

---

# NATO SUMMIT

Riga, Latvia - November 28-29, 2006

---



*"I'm looking forward to Riga. The Riga summit is a time for us to celebrate the great successes of this partnership. Mr. Secretary General and I will be there reminding our partners that we have a lot of work to be done in the noble cause of peace."*

**President George W. Bush, Remarks with NATO Secretary General de Hoop Scheffer, Oct. 27, 2006**

**Information compiled by  
The Information Resource Center  
Embassy of the United States of America**

**November 21<sup>st</sup> 2006**

**This page intentionally left blank**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<b>Page</b>
<b>Introduction.</b>	5
<b>1. Kurt Volker's Biography.</b>	7
<b>2. Key Themes for the Riga Summit. US Mission to NATO.</b>	9
<b>3. <i>Transatlantic Values after September 11.</i></b> Kurt Volker, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for European and Eurasian Affairs. Remarks as delivered, The Hague, Netherlands, September 12, 2006.	11
<b>4. <i>NATO: A 21st Century Alliance That Is Delivering.</i></b> Ambassador Victoria Nuland, U.S. Permanent Representative to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). Remarks at the Center for European Policy Studies (CEPS), Brussels, Belgium, October 30, 2006.	17
<b>5. Selected Web Sites.</b>	23

**This page intentionally left blank**

## **Introduction**

The Information Resource Center (IRC) of the Embassy of the United States in Madrid has prepared this information packet for the Digital Video Conference on the *NATO Summit* organized by the American Embassy in Madrid with State Department's Bureau of European and Eurasian Affairs Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary Kurt Volker, on November 21<sup>st</sup> 2006.

**This page intentionally left blank**

## **1. Kurt Volker. United States State Department, Bureau of European and Eurasian Affairs. Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of State.**

Source: U.S. State Department , <http://www.state.gov/p/eur/rls/or/50139.htm>



Kurt Volker assumed his duties as Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for European and Eurasian Affairs in July 2005. As second-in-command of the Bureau of European and Eurasian Affairs, Mr. Volker is focused on working with Europe as a whole to address the common challenges our nations face, based on our shared values of freedom, through instruments such as NATO, U.S.-European Union relations, the OSCE, and our numerous bilateral relationships. He also oversees strategic planning, congressional relations, and post management for the Bureau.

Mr. Volker, a career member of the U.S. Foreign Service, previously served as Acting Senior Director for European and Eurasian Affairs at the National Security Council (NSC). He served at the NSC for four years, where as Director for NATO and West Europe, he was responsible for transatlantic relations, NATO policy, and bilateral relations with the United Kingdom, France, Spain, Italy, Portugal, and seven other countries. He helped work to reinvigorate U.S. outreach to Europe following the November 2004 U.S. elections. During his time at the NSC, Mr. Volker was responsible for U.S. preparations for the 2004 NATO Istanbul Summit and 2002 Prague Summit, including launching NATO operations in Afghanistan and Iraq, strengthening NATO defense capabilities, bringing in seven new members, and strengthening NATO-Russia relations.

Until July 2001, Mr. Volker was Deputy Director of the Private Office of then-NATO Secretary General Lord Robertson. Within the Secretary General's office, Mr. Volker took primary responsibility for Balkans peacekeeping, defense and nuclear planning, and NATO force and command structure issues.

Prior to working for the Secretary General, Mr. Volker was First Secretary at the U.S. Mission to NATO, responsible for the Membership Action Plan and Partnership for Peace issues.

From 1997-1998, Mr. Volker worked on foreign policy matters for U.S. Senator John McCain (R-AZ).

From 1994-1997, Mr. Volker was the Deputy Political Counselor and Political-Military Officer at the U.S. Embassy in Budapest, Hungary. He played the lead role in negotiating the establishment of U.S. military bases in Hungary to support the IFOR and SFOR missions in Bosnia, as well as a bilateral status of forces agreement.

He has also served in London and the State Department in various positions, including Special Assistant to the Counselor and Special Assistant to the U.S. Special Envoy for Bosnia negotiations.

Before joining the Foreign Service in 1988, Mr. Volker served for two years as an analyst at the CIA.

Mr. Volker has a B.A. from Temple University and an M.A. in international relations from George Washington University. He has studied in Sweden and France and speaks Hungarian, Swedish and French. He is married and has two daughters.

