various partner initiatives, such as the NATO Training Cooperation Initiative, constitutes part of our outreach to new partners, including in the broader Middle East.

There has been progress since Riga on all, but there is still much work to do on all.

Another significant transformation has been the growth in NATO's membership. NATO enlargement is one of the great successes in Europe after the fall of the Iron Curtain. This process continues as Albania, Croatia and Macedonia complete another cycle of the Membership Action Plan and seek invitations in 2008. Georgia and perhaps the Ukraine are pursuing reforms and may seek eventual NATO and possibly EU membership. Other countries, such as Montenegro, Bosnia and Serbia, may also choose this path.

The April 2008 Bucharest Summit will seek to build on these successes, strengthening NATO's capabilities and its global reach to undertake global missions with partners around the world.

NATO has more to do in each category, as I said, but it is in action in key operations around the world. It is the greatest security instrument of the transatlantic democratic community with which we can deal with security challenges today and tomorrow.

Mr. Chairman, members, thank you for your attention. I appreciate the opportunity to be here, and I look forward to your questions.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Fried follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE DANIEL FRIED, ASSISTANT SECRETARY, BUREAU OF EUROPEAN AND EURASIAN AFFAIRS, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Chairman Lantos, Ranking Member Ros-Lehtinen, members of the Committee, thank you for giving me the opportunity to share with you our thoughts on NATO's value to international security and defense.

I want to make two key points. *First*, I will describe how NATO is critically important in meeting the security challenges North America and Europe face today. *Second*, I will highlight the significant transformation that NATO has undergone and which it will continue to undergo. NATO is perhaps halfway through this transformation, in terms both of policies and capabilities. Some Allies could be doing more to support NATO operations. But the trend over the past several years is good: we see an Alliance effectively transforming itself and taking on the security challenges of the twenty-first century.

MEETING SECURITY CHALLENGES

Consider at the outset where we started. During the Cold War, NATO focused almost exclusively on Europe—recovering from WWII, building democracy in its aftermath, and defending freedom against Soviet aggression. While NATO has not abandoned its core missions and is aware of concerns from some of its new members, NATO increasingly looks outward—because the challenges to our common security are global, with their roots far beyond Europe. These dangers include violent extremism that preys on fragile societies, terrorism, proliferation of nuclear weapons, failed states, cyber attacks, and insecurity of energy resources, to name a few. Effectively protecting the security of NATO members in the face of these global challenges requires NATO to take on operations far afield, build partnerships with others who share NATO's values and can contribute to common goals, and develop new capabilities to meet these new kinds of challenges.

We should consider the magnitude of this historic shift. Europe's western half has now been at peace since 1945, the longest general peace since the *Pax Romana*, and this peace is now extended throughout Europe. Eleven states once behind the Iron Curtain are now democratic nations contributing to common security within NATO. There is still critical work to be done in Europe—for example, helping the nations of the Balkans maintain security while building democratic, prosperous societies and joining the European mainstream. We are aware of security challenges in Europe's East. But the most critical security challenges NATO faces today have their roots outside of Europe. And so NATO today is focused on how the United States and Europe can work together to deal with challenges *in the rest of the world.*

NATO's missions have spanned a wide geography—from Afghanistan and Pakistan to Darfur and Louisiana. And they can span a wide array of activities: from high-intensity peacekeeping, with combat as necessary, to airlift in support of other humanitarian or peacekeeping goals, to counter-terrorist naval operations. We expect that this trend is only going to continue. Because when faced with daunting security problems, our leaders always ask, "Who can help deliver a solution?" The answer often is NATO.

Clearly, there were differences within Europe, and between much of Europe and the United States, over the war in Iraq. Yet these differences never paralyzed NATO. In 2003, NATO established air defenses for Turkey against a possible Iraqi response to coalition operations. In August 2003, as differences over Iraq flared, NATO took over the ISAF operation in Kabul, and began the long process of expanding that operation to cover the entire country of Afghanistan. Though their role is different, there are now more forces under NATO command in Afghanistan than under Operation Enduring Freedom. And in 2004, Allies agreed to establish a NATO Training Mission inside Iraq, charged with the critical role of training and mentoring Iraqi security forces officers. All 26 Allies contribute to NATO's mission in Iraq, either through personnel or funding.

Critics may argue that the United States does not believe in NATO, and instead prefers coalitions of the willing. Others charge that Europeans are not assuming their share of the hard military burden. Neither accusation is true today, and it is the job of Allied leaders on both sides of the Atlantic to make sure they never become true.

In fact, the United States and Europe are working together, through NATO, dealing effectively with the real security challenges we face as a democratic community. This cooperation is demonstrated by NATO's two largest operations today: Kosovo and Afghanistan.

KOSOVO

It has been eight years since NATO intervened to stop Milosevic's ethnic cleansing in Kosovo. Starting from a bombing campaign to drive out Milosevic's killers and then an initial Kosovo Force (KFOR) deployment of approximately 40,000, the Alliance currently has over 15,500 personnel deployed. Twenty-four of 26 NATO nations contribute forces to KFOR, along with 11 non-NATO contributing countries.

Just over 1,500 of these are American: U.S. National Guard soldiers, currently led by the Virginia-based 29th Infantry Division. Our Guardsmen and women have played an important role in community building in both Serb and Albanian areas and are viewed by both groups as vital to the success of NATO's operations.

NATO is in Kosovo with the UN, the EU, the OSCE, and others—providing basic security, while the work of building a society goes on in many other ways. NATO's role is critical, but it is only part of the picture.

When Kosovo's status is resolved, which we believe will be through supervised independence, KFOR will continue to maintain a safe and secure environment during this critical time, by providing a robust security presence throughout its area of operations. Every poll taken in Kosovo shows NATO to be the single most respected institution there.

After status resolution, KFOR will supervise the establishment of a small, lightly armed, multiethnic Kosovo Security Force and oversee the creation of a civilian institution to provide civilian control over it. Development of these structures will hasten the day when Kosovo can provide its own security and NATO can successfully conclude its deployment in the region. Kosovo's provisional government has already signaled that it will wish to join NATO's Partnership for Peace when possible, and begin contributing to NATO operations itself.

I also want to note, that as we implement Kosovo's final status, we must not leave Serbia behind. Serbia deserves a European future. As Serbia takes the steps it must take—reforms at home and cooperation with the ICTY war crimes tribunal at The Hague, the transatlantic community must take clear, strong steps to bring Serbia into our family and institutions. For that reason, I was pleased that Serbia and the European Union have re-opened talks aimed at Serbia's closer integration into Europe.

Kosovo has been a success story for the Alliance. By proceeding with the resolution of its status, we can move toward ending our post-conflict military involvement and put the Balkan region on the road to becoming an exporter, rather than a consumer, of security.

AFGHANISTAN

NATO's largest and most challenging mission today is in Afghanistan, a mission that says a lot about NATO today, and where it is going. The fact that NATO is in Afghanistan at all is a reflection of the changing security environment facing our Alliance. Events thousands of miles from NATO territory have a direct impact on the security of NATO members. The strengthening of a stable, democratic society in Afghanistan is likewise a critical national interest for all Allies. The tools that NATO needs to succeed in Afghanistan—from combat forces, to peacekeeping, to global partners, to coordination with civilian donors and institutions largely define the directions in which NATO must grow in the future.

Afghanistan provided the training ground for the September 11, 2001 armed attack on a NATO member—the United States. The Alliance reacted with speed and unity in invoking Article 5 for the first time. Europe recognizes that global jihadist ideology and organizations threaten not only the United States, but also either inspired or directly coordinated attacks on NATO Allies in Madrid, London, and Istanbul. While NATO did not immediately engage militarily, it began consultations about Afghanistan, individual Allies gradually joined coalition operations, and in 2003 NATO took the first step by taking over the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) mission in Kabul.

Many were concerned that this spring would bring a Taliban offensive of greater strength and severity than 2006. Reports on this enemy campaign were all the rage for months. That offensive never materialized thanks largely to the efforts and sacrifices of Afghan, U.S. and Allied forces.

Instead, *NATO* has taken the initiative this spring with our own civil and military efforts: NATO and Afghan forces have increasingly denied the Taliban safe haven

in Afghanistan, and the Government of Pakistan has done same across the border. We have taken many mid- and senior-level Taliban leaders out of the fight; and we have more closely linked military operations with follow-on reconstruction efforts to help the civilian population.

Our "comprehensive approach" in Afghanistan, where soldiers and reconstruction experts work hand-in-hand, where NATO security efforts support the priorities of Afghanistan's democratic leadership, shows how NATO is likely to operate in coming decades.

Today, 37 countries—26 Allies and 11 non-NATO partners—participate in NATO's UN-mandated International Security Assistance Forces, providing over 40,000 troops. About 24,000 of these troops—nearly 60 percent—are from our Allies and partners, and (since October 2006) serve throughout all of Afghanistan. Many of our allies also continue to contribute to the separate Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF) mission in Afghanistan, spearheaded by the United States.

At a time when our own military is stretched, it is important to recognize the tremendous impact that Allied contributions have on our own security. Together with growing Afghan forces, Allied forces are fighting off the Taliban, securing Afghan territory, protecting Afghan counternarcotics teams, helping extend the authority of the democratically elected Afghan government, and enabling reconstruction and development that is improving the lives of the Afghan people.

At the NATO Summit in Riga in November 2006, as well as at four Foreign and Defense Ministerial meetings since January, NATO Allies and partners reaffirmed their commitment to the Afghanistan mission. We have continued to press Allies to fill force shortfalls in ISAF, and since last fall Allies and partners have pledged well over 7,000 new troops to the mission—half of them U.S., and half European—and most without caveats. Although some caveats restricting operations of longstanding deployed forces remain a concern, Allies have expressed a willingness to come to each others' aid, should the need arise, and new forces are providing commanders with increased flexibility.

NATO forces increasingly serve side-by-side with Afghan National Security Forces. The United States, along with its NATO Allies and partners, are doing everything possible to train and equip Afghan National Army and Police forces so they can take an ever increasing role in providing for Afghanistan's security. Allies and partners are adding new embedded training teams and sending much needed arms and equipment. The recent supplemental passed by Congress, which provided funding to better train and equip Afghan forces, has helped us leverage even more from other contributors.

We are also grateful that non-U.S. donors have pledged nearly $1.3 billion over the last year in *new* multi-year assistance. Afghanistan deserves our full effort and we believe the international community can and should do still more. Europe recognizes that Afghanistan matters for its own security and European partners have provided, individually or through the European Commission, over $2.2 billion for Afghan reconstruction since 2002.

It's important to underline the scope and scale of the changes over the past five years in Afghanistan, due in large part to the combined efforts of the United States and its Allies. Afghanistan has a democratically elected President and Parliament. Five million Afghans have returned to their country. The number of children attending school has increased five-fold since 2001 to six million, two million of those girls—who had no access to schools under the Taliban. Over 80 percent of Afghans have access to basic healthcare and approximately 6,000 kilometers of new roads are expanding commerce and opportunity. However, the challenges that remain are real and our commitment must not waiver.

NATO AND MISSILE DEFENSE

A final example of how Europe is working together with the United States to address security challenges is through missile defense.

Today, NATO faces the possibility that some of the world's most threatening and unstable regimes can develop nuclear weapons and the ballistic missiles to deliver them to Europe and even the United States. Iran already possesses hundreds of medium range Shahab-3 and short-range ballistic missiles. The Intelligence Community estimates that Iran could develop long-range missiles capable of reaching all of Europe and the United States by 2015 if it continues on its present course.