## 2. Key Themes for the Riga Summit. US Mission to NATO.

Source: United States Mission to NATO,  
[http://nato.usmission.gov/Summit/Riga\\_Summit\\_Key\\_Themes.htm](http://nato.usmission.gov/Summit/Riga_Summit_Key_Themes.htm)

Today's NATO is delivering **21st century security and effective multilateral action** on a truly global scale. In the past year, NATO has conducted operations on four continents, in places far outside the traditional Euro-Atlantic area: Pakistan, Afghanistan, Iraq, and Darfur, as well as conducting operations in non-traditional theatres like the Balkans and Mediterranean.

**Afghanistan**, more than 2,000 miles from Europe, is NATO's top priority and one of the greatest challenges of its 57-year history. The Alliance that helped bring down the Berlin Wall, reunite a divided Europe, and bring peace to the war-torn Balkans, is today on the frontlines of a struggle every bit as important: defeating a resurgent Taliban and supporting the development of a free, democratic, and economically viable Afghanistan.

The Mission in Afghanistan is driving much of the transformational change we are seeking for NATO at Riga. Allies now understand first-hand why we must be able to deploy and sustain forces at strategic distance, develop a more open and global approach to those like-minded democracies who share our values and goals, and create more effective civilian-military cooperation to deliver the kind of stability and reconstruction critical to long-term success in Afghanistan.

**Our Riga agenda is**, therefore, focused on strengthening the Alliance's three main pillars: political, operational, and training.

**Politically**, we seek a more global and flexible approach to NATO's partnerships, one that recognizes the real contribution of our democratic partners, like Australia and New Zealand. There are 11 non-NATO nations fighting with NATO and the Afghan military in Afghanistan. These nations do not seek membership in the Alliance, nor do we seek it for them. We simply want to enhance their ability to operate, train, and communicate more effectively with NATO forces.

**Operationally**, Allies are moving towards investing more in 21st century military capabilities – a fully manned and equipped NATO Response Force, strategic airlift, and more commonly funded assets.

**On training**, we want to expand NATO's role to build on its successful training missions in Iraq and for the African Union in support of its Darfur Mission. NATO training can help spread security and reform broadly throughout the Middle East and Africa.

Finally, NATO plays an enduring **role as a mentor and magnet to new democracies in the Trans-Atlantic space** and its door will remain open to new potential member countries. Membership is still performance-based however, and NATO will continue to work with aspirants to ensure they are ready to meet the responsibilities of membership before invitations are offered.

Far from a relic of the Cold War, NATO today is a vibrant, growing Alliance that is transforming itself and meeting challenges of the 21st century.

**This page intentionally left blank**

### **3. Transatlantic Values after September 11. Kurt Volker, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for European and Eurasian Affairs. Remarks as delivered, The Hague, Netherlands, September 12, 2006.**

**Source:** U. S. State Department, Released by the U.S. Mission in the Netherlands,  
<http://www.state.gov/p/eur/rls/rm/72137.htm>



Thank you. It is a great pleasure to be here, and to be able to speak here at the Netherlands Atlantic Association.

I have spent all of my professional career working in one way or another with NATO, and with transatlantic security issues. I believe the connection between the United States and Europe forged after World War II – anchored on a common foundation of shared democratic values – is one of the most important and historic developments in the modern world. The implications of this development have been astounding – from freedom in the eastern half of Europe, to the rise of democracy around the world, to the continued rise of global prosperity.

I am especially honored to be speaking to you on September 12, five years and one day after the attacks on the United States of September 11, 2001. As we all know, on that day, thousands of innocent victims from over 90 countries, including the Netherlands, lost their lives.

Those attacks – and the many which preceded and followed them – have changed the world. As Secretary of State Rice said yesterday, the attackers know no boundaries, neither of territory nor of morality. These attacks, are attacks against us all.

And they present our generation with a challenge we did not seek, which is deeply complex, and which we must meet decisively. There is no other choice. As we have been reminded through pictures of those early days five years ago, the transatlantic community showed remarkable solidarity immediately after 9/11. And we have worked together to bring democracy, development and security to Afghanistan, where the 9/11 plots were hatched.

But over time, differences emerged. As America weighed the risk that weapons of mass destruction could reach the hands of terrorists, the United States began to become more concerned about Iraq. Europe was divided over war in Iraq, and thus the transatlantic community became divided. And though much has improved, that division continues to cast something of a shadow over the intense cooperation among democratic Allies we have today.