NATO has also begun to explore options to protect the Alliance against ballistic missile threats. NATO's work on missile defense has focused on three activities: the Active Layered Theater Ballistic Missile Defense (ALTBMD) program, technical work to support decisions on possible missile defense for the protection of NATO ter-

ritory and population centers, and cooperation with Russia on Theater Missile Defense.

In 2005, the North Atlantic Council approved the ALTBMD program, a NATO-funded Command and Control structure to integrate member states' sensors and missile defense interceptors. This system is focused on protecting of NATO *deployed forces* against ballistic missiles with a range of up to 3,000 km (shorter-to-medium range missile defense). NATO plans to achieve by 2010 an initial capability to defend NATO forces; a fully operational system capable of protecting *defined areas* against missiles up to 3,000 km is tentatively planned for the 2015–2016 timeframe.

At the 2006 Riga Summit, NATO Heads of State and Government noted the conclusions of the Missile Defense Feasibility Study, which found that missile defense for all NATO territory is technically feasible within the assumptions and limitations of the study. At April's meeting of NATO Foreign Ministers in Oslo there was near unanimity in support of missile defense from our NATO allies. Minister after minister acknowledged that a genuine threat exists. Now that the United States is proposing a long-range missile defense system in Europe, Allies have agreed to assess the implications for the Alliance of the U.S. system and the possibility of integrating NATO's short- to midrange system to ensure all allied territory is protected. Allies also expressed support for our offers to increase cooperation with the Russians in the field of missile defense.

During his press statement on April 26, Secretary General de Hoop Scheffer noted that U.S. missile defense plans do not upset the strategic balance of Europe. He stated, "It is clear that there is a full understanding between the Allies that the plans in the framework of the third site cannot, and will not, and do not upset the strategic balance in Europe. There was a lot of support for the wide-ranging United States proposals vis-à-vis our Russia partners for closer cooperation on missile defense."

Transatlantic security is indivisible. As we learned the hard way in the twentieth century, if Europe is not secure, the United States is not secure. We cannot have U.S. security decoupled from that of our NATO allies. We cannot take a unilateral or isolationist approach to security. Our goal is to see NATO bolt its own missile defense efforts onto the burgeoning U.S.-led long range missile defense system, thus helping ensure full spectrum coverage for the entire Alliance. We need a common level of protection from threats for the United States and for our European allies, and with our NATO Allies we are working to develop that. We welcome the chance to cooperate with Russia on missile defense. President Putin's proposal at the G8 Summit for cooperation using the Russian radar in Azerbaijan may be an opening. Ideally, NATO, U.S. national efforts, and U.S.-Russia and NATO-Russia cooperation could all work together to provide more general and comprehensive security from this challenge.

TRANSFORMATION

NATO is going through its own transformation to develop its capacities and intellectual horizons to deal with these new challenges. Much more needs to be done, but much has been done already.

Consider 1994: NATO was an alliance of 16 countries. It had never conducted a military operation. It had no partners. Now consider NATO just 11 years later, at the end of 2005: the Alliance was running eight military operations simultaneously; had 26 members, and partnership relationships with another 20 countries in Eurasia, seven in the Mediterranean, a growing number in the Persian Gulf, and a number of Contact Countries.

Many of us hoped that NATO's transformation would happen faster. We set transformational goals at the Prague Summit in 2002. We refined them at the Istanbul Summit in 2004. But transformation does not end—not because we fail, but because, in a changing world, the challenges facing NATO change. And this requires new approaches to meeting them.

Developing the capabilities so that NATO can launch and sustain these missions takes political will and money. So far, the will has been in the hand-off to NATO—but not necessarily in the will to give NATO more resources to do the job.

NATO CAPABILITIES

The Riga Summit last November marked an important step forward in NATO's transformation to meet twenty-first century challenges.

At Riga, the *NATO Response Force (NRF)* was declared to have reached full operational capability. The NRF is a prime example of NATO's transformation to meet global challenges. Twenty-five thousand strong land, air, and sea elements when at full strength, the NRF can act as a quick reaction expeditionary force capable of be-

ginning deployment of elements with as little as five days notice. NATO operations in Bosnia and Kosovo in the 1990s showed that NATO needed a scalable option for dealing with operations that required limited number of troops and special capabilities, different from the Cold War era force structure. The NRF concept, launched at the 2002 Prague Summit, emerged in response to this perceived need.

Even before it was declared fully operationally capable, NATO needed to mobilize the NRF. Elements of the NRF were used to provide additional security to the 2005 Afghanistan elections and to provide air transport and medical assistance to refugees from the 2005 earthquake in Pakistan and to the U.S. Gulf region after Hurricane Katrina. Important lessons have been learned from these operational deployments, as well as from the joint training exercise in Cape Verde.

The NRF construct has served well as a catalyst for the transformation of Allied forces and capabilities but much work needs to be done to make it a viable option for the range of missions to which NATO may need to respond. More analysis on its composition, deployability, potential uses *in extremis*, and as a reserve force, as well as approval of common funding for short notice deployments, will improve the utility of this key capability.

The *Strategic Airlift Initiative* marks an important step forward in addressing one of NATO's chronic weaknesses—a lack of dedicated strategic airlift. Airlift has become increasingly important over the last five years as NATO operations have taken the Alliance thousands of miles from Europe. Fifteen Allies and two Partner nations formed a consortium to operate a small fleet of C–17 aircraft that could be used by consortium nations to provide airlift when needed. Participating Allies would proportionally share ownership of the fleet based on their projected annual airlift requirements. The aircraft will be nationally owned but operated by the contributing nations from a European airfield. All ten of the newest NATO members are participating. The initiative also offers to coordinate support structures for A–400M strategic airlift.

The Strategic Airlift Initiative will greatly increase NATO's capabilities to fight expeditionary warfare. Authorization and appropriation of the U.S. in-kind contribution of one aircraft is still underway. Allies who are not participating have expressed concerns on ownership issues, but seem closer to endorsing the NAMO Charter which will formalize the consortium. This initiative is important because it also sets an important precedent for voluntary, shared Allied investment in high priority strategic assets that are needed for NATO-led operations. UAVs and Air Refueling strategic assets are two examples that may follow this model.

The *Special Operations Force (SOF) Initiative* will improve the coordination and interoperability of Allies' special operations forces. The complex and challenging environments in which today's military operations take place differ greatly from the Cold War realities NATO's military structure was originally designed to address. SOF will possess the ability to span the operational continuum and are uniquely suited for operations in unconventional environments. The SOF initiative will enable NATO to respond to the rapidly growing need for increased SOF capabilities in its operations. The initiative will facilitate SOF interoperability between nations, disseminate key lessons learned, expand and improve SOF training, and enhance SOF capability among Alliance nations.

The *NATO Training Cooperation Initiative (NTCI)* constitutes part of NATO's outreach to new partners in the Broader Middle East. It will deepen cooperation and reciprocal training opportunities with NATO's Mediterranean Dialogue (MD) and Istanbul Cooperation Initiative (ICI) partners. NTCI seeks to promote the ability of NATO and the MD and ICI nations to work together; strengthen regional security relationships; promote durable, democratic civil-military defense structures; and enhance military-to-military cooperation. To start this effort, NATO is working to establish a Middle East faculty at the NATO Defense College in Rome and to possibly bring NATO-supported Mobile Training Teams visiting interested regional partners to make this training more accessible by bringing it to the region. And as interest and demand grow, NATO could also support developing a Strategic Cooperation Center in the region.

NATO ENLARGEMENT

In addition to building its capabilities, a second significant transformation has been the growth in NATO's membership.

It is easy to forget that, back in 1989 and 1991, people spoke of a "security vacuum" in Central and Eastern Europe, and debated how it could be filled. Many argued that the newly free countries of Europe should have been relegated to a "gray zone" of Russian influence. But the Bush and Clinton Administrations rejected that course, and, today, the growth of democracy and prosperity in Central Europe, and

the integration of Central European nations into NATO and the European Union, is a fact, so successful it is taken for granted.

This was a great success of three U.S. Presidents. NATO acted boldly and invited ten countries to become members—three at the Madrid Summit in 1997, and seven more at the Prague Summit in 2002. These actions, along with the expansion of the European Union, secured a future of freedom, democracy, market economy, human rights, and the rule of law for over 100 million people. We rejected a gray zone, and helped the people of Central Europe consolidate the freedom they had gained.

To be clear—it was not NATO and EU membership itself that made the difference, but the realistic *prospect* of membership that convinced nations to make hard decisions about political, economic and defense reform. In the pursuit of NATO (and EU) membership, countries pursued reforms that improved the lives and opportunities of their citizens in ways far beyond basic security and defense. These reforms strengthened individual rights and freedoms, institutionalized democratic systems, fostered market economies, resolved border disputes, and protected minorities. All were challenging; many were hard; none could have been accomplished without political will.

Today, this process continues as Albania, Croatia, Macedonia, Georgia, and Ukraine pursue reforms and seek eventual NATO and possibly EU membership. Others, such as Montenegro, Bosnia and Serbia, may also choose this path.

NATO enlargement is still playing this transformative role. European countries still seek to join NATO, strengthening their democracies, their economies, and their militaries through reform and through working together with NATO. They believe that NATO membership is in their interest. But it is also in NATO's interest to add new members that meet NATO's performance-based standards. Democratic, market economies strengthen the Alliance with their commitment to share values and their determination to contribute to common security—whether by reducing tensions among neighbors or deploying troops as part of NATO operations.

Despite recent rhetoric on this topic, gone are the days when security in these regions was a cold calculus. Zero-sum thinking when it comes to security is an anachronism. NATO's history demonstrates the ability not only of nations, but of entire regions to transform fundamentally. Every state has the right to choose its own security orientation, its own future, for its own people. And by building strong, stable, democratic, prosperous societies, everyone's security is strengthened. A more secure Europe means a more a secure United States and, though they would disagree, it means ultimately a more secure Russia as well.

As was agreed at the November 2006 Riga Summit, NATO should issue new invitations for membership to qualified candidates at its next Summit in Bucharest in 2008. NATO is prepared to do its part, and they must do theirs by putting in place the reforms and policies necessary to meet NATO standards and contribute to the Alliance.

THE WAY AHEAD

The April 2008 Bucharest Summit will address many, if not all, of these issues. For us, Bucharest is about using NATO effectively to deal with today's security challenges, and strengthening NATO, with new capabilities and new members, so it is prepared to face the challenges of tomorrow. At the fourth major NATO Summit in this Administration, our goal is to consolidate and strengthen what we launched in Prague, refined in Istanbul, and built upon at Riga.

Thank you for your attention. I appreciate the opportunity to be here and I look forward to your questions.

Chairman LANTOS. Thank you very much, Ambassador Fried.

Both you and General Craddock have given us extraordinarily valuable presentations, and I would like to begin by picking up your phrase, Ambassador Fried, that if NATO did not exist, we would need to invent this.

I have given this a lot of thought over many years because clearly were we to invent NATO today, it would be a very different entity with very different geographic composition and very different missions.

One of the most powerful stories of the Second World War is the story of the guns of Singapore which were aimed at the sea because the Brits expected that to be a sea-born invasion. But the enemy came over land, and the guns of Singapore were never used.

Now, NATO is not like that, because with the creativity and the leadership that General Craddock and other leaders have provided, NATO has attempted to adapt to an entirely new set of challenges and problems and geographic locations.

But let me just raise the broadest philosophical question, because both of you are not only great military leaders and diplomats but thinkers about global security.

In a period of globalization where everything is globalized, from academics to trade, clearly NATO ideally would be transformed into a global security mission. Is there any serious planning ongoing, General Craddock, under your auspices, and, Ambassador Fried, within the confines of the State Department, to seriously explore the transformation of this absolutely unique alliance which kept Europe from being overrun by the Soviet Union, which is no mean task, because my flippant phrase about socialist Belgium, Soviet Republic, or Portuguese Republic is not that fanciful because the Kremlin would have loved to have taken over Western Europe had it not been for NATO?

What kind of serious thinking and planning, if any, is ongoing either within NATO or within the confines of the State Department? And what kind of work would you like us to authorize and support financially and intellectually and in other ways that would more rapidly transform NATO into a global security alliance designed to deal with the challenges of the 21st century, which is very unlikely to be big army, big air force, big navy challenges, although we cannot discount that possibility, but much more likely to be terrorism challenges, weapons of mass destruction challenges from rogue nations and the like?

General Craddock, would you start with sort of a speculative answer on a very speculative question?

General CRADDOCK. Thank you, chairman.

Indeed, it is a global perspective.

If I may, maybe I'll start small and try to widen the construct.

The notion of a global security organization is indeed fascinating and provocative. There obviously are political constraints that will tenure and flavor all of the arguments in the North Atlantic Council. If I may, from a Supreme Headquarters Allied-Powers Europe perspective, address the notion of partners at this time.

We obviously have 26 members, and we have partners and we have different categories of those who would aspire to be members or who would like to gain contact status, if you will.

Any active planning? Right now, we are working through the sourcing and the long-term viability of the NATO Response Force.

As Ambassador Fried indicated, this is a 25,000-person force, very robust, specified missions from a high-order conventional combat capability to a low-order response to humanitarian disaster. It is a graduated readiness requirement. So all nations have to come together and bid on what capabilities they want to contribute.

And we are finding now a difficult task at my headquarters when we asked the nations to come in and subscribe to these capabilities for them to do so. So what we call our fill of the requirements is not where we want it to be.

Now part of looking broadly at this issue is, where can, not only members but partner nations who might have capabilities and

want to be a part of that, contribute in an expansion of the capability of NATO? So we are exploring, what is the possibility, the range of possibilities, for partner nations? What are the ranges of possibilities that we might want, ask or need from nations, maybe not partners, but our contact nations throughout the world?

So, from a perspective of planning and preparing, at my headquarters, we are looking at the ability to expand. Is that a first step to a global enlargement? I don't know. That will be, obviously, a political decision. But I think it is indeed a recognition that the level of ambition is significant, and, quite frankly, and it may be a harsh judgment, but I think, my judgment, it is not matched by political will of the nations to meet that level of ambition. And we must continue to push on our member nations to provide that capability. Absent that, then we will either have to reduce the level of ambition, which hasn't happened, or look for partners who can provide support and capability so that we are ready when called.

I think NATO's honor is at stake; that if the force is not ready when called, we will be called to answer for it.

Chairman LANTOS. Thank you very much.

Ambassador Fried.

Mr. FRIED. You have raised a question of how NATO can match the reality of missions around the globe with its original identity as a North Atlantic security organization.

And NATO is wrestling with that, both intellectually and organizationally.

As General Craddock said, the current policy answer that we have is to develop our global partnerships with nations like Australia and Japan and other nations willing and able to work with NATO who are in fact working with NATO in, for example, Afghanistan through ISAF.

The immediate answer to your question is NATO is a transatlantic organization with global partners, global missions and global capabilities.

Now that is the current answer.

There is a debate going on about whether NATO's identity and membership should be expanded and reflect the reality of a potentially global field of activity, and in this context, Article 5 does not mention the Soviet Union or communism; nor is it bounded geographically.

It talks about threats to the alliance, the members of the alliance.

And Article 5 was invoked for the first time on September 12th, 2001, the day after the attacks on the United States and invoked in response to an attack originating in Afghanistan.

Now what I don't have for you is an answer whether or not NATO will ever be ready to take that step. Right now, it is—right now, it is not ready to do so, and partners is where we are as an alliance. That is, we are developing global partnerships. These are useful. These contributors are important. General Craddock talked about what they have to contribute, and it is a very interesting notion about partners with the NATO Response Force.

But this debate is ongoing. NATO is getting its collective minds around the issue of its 21st century missions.

You asked what you could do to contribute, what the committee could do to contribute to this debate.

I think the discussions such as this and discussions with NATO's global partners would be useful. And I think helping the Congress and getting the executive branch used to the idea, all of us used to the idea of NATO's new reach, and working with the global partners could be very useful as this debate develops. And I think it is going in a good direction.

Chairman LANTOS. It is probably just youthful impatience that makes me feel somewhat dissatisfied with your answer because global conditions will not wait until our slow-moving bureaucratic structures catch up with the global challenges. So let me just state one specific example.

General Craddock and I—I had the pleasure of having breakfast with him, and he mentioned this, and I hope I am not violating any confidences. I know I am not.

What prevents Australia, with which we share values, with which we have cooperated, going back a century, in a military fashion, which has the willingness and capability and the political will to do the things that we are doing—after all, they took the lead in their part of the world in a military operation and did so magnificently—what, except the word Atlantic, prevents Australia, with flexibility on the part of NATO, to become a member of a renamed North Atlantic Treaty Organization? Would it not be good for General Craddock to be able to look down to Sydney and Melbourne and this magnificent continent with its great military capability as part of his domain?

Similarly, you mentioned Japan. Clearly, there is a democratic peace-loving, contributing nation with significant military capabilities. Would it not make the supreme allied commander feel more comfortable about upcoming global crises if he would have a NATO of a global reach?

Mr. FRIED. I think having robust partnerships that could contribute to NATO's capabilities, particularly partnerships with democracies that share our values and are willing to share the burdens of security responsibilities, brings nothing but good.

I welcome this debate, and I welcome suggestions and even pressure to make these partnerships ever more robust.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there is nothing more dangerous than speculating, but I found that it is useful to start building consensus one step at a time with a large vision. And never say never.

Chairman LANTOS. General Craddock, would you like to add anything, sir?

General CRADDOCK. Well, from a best military advice perspective, it would indeed be enormously helpful to have democratic peace-loving nations as a part, more democratic peace-loving nations, as part of alliance. And the ability for them to bring, as they see fit, based on their judgments and their political decisions, capabilities to the alliance no doubt would be very helpful.

We find that, by and large, when partners are interested, they—we are able to work through the military modalities because we have common interests, maybe it is called doctrine or how we are brought up in multilateral organizations throughout the military experience around the world, particularly in this day and age.

So I think that I am a bit impatient. I agree with Ambassador Fried. We need to have a dialogue. Enormously helpful. This dialogue is helpful. People will read about it, and I think it will be influential.

But I think we need to crack the whip a little harder and move a little faster because NATO is involved today in operations, not in planning and preparing to counter the Warsaw Pact. Those days are over. And we have our service members, our soldiers, airmen, sailors engaged every day in operations. There are those who are making the ultimate sacrifice in Afghanistan, and I think we need to push harder to find answers quicker.

Chairman LANTOS. Thank you very much.

Congresswoman Ros-Lehtinen.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Continuing on the chairman's theme of global security organization and the transformation of NATO, I wanted to ask a question on Israel and a question on Darfur.

First, on Israel, if you could comment on the decision by Israel to contribute to Operation Active Endeavor and to finalize the cooperation agreement with NATO. Do you think this represents a significant step forward in a cooperation with the alliance? And do actions, such as Operation Active Endeavor, have the potential to be integrated into an action that is aimed at enforcing an embargo on arms to Hezbollah that is in accordance with United Nations Security Council Resolution 1701?

And, secondly, on Darfur, though NATO has provided logistical and other support to the African Union Mission in Sudan, advocates consistently have called on NATO to play a more direct role in stabilizing Darfur. Please describe, if you would, the support that NATO has already provided to the African mission in Sudan. And what role NATO would be willing to play in the future as even the most optimistic estimates tell us it will take at least 1 full year for the proposed hybrid African Union peacekeeping mission to reach full deployment in Darfur? Would it be appropriate for NATO to provide a bridging force during the interim? What would such a mission entail? Or given the difficulty that NATO has encountered in fielding troops for existing missions in Kosova and Afghanistan, as successful as it has been, but could the organization realistically undertake a new mission in Darfur?

Thank you so much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FRIED. With respect to your question about Israel, Israel has indeed developed its relations with NATO. It is participating in Operation Active Endeavor. It is one of three Mediterranean Dialogue partners doing so. It has agreed to place liaison officers at various subcommands at NATO's Joint Force Command at Naples, and it has concluded an individual cooperation plan with NATO.

So these routine and working-level contacts and operational contacts between NATO and Israel are developing, and we welcome this.

You asked a speculative question about NATO and Israel possibly operating to enforce an arms embargo against Hezbollah. Now, it is the nature of speculative questions that they are dangerous to try to answer. But let me anticipate other such questions by saying this: On September 10th, 2001, no one would have dreamt that NATO would be undertaking security operations in Af-

ghanistan. Ever. It would have not made it to an agenda item of any NATO meeting. And yet here we are. Here we are.

So experience suggests that, in the 21st century, NATO can undertake operations that seemed impossible. And the distance between the impossible and the inevitable is shorter than we think.

So I am not—I don't want to say never. We want to see what is—what is needed. That is not forward-leaning speculation, but it is a recognition that we have to be open to contingencies that may arise.

General CRADDOCK. If I may add to it, I would only endorse Ambassador Fried's statement with regard to—does Operation Active Endeavor have the potential to be a part of an embargo against Hezbollah arms. The capability is definitely resonant in Active Endeavor. The multilateral aspect, multinational contributions, the fact we were just recently joined by a Ukrainian ship, and there will be a Russian ship that will join that operation in September, I think is proof of the value of that operation.

So the capability exists. The question would become one of political will and consensus to do so.

If I may, moving on to Darfur. What have we done to date? The NATO contribution has been an airlift of the movement of battalions of the African peacekeepers of the African Union from their home station to the Darfur area. We also have participated in training of staffs for the African Union battalions and brigades who are the identified designated peacekeeping forces at this time moving into Darfur. That has been pretty much the general limit of participation at this time.

What more could NATO do? That will depend, again, on the political decisions being made.

I will tell you that, based upon the effort in Afghanistan and the fact that what is required there to accomplish that mission has yet to be sourced by the nations of NATO, I am suspect that NATO will take on in any large way another commitment in Darfur.

Could NATO provide a bridging force? That could be a potential mission for the NATO Response Force if there were political consensus to do so.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman LANTOS. Thank you very much.

Ms. Woolsey.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, gentlemen.

I am going to try to marry two questions, so we can kind of get through to an answer.

I want to talk about trafficking. And we have seen how NATO's efforts in order to stem the small arm's trade have had successes.

So how can NATO or can NATO or will NATO work with international governmental organizations for a similar effort in trafficking of persons, especially since the sex trafficking is being seen throughout Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union?