America has not suffered a major terrorist attack since 9/11, though the terrorists have tried. Europe has suffered attacks in Madrid, London, and Istanbul, for example, and has thwarted still other attacks – in the UK, Germany and elsewhere. And we must not be too Euro-centric: attacks in Bali, Amman, Sharm-el-Sheik and elsewhere have been just as deadly.

For the transatlantic community, most striking are the differences in the public perception of U.S. policy. Whereas the United States sees its efforts in the world as inextricably linked to supporting

**Information Resource Center, Embassy of the United States of America  
Madrid, Spain**

freedom, democracy, human rights, the rule of law, and security, globally, Europeans often view U.S. policy with suspicion. And the rhetoric from Europe can be strident.

As a policy official, I am used to leaping right into this kind of policy debate. But sadly, this kind of debate on policy often obscures the human issues that are really at stake.

Anniversaries are times to reflect on meaning. And as we approached the fifth anniversary of 9/11, I asked my colleagues working in the European Bureau of the State Department if they wished to share their recollections of that day, five years ago. Many responded, and let me read a few of them to you:

A colleague named Stephanie said, "My September 11 was spent in the Ferghana Valley of Uzbekistan speaking with a group of women whose husbands had been imprisoned for studying the Koran. I remember leaving the meeting worried about the future of these women and our driver then frantically telling us to get in the car because they were blowing up America. I looked at my colleague and we both laughed. I remember thinking "Is this really possible?" We drove to a hotel and found a working television. For all of the words and rumors we heard that evening it was the image of the World Trade Center falling that I believed. I realized then that U.S. diplomacy was going to undergo a major transformation and I wanted to be a part of it."

Jamal, now serving in Bishkek, wrote: "The tragic events that unfolded on September 11, 2001 occurred shortly after I graduated from college. As I sat there staring at the television screen for what seemed like an eternity, watching one horrific update proceed another, I realized right then and there that I needed to do something - anything - to ensure that no one would ever have to experience what the families of the 9/11 victims had and continue to endure. Believing that I had something to offer to the nation that had given so much to my family after immigrating to the United States from Iraq, I knew that I would be doing myself a disservice if I did not pursue a career in public service. Five years later, I'm doing just that... as a Political officer in Bishkek..."

Alex wrote in: "I was serving at the U.S. Mission to the United Nations on September 11, 2001. The first plane flew over me as I walked to work in mid-town; the second plane cashed into the tower just as I reached my 10th floor office. Our [secretary] had a brother who worked in one of the towers, and she was beside herself with worry for his safety. By the time I arrived, she had already failed to get through on his home, office and cell phones. As we were ordered out of the building, three of us walked her to a nearby corner, each calling one of his numbers over the din of passing sirens. After 10 minutes, she finally got through on his cell phone and discovered – mercifully – that he had overslept and was just driving on to the Brooklyn Bridge when the towers were struck. At that point, none of us understood yet the magnitude or the implications of what was going on a few miles south of us. We were simply relieved that this one family had escaped tragedy."

Dana wrote to me: "I was serving as the management officer and post security officer at U.S. Consulate Naples. Our consulate had been a potential target for attack for some time, and all summer long we thought that the terrorist attack warnings could potentially be aimed at us. We were on full alert for months. I was sitting at my desk working when a fellow Bostonian colleague, Claire, called me from the visa waiting room: "you are never going to believe this, but there was a terrible accident—a plane from Boston just crashed into the World Trade Center!" We got word from Washington that there could be other attacks but we didn't know where. I called my police and military contacts who immediately sent armored vehicles with .50 cal machine guns to guard our premises. We were fortified, protected by the Italians. The Chief of Police, the Carabinieri Generals, the Regional president, the Mayor and other officials all came to the Consulate to

express their deepest sympathy and complete disbelief at what had happened. Dozens of local Italians lined the Consulate gate with flowers and offered their condolences..."

My own 9/11 started with a walk into the Old Executive Office Building, part of the White House complex, where I had recently taken up duties at the National Security Council.

I remember the walk, because it was a beautiful fall day. The kind one remembers on the East Coast, after a hot and humid summer, and the air is cool and crisp, and the sky is bright and clear and blue. It was invigorating. Today, I am marked, because when I experience weather like, I always think of 9/11.