So is there a military civilian partnership coordinated with these efforts? And along with that, with Kosova, did we learn anything? I mean, that was happening in Kosova. Did we stem that? Have we learned from the Kosova experience what we need to be doing regarding trafficking in other parts of Europe and the world? And

are we learning from Kosova what we can and should be doing in Afghanistan all the way around, not just on trafficking?

That is a big question, I know that.

Mr. FRIED. Let me start with the last piece of the question.

Certainly some of the lessons of Afghanistan and Kosova—some of the lessons we have learned in Kosova we have applied to Afghanistan. And some of the difficulties we have encountered in Afghanistan have played back into Kosova, and we have learned in Kosova how to do things better because of that experience.

I will illustrate that with a story. The last time I was in Kosova, I visited the American troops who were delivering some assistance to some Serbian villages, and the captains and lieutenants came up to me and said, this is the kind of thing we need to learn to do all over in Iraq, in Afghanistan. We need to learn how to get the trust of the local people to work with them so that troublemakers, terrorists, extremists, are marginalized and have no place. So we are learning that the information, the lessons learned are going back and forth.

With respect to trafficking, there may be more that NATO could do. We have looked at this in a couple of places.

One of the assets, one of the capabilities NATO will have to pick up is how to interface——

Chairman LANTOS. Could you put the mike closer to you?

Mr. FRIED. NATO will have to learn how to work more closely with organizations like the European Union and NATO. We need to develop a seamlessness of European and military agencies, so you don't have things like trafficking out of the competence of one organization and falling through the cracks. That is a general problem, and we are working at it.

General CRADDOCK. Let me just add, on Operation Active Endeavor, in the Mediterranean, where we are patrolling, to stop traffickers of mass destruction, arms, things like that, if NATO would decide—if the decision politically would be to add to that mission set, search suspect vessels who may be trafficking in persons, then I think that would be a subset of the other mission, and it would be doable.

Now let me caveat that. I hate to use that word, but it is a very appropriate word at this point.

I think the nations of Europe have each, and rightfully so, their own judgments of and definitions of public security and national security. And in many cases, what we view as an opportunity to use military forces to assist the public security forces, the police, it sometimes, oftentimes are viewed differently there. And this may well be differences among nations of whether or not this is their sovereign police authority that they don't want to grant to multinational forces, say, on the high sees of the Mediterranean. So there will have to be debate and discussion on that if that mission set were to be changed.

How do we do it better? I think we are focused now on leveraging commercial technology into the operation. Instead of patrolling with Frigates and corvettes out on the Mediterranean, we are tying in the capability to see what is moving.

On any one day in the Mediterranean, there are about 7,000 ships that are out there moving around that we know about. And

there are a few we don't, and those are the ones we have to find. So that is the first set.

The second is: What about the 7,000 we know? If we can tie into commercial shipping networks, and we know from this port to that port, this would be the normal path, and if we then understand there are variations and ships may move out of that normal steaming path and maybe do an unannounced port visit somewhere else, that is an aberration, and we have got to follow aberrations and understand these things are happening. Those will be the tippers that we need.

So we are leveraging this network technology to be able to bring this in by coordinating agreements by nations to support this. I think that is the future; fewer ships out there, but where we have them out there, they are focused where the problems occur.

With regard to Kosova, I think we indeed did learn lessons about trafficking. Kosova sits astride the centuries-old smuggling routes of everything from commodities to people to weapons back and forth, and we watched that closely. We have applied some of those lessons into Afghanistan, but it is a different environment with different regional consideration. But we might migrate those in. Are they as fast and effective as we like? Probably not. And more effort is required.

Chairman LANTOS. Thank you very much.

Congressman Smith.

Mr. SMITH OF NEW JERSEY. Thank you very much.

First of all, I would like to ask unanimous consent that an article by Captain Keith Allred on NATO anti-trafficking initiatives be made a part of the record. He is the senior military judge in the Judge Advocate General's Corps of the U.S. Navy. And I also ask unanimous consent that a transcript of a video interview with the Assistant Secretary, General John Colston, who is NATO's new anti-trafficking coordinator, be made a part of the record.

Chairman LANTOS. Without objection.

[The information referred to follows:]

ANALYSIS

COMBATING HUMAN TRAFFICKING

Captain Keith J. Allred examines NATO policy on countering trafficking in human beings.

One of the lesser-known outcomes of NATO's 2004 Istanbul Summit was the adoption of a NATO Policy Against Human Trafficking. The *Policy* calls human trafficking a crime meriting universal condemnation, describing it as a "modern day slave trade that fuels corruption and organised crime" bringing with it the potential to "destabilise fragile governments." The Policy was adopted by all heads of state and government, and applies to all nations contributing troops to NATO operations. Two years on, progress is beginning to show and the initiative has led to many efforts to tackle the problem of trafficking.

It may seem odd for NATO to have decided to make a security issue of what appears to be a social or police problem, but the initiative reflects a growing awareness that human trafficking poses a threat to NATO operations, which themselves can create or increase the demand for trafficked women. Various international organizations have estimated that hundreds of thousands of victims are trafficked each year. Human trafficking is a significant source of revenue for criminal organisations whose activities may destabilise legitimate governments and undermine the NATO mission. Hence, human trafficking should be viewed as a security threat that merits NATO's attention.

While the Policy addresses all aspects of human trafficking, it specifically recognises the impact that deployed troops can have on the demand for women trafficked for the sex trade. When deployed forces patronise prostitutes, they are often purchasing services from organised criminal enterprises and are creating the "demand" for trafficked women. NATO troops engaged in such activities are often patronizing sex slaves and filling the coffers of organized criminals in countries where NATO operates. Neither of these outcomes is worthy of NATO or its members.

NATO's decision to address human trafficking coincided with other incidents that demonstrated the role of deployed troops in the illegal sex trade. Allegations of sexual offences by UN peacekeepers surfaced in Congo in 2003 to the embarrassment of the United Nations. Secretary-General Kofi Annan was outraged to learn that UN peacekeepers were accused of raping and molesting Congolese women and children.

Similar accusations over the previous decade made the reports credible. In a 2002 UN Development Fund for Women study entitled *Women, War and Peace: The Independent Experts' Assessment of the Impact of Armed Conflict on Women and Women's Role in Peace-Building*, authors Elizabeth Rehn and Ellen Johnson Sirleaf substantiated UN peacekeepers' involvement in sexual offences, including human trafficking in Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, the Democratic Republic of Congo, East Timor, Kosovo, Liberia, Mozambique, Sierra Leone and Somalia.

When peacekeepers deployed in the former Yugoslavia in the 1990s, they brought with them a demand for sexual services that was promptly met by an increase in women trafficked there for the purpose. Brothels sprang up almost overnight outside these compounds, with club names and atmospheres that appealed to the nationality of the troops in the nearest base. When bases closed, the brothels closed as well. Many of the women employed in these brothels had been trafficked to the former Yugoslavia expressly to serve UN Peacekeepers. The relationship between deployed troops and the demand for trafficked women was unmistakable.

The United States also suffered an embarrassing incident that demonstrated the overly close relationship between troops and trafficked women. In May 2002, a Fox News television report suggested that US troops in South Korea carried out "courtesy patrols" to protect brothels that exploited trafficked women. The broadcast of this television exposé in the United States caused 14 Congressmen to write to the Department of Defense Inspector General urging him to investigate what appeared to be official participation in or support for human trafficking. While the Inspector General concluded that there was no overt military support for human traffickers in South Korea, he did find an "overly familiar" relationship between US forces there and the sex trade. US forces in South Korea were embarrassed by these findings and took swift steps to prevent US soldiers from any further involvement.

NATO policy

In part as a result of incidents such as these, the Norwegian and US ambassadors to NATO initiated consideration of a wide-ranging NATO policy on the issue of human trafficking in March 2004. The Policy, finally adopted at Istanbul, set NATO on a course that should prevent Allied troops from engaging in activities that facilitate or support human trafficking.

HUMAN TRAFFICKING THREATENS TO DESTABILISE GOVERNMENTS AND EMBOLDEN CRIMINAL NETWORKS

It requires member states to take a variety of actions to reduce human trafficking. These include reviews of national legislation; ratification, acceptance or approval of the UN Convention Against Organised Crime and its Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, especially Women and Children; training of all personnel taking part in NATO-led operations; contractual provisions that prohibit contractors from engaging or facilitating human trafficking; and a commitment to evaluate implementation of their efforts as part of ongoing reviews carried out by the competent authorities.

All NATO nations had signed and many had ratified both the UN Convention against Transnational Organised Crime and its Protocol long before the Istanbul Summit called for it. Since the Summit, two more NATO nations—Belgium and the United States—have ratified the Convention on Organised Crime and the Protocol on Human Trafficking. Nine have yet to ratify either treaty: the Czech Republic, Estonia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg and the United Kingdom.

Much recent progress in combating human trafficking has come via enacting new laws; building the capacity of non-governmental organisations, law-enforcement agencies and the judiciary to provide services to trafficked persons; and learning best practices for investigation and prosecution.

Norway, for example, put in place a National Plan of Action to Combat Human Trafficking in 2003 and published a revised plan in June 2005. This plan provides for identification of victims and increased efforts to identify and prosecute traffickers, and will be implemented between 2006 and 2008. The Norwegian Armed Forces Code of Conduct prohibits the purchase of sexual services and relations that might otherwise weaken confidence in the impartiality of the force. Norwegian military personnel who violate the code are subject to punishment.

The United States has implemented a new article in its military code, effective on 15 November 2005, which prohibits members of its armed forces from patronising prostitutes. The new *article* will allow military commanders to punish soldiers who pay for sexual services. US Forces in Korea have a robust and far-reaching programme to prevent American Soldiers deployed there from patronizing establishments where trafficked women may be kept.

Capacity-building

The US Agency for International Development (USAID) and Romania have collaborated on a regional anti-trafficking *"best practices"* training manual for law enforcement officers. The manual is the result of two years of intensive cooperation between USAID/Romania, the UN Development Programme, and Romania's Ministry of Administration and the Interior.

Written for border police officers, specialised police units, and prosecutors, the manual was officially adopted by the UN Office on Drugs and Crime at the regional law enforcement senior officials meeting in Vienna in December 2003. The regional anti-trafficking training strategy has been endorsed by 13 Southeastern European countries—Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Greece, Hungary, Serbia and Montenegro, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia,* Moldova, Romania, Slovenia, Turkey, and Ukraine, as well as the UN Mission in Kosovo—and is projected to be the most advanced anti-trafficking training programme for law enforcement in the world. Several hundred police officers in the region have already received specialised anti-trafficking training based on this new manual, and police academies in several countries have adopted its modules in their student curricula. The manual includes a legislative compendium and a contact directory specific to Southeastern Europe. The best practices section, which includes an overview of trafficking methodology, practical suggestions for international cooperation, specialist investigative techniques, and tactics for disrupting trafficking, can be adapted throughout the world.

The International Organization for Migration (IOM), USAID and the Turkish government have implemented an anti-trafficking in persons project initiated by the IOM office in Ankara. The project takes a comprehensive approach to combating human trafficking, increasing the prosecution of traffickers, protecting trafficked individuals and preventing trafficking through public awareness and intervention. The $600,000 project included funds for a "157 Helpline." Passport inserts given to potential trafficking victims as they pass through immigration checkpoints alert them to this service. Similar to the 911 emergency number popular in the United States, 157 is a dedicated emergency response line that has already helped coordinate the rescue of 60 trafficking victims, and has helped IOM return more than 200 trafficked women to their homes. A national referral network for trafficked persons is in development.