I had just moved to Washington from Brussels, so I was living in a temporary apartment, and our oldest child had just started school the previous day.

I arrived slightly late for the staff meeting, having helped get the kids ready in the morning. As I walked into the meeting, our secretary was watching the news, and the first tower was already burning. She said a plane had struck it, and I reported that to my colleagues as I walked in. The meeting went swiftly, and as we left, I glanced at the TV again and was able to watch live as the second plane struck. We were stunned.

But as a testament to how unprepared we were mentally for this kind of attack, we simply went back to work, wondering what this attack meant, and how we would deal with it. I then received an email, in red font, ordering us to evacuate the building immediately. Having just watched planes fly into buildings on TV, I did not hesitate, and as our office trooped down the stairs, I heard that another plane had hit the Pentagon.

But I still didn't get it. I knew I did not want to stand around on the sidewalk just outside the building – what if another plane did hit? So I decided to go across town to the Department of Motor Vehicles, because having just arrived in Washington, I still needed to register my car. My office was out of reach, so now was a good time to run an errand.

I got to the motor vehicle office, and they had closed and sent their employees home. And that's the first moment I realized that this was far bigger than I had at first understood. And we all have been on a learning curve ever since.

One of the things we have learned is the nature of the challenge that we face. This is more than a criminal act. It is an ideologically based assault – one that deliberately targets civilians on a massive scale – that is against freedom, tolerance, democracy, and all the values you and I share. And don't take it from me: that is what the terrorists say about themselves.

Given its history, the Netherlands, of all countries, knows that passivity in the face of determined violence against democratic values just doesn't work. Neutrality in those circumstances is an illusion.

Do not misunderstand me: I am not saying that we are in a clash of civilizations. Indeed, we believe our civilizations are united in a belief in human dignity, justice, tolerance, and peace. We face a number of determined, violent extremists who exploit Islam and the desperation of many people in the Islamic world – and even here in Europe – to justify their goals and their violent actions. This is an affront to Islam as much as it is to non-Islamic civilization. And we must reach out and work together with Muslims, Christians, Jews, Hindus, and all others who stand for civilization, tolerance, and peace.

To be sure, we need to counter the violent extremists. Given the attacks we face, military means are appropriate – for example, in Afghanistan, where military means are being deployed by the terrorists against the civilian population, against NATO forces, and against the Afghan government. Our job is to defend the population against those assaults, and to maintain a secure space so that democratic institutions and economic development can proceed.

We must also use intelligence, law enforcement, financial sanctions, and all other legal means at our disposal to fight these terrorists.

But something else we have learned along the way is that the real antidote to global terrorism in the long run is advancing the human condition: freedom, economic opportunity and prosperity, social integration, democracy, human rights, the rule of law, security. Military and law enforcement and judicial and financial means are all necessary against al Qaeda and other terrorist groups. But success will come only when the majority of moderate, peaceful citizens throughout the world insist on an end to violence, and a focus on building better societies.

One of the principal jobs of western governments must be to help empower these people, to help them gain their voice. These values are universal. They are captured in the UN Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Foreign policy may come and go. But there is something different about freedom, about free people choosing how to build their own society – that is lasting and significant.

This recognition of the long-term struggle of ideas – of freedom versus an imposed, violent ideology – is one reason why the President launched the Broader Middle East Initiative at the Sea Island G8 Summit in 2004. Taking account of EU's Euro-Med process and the United States' Middle East Partnership Initiative, the Broader Middle East Initiative embraces a positive vision of support for civil society, business, and political and economic development throughout that region.

I mentioned that the war in Iraq divided our community. And that is true. But there are three myths about the Iraq war I think it important to debunk:

First, the war in Iraq did not cause the global terrorism we see today. The attacks of September 11 took place before the war in Iraq. And that was the second attack on the World Trade Center. The first one, in 1993, failed. Colleagues of mine were killed by al Qaeda at U.S. Embassies in Africa in 1998. The U.S. Cole was bombed in 2000. The Taliban was running Afghanistan, and tens of thousands of terrorists had trained in facilities there, and returned to form cells in the Middle East, Asia, Europe and North America. These terrorists were plotting their attacks years and years ago. The war in Iraq did not create them.