The NATO School has developed three modules that it offers in eight of its resident courses taught at Oberammergau, Germany. A General Module, a Module for Military Commanders, and a Law Enforcement Module alert NATO School students to the issues of human trafficking. All of these modules are available to other NATO and Partnership for Peace (PfP) training institutions, with a web version for advanced distributed learning purposes. The Turkish PfP Training Centre in Ankara created a one-week course on Combating Smuggling and Trafficking in Human Beings, and delivered it via mobile training teams to Albania, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Romania, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia,* Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Ukraine during the past year.

These initiatives, and many more like them, are in various stages of planning and implementation throughout the Alliance. NATO recognised at Istanbul that it could no longer ignore the two-pronged threat that human trafficking poses. First, as a business enterprise that provides millions of dollars to organised crime each year, human trafficking threatens to destabilise local governments and embolden the criminal networks that oppose them. NATO troop patronage of these establishments funds and supports a security threat that is intensely counter-productive to the NATO mission. Furthermore, the NATO Allies have also recognised that NATO troops who patronise brothels or otherwise facilitate human trafficking are themselves involved in the criminal enterprise as customers. For reasons of principle and

to maintain the integrity of NATO operations, this must be prevented. To date, however, only Norway and the United States are known to have taken action to prohibit their military personnel from patronizing prostitutes while deployed.

Other NATO Partners are moving to implement the Policy in other ways. In addition, NATO is conducting a thorough review of the Policy with a view towards possible enhancements should they be deemed necessary by the North Atlantic Council. While there has already been some positive movement, it is still too early to assess the impact of all the initiatives that are currently under development. But there is reason to hope that initiatives that are now coming into force will begin to disrupt and weaken the criminal enterprises that profit from organised human trafficking. More governments must take steps to prohibit their forces from facilitating human trafficking by patronizing establishments where trafficking victims may be kept against their will. Only time will tell the extent to which the new Policy helps reduce what is one of the great evils of our day.

Captain Keith J. Allred is a Senior Military Judge in the Judge Advocate General's Corps, US Navy. Between 2003 and 2005 he was on the faculty of the George C. Marshall European Center for Security Studies in Garmisch-Partenkirchen, Germany. The views expressed are those of the author alone, and do not represent the views of any government agency.

NATO'S ANTI-TRAFFICKING COORDINATOR EXPLAINS PRIORITIES

VIDEO INTERVIEW WITH THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY GENERAL FOR DEFENCE POLICY AND PLANNING, MR. JOHN COLSTON

May 7, 2007

INTERVIEWER: We're here today with Mr. John Colston, the NATO Assistant Secretary General for Defence Policy and Planning Division. Welcome.

You have just been assigned as NATO's special co-ordinator on combatting trafficking in human beings. We know that both allies and partners feel strongly about this subject, but why is this subject important for NATO?

JOHN COLSTON *(Assistant Secretary General for Defence Policy and Planning, NATO):* Well this subject is important for everybody. Trafficking in human beings constitutes a universally condemned crime and all nations and all international organisations, including NATO, have to do whatever they can to combat it.

Just to give you one or two facts and figures by way of example: this is an illegal industry, a criminal industry, which is estimated to generate some seven billion euros a year for the criminals who are engaged in it. We estimate that somewhere between 400,000 and 800,000 people, mostly women and children, are engaged in the trafficking of human beings. Nearly 130 countries are involved in this trade in some form or other. And I have to say unfortunately Southeast Europe, where NATO is engaged both politically and militarily, is one of the areas where this criminal activity is concentrated most. It is potentially de-stabilizing of nations and so it works against our interests in building stability and security in countries throughout the world, but particularly in Europe. There are also risks that illegal funds on this scale are potential sources of income for terrorism.

So both in political and in military, as well of course as in humanitarian terms, it's essential that NATO tries to do whatever it can to contribute to the response to this problem.

INTERVIEWER: Does NATO have a role in combatting human trafficking?

COLSTON: Yes it does and I think it has a very important role. There are two aspects in which NATO has a responsibility in relation to combatting human trafficking. The first is the way in which our military personnel behave when they are deployed on operations. We must make sure that they do not become part of the problem; that NATO, our peacekeepers, do not become part of the problem. And so we've developed a series of policies and a series of educational training practices to try to address this.

When NATO Heads of State and Government met in Istanbul in 2004, they agreed a zero tolerance policy in relation to human trafficking and that said that any of our personnel, military or civilian, deployed on operations must not act in a way which contributes to the problems of human trafficking. Our partner nations were fully involved in the development of this policy and our partner nations are also fully involved in its implementation. We working together, allies and partners, to ensure that we deliver our commitments to our relevant United Nations conventions in relation to human trafficking and that we undertake a series of actions to respond to these threats; that we review our national legislation and we report on

national efforts to meet our obligations under the United Nations conventions; that we encourage nations who are contributing forces to operations to abide by the relevant UN and OSCE documents and that we provide appropriate training for all personnel who are serving on NATO-led operations.

But I said that there were two ways in which we can help. The way in which our own military and civilian personnel behave is the first of those reasons. The second is what we can do to help the host governments in countries where we are deployed militarily; what we can do to help those countries who are our partners within the Partnership for Peace, but who face challenges from organized crime in general and human trafficking in particular, to respond to those challenges.

So there is a political, as well as military dimension to what NATO can do in response to this problem.

INTERVIEWER: But what are your main challenges and priorities as NATO's senior co-ordinator on combatting human trafficking?

COLSTON: The challenges are considerable, not least since I've only just begun this role and I recognize how much hard work lies ahead in trying to assist the nations, allies and partners, in responding to this challenge. As far as what I will be seeking to do, I think it falls into three broad areas.

The first of those is working with allies and partners to encourage the necessary action to put the right legislation, the right national legislation in place, in each of our countries; and to put the right military procedures to ensure that the disciplinary codes, the codes of conduct, are there which minimize the risks that our military personnel will contribute to the problem, as well as working with partner nations where human trafficking may have become an issue in terms of organized crime in those countries.

The second area where I see myself having a role is working closely with colleagues inside NATO and working closely with the military commanders for the NATO operations to ensure that everybody understands what needs to be done, that everybody is putting in place the right procedures, the right training modules and so on, in order to ensure that service personnel are as well prepared as possible.

And the third and last area where I think I will have a particular responsibility is in liaising, is in talking to other international organisations. NATO has to recognize that other organisations, the United Nations, OSCE, have more experience and more understanding of these issues than we do. We're in a supporting role. We want to learn from them and we want to work closely with them to deliver our common aims.

INTERVIEWER: Can you explain more about the implementation of NATO's zero tolerance policy?

COLSTON: Let me try and do so. What we need in particular is to ensure that we have good feedback from the nations and from the military chain of command. It is one thing to say that we have a zero tolerance policy, but we need to know that it's working; we need to know that it's having a real impact on the way in which our personnel operate. Now we have asked our military commanders to report positively that all NATO personnel, including contractors, working in a mission or operation are aware of NATO's zero tolerance policy. So awareness training is a major element of our work.

But it must go beyond that as well and we're looking at the designation of focal point offices at each operational headquarters who would be responsible for this issue. We are looking at the content of the courses at the NATO school in Oberammergau and the NATO Defence College in Rome to ensure that they take proper account of the requirement to train personnel in relation to the risks of human trafficking. Training is primarily a national responsibility, but we want to make sure that each of the nations has the information that they need in order to implement this effectively. And we're also looking to see whether alongside or as part of the process of certifying troops as fit to contribute to NATO-led operations as part of that process. We're also looking to see whether there should be an element of certification specifically in relation to combatting trafficking in human beings. So a whole range of very practical things that we're trying to put in hand.

INTERVIEWER: Well obviously NATO cannot do this alone. What partners will NATO seek out to help?

COLSTON: Well indeed NATO cannot do this alone and nor should we be expected to do so, nor should we try to do so. There are a great number of national and international organisations who are actively involved in trying to address the challenges of human trafficking and close co-operation with those organisations is absolutely essential. NATO's policy itself is based on the experience of the United Nations and co-operation with the United Nations, both at headquarters level and in the context of specific operations, is going to be very important indeed.

We're also trying to develop regular contacts with other organisations involved in countering human trafficking, such as the OSCE, such as the European Union, to ensure that we can work with them and learn from them. And I should say that in our operational theatres where NATO forces are deployed operationally, there is already a very good pattern of co-operation and liaison with other international organisations working in that theatre.

So in summary we have still a big task ahead of us, but I am sure that NATO and NATO nations in close co-operation with all of those who are working so hard and so well, will really help to combat this terrible crime.

INTERVIEWER: Let's hope so. Thank you.

Mr. SMITH OF NEW JERSEY. Let me say again to our very distinguished guests how grateful we are for your leadership. I would like to focus on the trafficking issue if I could.

I have been working on this issue for well over a decade. After the breakup of the Soviet Union, many thought there would be a peace dividend, that democracy would begin flourishing, and obviously, that turned out to be a Pollyannish view. And trafficking became a dominant, ever-expanding nefarious enterprise that took off like a rocket in the 1990s.

We wrote the Trafficking Protection Act in 2000, 2003, 2005, ever improving our tool box to try and mitigate and hopefully end this modern day slavery.

And the effort, just so you know, General, with regards to the military, began—not began but was given an impetus—when a Fox News reporter walked into my office with a tape of, unfortunately, our military in South Korea outside of brothels, inside of brothels; Russian women had been trafficked to those brothels.

We asked John Schmidt, then the Inspector General, to do a global review of trafficking and prostitution vis-à-vis our military. He came back. First segment was in South Korea. Second was in the Balkans. And it was a devastating report.

To the credit of our military and President Bush, his zero tolerance policy was initiated in 2002. It was sweeping. The Uniform Court of Military Justice was updated more recently to make the crime of prostitution an actionable offense. So we are really, I believe, showing tremendous leadership for the world and especially on the military side.

I chaired several hearings; General Port came, our Supreme Allied Commander, and discussed with us his best practices that he employed working with the Government of South Korea. South Korea just shut down the visa that was allowing these Russian, Moldavian and Filipino women to be brought in by the mob to be exploited. Many brothels were put off limits.

The bottom line is that good, solid actionable or action-oriented efforts were made, led by the United States military.

The effort to get NATO to adopt zero tolerance in like manner was done by our State Department working with our military commander.

So I am saying this to commend you and to thank you for that leadership.

We have had hearings on the U.N. zero tolerance policy. I had two on the Congo and on the peacekeeping effort there, and despite the fact that those peacekeepers face considerable difficult challenges, that is no excuse when U.N.-deployed troops rape 13-year-olds for a loaf of bread, which became commonplace.

We hear there is a U.N. zero tolerance policy, but as many of us have realized, that is zero enforcement and compliance, although maybe it is getting a little bit better now.

But, so best intentions, what is good on paper often doesn't translate in the field.

So my question with regards to John Colston's new mission, does he have the resources to really make implementation of zero tolerance meaningful? Is there a general sense of seriousness and clout that this is not something that is going to appease the human rights or human right types and others? Because, from my point of view, it is first about exploitation of the women and holding them harmless and helping them, and secondly, and maybe 1A, it is force protection. We need to make sure that our military men and women are protected in all means of that word.