Second, some people speak as though all the problems in the Middle East stem from the war in Iraq and American policy in the war on terror. Let me recall that the Middle East had suffered from violence, authoritarian governance, and conflict long before the war in Iraq. Syria occupied Lebanon. Hezbollah and Hamas openly supported terrorism and refused to recognize Israel's right to exist – as they still do today. Saddam Hussein was in power in Iraq. The Iran-Iraq war had claimed over a million lives. The Arab-Israeli conflict had gone on for years. The UN Human Development Reports, the first of which was issued in 2002, documented these and other challenges in the region. So yes, the war in Iraq has inflamed emotions, and violence has risen in the past few years. But the problems in the Middle East have origins well before the Iraq war: it did not cause them.

Third, the picture since the war in Iraq began is not uniformly negative. Syria withdrew from Lebanon. The Lebanese and the Palestinians held free elections. The Iraqis have agreed a democratic constitution, held free elections, and formed a government including Sunni, Shia and Kurd. Kuwaiti women have gained the right to vote. Elections are scheduled under new constitutions in some of the Gulf States next year. Taboos on open political debate are being eroded throughout the Broader Middle East. The Forum for the Future has become a vital forum for Arab civil society to speak with Arab, European, and the American government about its concerns.

Critics of the United States will argue that the problem with this vision of long-term democratic progress is that the United States has lost credibility, and is not adhering to its own values. First, this is an exaggeration, and I cannot stress enough the need to have a more balanced and serious discussion about the very difficult challenges we all face. But second, I want to point out some of the important decisions the President announced in his speech on September 6.

The significance of those decisions is that the President is squarely reaffirming that the United States stands as a nation of law.

Let me recap a few of the key elements of what the President said:

- All detainees have been transferred to DoD control, have been notified to the Red Cross, and the Red Cross has access to them. There are no detainees in CIA-run secret facilities anywhere.
- The President confirmed that Common Article 3 of the Geneva conventions indeed applies to these detainees.
- He affirmed again that the United States does not condone or conduct torture, nor cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment of detainees. This is a matter of policy, a matter of treaty obligation, and a matter of U.S. law. And it applies to U.S. personnel, civilian and military, at home and abroad.
- The President has made clear he intends to close the "legal gap." He is seeking legislation on military commissions consistent with the recent Supreme Court ruling. We will bring detainees to trial. And provided their home countries will accept them, not torture them, and where appropriate keep them guard or surveillance, we will return them. We hope to reach that point when the Guantanamo facility will be closed.
- We continue to face a longer term legal gap – between the application of civilian justice and the law of war. International terrorism does not neatly fit either category. And the President said he wants to work together with other nations to address the continuing, long-term challenge of handling terrorist detainees.

Given the significance of these decisions – the President moving to close the legal gap and give clear legally-binding assurances on treatment issues – I thought I would have seen European politicians patting themselves on the back for having pushed for decisions like this for some time. These are major decisions on the part of the President, and I would hope they would be reciprocated in Europe – by a renewed commitment to working together, based on our shared values, to meeting the terrorist challenge.

Instead, I have heard a media focus on the acknowledgement that secret facilities have existed, and even accusations that the United States misled Europe. This latter allegation is simply wrong. Secretary Rice was very clear in her comments last December before and during her visit to Europe: the United States adheres to its own laws; meets its international obligations; and respects

the sovereignty of others. The Secretary was asked specifically about secret sites, and said with great clarity that she would not comment on specific intelligence activities. She did, however, stress that intelligence cooperation with Allies is vital for the safety of our citizens.

And this is a critical point. The difference between law enforcement and intelligence is this. Law enforcement is for prosecuting individuals after a crime. Intelligence, however, is vital for preventing the crime from happening. And when the crime is bombs on 10 airliners out of London, or trains in Berlin, intelligence saves thousands of lives.

So we would hope to see greater, sober recognition from our allies that intelligence sharing is necessary for the safety of citizens around the world. And equally, a sober recognition that our current, international legal framework is not adequate for dealing with the kinds of challenges we face. Neither civilian law enforcement nor the laws of war are fully adequate for addressing a global terrorist network that has no state, no uniforms, and yet can inflict damage at the level of a state.

Underlying this hope is a recognition that it is critical that the transatlantic community remain united in facing common challenges. When divided, we are less effective, and we send a confusing signal to the world. But when the two pillars of our democratic, transatlantic community speak with one voice, based on our shared values, we provide a clarity and combined commitment that is greater than the sum of its parts.