Finally, the 2005 act says that, by January 2008, we will now make part of the minimum standards a review of a country's military, how well or poorly they are doing in the role of human trafficking. The cultures of many of the militaries that are being integrated into NATO are questionable, as we know.

I met with several defense secretaries on trips in Eastern and Central Europe, and I will never forget one in particular, and I won't do it on the record as to who he was, but he was the top guy in that country. And when I talked about trafficking, he laughed. And he said, basically, what the admiral said in 2001 when I met with him at NATO command headquarters in Brussels, when he said that this is an outlet; this is all about recreational sex. I said, "You don't understand what these women go through." And so we had a give and take, but it was not a positive one.

I am wondering, as we reform, integrate the military cultures of some of these post-Communist countries who have a jaundiced view when it comes to women and they see them as play things, and that means trafficked women, what do we do to get them on the same page so that trafficking ends and ends quickly?

General CRADDOCK. Let me address that, and I don't know if Ambassador Fried wants to or not.

With regard to the NATO participation in a zero tolerance and non-trafficking issue. I think NATO is on board. Does John Colston have the resources? In my judgment, this is not a resource issue. This is a leadership issue. I think that your point, new nations come in that may not have the background, the cultural perspectives that we generally share. The value of engagement, of exercises, of participation, of habitual relationships is what I think is essential here for this process.

This is, again, it is leadership. It is, when I meet with my counterparts, and then NATO leaders, through exercises, through conferences, seminars, operations, meet with their counterparts; and it is about deeds, not words. It is about watching how these militaries, established militaries over a long period of time, have integrated females into the military in a very productive manner. That is the first part.

And secondly, then, is to watch the contributions, quite frankly, of females in the military, minorities in the military, and this becomes an extraordinarily powerful message and signal sent to those

who want to be NATO members, those who are and want to be better and who want to have security sector reform.

So, in my meeting with my subordinate commanders throughout the Allied Command Operations, I have experienced no concern over our ability to do this, whole-hearted support for this effort and the fact that we need to continue to set the example for those who may not share the same values, but once they see, understand, I think, that they—my experience has been—I was in Kosova when we all went in initially. And there were a lot of different value sets that, over time, changed because of the realization that there was a different perspective out there, and if one understood it, then they could see the value of changing your mind set.

Mr. FRIED. Thank you.

Chairman LANTOS. Thank you very much.

Congressman Scott.

Mr. SCOTT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and welcome to the committee.

I am, as John Tanner is our distinguished chairman of NATO's Parliamentary Assembly, I am also a member of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, and my first question involves them.

During our most recent meetings, the issue consistently came up of the United States involvement in Iraq and Afghanistan. I feel that it is a very piercing concern, none more demonstrative than on the very week we were over in Europe, as we were flying into Italy, was the same weekend that that government basically dissolved.

And it basically dissolved around two major issues, paramount, of course, was anti-American attitude in terms of our involvement in Iraq and Afghanistan, and with Italy's troops demanding that they remove themselves from any involvement in Afghanistan.

The other one was the building of and expansion of an air base and military facility in Italy.

Both of those reasons.

There were constant discussions. There was a considerable amount of erosion in our relationship with NATO because the public tide of opinion has turned in many of these NATO nations against the United States as a result of the involvement in Iraq and Afghanistan.

I would like an answer, the first part of my question is your assessment of the relationship and just how damaging is that? What do we have to look for for the future of our relationship with our NATO allies, especially because of the damage that is because of our involvement in Iraq and Afghanistan?

Mr. FRIED. Congressman, we certainly had a major difference with many European governments about Iraq, and European governments had differences among themselves. That—those differences erupted in a very bitter debate in 2003 and 2004, and there is no question that it hurt our relations with Europe.

In 2005, President Bush made an intense effort to reach back to Europe and get past the disagreement over Iraq, and happily, European governments reached back. And our relationships with European governments have greatly recovered since the low point over that debate.

Differences over Afghanistan were never as acute as they were over Iraq. And there remains much greater support generally in Europe for their countries' involvement in Afghanistan than in Iraq, although that is also a divisive issue.

I will put it this way, though, to be responsive to your question: There are some segments of European opinion which we will never reach. The Italian hard left will never appreciate—will never like the United States and what we do, no matter what we do. Now that is a pretty sweeping statement, but the hard left is a pretty—hard lefts in Europe tend to be, well, pretty hard.

There is a larger body of opinion in Europe that has differences with the United States over certain of our policies but is not anti-American, per se. And we need to work with them and work through the differences. We also need to work with European governments so that when they do have individual policy differences with us, it doesn't expand into an overall strategic split.

And in that, we are most fortunate that the current leaders of Germany and France are leaders who can have and express differences with the United States over particular policies but want to work to strengthen the transatlantic alliance and NATO.

Mr. SCOTT. Ambassador, if I may, my time is inching on. It leads me into my next question. Because I, quite frankly, believe that it has damaged our relationship going forward.

And I think an example of that is within the missile defense system that is being proposed. I would like to get your thoughts on that. I mean, global warming; I mean, all of the other areas that we need vital cooperation.

At the recent G–8 Summit, for example, the discussion of a missile defense system came up and Mr. Putin put forth a proposal. I would like to get your thoughts on that. I would like to get your thoughts of what the Russians are up to and the complications that we are entering now with getting cooperation from our allies with our missile defense system.

Mr. FRIED. I was at the G–8 Summit and am familiar with President Putin's proposal, and, frankly, we welcome it as a very promising idea. And we look forward to working with the Russians in a cooperative way on missile defense as well as in other areas.

It is true that missile defense sparked a very exaggerated initial debate in Europe. But in the months since that debate erupted, we have taken pains to explain our intentions, to be completely transparent about what we have in mind and why. And I am happy to report to you that NATO governments have been far more supportive recently than they were when they felt, for good reasons or not good reasons, less informed about our plans.

At the latest NATO ministerial, support for missile defense was pretty strong. And at the defense ministers—at the NATO Defense Ministers' meeting in the past 10 days, support for missile defense was, I would say, overwhelming.

Now countries want us to be—NATO met—countries want us to be willing to work with Russia, and we are. They want us to be transparent in our plans, and we are. And they want our national plans to be compatible with NATO plans so that they don't see us going off, as they say, unilaterally. And we are not. We are working with NATO so that all countries, Europe, all countries in Europe

and the United States and hopefully Russia find their security increased, not decreased, through missile defense.

Chairman LANTOS. Would you like to add something, General Craddock?

General CRADDOCK. I would only endorse the fact that I was at the Defense Ministerial recently. Indeed, as Ambassador Fried indicates, there was support across the board from the defense ministers there.

A couple of months ago, in Oslo, Foreign Ministerial, same support, and I think the Secretary General has already announced publicly there is NATO support with this, with the intent to pursue the opportunities for integration with NATO efforts.

Chairman LANTOS. Thank you very much.

Mr. Rohrabacher.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and let me recommend that you take the opening statements that you have made before this committee and put them in a book so that young people can read them in the years to come because they are exemplary of the best that Congress has to offer, and I was impressed by your opening statement.

General, you said that the NATO leaders there were across-the-board supportive of the missile defense now. How much money have they put into our missile defense technology?

General CRADDOCK. I don't know the exact answer to that. But at this point, I think it is very little, if any.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Right. So their report means zero in terms of financial support?

You know, I think it is nice for us to think how wonderful it is to have, you know, some sort of people giving us their good will, you know, and I don't beg for people's good will. I do what I think is right. I think the United States won the Cold War because that is what we did. We didn't curry people's good will before we acted.

The last thing we need to do is put billions of dollars into a missile defense system like missile defense and then decisions on where to deploy and how to use that system is based on the acceptance of people who have never invested in it.

Now let me note that yesterday we had some members of the Duma from Russia here, and I suggested they go out, and the chairman used his influence to make sure they got to go out and see the airborne laser system that was on display at Andrews Air Force Base. And let me note that was no longer classified, so that was perfectly all right.

And the Russians were very impressed by this and Russia may have something to contribute rather than good will. They actually have technology and maybe they are willing to invest in this.

So perhaps we have to evolve out of the thought pattern that having the acceptance of those people in Europe means anything to our security in the new world, in the new era.

Let me ask you this. What is the budget of NATO?

General CRADDOCK. I don't know. I don't deal with the——

Mr. ROHRABACHER. What is the budget of NATO?

Mr. FRIED. The NATO common budget, I think, is several hundred million dollars, but if you were looking at it more broadly, you

would have to combine the defense budgets of all of the NATO countries.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I am interested in NATO as an organization. And how much do we pay of that?

Mr. FRIED. We pay somewhat under 25 percent.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Okay. So they are paying for the actual management operations, and the number of personnel that they have assigned to NATO as an organization is roughly——

Mr. FRIED. NATO assets include the headquarters, the AWACS facility. We are working on strategic lift capability. And there are just, for the record, NATO missile defense programs that are real that will help link certain NATO members, national short and mid-range missile defense programs. So there are some NATO countries that are indeed investing their own national funds in missile defense programs.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I can imagine the General didn't know about it because they are so miniscule that you need a microscope to find it. The planes that flew into Darfur, whose planes flew in? Who are they?

General CRADDOCK. They are ours.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Did we finance it? Did it come out of America's military budget or did it come out of something where they helped pay for the time, the plane, the fuel?

General CRADDOCK. Could I take that for the record and respond to you?

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Yes.

My guesstimate is where we look at this NATO operation we have the good will of our friends in Europe, but the United States, again, carried the full load. And what we need in the future is a system that is based on those people are helping carry the load. Actually we need to pay attention to them and we need to talk to them, we need their good will. We do not care about the good will of people who only are there to harp and criticize if we make a mistake, but never to be there if we actually have a mission.

Let me note in Afghanistan, which we have heard much about today, Mr. Chairman, we had a hearing on Afghanistan. It is very nice that our NATO allies are spending, expending something in Afghanistan. But let us note that it is being done by ignoring their commitments to reconstruction and development. Our NATO allies have all committed early on to large amounts of reconstruction/development money, which they have not been coming forth with.

So I am very happy that they have got some of their people on the line and that they have made that type of commitment, but if it is being done simply by, well, we are going to spend it here instead of fulfilling our obligations for reconstruction and development, it is a rather hollow contribution.

So as we enter the future, Mr. Chairman, I think the idea of alliances with the willing is a good idea, it is a good concept, and perhaps we should be looking instead of at people who don't have a track record of actually participation, in actually helping, maybe we should look to countries like India and like Japan and like Russia who are non-NATO countries who our association with them may be much more important for our national security than the alliance of yesteryear NATO.

Thank you very much.

Chairman LANTOS. Thank you very much.

Mr. Tanner.

Mr. TANNER. Thank you very much. I have two or three just sort of specific questions I would like to get you all to comment on if I might.

First of all in Afghanistan, the provincial reconstruction teams. We get mixed reports on those when we attend NATO meetings, and I wondered if there was an overall strategic plan to coordinate the various teams that are administered by, as I understand it, various countries so that we have some way to judge how well we are doing with regard to stabilizing the entire country and not just by section.

That is first of all.

Secondly, as we discussed with Ambassador Nuland every time we go to a meeting, the caveats by other member nations, General, how are they coming along? We do what we can to talk to the parliamentarians in that regard.

Third, I think the United States would reap enormous benefit from some sort of coordination of a regional policy in the area in regard to Pakistan and even Iran as we go forward there and as we try to figure out how to bring stability to Afghanistan, Pakistan and Iran, both in Afghanistan and Iraq.