In closing, let me say that five years after 9/11, we are better prepared to face the challenges in the world than we were before. We have learned a lot along the way. We see that we face not only determined groups of violent individuals – we face an ideology of extremist violence that we must overcome with a better, more positive vision of human development. And we know that to succeed in the long-term, the United States, and other democratic states throughout the world need to act together, based on our shared values. We have been doing this work for some time now, and we look forward to continuing to do so, together with our close friends in the Netherlands.

**4. NATO: A 21st Century Alliance That Is Delivering. Ambassador Victoria Nuland, U.S. Permanent Representative to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). Remarks at the Center for European Policy Studies (CEPS), Brussels, Belgium, October 30, 2006.**

Source: U.S. State Department, <http://www.state.gov/p/eur/rls/rm/75477.htm>

Thanks. It's great to be back at CEPS. I'm a long-time admirer of this organization and I particularly appreciate what CEPS is doing today to try to bring the two sides of Brussels together -- NATO and the EU. It sometimes seems harder to do that here in Brussels than it is in places like Afghanistan.

I'm also delighted to see so many colleagues and friends here including a number of NATO partner Ambassadors as we look to expand NATO partnerships at our Riga Summit in November.

I thought I would start today with a little quiz. This is a quiz for all of you. It's a geography quiz. What do the following places have in common? Panjwai, Ar-Rustamiyah, Bagh, Leposavic, El Fashir, and Little Rock, Arkansas. Anybody know? I don't see any hands. All of these places are places where NATO has deployed within the last 18 months. Fifty thousand soldiers operating in the last 18 months on four continents around the world. This is NATO delivering 21<sup>st</sup> century security in defense of our members' values, in our operations, in our training missions, in our humanitarian relief operations. We do it on the basis of the political unity that the 26 allies bring to the table and based on our common understanding that if you want to be safe at home, you better be ready to deliver security and security training out there, and make an investment in it.

Not every ally is doing everything, but all allies are doing a lot, and doing it together makes it possible for every one of us to do more than any of us would be able to do individually. That's why we entitled today's talk, "NATO, a 21<sup>st</sup> Century Alliance That Is Delivering."

It's no secret that ever since President Bush came here in February '05, the U.S. has had a very, very ambitious agenda here in Brussels. As President Bush made clear then, we want the strongest possible NATO, we want the strongest possible EU, and we want the strongest possible NATO-EU relationship.

I'm going to leave it to my colleague Boyden Gray down at USEU to talk about how we are working on our U.S.-EU relationship, but today I wanted to talk to you about our ambitions for NATO.

Let's start with a little walk down memory lane. Just remember three years ago today that most of the pundits in this room would have said of NATO "Out of area, or Out of business." There were other folks in this town and elsewhere saying things like, "Americans are from Mars and Europeans are from Venus." [Laughter]. Who could that guy possibly have been? And I hope he made a lot of money on that comment. [Laughter].

And in some quarters Americans were perceived as Martians when a year ago we started rolling out an extremely ambitious agenda for NATO's Summit in Riga that will take place in just four weeks. We wanted, and we still want, NATO to be able to demonstrate, when our Heads [of State] meet four weeks from now, that we have an alliance that is taking on global responsibilities, that it

increasingly has the global capabilities to meet those challenges, and that is doing it in concert with global partners. We wanted to demonstrate an alliance that was stronger politically, stronger operationally, and stronger as a global trainer.

Very, very quickly, just to recap, in political terms we wanted to expand the strategic dialogue among Allies. We wanted to get back to a time where at that round table where Allies meet, the conversation isn't only about Afghanistan or Kosovo where we are deployed, it is about all of the challenges that our leaders face in security terms. Allies should use the NATO table to strengthen our political approach and to talk about the tools that we had to bring to today's challenges.

We've done that, I think, over the last year where at NATO Headquarters we've talked about Iran at the Foreign Minister level; we've talked about energy security with experts; we've had Africa experts in to talk about the broader challenges we face there. We've recently released statements on the North Korean nuclear threat. So the dialogue is getting broader.

We also wanted to strengthen our relationship with partners. NATO has for more than a decade had good relations with our partners in the Euro-Atlantic space, but increasingly today's missions require that we work well with nations around the world, particularly countries who share our values and are willing to commit and to work with us in our missions and in our efforts to combat today's threats.

Third, on the political side we wanted to reaffirm NATO's open door. At a time when many Europeans are questioning the limits of Europe, from an American perspective, NATO's role as a mentor and magnet for change and positive democratic reform throughout the transatlantic space has been one of its greatest exports. It is absolutely essential that we keep that door open, and that we continue to work with those countries who aspire to meet NATO's performance-based standards for membership.

On the operational side, what have we wanted? We have wanted since Prague to be able to meet that declaration that Heads made that we would be able to go wherever and whenever the threat confronted us, and that we would have the capability to do it when allies agreed that NATO was the instrument. We wanted to be funded and enabled and ready to go.

From a US perspective, we also wanted to strengthen NATO's role as a security trainer. We have always done well training our own, but increasingly in today's world it's important to be able to export security training to those countries who are willing but fragile in their effort to meet their internal security challenges.

So as you look around the Alliance today, in addition to our operations, we are also training the next generation of military officers in Iraq. We are training the Afghan National Army in Afghanistan. Our operation in Darfur is essentially a training mission for African Union forces.

So where are we today as we head towards Riga? For the next four weeks, Allies are going to spend a lot of time arm and mud wrestling about the words that we use in our NATO documents, our communiqués – many of you have been there on the EU side; I see heads nodding – to reflect today's reality. It's going to be an intense conversation as we head towards Riga.

But today, I would argue that the reality of what's going on in NATO is outstripping our ability to encapsulate it in NATO doctrine, in theory, here at NATO Headquarters. It's outstripping theory, most importantly, where it counts in Afghanistan, NATO's most challenging and most important undertaking.

I wanted to spend a couple of minutes before we go to questions talking about Afghanistan and what it means for NATO, what it means for transformation of the Alliance's approach to 21<sup>st</sup> century security and what it means about our ability to work together as 26 – and as 26 with partners – in defense of our common security and values.

First of all, as I said, if three years ago we were talking about NATO "Out of area or out of business," today 26 Allies and 11 Partners are bringing stability to nearly 30 million Afghans all across that country. Who would have thought that we would have made this long term commitment? Who would have thought we would be working throughout Afghanistan? And equally importantly, who would have thought that countries like Australia, New Zealand, Albania, Croatia, and Macedonia, would be NATO troop contributing countries today?

So as we struggle at NATO Headquarters to reflect in communiqué language our new, more flexible partnership concept, remember that global partnership is a reality and "out of area" is a reality today in Afghanistan.

Similarly, we've had a lot of doctrinal debates and discussion at NATO Headquarters about our ability as a political-military organization to work effectively with the other great international organizations – the UN, the EU, and the African Union as well, and to work well with development providers in common effort on the ground where we're operational.

As we struggle at NATO Headquarters to reflect the importance of what we call "concerted planning and action" – military and civilians working well together in theater – remember that in Afghanistan all of us know that there is no security without development and no development without security. And it is a reality that NATO is working increasingly effectively with the EU and with the UN there.

So as you watch us struggle with the words, remember that we are now doing it on the ground in Afghanistan – we're also doing it in Kosovo – and that is far more important.

The next thing is military capabilities. For years if not decades, Americans have stressed to Europeans the importance of being ready for the high-end of military engagement, that Europeans needed to invest more in strategic enablers. But all of our hectoring did not have as much success with Europeans as the reality of their service in Afghanistan has had. What do I mean by that?

At Riga, 14 Allies and Sweden will buy three or more C-17 aircraft together, because all of us have realized that if you want to get to Afghanistan, if you want to sustain your troops, you need strategic lift. How many times in Brussels, whether it's down in Evere or whether it's here closer to the EU, have we all said we need strategic lift, and how hard has it been to get it? Today we are buying it because we need it for Afghanistan, and if we have it for Afghanistan, ladies and gentlemen, we will also have it for the EU missions of the future, for the UN missions of the future, for national needs and for coalition operations.

That is what your Alliance can do today. It can provide a platform for Allies to work together to meet common needs, and in the process, strengthen all of us.