But does NATO have an overall strategic plan, and if so, are we coordinating it with our own interests so that we can basically leverage the United States' interest there with our European allies in NATO?

David Scott asked about the question about the missile question, and I want to finish with the Mediterranean Dialogue.

We, from the NATO meeting in Portugal just in May, went to Tunisia and Morocco. Both are, I want to say, moderate voices in a particularly difficult place in the world, may we say.

In both instances, and in Tunisia we met with the President and in Morocco we met with the Minister, and so on, in both countries. There was a concern that the trend line with respect to fundamentalism is not going in the direction we would like to see.

And I wondered what, if anything, we are thinking about either diplomatically, militarily, how are we combating that? Because if we know the trend line is going in the wrong direction, we need attention to that before it becomes something that evidences itself in violent ways. Mr. Boozman, of course, was with us on that trip. He may have further comment on that.

Thank you both for being here.

Mr. FRIED. Let me answer some of those the best I can.

With respect to the PRTs and coordination of assistance, the task in Afghanistan, as General Craddock said, is not simply military. We can't win simply by killing our enemy. We have to win by helping the people and the Afghan Government win. And the non-military side of that is at least as important.

The PRTs are an instrument of that consolidated, that coordinated strategy. They are supposed to help local governance and bring together security, local governance and economic dependence.

We do try to coordinate PRT efforts, and there is an overall coordination mechanism where the U.N., World Bank, IMF, NATO

all sit where we make sure our plans are pulling in the same direction.

Now in reality the only coordination that counts is on the ground, and that is where the PRTs are critical. We have gotten a lot better at this in the past year. We took a hard look at our strategy, starting a year ago developed what we call the comprehensive approach which is this combined civil-military approach. Now we are implementing it.

It is working much better. Our efforts are doing much better overall in the country than they were a year ago. That is close to a universal impression I get from talking to people on the ground.

There is more to do. I don't want to be too rosy. This is a hard struggle. Some places it is better than others. But I think we have come to the right place. Now we need to implement it and make it work.

You are right that NATO needs to work with Pakistan, and it has to regionally.

The tribal areas along the border are tough places, and the General Craddock has been to Pakistan and so we are beginning to think in a regional way. General Craddock might have more to say with respect to NATO's efforts in North Africa and the Mediterranean Dialogue.

Military interaction can be an important asset as we struggle to help moderates in the region and reformist forces in the regime against Islamists and radicals.

Military and military-to-military contacts can't do it all. That is only one dimension, but it is an important piece of what we are trying to do. And that is a piece, of course, of a larger political, almost in a sense ideological struggle. NATO can play a part through its Mediterranean Dialogue contacts. The NATO parliamentary assembly can also play a part, as I know you are doing, and you have been a leader in those efforts.

We are doing all of this. We have a lot more to do. And Secretary Rice has often used the analogy of the post-Cold War, immediate post-World War II Europe where it took us a few years to get our minds around the new challenge and develop the institutions which eventually led us to victory in the Cold War 40 years later. This will be a generational struggle.

General CRADDOCK. PRTs. Getting better. Still work to be done. Twenty-five PRTs. I think 12 are U.S. That is pretty well coordinated. I will tell you we need better U.S. Government interagency representation.

I just came back. Visited two PRTs. One United States, one German. There was not a USAID person at either one. We need more USDA Department of Agriculture representation there. Critical there. Agriculture can be a huge offset to the poppies, but we need help to get that working.

We are sharing best practices. We have quarterly conferences. We bring commanders into Kabul or Kandahar. They bring in their projects. It is coordinated now, so we are having the PRTs projects that complement both the district center, the provincial and the national efforts.

So I think there is progress here. It is not perfect. We have got to continue to work it harder.

Mr. TANNER. May I ask you, we help put together the aid or Department of Agriculture? Is there some way we can help make that happen? This is critical, in my judgment, to our success.

General CRADDOCK. Congressman, I am sure there is leverage here. I take that information back and pass it into our Ambassador. He is aware, and he is working to get representation.

Part it is a changeover. Part of it is a lack of personnel. There are a lot of reasons. We just need, I think, in our interagency, emphasis out to these departments and agencies for their support. As we said earlier, this is not a military solution. The military will set conditions for security that other elements of national power, economic, diplomatic, in this case, agricultural, justice, things like that, will have to work.

So any engagements you would have would be possible.

Chairman LANTOS. Thank you very much.

Mr. Boozman.

Mr. BOOZMAN. In regards to the caveats that—I don't think we got to that.

Can you tell us, General Craddock, kind of how that is going? I know that most Americans don't understand that many of our allies in NATO that are deployed can do everything but fight because of the restrictions that are put on them as they go.

Can you talk a little bit about that? Tell us if it is moving in the right direction. Tell us who are the worst offenders and who are the people who have the least caveats.

General CRADDOCK. I think we are making some marginal progress as a result of caveats. I think as a result of the Riga Summit, all of the nations affirmed there would be no caveats from any participating NATO member state with regard to in extremis use of forces. In other words, if there are NATO or partner nations who have forces in Afghanistan under duress from enemy opposition, no nation would say we cannot use their forces to alleviate and solve that situation for the forces under duress.

To my knowledge, since then, we have not had an occasion where any nation has said no, and we have had a few instances where we had forces under fire and had to move other forces for them then to be able to break contact or to prevail.

However, there are still too many caveats, geographical caveats, functional caveats, that we continually work with the nations as we can to get them to either eliminate or to loosen, to mitigate.

We do not have the full statement of requirements, the troop list sourced, we are still short. We also have caveats. That is a compounding factor that limits the commander of ISAF, limits his regional commanders, and I think increases the risk to every NATO service member on the ground in Afghanistan.

And we have got to continually redouble our efforts at the highest military and political levels to fill up that requirement to 100 percent and then knock down those caveats.

With regard to nations worst offenders. I would not want to—privately, I would provide my insights, but I would not want to do it in this public forum.

Chairman LANTOS. Will you provide your best performers, General Craddock?

General CRADDOCK. For the record, yes.

Mr. FRIED. I would say that Chairman Lantos mentioned the Dutch and the Canadians, and they have been in hot places doing very good work. The Dutch went into Uruzgan Province knowing it would be a combat assignment. They did so after a debate knowingly, willingly and it has been rough and they have been there.

The Canadians have had some serious losses, but they have been there.

And I think that since the contributions of our NATO allies has been raised, as a question—the ones that are fighting allies ought to be recognized. Also mentioned that when the commander of ISAF asked for more troops, the Poles almost overnight offered a combat battalion, no caveats. It is moving out for the east, which is a tough place.

So just to mention a few of the fighting allies for you.

Mr. BOOZMAN. And I think that is very important, and we appreciate their efforts.

Mr. Lantos alluded to the expanding NATO and perhaps getting out of the geographic area. One of the problems that we are having a little bit is with the EU itself. You know, coming about with—there is a lot of talk of them having their own forestructure.

Can you tell us a little bit about where you see that going, and if that is creating problems, how you see that in the future as far as what is happening now and kind of down the line?

Mr. FRIED. The issue of the EU military force and its relation to NATO has been debated for years and years. We, as a Government, don't have an objection in principle to the Europeans developing more capable forces. And if giving it an EU label gets us more deployable forces that we can use where we have to, I am willing to swallow a certain amount of theoretical to and fro to get what we need.

Now I have to say recently this has been less of a hot issue partly because NATO's relations with the EU are better in practice than they are in theory and also because now countries are involved in serious operations, and so the debate tends to be less theoretical and less labels and more real forces for real missions.

That said, ideally what we want is a kind of seamlessness between NATO and the European Union. They are going to be tasked for things better suited for the European Union, maybe lower-end, peacekeeping, humanitarian tasks, other higher-end, rougher tasks where you need NATO, and we need to be able to have a smooth continuum so we don't worry about who is doing the job, we worry about getting the job done.

Chairman LANTOS. Thank you very much.

The gentleman from California, Mr. Costa.

Mr. COSTA. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, for this once again robust and informative hearing.

I want to ask a specific question, General, and then I want to ask a broader question to both of you.

When I was in Afghanistan over a year ago with a group, one of the problems that the NATO forces expressed by one of the—two of the Generals actually that we had had an extended briefing with was the logistics in the multinational forces that were gathered there that seemed to be, as explained to us, costly and duplicative, in terms of the bivouacking of these different forces, the common

things like meals and other kinds of things. That in fact—and I note they are stationed, of course, in different areas but the ability, if you provide a brigade or if you provide a limited amount of resource to have to reinvent all of the logistics to support that brigade without having just a general ability to support it, would seem to be much more efficient.

Is that, in your view, still a problem, and if it is, is there work being done to try to provide for better responses for these multinational forces that come together in NATO?

General CRADDOCK. Congressman, I think it is still a problem. I think there has been progress made within countries in the regional commands.

Mr. COSTA. I know they have different diets and different tastes.

General CRADDOCK. But they all bring in their own national support elements. They are expensive. They obviously share different requirements, but each country is doing their own.

We have tried repeatedly at NATO headquarters, at my command, to go after a multinational logistics capability to the extent that we have even started conceptually looking at a multinational logistics command. We are trying to put that into the transformational effort, the NATO Response Force, and have a joint logistics element there that the nation would subscribe to, is where one nation brings a certain capability and another brings another inside, then have a package as opposed to each nation bringing their own. It has not been as successful as we would like it.

Mr. COSTA. I would urge, and if there is something that we can do to be of some assistance with our counterpart here, Mr. Tanner and others, who are part of the international or the NATO delegation—it just seems to me not only from a cost effective standpoint but this would be the effort in Afghanistan, a prototype, if we figure out how to really do this in a much more cost-effective fashion.

It saves these countries money, by the way. If they have less of a burden to do this logistical stuff, they can add a second brigade.

So it seems to me that it would be multiple benefits, and I would urge you to continue to work on it. Because the long-term benefits of NATO—I am just a lay person, of course.

To both of you, I think we have had a robust conversation about NATO present, NATO future, and I think the chairman and others have talked, I think, at extensive lengths to what we would like to envision NATO to be.

When we talk about getting the current commitments today from those who have had a long-term partnership in NATO, I am not talking about the expansion, of course. Some of the new expansion we seem to have more eagerness or more enthusiasm. So I am not sure really what that denotes.

But I wonder if either of you would care, or both of you, to put a finger specifically on whether we are talking about the lack of commitment when we talk about the amount of GNP spent by these individual countries to fulfill their role, whether it is political or economical or in some cases both, and do you think, as a follow-up to that, that with the change in the governments in France and now last year in Germany and soon the U.K., that we may get some greater commitment?

Mr. FRIED. I think European commitment varies. I think certainly the British have been both staunch politically, strong militarily, enormously active and important contributors.

A lot of NATO's new members have contributed at tremendous cost to their small or military budgets. They have contributed fighting forces, very expensive, and they have done it.

I do think that in some especially West European countries there are issues of political will to support militaries with expeditionary capabilities.

The French military is a very serious outfit. They are fighters. They know and are unsentimental when it comes to what needs to be done. I think now with strong leadership, strong new leadership in France, you may see a development of France's relations with NATO.

But so this is going to be an issue for some time to come. We are going to want our NATO partners to develop expeditionary capabilities and the will to use them, and despite all of the progress in Afghanistan and all of the progress in transforming NATO, this will be an issue for a while.