Similarly, we have talked for a long time about Special Forces and the particular role that they play in 21<sup>st</sup> century operations. Today at NATO, we're working on a Special Forces initiative. It would have been impossible five years ago, but because of the reality of working in Afghanistan, because so many of our Special Forces are working together there, we have proven the point that we need

to be able to do it more seamlessly. We need to train together. We need to be able to communicate with each other. We need common operating procedures.

So today, again, Afghanistan has ensured that we are doing better in reality than we are doing in theory.

Similarly training: today in Afghanistan we are embedding trainers with the Afghan National Army. We're doing it not simply because it is our exit strategy. We are doing it because we need partners in today's fight. When we embed with the ANA, we ensure that they work seamlessly with us as they did in NATO's recent combat operation in Panjwai where you had eight Allies working together with two battalions of Afghan National Army. That's 21<sup>st</sup> Century NATO working together and working well with partners and with the countries where we are deployed.

But there's also some bad news that Afghanistan has exposed and highlighted. Number one here is the fact that all of us, all 26 Allies are stretched when you look at our security forces. There is not a single ally who is not working hard to maintain operational tempo out there in the world, my own country included.

What does this mean? What it means is that collectively we are not spending enough on defense and security and we're going to have to spend more if we're going to maintain the operational tempo and meet the security commitments that we have made to each other and made around the world, not just as allies, but as members of the international community.

Whether you're talking about meeting our NATO commitments in Afghanistan or Kosovo, whether you're talking about meeting EU commitments in Congo and Bosnia, whether you're talking about international commitments like Iraq for those of us who are there, or Lebanon for those of you who are there. Most Allies are stretched by all that we have to do in the world. When you look at defense spending, if you take the United States out of the equation – we spend some 3.7 percent of GDP on defense now, higher depending upon how you calculate – the rest of the Allies combined only spend 1.8 percent of GDP and only seven Allies today are meeting NATO's unofficial floor of 2 percent of GDP on defense spending.

Why? Because so many of us took a peace dividend at the end of the Cold War. There were good reasons for that. But today as we look around the world, and we look at all we are trying to do together as Allies and Partners who share values, who share a commitment to common security, and who understand that if we don't do it out there it's going to come here, we need to increase our investment.

We also need to ensure that we maintain our commitment and our solidarity to each other. That means in Afghanistan and elsewhere ensuring that when we agree to deploy troops, they are as flexible and open and caveat-free as possible so that we can help each other in extremis.

Ladies and gentlemen, we're living in complex times. As President Bush said on Friday in the Oval Office when he met with NATO Secretary General de Hoop Scheffer, "The real challenge for the future is to help people of moderation and young democracies succeed in the face of threats and attacks by radicals and extremists."

I would argue that NATO today is delivering this kind of 21<sup>st</sup> century security. We're doing it in Afghanistan, we're doing it in Kosovo, we're doing it with our training mission in Iraq, with our support for the African Union in Darfur. Why are we doing it? Because it's in our own interest to strengthen those parts of the world and ensure that what's going on out there doesn't come here.

But this is hard, expensive work which requires a long-term, sustained commitment and resources. I'm confident that when NATO Heads of State and Government meet in Riga in just four weeks, they are going to highlight and salute how far NATO has come, how much it is delivering today, but also redouble their commitment to each other and to all of the folks out there who are counting on us to deliver security and peace, and ensure that we are sufficiently invested in the missions that we're engaged in.

Thanks very much.

**This page intentionally left blank**

## 5. Selected Web Sites.



- **U. S. Mission to NATO: Riga Summit**  
<http://nato.usmission.gov/>

The U. S. Mission works everyday with the 18 North American and European allies to ensure joint security through political and military cooperation. It also promotes Euro-Atlantic stability with the NATO Partnership for Peace program, the Strategic Partnership with Ukraine and through a continuing security dialogue with Russia.



- **USINFO Web Page on the United States and NATO**  
[http://usinfo.state.gov/is/international\\_security/nato.html](http://usinfo.state.gov/is/international_security/nato.html)

USINFO delivers information about current U.S. foreign policy and about American life and culture. This site is produced and maintained by the U.S. Department of State's Bureau of International Information Programs.



- **NATO Site on Riga Summit**  
<http://www.nato.int/docu/comm/2006/0611-riga/index.htm>

This is the official NATO web site on the Riga Summit.



*The Information Resource Center*

**Embassy of the United States of America**

**<http://www.embusa.es/irc>**

**November 21<sup>st</sup> 2006**