General CRADDOCK. If I may, 26 nations, six meet the 2 percent for GDP for defense that we asked for. We have set a benchmark of 40 percent of the forces, the nations' own land forces, should be deployable. Ten nations meet that benchmark. We have a benchmark of 8 percent of that should be sustainably deployable; in other words, deploy and continue to sustain that over time. Eleven nations meet that benchmark.

I think if you look at economic indicators and you look at the growth of most of the countries there and the alliance, the reasons that these levels of support have not been reached are by and large political. I think the economic capacities are there, but they will be made by political decisions that the nations will choose based on their priorities and interests.

Mr. COSTA. My time has expired, but for the record, on those benchmarks, if you could provide a more detailed expression and some history as to whether or not they are better or worse or about the same over the last 5- or 10-year period.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman LANTOS. Thank you very much.

The gentlelady from Texas, Ms. Sheila Jackson Lee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, let me thank you and the ranking member for having a series of very important hearings, and let me thank the witnesses as well for their testimony and recognizing the importance of the relationship between the United States and NATO.

I don't always necessarily believe that a military action is always the only and best action, but I do believe that NATO is more than that. It is a strong representative of unity and coalition and collaboration. And in many instances, diplomacy is as much a factor in NATO as is the military cooperation.

Let me say to both the Ambassador and to General Craddock, my experiences with NATO on the Afghanistan-Pakistan border and my meetings at the NATO headquarters have always been open. Certainly the border is challenging, but the Generals who had

briefed us when we have gone have done their very best to be able to be as forthright as they possibly can be.

So I want to pose a series of action questions, if I can, and my colleagues may oppose these, and I hope not in the framework that I offer them.

I am troubled by hearing that Kosova is somewhat beyond where we will wind up, but its whole situation is somewhat unstable. When I say that remembering the efforts that were made by NATO but also, if my recollection is correct, General, from the Bosnia incident on into Kosova, it seems to me that NATO was slow in moving, that we initiated it or the United States sought to be aligned by. It seems they were slow in moving.

My question for both would be then beyond where and how Kosova will ultimately wind up militarily, how do we see NATO's involvement in Kosova and is Kosova in crisis?

I am going to raise these questions so that you can take them. Sudan——

Chairman LANTOS. Let me remind my colleague that if she has many more complex questions, the answers will have to be in writing because we will be closing this hearing within a few minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the distinguished gentleman.

And Sudan, and I will leave it at that, NATO's involvement in Sudan.

Why do we have trouble with our allies helping us in Afghanistan and what do we do with a Russia which seems to be somewhat hostile continually to NATO's collaborative efforts? And I thank both gentlemen if they would be able to answer those. And I imagine the answers would have to be abbreviated.

Mr. FRIED. With respect to Kosova, NATO forces have done a good job and have been successful in keeping the peace. There has been one major incident of disorder of March 2004. NATO has improved its capability since then.

I would not say that Kosova was in crisis now. But it is our judgment that without movement toward a settlement of Kosova status, the current calm will not last, and it is because of that assessment that we have tried to move ahead in the U.N. to the resolution of Kosova's final status in line with Ahtisaari's plan with supervised independence of Kosova.

With respect to Sudan, as General Craddock said earlier, countries might feel—there might be an issue of how much NATO could contribute, but I think that NATO does have some assets, and under the right circumstances, I can imagine NATO providing an important support role to the hybrid force now being contemplated.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. May I let General Craddock answer the Afghanistan question?

General CRADDOCK. My trouble with the allies helping in Afghanistan, I think the allies are helping. We have got all 26 NATO nations. They have yet to subscribe to the level of effort that they gave us with regard to the mission. That is the problem. The level of effort is not matched by political will. We continue to chip away at this. There are more contributions. We will have another British battalion that will tap into the fall, winter. We will have another Danish battalion coming into the south later this year. So we are getting contributions. We have yet to realize the full extent.

There are niche capabilities. ISR, intelligence surveillance reconnaissance, helicopters, that there just are not capacities left in NATO, and the U.S. has those.

So we still have to continue to transform NATO to get it to the expeditionary capability that they don't have today.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Thank you.

Chairman LANTOS. Thank you very much.

Ambassador Watson.

Ms. WATSON. I will take my answers in writing, Mr. Chairman.

I address these comments very quickly to Ambassador Fried.

There have been some concerns, and certainly they are my concerns, about the NATO-Russia relationship, and it looks like there is a deterioration there.

And our administration's decision to build a missile defense system is viewed by the Putin government as a provocation. So I am curious why NATO has made the decision to place a limited number of missile interceptors and radars in Eastern Europe at a time when missile defense will suffer.

And finally, we are aware that Estonia has been the subject of a coordinated cyber attack on its governmental computer system allegedly carried out by the Russians. So the attack represents a new and growing threat to national security.

So I would be interested in you responding as to what role NATO can play or should play.

And, General Craddock, if you want to respond to that, I would be happy to receive your response in writing.

Thank you so very much.

Chairman LANTOS. May I express on behalf of the entire committee our deepest thanks, General Craddock and Ambassador Fried, for a singularly valuable and analytical and informative session.

This hearing is concluded.

[Whereupon, at 12:30 p.m., the committee was adjourned.]

APPENDIX

MATERIAL SUBMITTED FOR THE HEARING RECORD

PREPARED STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE DONALD A. MANZULLO, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF ILLINOIS

Mr. Chairman, thank you for holding this important hearing on the future of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). For almost six decades NATO has faithfully defended the people of Europe and America against the threats of communism and terrorism. Now, as we look forward to the future of NATO, there is an important need on both sides of the Atlantic to update our policies to ensure that our alliance remains strong.

We currently have a healthy defense trade relationship. However, it is at risk. We must seriously examine our own domestic policies to ensure that America's export policies, such as the International Trafficking in Arms Regulations (ITAR), do not inadvertently tie the hands of our closest allies from modernizing its forces. Because our export control policies contain extraterritorial constraints, European countries and their firms are now designing out U.S. parts and content. It is my understanding that Great Britain's equivalent to the Future Combat Systems, the Future Rapid Effect Systems (FRES) is designed to be 100 percent free of U.S. parts and technology and is being advertised as "ITAR free." The United Kingdom (UK) is concerned that if the FRES has U.S. parts and content, they will have to submit their national sovereignty to U.S. rules and regulations. These policies that were originally meant to unite NATO allies against communism are now beginning to divide us and must be changed. I am heartened by the treaty signed yesterday by President Bush and Prime Minister Blair and I look forward to its ratification in the Senate. I also look forward to working with the Chairman, Ranking Member, and the Administration on policies that will allow greater collaboration with our other NATO allies.

Our NATO allies must increase their own investment in the defense sector to boost combat readiness and interoperability. They must also be willing to continue to stand against tyranny and oppression by blocking the transfer of arms and military technology to countries that trample the rights of their citizens or are a threat to the peace and safety of the rest of the world.

Strengthening the North Atlantic Treaty in this new century is important for the overall security of Europe and the United States. The threats we face today are different and ever evolving. Adapting to combat new and asymmetrical threats is vital to the long-term sustainability of the Alliance. The threat is real and we must be prepared to meet it.

Our colleagues will remember that NATO came to our assistance following the terrorist attacks of September 11, and they remain to this day alongside the United States in Afghanistan. I look forward to hearing from Assistant Secretary Fried and General Craddock about the Administration's plans to ensure that NATO continues to serve a strong foundation. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE SHEILA JACKSON LEE, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF TEXAS

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for convening today's hearing. May I also take this opportunity to thank the Ranking Member, and to welcome our distinguished witnesses The Honorable Daniel Fried, Assistant Secretary of the Bureau of European and Eurasian Affairs from the U.S. Department of State; and General Bantz J. Craddock, of the United States Army. I look forward to your informative testimony.

Yesterday, members of this committee gathered in this room to exchange ideas with our Russian counterparts, something that would have been unthinkable in the days of NATO's inception. As yesterday's friendly meeting indicates, much has changed since the North Atlantic Treaty was signed in April of 1949, but we continue to value our important partnership with our NATO allies.

Mr. Chairman, we share a long and proud history with our NATO partners. Since the end of the Cold War, NATO has shown its willingness and ability to adapt to a world full of new threats, as well as new promises. As NATO works to meet these emerging challenges as it becomes a global, rather than a regional, security instrument, I welcome today's effort to examine the role the NATO alliance currently plays within broader U.S. and European security interests.

Europe, and the individual states that comprise it, have remained valuable allies in this new age of global terrorism and weapons proliferation. European support following the attacks of 9/11 was reciprocated following the July 7, 2005 bombings of London's transit system. I continue to believe that it is in the interests of both the United States and Europe to work to address these issues together.

NATO clearly proved its post-Cold War value in Kosovo, where it was able to intervene quickly, decisively, and multilaterally to end ethnic cleansing. NATO has maintained an active presence through the Kosovo Force, or KFOR, which currently has over 15,500 personnel deployed. As we work through the United Nations to finally resolve Kosovo's status, I would like to pay tribute to the NATO soldiers who have worked to make Kosovo a secure environment.

Mr. Chairman, NATO has also proven a valuable asset in the stabilization of Afghanistan. Though much still remains to be done, NATO has made brave efforts to quell the insurgency, encourage improved governance, and combat the narcotics trade. Only two days ago, on Wednesday, three Canadian NATO soldiers were killed by a roadside bomb in southern Afghanistan, making them the most recent of the approximately 90 foreign troops killed in Afghanistan this year alone. I would like to express my condolence to their families, and my gratitude for their service.

Afghanistan presents a new challenge to NATO, and is in many ways testing the organization's political will and global posture. As civilian and military casualties exceed the estimates made by most NATO governments, many critics believe that NATO lacks an overall strategic plan to stabilize and reconstruct Afghanistan, and they contend that such an effort is beyond the resources or expertise of NATO.

NATO has made significant efforts in recent years to become a more mobile, more "deployable" force. In 2004, NATO launched a new capabilities initiative, in an attempt to make its forces more able to travel long distances and to sustain themselves in the field. The organization has also developed the NATO Response Force (NRF), which is now operational. The NRF was conceived as a rapid-reaction insertion force of 25,000 troops.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly believe in the value of multilateralism. In the context of the global war on terrorism, it is vital that we continue to work with our NATO allies. I believe that NATO is robust enough to adapt to emerging security threats, that it remains important in meeting these new challenges, and that it can effectively transition to its new global role. NATO membership also continues to be a valuable incentive to encourage the states of Central and Eastern Europe to institute important political, social, and economic reforms.

Recent years have seen a number of important issues place new strains on our relationship with our long-time European allies. In particular, the Bush Administration's 2003 invasion of Iraq has garnered strong disapproval in many nations across Europe. Other issues, including the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, Iran, treatment of detainees by the United States, and climate change have compounded disputes. In particular, the United States' willingness to bypass international organizations and use force unilaterally has found much disfavor among many European allies, who have shown a strong reluctance to this approach.

I sincerely believe that it is in the interests of all involved to make a concerted effort to address the range of concerns that have been raised on both sides, and to work to move forward together, in pursuit of our common goals. I continue to advocate a policy of constructive engagement and dialogue, and I believe we should continue to seek multilateralism in our efforts to fighting terrorism.

I look forward to the insightful testimony of our witness. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I yield back the balance of my time.